

Office of Electricity Ombudsman

(A Statutory Body of Govt. of NCT of Delhi under the Electricity Act, 2003)

B-53, Paschimi Marg, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi – 110 057

(Phone No.: 32506011, Fax No.26141205)

Appeal No. F. ELECT/Ombudsman/2006/140

Appeal against Order dated 17.10.2006 passed by CGRF – BRPL in Case No.:
CG/323/2006

In the matter of:

Shri Sidharth Gupta - Appellant

Versus

M/s BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd - Respondent

Present:-

Appellant Shri Sidharth Gupta

Respondent Shri Sunil Singh, Business Manager, Distt. Alaknanda,
Shri Biswajeet Biswas, Commercial Officer on behalf of BRPL

Date of Hearing: 21.02.2007

Date of Order : 04.03.2007

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2007/140

Shri Siddharth Gupta son of Shri N.K. Gupta registered consumer has filed this appeal received on 04.12.2006 against CGRF-BRPL order dated 17.10.06 in regard to meter installed at his residence E-449, Greater Kailash, New Delhi-110048. It appears that the appellant was not satisfied with the order of the CGRF and therefore sought redressal from the DERC. The DERC vide letter dated 13.11.2006 informed the appellant of the Electricity Ombudsman for filing appeal against the CGRF order. Later the appellant, filed the appeal in this office.

The facts of the case are that the appellant received a bill for the month of September 2005 (showing a reading of 46325 units) for Rs.41,930/-. The consumption in this bill was far higher than the consumption of the earlier bills and therefore the appellant filed a complaint with the CGRF- BRPL.

64

The CGRF vide order dated 17.10.06 held that the reading of 46325 units as recorded on 15.9.05 appears to be erroneous as consumption is extremely inflated as compared to the preceding period and period subsequent to September 2005. Therefore it ordered that the reading of 46325 reflected by the meter on 15.09.2005 may be "declared faulty and treated Null & Void.

No doubt was expressed regarding other readings either by the appellant or by the CGRF. CGRF therefore directed the consumption of 19975 units (56954-36979) between 10.6.05 to 25.8.06 to be spread over proportionately amongst all the billing cycles and the bills to be revised accordingly. No LPSC was to be charged.

Not satisfied with the orders of the CGRF the appellant filed the appeal before the Ombudsman stating that although the CGRF had held that reading of 9346 units appeared inflated yet the same was not deducted from total meter reading of 19975 units (56954-36979) between 10.6.05 to 25.8.06.

In his appeal the appellant has requested for reduction of 9346 units from the total meter reading of 19975 units.

After scrutiny of the contents of the appeal and the submission made by both the parties in response to the queries raised by the Ombudsman, the case was fixed for hearing on 21.2.07.

Sh. Siddharth Gupta, son of the appellant attended. Sh. Sunil Singh, Business Manager attended along with Sh. Biswajeet Biswas, Commercial Officer on behalf of BRPL.

The case was discussed and the consumption pattern of the appellant was scrutinized. It shows the following:

<u>Period</u>	<u>Consumption in Units</u>	<u>Average Consumption Per Month</u>
11 th Feb. 04 to 12 th Feb. 05	20911 units ÷ 12	= 1743 units consumption
12 th Feb. 05 to 27 th Feb. 06	20718 units ÷ 12	= 1726.5 units consumption
Total for 2 years	41629 units	

The above shows that there is not much variation in the average consumption between the two years i.e. 1743 units in the 1st year, and 1726.5 units in the 2nd year (which includes September 2005 bill in dispute). From the above, it appears that readings were not taken regularly by the meter reader and some random reading figures had been put by him. Later, when readings were

63

actually taken by him the corrected units are put on the bills. **Because of faulty reading by the meter reader the consumption pattern shows that in some months the consumption is as low as 636 units, 759 units, 881 units and so on and in other months, it is 1019 units, 1431 units, 2853 units.**

The fact that in each of the two years Feb. 2004 – Feb. 2005 and Feb.2005 – Feb.2006, the average consumption is nearly the same shows that **the appellant has been billed on the basis of his total consumption of electricity**, even though the bills have not been correctly raised on the basis of readings correctly taken.

The DISCOM is directed to revise the bills by spreading equally in each billing cycle between 8th October 2004 to 15th September 2005 the units consumed as shown in the consumption pattern filed by the Discom and to give the benefit of slab in tariff. No LPSC to be charged.

The CGRF order is set aside.

36/2/11 अश्विनी
(Asha Mehra)
Ombudsman