

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN
O/o: ANDHRA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
4th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad – 500 004

Present

K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu
Vidyut Ombudsman

Dated: 05-06-2012

Appeal No. 22 of 2012

Between

Sri. Harikishan Karwa,
20-2-366 / 1, Old Kabutarkhana,
Hyderabad – 500 064.

... Appellant

And

1. Assistant Engineer / Operation / Hussaini Alam / APCPDCL / Hyderabad
2. Assistant Divisional Engineer / Operation / Charminar / APCPDCL/ Hyderabad
3. Asst. Accounts Officer / ERO / Salarjung Road / APCPDCL / Hyderabad
4. Divisional Engineer / Operation/APCPDCL / Anantapur
5. Superintending Engineer / Operation / Charminar / APCPDCL/Hyderabad

....Respondents

The appeal / representation received by this authority on 28.03.2012 against the CGRF order of APCPDCL in C.G. No. 237 / 2011-12 / Hyderabad South Circle / Dt. 03.03.2012. The same has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 30.05.2012. Sri. Harikishan Karwa, appellant present. Sri. P. Anil AAO / Charminar on behalf of respondents present, heard and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed / issued the following:

AWARD

The petitioner filed complaint before the CGRF against the Respondents for Redressal of his Grievances. In the complaint he has mentioned about his grievances as hereunder:

“It is due to faulty meter & other factors exorbitant bill raised in respect of S.C.No.M2002151 in July, 2011 for Rs.29, 255.00. And on complaint, the defective

meter was changed on 17.11.2011 with meter reading 77781 but the bill was not rectified till date.

In respect of S.C.No.M2001411, an exorbitant bill for Rs.17444.00 was issued in September and October, 2011. On complaint, the faulty meter was changed on 27.10.2011 with meter reading 12166, but the bill was not rectified.

For the S.C.No.M2001086, abnormal bill for Rs.10, 199.00 was issued. So far no action has been taken to rectify the same.

In view of the above, it is requested to rectify the bills issued in respect of the three service connections at an early date”.

2. The second respondent, A.D.E/O/Charminar/Hyderabad furnished written submissions vide Lr.No.1772 dt.01.02.2012 wherein he stated as follows:

- 1. The consumer has three numbers services with S.C.No.M2001086, M2001411 and M2002151.*
- 2. On inspection of the service, it is found meters working normal and standards of meters are as per APCPDCL norms.*
- 3. The bills issued to the consumer are with low power factor penalty for maintaining the minimum power factor.*
- 4. The same has been informed to the consumer, Sri Hari Kishan Karwa, to maintain power factor up to unity to avoid Low Power Factor Surcharge.*
- 5. There is no excess billing.*
- 6. Hence, the meters and billing for the consumption is correct.*

3. After hearing both sides and after considering the material on record the Forum passed the following order.

“The Respondents are directed to revise the bill of the Consumer S.C.No.M2001086 duly taking the Multiplying Factor as 1 for the period from 15.02.2008 to till date and the amount arrived on such revision may be shown as advance payment till the credit exhausts.

The complaint is disposed off accordingly”.

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that the meter was changed on 18.06.2005. It was also mentioned that it was on their panel board and he requested for revision of the bills from 18.06.2005 onwards.

5. Now the point for consideration is, whether the impugned order is liable to be set aside by ordering refund from 18.06.2005?

6. The appellant appeared before this authority and categorically stated that the department has not considered his request for revision of the assessment from 18.06.2005 in spite of his request, but they have given only with effect from 15.02.2008 and the impugned order is to be modified as pointed out by him. The respondent represented by Anil, AAO categorically stated that the bills were revised in SC No. 1086, with effect from 15.02.2008 and an amount of Rs. 1,16,794 was given credit and the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

7. The meter of the consumer for SC No. 1086 was changed on 15.02.2008 with MF (1) but bills were issued wrongly under MF (2). Though the claim was made for two more service numbers i.e. SC Nos. 1411 and 2151 but he did not claim anything on those two numbers but claimed only against 1086 those. On those two service connections he was charged on the ground that he did not maintain power factor of 0.99 as per L.T. agreement due to which KVAH units were increased. As there was no claim on those SCs there is no need for this authority to discuss about the same.

8. The petitioner has claimed revision of bills from 2005 onwards against S.C No. 1086. Infact, the said claim for revision is barred by limitation, as the claim has to be made with in 3 years. The meter was changed on 08.06.2005 at the first instance. Again the meter was changed on 15.02.2008 and the bills were revised as they were charged under MF (2) instead of MF (1) with effect from 15.02.2008 but not from 08.06.2005. It is a lapse on the part of the department. This aspect has been rightly observed by the Forum and revised the same with effect from 15.02.2008. In the light of the above said discussion I do not find any merits in the appeal preferred by the appellant.

9. In the result the appeal is dismissed. No order as to costs.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 5th June, 2012

Sd/-
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN