



**BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN
Andhra Pradesh :: Hyderabad**

:: Present ::

C. Ramakrishna

Date: 01-09-2016

Appeal No. 11 of 2016

Between

Sri. N. Krishna Murthy, D.No. 2-429, Balaji Nagar, First Main Road, Ramanayyapeta,
Kakinada, East Godavari District.

... Appellant

And

1. The AE/Operation/APEPDCL/D4/Kakinada/East Godavari District
2. The AAO/ERO/APEPDCL/Kakinada/East Godavari District
3. The ADE/Operation/APEPDCL/Kakinada/East Godavari District
4. The DE/Operation/APEPDCL/Kakinada/East Godavari District

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 24-05-2016 has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 18-08-2016 at Rajahmundry. The appellant, as well as respondents 1 to 4 above were present. Having considered the appeal, the written and oral submissions made by the appellant and the respondents, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following:

AWARD

2. The appeal arose out of the complaint of the consumer about excessive billing on his service connection number ending with 004370. He was not happy with the

disposal of his complaint by the CGRF and hence the appeal.

3. The appellant objected to the CGRF's observation about his consumption being only in the range of 150-200 units; that for the period January to March, he was out of station; that on 21-04-2016 when the meter reading was taken, it read 662 (consumption of 250 units) and that as on 19th May, 2016 it was reading 1574 i.e., showing a consumption of 912 units; that this consumption pattern is incorrectly on the high side as his premises does not have load commensurating with that consumption; that he was asked to pay a challenge fee of Rs. 100/- to have the meter tested; and that therefore the matter may be looked into.

4. Notices were issued for hearing the matter. The respondent AE stated in his written submission that the consumer has lodged complaint about excess billing on two of his services; that on the consumer's complaint with reference to his service connection bearing number 4354 when he lodged meter burnt complaint on 19.9.2015, the meter was changed on 22-09-2015; that as the consumer complained about meter creeping relating to his service 4370, it was inspected and found that the meter is running normally; that as the consumer paid the challenge fee on 16-05-2016, the meter was replaced on 02-06-2016 and sent for testing; and that soon after the receipt of the test results, necessary action would be taken. The respondent AE further submitted that in spite of prior intimation about testing, the consumer has not been attending the meter testing.

5. In the meantime, the consumer, who has not attended even one hearing informed through his letters expressing his inability to attend the hearings, as he is not keeping well and pleaded that his problem be looked into to his satisfaction.

6. During the hearing on 18th August, 2016, the respondents informed that having complained about the creeping meter on his service connection bearing number 4370, the consumer has so far not presented himself for meter testing; that meter testing cannot be undertaken unless the consumer or his representative is present for the testing and that therefore the matter of consumer's presence for the meter testing will be pursued and based on the meter test results, necessary action would be taken.

7. In view of the continued failure of the consumer to present himself for any of the hearings as well as for meter testing, nothing much can be done at this stage. As seen from the record, when the consumer complained about burnt meter for his service bearing number 4354, the meter was replaced and the respondents reported about the normal functioning of the new meter. The consumer also appears to be not having an issue in this regard. Hence the basic grievance about the complaint before the CGRF is considered as having been taken care of. The present appeal is about service connection bearing number 4370 and the respondents' version that they are waiting for the appellant to present himself for meter testing appears reasonable. It is for the consumer to either present himself or somebody else for meter testing to look into his grievance.

8. Therefore, it is hereby ordered that:

- the order issued by the CGRF is upheld as there is nothing that appears amiss with it;
- the appeal filed is dismissed as nothing can be looked at this stage;
- the consumer should understand the necessity of his presence either in person

or through somebody else for the meter testing and cooperate with the DISCOM's officers for having his meter tested; and

- the respondents shall take necessary action based on the result of the meter testing.

9. It is made clear that the consumer can approach the CGRF again, if he is not satisfied with the outcome of the meter testing or the consequential action that might be taken by the DISCOM's officers after the meter testing.

10. This order is corrected and signed on this 1st day of September, 2016.

11. A digitally signed copy of this order is made available at www.vidyutombudsman.ap.gov.in.

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

To

1. Sri. N. Krishna Murthy, D.No. 2-429, Balaji Nagar, First Main Road,
Ramanayyapeta, Kakinada, East Godavari District - 533 005
2. The Assistant Engineer, Operation, Kakinada-D4, APEPDCL, Operation
Section, D4, 33/11 KV Substation, Sarpavaram, Kakinada, East Godavari
District - 533 005
3. The Assistant Accounts Officer, ERO, APEPDCL, Kakinada, East Godavari
District - 533 004

4. The Assistant Divisional Engineer, Operation, Kakinada Town-2, APEPDCL,
Near Water Works, 33/11 KV SS, Power House, Compound, Kakinada, East
Godavari District - 533 004
5. The Divisional Engineer, Operation, Kakinada, APEPDCL, Operation
Division, Near Water Works, Power House Compound, Kakinada, East
Godavari District - 533 004

Copy to:

6. The Chairman, C.G.R.F., APEPDCL, P & T Colony, Seethammadhara,
Near Gurudwara Junction, Visakhapatnam - 530 013
7. The Secretary, APERC, 11-4-660, 4th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills,
Hyderabad - 500 004