

**Office of the 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/2014/623**

Appeal against the Order dated 05.02.2014 passed by CGRF–BRPL in CG.No.225/2012.

**In the matter of:**

Shri Udai Vashist

- **Appellant**

Versus

BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.

- **Respondent**

**Present:-**

**Appellant:** Shri Udai Vashist was present in person.

**Respondent:** Shri Amit Kumar, Division Head (PJB) attended on behalf of the BRPL.

**Date of Hearing :** 22.07.2014

**Date of Order :** 05.08.2014

**ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2014/623**

This is an appeal filed by Shri Udai Vashist, tenant of 13/7, II Floor, Punjabi Bagh Extension, New Delhi-110026, against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (CGRF-BRPL) dated 05.02.2014, on the ground that the CGRF did not appreciate the evidence on record, and only partially accepted his plea by way of giving the benefit of fast running of meter only from the day when the meter was last tested.

Dissatisfied with the order of the CGRF, he has approached this office for modification in the order of the CGRF by granting the above benefit from September, 2009 i.e. when the initial variation was noticed by him.



On going through the details, it is observed that the existing meter was installed in 2003. The said meter was tested on 19.02.2010 after the consumer approached the DISCOM for testing of meter and paid the testing fee. Further, the said meter was again tested on 27.09.2011 when the appellant approached the Department of Power, Govt. of NCT of Delhi, and the accuracy of the meter was found to be O.K.. However, the appellant appended some remarks on the report that the meter was found running even after switching off the MCB. The DISCOM's testing team explained the reason for this as "Consumer Wiring Problem, Output Neutral Common" and these remarks were mentioned on the testing report itself. Subsequently, the meter was again tested on 21.06.2012 when the accuracy was again found to be O.K..

Further, as per the order of the CGRF, a check meter was installed on 10.07.2012. A comparison of the consumption of both the meters was made after a period of 84 days and the consumer's meter was found to be running fast. The CGRF accordingly asked the DISCOM to give the benefit of the fast running of the meter from the day the meter was last tested.

The DISCOM in their reply have tried to explain the reason of this variation in the consumption of existing meter and the check meter. It has been stated that the initial reading of the existing meter was incorrectly recorded which subsequently led to be difference in the consumption of the existing meter as compared with the check meter. The plea of the DISCOM was not taken into consideration by the CGRF although it cannot be set-aside merely on the ground that the same should have been raised earlier while submitting the comparison chart. However, to remove any confusion, it would have been appropriate had another check meter been installed, with accurate recording of initial readings, and a comparison of the consumption of both the meters made thereafter. The benefit of fast running, if any, could have been then afforded to the consumer prospectively.



On going through the details, it is observed that the meter of the consumer was tested repeatedly in accordance with the DERC Supply Code & Performance Standards Regulations, 2007 on 19.02.2010, 27.09.2011 and again on 21.06.2012 and its accuracy was found O.K. on all occasions. No technical explanation has been given by the appellant to counter the authenticity of the multiple testing reports of the meter.

Therefore, the plea of the consumer to extend the benefit of fast running of meter from September, 2009 is not tenable. Till the testing on 21.06.2012 the meter was found O.K.. The discrepancy in reading between the check meter and the existing meter has been discussed above. Since wrong initial reading is a plausible reason and no further testing was done to conclusively prove the meter was running fast the complainant's plea cannot be accepted.

Given the above facts, the order of the CGRF is upheld and the appeal is dismissed.

  
(PRADEEP SINGH)  
Ombudsman

SK

August, 2014

