

**PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LIMITED
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF GRIEVANCES OF CONSUMERS
P-1 WHITE HOUSE, RAJPURA COLONY, PATIALA
PHONE: 0175-2214909; FAX : 0175-2215908**

Case No.: CG-101 of 2013

Instituted on: 08.08.2013

Closed on: 26.09.2013

**Sh. Raj Kumar Khanna,
1730, Phase-7,
Mohali.**

.... Appellant

Name of the Op. Division: Mohali

A/c No. UF-86/700

Through

Sh. Raj Kumar Khanna, PR

V/s

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD.Respondent

Through

Er. A.K.Sharma, ASE/Op. Divn. Mohali.

BRIEF HISTORY

Petition No. CG-101 of 2013 was filed against order dated 21.05.2013 of CDSC Mohali, deciding that the amount charged to the consumer is correct and recoverable.

The consumer is having DS category connection with sanctioned load of 14.94 KW, operating under Commercial S/D, Mohali.

The consumer was served a bill-cum-notice in 10/2012, for the period 28.06.2012 to 24.09.2012 (88 days) for consumption of 17531 units, amounting to Rs.1,16,649/-. The consumer deposited

Rs. 15,000/- on 24.09.2012 and challenged the energy meter. The energy meter was replaced on dated 04.10.2012, vide MCO No. 100000103422 dated 25.09.2012. The energy meter was sent to ME lab for testing, where accuracy of the meter was declared OK, as per report No.5 dated 01.01.2013. The energy bill for the period 24.09.2012 to 01.03.2013 was issued for consumption of 4801 units (2116 units consumption of old meter + 2685 units of new meter), amounting to Rs. 31731/-. Thus total amount of the energy bill issued in 03/2013 became Rs.1,35,870/- including the previous unpaid balance of Rs.1,04,139/-. The consumer referred his disputed case amounting to Rs. 1,35,870/-, for review by CDSC, Mohali.

CDSC heard the case on 21.05.2013 and decided that amount charged to the consumer is correct and recoverable.

Being not satisfied with the decision of CDSC, the consumer made an appeal in the Forum. Forum heard the case on 22.08.2013, 09.09.2013, 12.09.2013 and finally on 26.09.2013. Then the case was closed for passing speaking orders.

Proceedings:

PR contended that the bill for the period 28.06.2012 to 24.09.2012 and 24.09.2012 to 01.03.2013 have been received abnormally. The consumption in the first bill has been worked out as 5976 units per month. In the second bill the consumption for the period 24.09.2012 to 4.10.2012 have been found to be 2116 units for 10 days, which worked out as 6348 units per month. Such an abnormal consumption have not been found neither in the past 4 years and nor in the present, after the change of meter on

04.10.2012. After the change of meter the consumption of the new meter have been found to be 544 units per month i.e. consumption of 2685 units for 148 days from 24.09.2012 to 01.03.2013. Maximum consumption during the 5 years mentioned in the table attach in the reply has been found to be 1563 units per month of the corresponding period. As such there is no comparison between the consumption of the challenged bill and the previous / presentation.

The decision conveyed by the SE level Committee has referred the maximum consumption from 21.06.2011 to 20.08.2011 as the base of the decision. The consumption during the said period has been found to be 1520 units per month. The Second point referred in the decision was the consumption 2685 units for the period of 05.10.2012 to 01.03.2013 i.e. for the period 148 days which works out as 544 units per month &, in both the above said reference there is no comparison of the said consumption with the challenged consumption of both the bills which are 5976 units and 6348 units per month respectively.

Keeping in view the above facts the bills for the disputed period from 28.06.2012 to 24.09.2012, 24.09.2012 to 01.03.2013 may kindly be revised keeping in view the consumption in the past and the present.

PSPCL contended that consumer has challenged the meter due to High consumption, which is billed in the month of 09/12. The meter has been replaced by MCO No. 100000103422 dated 25.09.2012 effected on 04.10.2012. The meter was got checked from ME Ropar on dated 01.01.2013 and its accuracy found to be OK as per ME report no. 05 dated 01.01.2013. After going through the consumption for the period of last three years, the

consumption from 21.06.2011 to 20.08.2011 the consumption is 3039 for 60 days and this is consumption for summer period. The consumption for the bill 01.03.2013 is 2685 units for 116 days and this is period of winter season. Keeping in view the above facts the consumption for the period 01.03.2013 seems to be normal and the bill for the period 28.06.2012 to 24.09.2012, 24.09.2012 to 01.03.2013 is chargeable.

PR further contended that the bill dated 01.03.2013 also includes the consumption of 2116 units of the old meter w.e.f. 24.09.2012 to 04.10.2012 i.e. for 10 days only, which work out as 6348 units per month that too for the winter season. Besides the consumption of 2685 units of the new meter w.e.f. 04.10-.2012 to 01.03.2013 have been billed. As such the said bill also needs to be corrected besides the bill dated 24.09.2012. The consumption from 06/2011 to 08/2011 has also no comparison with the challenged consumption.

Observations of the Forum:

After the perusal of petition, reply, written arguments, proceedings, oral discussions and record made available to the Forum, Forum observed as under:-

The normal consumption of the consumer during summer period (April to September) is in the range of 2500-3000 units per bi-monthly & during winter period (October to March), it is 1000-1500 units per bi-monthly. The consumption of the petitioner is very consistent and comparable with the previous corresponding period, from the year 2009 onwards. The energy bill issued to the consumer for the period 28.06.2012 to 24.09.2012 for 17531 units is very much on the higher side, keeping in view the fact that connected load of the consumer is only 14.940 KW. The energy

meter of the petitioner was replaced on 04.10.2012. The consumption for the period 24.09.2012 to 04.10.2012 (10 days) is 2116 units, which is also abnormal. Thus the behaviour of the energy meter during the period 28.06.2012 to 04.10.2012 might be erratic.

The major contention put forth by the petitioner is that the consumption of about 6000 units per month has been recorded during the disputed period but such a high consumption was never recorded before or after the replacement of meter.

PSPCL contended that accuracy of the meter was declared OK in ME Lab and consumption recorded during the period 28.06.2012 to 04.10.2012 seems to be normal.

The Forum find merit in the submission of the petitioner that consumption during the period 28.06.2012 to 04.10.2012 is abnormal and behaviour of the energy meter during this period appears to be erratic. Although the accuracy of the meter was declared OK, but in such like cases jumping of reading of the meter cannot be ascertained in ME Lab. Therefore, the Forum is of the view that account of the consumer for the disputed period is required to be overhauled on the basis of consumption of corresponding period of previous year.

Decision:-

Keeping in view the petition, reply, written arguments, oral discussions, and after hearing both the parties, verifying the record produced by them, Forum decides:

- That the account of the consumer for the period 28.06.2012 to 04.10.2012 be overhauled on the basis of consumption recorded during the corresponding period of previous year.

- That the balance amount recoverable/refundable, if any, be recovered/refunded from/to the consumer along-with interest/surcharge as per instructions of PSPCL.
- As required under Section 19(1) & 19(1A) of Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum & Ombudsman) Regulation-2005, the implementation of this decision may be intimated to this office within 30 days from the date of receipt of this letter.

(Rajinder Singh)
CAO/Member

(K.S. Grewal)
Member/Independent

(Er. Ashok Goyal)
EIC/Chairman

