

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: 04-09-2012

Appeal No. 49 of 2012

Between

Sri. G. Subba Raju,
H.No. C-36, LIC Apartments, HB Colony, Visakhapatnam. **... Appellant**

And

1. Assistant Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL/ HB Colony / VSP
 2. Asst. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Seethammadhara / VSP
 3. Asst. Accounts Officer / ERO / APEPDCL / West / Visakhapatnam
 4. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Zone – I / Visakhapatnam
-Respondents**

The appeal / representation dt. 06.07.2012 received by this authority on 09.07.2012 against the CGRF order of APEPDCL C.G. No. 612 / 2011-12 of Visakhapatnam District Dt. 22.05.2012. The same has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 06.08.2012. Sri. G.Subba Raju, appellant present. Sri. Ch. Naga Raju, AE / O / HB Colony / VSP on behalf of the respondents present. Heard both the parties 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, the appellant has mentioned about the grievances as hereunder:

In the complaint he stated that abnormal CC bill was issued against his service in the month of November, 2011. Hence, he approached the Forum for justice.

2. The 1st respondent filed his written submission as detailed below.

The consumer of Sri G. Subba Raju of Sc. No: HB05-073482 requested the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances for rectification of excess CC Bills.

The consumer of Sc. No: HB05-073482 / Cat-1 in LIC Apartment Flat No. C-36 in favour of Sri G. Subba Raju has applied in CSC Siripuram as the meter is running fast.. The meter check reading was taken on 21-12-2011. The bill reading on dated 14-12-2011 was 21196. The consumption from 14-12-2011 to 21-12-2011 was 35 units for 7 days and again the check reading was taken on 02/01/2012, the reading was 24587. The consumption from 21/12/2011 to 02/01/2012 was 56 units recorded. It is observed that the high consumption recorded on 12/2011 was 1419 units. The consumer load was 3095 Watts (A.C + refrigerator + Color T.V + 4No's Tube lights + Washing Machine + Computer + 5No's Fans + 3No's 15W CFL Lamps).

The consumer also paid challenging fees for meter testing at M.R.T. The meter was tested in MRT lab on Dt. 06/01/2012. The meter test results were shown as errors were within the limit at MRT lab.

As per the consumption pattern it is observed that the reading might have been suppressed apportion is done for 1 year and the bill would be reduced to Rs. 4,930/- from Rs. 8,056/-.

3. The 3rd respondent filed his written submission as detailed below.

The proposal received from the Asst. Engineer/ Operation/H.B.Colony and as per the representation of the consumer, the demand of Sc.No.HB05/073482 is apportioned from 01/2011 to 12/2011 and an amount of Rs.1531/- is adjusted vide RJ.No.33/02-12 in the bill of the service. The Asst. Engineer has stated that the defect is not identified with the meter, but opined that suppression of consumption might have happened and hence proposed apportion of consumption. Hence, based on the recommendation the bill is revised. No further proposal is received from the field to revise the bill again.

Therefore, the grievance is redressed and the compliance is being intimated to the consumer also.

4. The Forum taking into cognizance of the written submission of the 1st and 3rd Respondents, the Forum passed the following order.

- *The 1st and 3rd Respondents have redressed the grievance duly apportioning the demand of the consumer is from 1/11 to 12/11 and an amount of Rs.1531/- is adjusted vide RJ No. 33/02-12 in the bill of the service. Hence the grievance is redressed.*
- *The respondents are herewith directed to replace the existing meter with new electronic energy meter if there is no electronic meter in the premises.*
- *After changing of the meter, the energy meter readings may be observed for 2 or 3 months. If his consumption within the limits of average consumption already arrived in the previous month, there is no need to revise previous average bills, because at the time of testing of meter at MRT lab no error was found in the functions of meter.*

The C.G. No. 612/11-12 is disposed off with no costs.

5. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal projecting the following grounds.

- i) The monthly consumption charges for average is 202 units but for the month of November it was shown as 1419 units.
- ii) The meter is 12 years old they did not check the same with an interval of 5 years.
- iii) The old meter would develop temporary malfunctioning, due to various reasons.
- iv) The meter test carried could neither establish the grounds nor the manner in which the test done was in order.
- v) The respondents have stated that all are well within the limit but the conclusion was “abnormal meter reading due to suppression of the meter reading.”
- vi) The impugned order is liable to be set aside as it has not made any attempt to at least repudiate the grounds of his grievances.

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 Sri. B. Subba Raju appeared before this authority on 06.08.2012 Sri CH. Nagaraju, AAE, Operation HBC appeared before this authority and the appellant reiterated all the grounds mentioned in the grounds of appeal

before this authority. The AAE operation stated that the meter reading is suppression out come and there are no grounds to set aside the impugned order.

8. The appellant herein submitted about the malfunctioning of the events from the book Electrical Measurements and Measuring Instruments. The relevant aspects are extracted as hereunder.

“The effect of increase of temperature, in general, is to cause the meter to run fast and to register high. Therefore, the temperature effects can be compensated for by simply using a temperature shunt on the brake magnet. Special magnetic materials such as ‘Mutemp’ are available which show a considerable decrease in permeability with increase in temperature.

(i) Errors in single phase energy meters. The errors cause by the driving system are incorrect magnitude of fluxes. This may be due to abnormal values of current or voltage. The shunt magnet flux may be in error due to change in resistance of coil or due to abnormal frequencies.

(ii) Incorrect phase angles. There may not be proper relationship between the various phasors. This may be due to improper lag adjustments, abnormal frequencies, change in resistance with temperature, etc.

(iii) Lack of symmetry in magnetic circuit. In case the magnetic circuit is not symmetrical, a driving torque is produced which makes the meter creep.

The errors caused by the braking system are:

- (i) Changes in strength of brake magnet.**
- (ii) Self-braking effect of series magnet flux, and**
- (iii) Changes in disc resistance,**
- (iv) Abnormal friction of moving parts.**

9. It is the contention of the respondents that it is an out come of suppressed reading. If really it is a suppressed reading, the reading subsequent to November 2011 should be as stated, but not 195 units. Even subsequent months also the reading is ranging between 126 to 378. In no other month, it is more than 500 units. Therefore, this authority feels that if it is a case of suppression the reading subsequent to the disputed month would not be as in the earlier months prior to the disputed month.

10. The reasoning assigned by the appellant is quite reasonable and the above said guidelines are also in support of his contentions. The reasoning assigned by the Forum is not on correct lines.

11. In the result the appeal is allowed and passed order as hereunder.

“The respondents are directed to minimize the bill by reducing it to the average of 350 units for that month and raise the bill accordingly. The excess amount if any, it shall be adjusted in the future bills.” No order as to costs.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 4th September, 2012

Sd/-
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN