

BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

:: Present ::

C. Ramakrishna

Date: 27-05-2014

Appeal No. 108 of 2013

Between

Sri. S. A. Alexander, Plot No. 94, Railway Colony, Beside Maa Santoshi Colony,
Bolaram, Secunderabad

... Appellant

And

1. The Assistant Engineer, Operation, Bolaram, APCPDCL, Secunderabad
2. The Asst. Divisional Engineer, Operation, Lal Bazaar, APCPDCL,
Secunderabad
3. The Asst. Accounts Officer, ERO, Bowenpally, APCPDCL, Secunderabad

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 23-10-2013 has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 20-05-2014 at Hyderabad. The appellant, as well as respondents 1 to 3 above were present. Having considered the appeal, the written and oral submissions made by the appellant and the respondents, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following:

AWARD

2. The appeal arose out of the grievance of the appellant that he is getting exorbitant electricity bills and that the CGRF had not considered his complaint favourably.

3. On 23-10-2013, the appellant filed the appeal stating that his single phase LT service connection was converted into a 3 phase connection in the year 2011; that in August 2013 he received an exorbitant bill to the tune of Rs. 5,191/-; that even during peak summers this much of amount was not charged; that in the month of July, 2013 the amount charged was Rs. 2,929/-; that in the month of July he went out on vacation in the last week of July and returned on 6th of August, 2013; that the season being monsoon season there is no reason for him to have consumed electricity for his air conditioners; that his appeal to the CGRF on the matter did not give him any relief; that on 15-09-2013, the respondent AE installed a new HPL meter whose reading taken on 20-10-2013 has correctly reflected a bill of Rs. 981/-; that the enumerator had withheld this bill without serving it on him; and that because of this he came to the conclusion that he was supplied with a faulty 3 phase meter for all these years and had to pay bills beyond his legitimate consumption.

4. The respondents were served with a notice for hearing the case, directing them to submit their written submissions, if any, duly serving copies of the same on the appellant. The respondent ADE filed written submissions on 03-04-2014 stating that the consumer appellant had approached the respondent AE on 13-08-2013 to check his meter and revise the abnormal bill received by him; that as per the consumer's representation, the respondent AE had inspected the premises of the consumer and found that the meter was not

creeping and that the consumer had a total connected load of 6,520 W; that the meter of the consumer was tested in the presence of the consumer in the MRT lab; that the consumption pattern recorded in the new meter that was fixed in October 2013, was not much different from the pattern recorded by the old meter also; that the comparison of the consumption pattern with a similar period in the previous year did not reveal any abnormality; that hence the bills being served on the consumer are in order and commensurate with the connected load and consumption pattern of the consumer.

5. During the course of the hearing on 04-04-2014, the appellant was categorical in stating that many of his neighbouring services were having connected loads and consumption pattern that is similar to his and pleaded that a test check of a couple of services would reveal that he is being billed abnormally. Having seen that the version of the respondent officers is unassailable, and in view of the fervent pleading of the appellant, it was considered fit and proper to order for a test check of at least two of the neighbouring services of the appellant herein. The respondent offices were ordered in the hearing that a test check of two of the neighbouring service connections, as pointed out by the appellant, can be taken up to verify whether or not the fervent appeal being made by the appellant herein holds substance.

6. The respondent ADE submitted a report dated 16-05-2014 stating that the services of two of the neighbours were inspected as per the instructions of this authority and it was found that there is no abnormality in the consumption pattern recorded by those services and the bills being raised on them. As both the neighbouring services were having more connected load than what was contracted for, he reported that notices for development charges were issued

and levied. Further he submitted the record of the two service connections for perusal. A perusal of the records revealed that the consumption being recorded by the appellant has been consistently on the high side when compared with the consumption recorded by his neighbours. Thus it appears that there is no substance in the pleading being made by the appellant that he is getting abnormal bills when compared with his neighbours having similar consumption pattern and connected loads.

7. The CGRF noted in its order that the respondents have issued the bills as per the consumption recorded in the meter. Going by the record of the appellant and the record of his neighbours, this authority also comes to the same conclusion. There appears to be nothing wrong with either the meter or the billing. Therefore, the appeal filed by the appellant herein is dismissed.

8. This order is corrected and signed on this 27th day of May, 2014.

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

To

1. Sri. S. A. Alexander, Plot No. 94, Railway Colony, Beside Maa Santoshi Colony, Bolaram, Secunderabad
2. The Assistant Engineer, Operation, Bolaram, APCPDCL, Secunderabad
3. The Asst. Divisional Engineer, Operation, Lal Bazaar, APCPDCL, Secunderabad
4. The Asst. Accounts Officer, ERO, Bowenpally, APCPDCL, Secunderabad

Copy to:

5. The Chairperson, CGRF-2 (Greater Hyderabad Area), APCPDCL, H. No. 8-3-167/E/1, CPTI, GTS Colony, Vengal Rao Nagar Colony, Erragadda, Hyderabad - 500 045.
6. The Secretary, APERC, 11-4-660, 5th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad - 500 004.