

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

**Appeal No: CG-98 of 2013**

**Instituted On: 01.08.2013**

**Closed On: 12.09.2013**

**Sh.Chander Parkash  
Street No.3, Janta Nagar  
Back side A.T.I. College,  
Ludhiana.**

**.....Appellant**

**Name of Op/Division: Janta Nagar (Spl.) Ludhiana.**

**A/c No.: W-21/JM-15-0028/T**

**Through**

**Sh. Dinesh, PR**

**V/s**

**PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD .....Respondent**

**Through**

**Er. Kuldeep Singh, ASE/Op. Janta Nagar (Spl.) Divn. Ludhiana.**

**BRIEF HISTORY**

**Petition No. CG- 98 of 2013 was filed against order dated 29.09.2012 of CDSC West Circle, deciding that the amount charged to the consumer is correct and recoverable.**

**The consumer is having NRS category connection with sanctioned load of 28.98 KW, operating under Janta Nagar ,Unit-I Ludhiana.**

The consumer was served a bill-cum-notice for 13815 units amounting to Rs. 73,078/- for the month of 08/2011. The consumer challenged the working of the meter. The meter was checked by Enforcement-3, Ludhiana on 08.08.2011 and DDL was also taken. The meter was changed vide MCO No. W-21/M/11/84089/1755 dated 08.08.2011. On the basis of DDL report Rs. 73,078/- were refunded to the consumer through sundry item No. 08/31/356. The disputed meter was sent to ME lab for testing where the results of the meter were found within limits.

On the basis of ME report dated 24.08.2011, audit wing re-charged the amount of Rs. 73,078/- vide half margin No.7 dated 25.10.2011.

A supplementary bill- cum- notice was served to the consumer for Rs.73,078/-. The consumer did not agree with the supplementary bill and approached CDSC, West Circle, Ldh. for review of his case. The consumer deposited Rs.14,615/- on dated 19.04.2012 i.e. 20% of the disputed amount.

The CDSC heard the case on 20.09.2012 and decided that the amount charged to the consumer is correct and recoverable.

Being not satisfied the decision of CDSC the consumer filed an appeal before the forum. Forum heard the case in its proceedings held on 20.08.2013, 27.08.2013, 03.09.2013 and finally on 12.09.2013. Then the case was closed for passing speaking orders.

#### **Proceedings:-**

PR contended that the monthly consumption is about 4000 to 5000 units per month, even before & after the change of the energy meter. It is only during Aug. 2011 that such abnormal consumption of 13815 KWH shown by meter which was incorrect

as meter actually jumped. The half margin on the basis of which the amount of Rs. 73078/- has again been charged has been prepared on assumption basis supposing that there may be variation in DDL data. This basis is totally incorrect and do not qualify to again charge the refund already given correctly to me.

PSPCL contended that we have the print-out up to 08.08.2011, regarding abnormal consumption on or after that, the question is hypothetical as per the print, meter did not jump up to 08.08.2011. The DDL print was taken on 08.08.2011, and the print out suggests that the meter have not jumped at least for the period 30.05.2011 to 08.08.2011.

Forum asked PSPCL to justify the higher consumption billed recorded specifically during Aug. 2011.

PSPCL: I have no record to justify as to why the consumption has been more for the period, since the meter is in the consumer premises & I can only talk on the basis of DDL print out.

**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 consumption of the consumer from the year 2009 till date is very consistent and in the range of 4300 to 5400 units per month. The consumption recorded in 8/2011 for 13815 units is very much on the higher side, keeping in view the consumption before and after the replacement of disputed energy meter. The DDL taken by ASE/Enf. on dated 08.08.2011 is not complete, it does not include

reading survey/date wise consumption from the energy meter, to ascertain the factual position regarding jumping of reading of the meter, if any.

The consumer contended that his monthly consumption is about 4000 to 5000 units per month, before the change of the meter as well as after the change of energy meter. the energy consumption of 13015 kwh shown by meter during Aug.2011 is incorrect which may be due to meter reading jumping.

PSPCL contended that the print out dated 08.08.2011 suggest that the meter have not jumped at least for the period of 30.05.2011 to 08.08.2011.

Forum observed that the consumption of 13815 units in one month is not possible with the sanctioned load of 29.98 KW and keeping in view, previous consumption record of the consumer. Although from the load survey data PSPCL has made clear that jumping of reading is not evident during the period 30.05.2011 to 08.08.2011 but at the same time it could not justify huge consumption of 13815 units in one month. Thus Forum is of the view that it is doubtful case of jumping of reading of the meter, as the same could not be established from the incomplete DDL report. The highest consumption recorded from the year 2009 onwards is 5421 units in 08/2009. Therefore, Forum is of the view that revising the bill of 08/2011 on the basis of highest consumption recorded during the previous 3-4 years is justified.

**Decision:-**

Keeping in view the petition, reply, written arguments, oral discussions, and after hearing both the parties, verifying the

record produced by them and observations of Forum, Forum decides:

- That the amount of the consumer for the month of 08/2011 be overhauled on the basis of consumption 5421 units recorded during the month of 08/2009.
- 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