

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/2007/145

Appeal against Order dated 13.12.2006 passed by CGRF – NDPL on
CG.No. 0947/11/06/CVL (K.No. 31200136084)

In the matter of:

Shri Bal Kishan

- Appellant

Versus

M/s North Delhi Power Ltd.

- Respondent

Present:-**Appellant** Shri Manoj Kumar son of the appellant**Respondent** Shri Jagat Singh, Sr. Manager, Distt. Civil Lines
Shri Suraj Das Guru, Executive (Legal) on behalf of NDPL

Date of Hearing: 15.03.2007, 02.08.2007

Date of Order : 03.08.2007

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2007/145

The appellant is resident of EW-150/1 old A-167 Christian Colony, Delhi-110009. He has an electric connection K. No. 31200 136084 with sanctioned load of 1 KW for domestic use. His meter was replaced on 7.2.06 and since then the complaint of high consumption started. It is evident from CGRF in its order dated 13.12.06 that the meter was checked and found fast by 2.29% as per meter test report. However as per Electricity Rules this is within permissible limits. CGRF therefore ordered the appellant to make the payment as per bill raised on actual consumption basis. LPSC amount was however waived.

Not satisfied with the CGRF order the appellant filed this appeal stating that his consumption is much lesser than that recorded by the meter ever since it was changed on 7.2.06. After examining the CGRF record, the reply of the NDPL dated 22.2.07 and other submissions made by both the parties the case was fixed for hearing on 15.3.07.

On 15.3.07 Shri Manoj Kumar son of the appellant attended.

Shri Jagat Singh, Sr. Manager, Distt. Civil Line and Suraj Das Guru, Legal Executive attended on behalf of NDPL.

As per records submitted by NDPL it was observed that the average consumption with the old meter w.e.f. 20.12.03 to 13.12.04 was 143 units per month and for the period 13.12.04 to 16.12.05 it was 160 units per month. **The consumer meter was replaced on 7.2.06 and it recorded a consumption of 4316 units up to 13.12.06 thus giving an average of more than 400 units per month.** This shows considerable increased consumption, after installation of new electronic meter on 7.2.06. NDPL officials argued that as per inspection report dated 13.12.06 the supply is being used on ground floor as well as on first floor. As per NDPL's report meter was tested on 10.11.06 when it was found 1.4% fast and same meter was again tested one month later on 13.12.06 when it was found 2.29% fast. NDPL officials emphasized that the consumption recorded by the changed electronic meter w.e.f. 7.2.06 shows the correct consumption of electricity.

In view of two different test results observed within a span of one month NDPL officials were directed to install a pilot meter for a period of two months and thereafter submit the test results.

The reports submitted by the Discom after installation of pilot meter also do not seem to be correct, as different results have been reported by 3 different officers.

As per report dated 08/06/2007 the pilot meter was installed on 1.3.07 with initial reading '03' and this meter was removed on 4.6.07 with final reading 763. The reading of consumer's meter at the time of pilot meter installation was 5375 and at the time of (pilot meter) removal the reading was 6080 units. As per this report the consumer meter was recording 7.23% slow.

This report does not appear to be correct as it has recorded installation of pilot meter on 1.3.07 where as instructions for installation of pilot meter were given by the Ombudsman during hearing much later on 15.3.07.

In the reply dated 5.7.07 NDPL has stated that pilot meter was installed on **21.3.07** with initial reading '06' and removed on 4.6.07 with final reading 763 units and consumer meter was found 7.23.% slow. It is also **mentioned in the reply that the consumer meter has been**

replaced and NDPL would revise the bill for period of six months prior to date of installation of pilot meter by adjusting the error of 7.23% and would revise the bill from 21.3.07 to 4.6.07 as per consumption recorded in the pilot meter.

The NDPL officials appear to be a confused lot as three different reports submitted by three different officials. This report is contradictory and has also not taken into consideration its earlier meter test reports when the meter was found 1.4% fast on 10.11.06 and 2.29% fast on 13.12.06.

- i) According to the report dated 22.2.07 the appellant's premises is being fed by meter no. 9902890 which as per their own report was replaced on 7.2.06
- ii) According to the report dated 8.6.07 pilot meter was installed on 1.3.07 (where as instructions were given for installation of pilot meter on 15.03.2007) the meter was found slow by 7.23%.
- iii) According to its report dated 5.7.07 the pilot meter was installed on 21.3.07 and meter results shows the meter to be 7.23% slow. The same meter was earlier found 1.4% fast on 10.11.06 and 2.29% fast on 13.12.06 but after filing the appeal in the Ombudsman office it is reported to be 7.23% slow.

The above contradictions cast a doubt on the reliability of the testing of meters by NDPL. It is difficult to rely on any of the 3 reports (meter 1.4% fast or meter 2.29% fast or meter 7.23% slow).

In view of the contradictory reports of the NDPL, another opportunity was given to the Discom and to the appellant to appear on 02.08.2007 to sort out the dispute. However, none of them could attend the hearing, on that day.

Considering the totality of the facts as mentioned above, (unreliability of the reports and the fact that the suspected defective meter has been replaced on 10.07.07) the grievance of the appellant seems resolved.

Since the meter has already been replaced on 10.07.2007, no intervention / change is called for on the basis of such reports.

The CGRF order is upheld.

Asha Mehra
Asha Mehra
Ombudsman