

(44)

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/2006/63

Appeal against Order dated 24.01.2006 passed by CGRF – BYPL on Complaint No.: CG-376/12/2005.

In the matter of: Shri Chaman Lal - Appellant

Versus

M/s BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. - Respondent

Present:-

Appellant Shri Chaman Lal

Respondent Shri P.C.Jain-Addl. General Manager, Shri Aniruddha Arya -
Commerical Officer of BSES- Yamuna Power Ltd. and
Shri Rany Mangsatabam

Date of Hearing : 16.03.2006 & 28.3.2006

Date of Order : 20.4.2006

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2006/63

The Appellant had two electric connections installed at his residence, one on Ground Floor (K. No. 1240 Q605 0178) for 1.0 KW load and another for first floor (K. No. 1240 Q605 0867). Meters of both the connections were replaced with electronic meters on 25.4.2005. After replacement of meters, Appellant received high consumption/inflated bills. He filed a complaint on 3.9.2005 with Business Manager informing that consumption recorded by electronic meters is very high and they are faulty. On the request of Appellant, meters were tested on 13.9.2005 but results were not informed to the Appellant. Since the Appellant did not get any reply, he filed another complaint with Business Manager on 13.10.2005 informing that meter testing was done on 13.9.2005 but till date he had not heard anything from the Respondent. He also submitted the records of inflated readings upto 10.10.2005 and requested for rectification of inflated bills. The Appellant filed another complaint with Business Manager on 8.11.2005 on the same issue.

On 5.12.2005 the Appellant filed a complaint before CGRF and sought relief for inflated bills received by him for June 2005, August 2005 and October 2005 . On the

43

direction of CGRF, Respondent produced the records of meter testing undertaken by it on 13.9.2005. Meter testing reports indicated that both the meters were running within the permissible limit. The CGRF directed to install Pilot Meters for both the connections for a period of 15 days. Based on the results of Pilot Meter, the CGRF issued a final order on 24.1.2006 and declared meter O.K. Not satisfied by the above orders of the CGRF, Appellant filed this appeal before Ombudsman on 6.2.2006.

After examining the records of the CGRF and contents of the appeal filed by the Appellant, hearing was fixed for 8.3.2006. On the request of Respondent, hearing was refixed for 16.3.2006.

On 13.3.2006, the Respondent submitted a reply through M/s R.K. Associates who were engaged by Shri Ranjit Kumar, Legal Officer of BSES.

No document was submitted empowering Shri Ranjit Kumar to engage an Advocate for representation before Ombudsman.

Hearing was held on 16.3.2006. Shri Chaman Lal, the appellant attended, in person. Shri P.C.Jain, Addl. General Manager and Shri Aniruddha Arya, Commercial Officer of BYPL alongwith Shri Rany Mangsatabam of R.K. Associates attended the hearing. After hearing both parties, and scrutiny of all documents, as well as meter test reports and on examination of consumption pattern submitted by the Respondent in respect of both the connections, following position emerges :

- a) Consumption pattern of both the connections is as under :

Ground Floor (K. No. 1240 Q605 0178)

Reading Date	Reading	Consumption	Bill month
9-4-2004	14138	125	Apr 04
7-6-2004	14252	114	June 04
4-8-2004	14360	108	Aug 04
8-10-2004	14474	114	Oct 04
6-12-2004	14743	269	Dec 04
4-2-2005	14934	191	
5-4-2005	15134	200	
25-4-2005 Meter changed	15319 0	185	
6-6-2005	682	682	
6-8-2005	1627	945	
13-9-2005 Meter tested	3071	1444	
10-10-2005	3249	178	Oct 05
7-12-2005	3427	178	Dec 05
8-2-2006	3584	157	Feb 06

Reading Date	Reading	Consumption	Bill month
9-4-2004	2968	313	Apr 04
7-6-2004	3293	325	June 04
4-8-2004	3587	294	Aug 04
8-10-2004	3917	330	Oct 04
6-12-2004	4362	445	Dec 04
4-2-2005	4868	506	Feb 05
5-4-2005	5276	408	Apr 05
25-4-2005 Meter Changed	5484 0	208	
6-6-2005	555	555	Jun 05
16-8-2005	2307	1752	Aug 05
13-9-2005 Meter tested	3662	1355	Oct 05
10-10-2005	4154	492	
7-12-2005	3938	784	Dec 05
8-2-2006	5627	689	Feb 06

The above consumption pattern reveals that consumption recorded by new electronic meter from date of installation 25.4.2005 to date of testing 13.9.2005 was excessively high as compared to consumption recorded prior to change of meter and after testing was done on 13.9.2005. It is not understandable how the same meter started recording normal consumption after testing was done on 13.9.2005.

Respondent officials were asked to provide following details on next date of hearing 28.3.2006:

- 1) Status of connections before installation of electronic meters for both old meters.
- 2) Status of connections done on new electronic meters.
- 3) Any deficiency in common wiring of connections noticed.
- 4) If bus bar arrangement was provided, when it was provided.
- 5) Any E/L indicator availability, if so any record of its working.
- 6) Reasons of high consumption recorded during June 2005 to October 2005 cycles.
- 7) Reason of drop in consumption thereafter.
- 8) Site report on A/c, cooler etc. connected at consumer premises.
- 9) Meter testing report does not indicate reading recorded before test & after test.

AGM (East) was asked to call the concerned persons in his office and find out the nature of work done while installing meters, during testing so as to know what actually was done prior to or during testing because of which the electronic meter started recording normal consumption, after testing was done on 13.9.2005.

(11)

In the reply submitted on 28.3.2006 during hearing, Respondent officials have stated that :

- i) Electronic meters were installed under a mass replacement programme, which being voluminous work, contract was given to contractors who do not maintain meter changed form; as such status of connections can not be given.
- ii) A rough unsigned sketch of connections/bus bar was submitted which does not reveal anything as same appears to have been prepared by a school boy and not by a technically qualified person
- iii) Respondent has further stated that reasons for high consumption during June to October 2005 bill months could be attributed to seasonal factor/leakage, faulty wiring and/or illegal stealing by the Appellant's neighbourhood. On query, whether any evidence of stealing was found during testing done on 13.9.2005, Respondent officials replied, that it is apprehended that this may be one of the various factors. After site visit, Respondent submitted the connected load report which reveals only 1.3 KW load with 3 fans was found in the ground floor premises. With such a low load, high consumption can not be attributed due to seasonal factor and use of maximum appliances.
- iv) No reason has been given for drop in consumption after 13.9.2005. The Appellant stated that there is no change in the electrical appliances being used by him. Whatever has been done, Respondent is responsible for that.

The reply of the Respondent does not reveal the factual reasons for high consumption being recorded by the electronic meters from the date of installation to the date of testing. It appears something wrong has occurred while installing new meters by contractors' personnel (under Mass Replacement Programme) of the Respondent, without the presence of any qualified supervisor of the Licensee as is required under the DERC guidelines. Perusal of Meter Change Report reveals that electronic meter was installed on 25.4.2005 by the officials of an agency. The meter change report is signed by the officials of the Respondent on 30.4.2005. In fact, the meter change report is required to be prepared and signed at site on the same date. No testing of the new meters was done at site after installation. Reply of the Respondent suggests that they were in a hurry to get the meters replaced through an outside agency without supervising/caring for proper execution of the work. Such casual approach on the part of the Respondent would necessarily bring bad name to the Company.

Records submitted by the Respondent reveal that **electronic meter started recording high consumption from the date of installation 25.4.2005 and same meters started recording normal consumption after testing was done on 13.9.2005.** The Respondent has not produced records of actual work done, status of connections before installation of electronic meters and at the time of testing.

The report of the site visit reveals use of only 3 fans on the Ground Floor i.eKno1240Q6050178. This minimum use of electricity could not result in consumption of 945 and 1444 units respectively.

1240

In view of above, the balance of convenience is in favour of the Appellant. It is therefore directed that he may be billed for the period 25.4.2005 to 13.9.2005 (disputed period) based on six months average consumption prior to 25.4.2005 and six months average consumption after 13.9.2005. Revised bills on the basis of the above directions may be prepared in respect of K no 1240 Q605 0178 and adjustment given for payments made by the appellant.

It is our experience that in case of 2 meters, when there is a problem of wrong connection, only 1 meter is adversely affected. Accordingly, relief is given only on Ground Floor meter K.No. 1240 Q605 0178) as stated above. No relief is called for in respect of the 1st Floor meter.

The CGRF order is set-aside to the extent mentioned above.

अशा मेहरा
(Asha Mehra)
Ombudsman