

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: 31-08-2012

Appeal No. 31 of 2012

Between
Sri. K.A. Lakshmana Rao,
C/o. PTG RAJ Towers,
D.No. G-8, Rebalavari Street,
Stone House Peta,
Nellore Town & Post Office,
Nellore Dist.

... Appellant

And

1. Assistant Accounts Officer / ERO / Town – II / APSPDCL / Nellore
2. Asst. Engineer / Stone House Peta / APSPDCL / Nellore
3. Asst. Divisional Engineer / Operation / Town – II / APSPDCL / Nellore
4. Senior Accounts Officer / Operation / APSPDCL / Nellore

....Respondents

The appeal / representation dated 28.03.2012 received by this authority on 03.04.2012 against the CGRF order of APSPDCL in C.G. No. 367 / 2011-12 Nellore Circle Dt.22.03.2012. The same has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 31.05.2012. No representation on behalf of the appellant. Sri. P. Vinod Kumar, Sri. A. Jaya Raju, Advocates filed Vakalat on behalf of the respondents. Heard the counsel for the respondents and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed / issued the following :

AWARD

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

- i) *The meter of their house service bearing SCNo: 3321301127407 is recording excess reading by running fast and the bills are also received on high side for the months from May to September 2011.*
- ii) *He made a complaint to the AE for replacement of the meter and the meter was replaced in October 2011.*
- iii) *Soon after replacement of the meter, the reading has become normal and is around 100 units for the months October to December 2011.*
- iv) *The meter was tested at MRT lab on 4-11-2011 where in it was declared **meter found OK.***
- v) *They have not resided in the house in the months of June and July 2011 and hence the bills shall be minimum.*
- vi) *He is 70 years old and a retired employee.*
- vii) *Requested for refund of the reasonable amounts at the earliest as he had already paid for the excess reading for the months from May 2011 to September 2011.*

2. The respondent-1 i.e. the Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Town-2/Nellore filed his written submissions as hereunder :

- i) *The consumption in summer season will be more when compared to winter, hence they cannot compare the consumptions as compared by the consumer in his representation.*
- ii) *The consumer is having a connected load of 3580 watts as per the letter submitted by the AE/O/Stone Housepeta.*
- iii) *The MRT test record also shown that the meter performance is satisfactory.*
- iv) *While observing the reading pattern from 6/2011 to 10/2011 there is no huge difference in the units showing signs of meter creeping as mentioned by the consumer in his representation.*

3. In view of the above, material on record, the Forum passed the following order.

There is no need to revise any of the bills as requested by the complainant.

Accordingly the case is disallowed and disposed off.

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant filed the above said appeal narrating the following grounds.

5. The consumption in summer season will be more than compared to winter is not fully correct. The consumption for the previous years have not exceeded more than 200 units. Whereas in the month of May to September, the reading is 800 to 1171 though only two senior citizens are residing in the house. He has got only table light, one Fan, one TV and a washing machine. The order of the Forum is biased and partial favoring the electricity department. He cannot rely on the MRT test on the ground that it gave wrong readings due to age old machines used for testing the meter and therefore the order passed by the forum is liable to set aside and the bill may be revised below 300 units per month and the appeal may be allowed.

6. Now the point for consideration is, whether the impugned order is liable to be set aside? If so on what grounds?

7. The appellant failed to attend before this authority. Even after receiving the notice, he has not sent any written arguments in support of his contention. Whereas, Sri. A. Jaya Raju, Advocate appeared on behalf of the respondents and submitted that the forum has passed the order basing on the MRT test and there are no grounds to set aside the impugned order.

8. It is an admitted fact that the meter is sent for testing and the test report discloses that the said meter is working satisfactorily. The only ground mentioned by the petitioner is that the machines tested the meter are old machines and the report cannot be relied upon. If really, the meter testing is not satisfied by him, he would have taken steps to send the same for EDIT test at Hyderabad for further testing. He did not make any effort on those lines, nor attended before this authority to substantiate his contentions. The respondents have mentioned in their written statement that he is having 3,580 Watts capacity. When the capacity is 3580 Watts

and when the meter test report establishes that there is no defect in the meter and there is no point to consider his case. Except the solitary statement of the appellant, there is no other material to consider his request. He would have assessed the electrical appliances available and put to use by a competent private Electrical Engineer. The Forum has rightly considered the issue and there are no grounds to set aside the impugned order and the appeal preferred by the appellant is liable to be dismissed.

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

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 31st August 2012

Sd/-
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN