

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN  
O/o: ANDHRA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad – 500004.

Present

K. Sanjeeva Rao Naidu  
Vidyut Ombudsman

Dated. 01.11.2012

Appeal No. 59 of 2012

Between

Dr. G. Vijayasardhi Phd., (Eng)  
Door No. 55-8-33/14  
102 BRK. Residency, KRM colony  
Seethammadhara  
Visakhapatnam-13. .

...Appellant

AND

1. Assistant Engineer/Operation/APEPDCL/H.B colony Visakhapatnam
2. Asst. Divisional Engineer/Operation/APEPDCL/Seethammadhara Vsp
3. Asst. Accounts Officer/ERO/APEPDCL/West Visakhapatnam.
4. Divisional Engineer/Operation/APEPDCL/Zone II/ Visakhapatnam

...Respondents

The appeal / representation dated 16.08.2012 received by this authority on 23.08.2012 against the CGRF order of APEPDCL C.G.No. 452/2011-12 of Visakhapatnam dated 27.03.2012. The same has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 17.10.2012 at Visakhapatnam. Dr. Vijayasardhi appellant present. Sri. CH. Nagaraju AE (O) H.B. colony, Sri. P.V. Ramanamurty, JAO (West) Sri. P. Ramesh Senior Assistant West on behalf of the respondents present. Heard the arguments of the parties and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed / issued the following:

AWARD

Sri Dr. G. Vijaya Sardhi PHD (Engg), 102, B.R.K Residency, KRM Colony, Seethammadhara, Visakhapatnam District has filed a complaint stating that huge amount of CC bill was issued against his service, hence approached the CGRF for arranging revision of CC bill.

2. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent has filed his written submission as detailed below.
- (i) The consumer Sri Dr. G. Vijay Saradhi of Sc.No. HB05-339140/ Cat-1 has already made a complaint in “SPANDANA” on dated. 14/11/2011. The Divisional Elect. Engineer/ Operation / Zone-1/ Visakhapatnam submitted his report but the consumer was not satisfied and again with report a complaint is made in Corporate Office.
  - (ii) The meter is replaced due to the Meter stuck up on 19.05.2011 vide change slip No. 132971, the old Meter final reading was 3161 dated 19.05.2011 and the new meter initial reading was 0023. The old Meter reading billed up to May/2011 and the reading was 2957. The remaining 204 units have to be billed. The new meter reading taken on 15.06.2011 is 0639 and the initial reading is 0023 i.e., total units are billed in June/2011 as 820 Units (i.e., 204+639-23).
  - (iii) The consumer has registered in his complaint filed in call centre for Meter running fast. The Meter was replaced for MRT Testing vide change slip No. 132765 dated. 30.07.2011 with final reading was 1427 and initial reading was 00006. The removed meter was sealed in carton box in front of the consumer and brought to MRT testing and the testing was done in the presence of Consumer. As per the MRT Test report there are Errors within the limits i.e. Meter working satisfactorily.
  - (iv) The service was inspected on 16.11.2011 and Meter Check reading is 00893 and the reading was taken by the meter reader on 14.11.2011 is 0869. I.e. for the 2 days consumption was recorded as 24 Units. The Connected load was 1915 Wats + AC 2000 Watts.
  - (v) From the above, and as per the MRT test report new meter changed is working satisfactorily. The consumption pattern observed is also in order. The consumption pattern is herewith enclosed. The Check Reading on dated. 06.02.2012 is 01449.”

3. The Forum, duly taking into cognizance of the written submission of the respondent, passed the following order.

“After thorough verification of records written submission of Respondents, the consumer should pay the bill and also his connected load is also high, and

also the billing agency should be punished as the readings are not taken correctly.

The consumption after changing of meter was recorded 24 units (KWH) per day as per the check reading taken by the Additional Assistant Engineer / Operation / H.B. Colony. If the consumer continuously utilizes the electricity for a period of 1 Month the total consumption may reach more than 700 units / Month.

As per Annexure XII II clause A-2.1 Domestic (LT-1) the assessed consumption is as follows according to connected load.

#### A2.1 Domestic (LT-I)

Type of Load	Indicative List of Appliances	Load Utilization Factor	Number of hours of usage per day		Number of days of usage per month
			Urban	Rural	
Heavy Usage Load	Fridge, Cordless Telephone	30%	24	18	30
Moderately Heavy Usage Load	Bulb, Tube light Fan, Television	25%	24	18	30
	AC, Cooler	40%	10	8	30
Infrequent Usage Load	Geyser, Water heater, Motor, Oven, Microwave, Computer, Cooking range, Music system, Iron Water Purifier	100%	1	1	30

- Assessed consumption for Moderate to heavy usage load } =load utilization factor X No. of usage hours / day X No. days X Connected Load =0.25 X 24 X30 X 1.915 =344.7 Kwh. or say 345 units.

- Assessed consumption for AC = 0.40 X 10 X 30 X 2.000 = 240 Kwh or say 240 Units.

Total Assessed consumption = (1) + (2) = 345 + 20 = 585 units

As per the consumption pattern observed for the period of 2 years is 9 / 2010 to 7 / 2011, the consumer has exceeded 500 units per month in 2 times.

From the consumption pattern it is opined by the Forum the meter reading might have been suppressed by the meter reader.

Hence Respondents are hereby directed to take average reading from 10 / 2010 to 6 /2011 and issue CC bill accordingly. If the consumer already paid the said amount may be refunded or adjusted in future bills.

With the above direction CG.No. 452/11-12 is disposed off.”

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the order passed by the Forum and also about the abnormalities recorded in the monthly electricity bills issued to him. It is also further stated that it is an admitted fact, that the meter was stuck up and an amount of Rs. 4,314 was shown in the monthly bill against his earlier monthly bills at Rs. 800 to 900 per month; and that the respondents did not give any response to the letters addressed by him; and that the Forum ordered to take average consumption and that also they did not do it and they have simply stated that they have given credit to Rs.565 and thereupon he approached this authority by filing this appeal.

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

6. The appellant appeared before this authority on 17.10.2012 at visakhapatnam and reiterated the same grounds mentioned in the grounds of appeal. The respondents are represented by Sri CH . Nagaraju AAE /O/ H.B.Colony Sri P V Ramanamurthy /JAO (West) and Sri P. Ramesh Senior assistant (West) present and stated that they have calculated and issued the proceedings dated 23.04.2012 by giving credit to Rs.565. At this stage this authority directed the AAO to submit the pattern of consumption recorded in the meter from 10/12 to 06/11 and asked him to submit the report within a week. He has submitted his report by fax on 30.10.2012.

7. It is an admitted fact that the meter was replaced and it was stuck up though the MRT report says that the errors were within the limits. But the fact remains, that the meter recorded abnormal reading of 820 units at Rs.4,193. The record shows

that the prior reading was in between 211 to 397. As per the report submitted by the JAO calculating the average and units therein are incorporated as hereunder.

SC.No. HB05/339/40

Load 3000

HB Colony

Group M2

Category I

Phase III

Already Billed				CC	CMC	EDC	SC	Total
10/2010	to	1080	397	1526:00	20:00	24:00		1570
10/2010		1477						
11/2010	to	1477	254	774:00	20:00	15:00		809
11/2010		1731						
12/2010	to	1731,	225	636:00	20:00	14:00		670
12/2010		1956						
1/2011	to	1956	231	665:00	20:00	14:00		699
1/2011		2187						
2/2011	to	2187	290	945:00	20:00	17:00		982
2/2011		2477						
3/2011	to	2477	269	845:00	20:00	16:00		881
3/2011		2746						
4/2011	to	2746	211	570:00	30:00	12:00		612
4/2011		2957						
5/2011	to	2957	263	817:00	40:00	16:00		873
5/2011		2957						
6/2011	to	2957	820	4193:00	45:00	49:00		4287
6/2011		639						
Units		2960		10971:00	235:00	177:00		11383
Number of Months – 9; Average Units = 2960/9 = 329								

The pattern shown in the table discloses that the calculation made in the proceedings dated 23.04.2012 is incorrect. When the meter itself is stuck up and when the very reading is shown abnormal prior to the stuck up and after changing the meter, the reading recorded is normal, shows that there was defect in the meter. Hence, it has to be construed that the meter has recorded abnormal reading. This

has been observed by the Forum and directed the respondents to take average reading from 10/2010 to 6/2011 and ordered to CC bill accordingly. So, there is no need to set-aside the impugned order except to order the respondents to prepare the bill for the average units of 329 as shown in the table and issue the bill accordingly.

8. In the result, the respondents are directed to issue revised CC bill for 329 units for the month of 6/2011 and the JAO is further directed to revise the bills accordingly and arrive at the differential amount and the excess amount paid by the appellant is to be adjusted in the future bills under intimation to the appellant.

9. With this observation, the appeal is disposed. No order as to costs.

This order is corrected and signed on this 1<sup>st</sup> day of November 2012.

Sd/-  
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN