

**BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM**  
**B.E.S. & T. UNDERTAKING**

(Constituted under section 42(5) of Electricity Act 2003)

Ground Floor, Multistoried Annex Building,  
BEST's Colaba Depot  
Colaba, Mumbai - 400 001  
Telephone No. 22853561

**Representation No. N-G(N)-251-2015 dtd. 03/03/2015.**

Shri Piroz Sher Khan .....Complainant

V/S

B.E.S.&T. Undertaking .....Respondent

**Present**

Chairman

Quorum : Shri V. G. Indrale, Chairman

Member

1. Shri S.S. Bansode, Member
2. Shri S.M. Mohite , Member

On behalf of the Complainant : 1. Mr. I.A. Shaikh

On behalf of the Respondent : 1. Shri S.M. Deshmukh, Supdt. CC(G/N)

Date of Hearing : 07/04/2015

Date of Order : 16/04/2015

**Judgment by Shri. Vinayak G. Indrale, Chairman**

Shri Piroz Sher Khan, S/o Late Sher Khan, 11, Ground flr., 255, Gunwantibai Ratansi Jetha Chawl, Dharavi Main Road, Chamda Bazar, Dharavi, Mumbai - 400 017 has come before the Forum for high Bill pertaining to A/c no.764-319-003\*0.

**Complainant has submitted in brief as under :**

- 1.0 The complainant has approached to IGR Cell on 18/12/2014 for high bill pertaining to A/c no. 764-319-003\*0. The complainant has approached to CGRF in schedule 'A' dtd. 02/03/2015 (received by CGRF on 02/03/2015 as he was not satisfied by the remedy provided by the IGR Cell Distribution Licensee regarding his grievance.

**Respondent, BEST Undertaking in its written statement  
in brief submitted as under :**

- 2.0 Shri Piroz Khan S/O Late Sher Khan has come before the Forum in respect of high bill in name of his deceased father pertaining to A/C No 764-319-003\*0.
- 3.0 The electric supply was rendered to Late Shri Sher Khan through meter No 0193229 for commercial purpose and through meter No A422411 for residential purpose having A/C 764-319-003\*0 . Further meter No 0193229 was replaced by meter no D036089 on 10/02/2004 and the same was removed on 08/08/2007. Later from April 2010 meter no. A422411 which is installed for residential purpose being used for commercial purpose.
- 4.0 On 07/02/2011 meter No A422411 was tested on site against low consumption memo generated in the month December 2011 by the system. During testing meter No A422411 found stopped and the complainant premises found locked. Same facts were observed during re-inspection on 02/05/2011, 03/06/2011 and 10/06/2011.
- 5.0 Hence meter No A422411 was replaced by meter No C091098 for official testing (O.T.) on 06/02/2014. As per OT report meter No A422411 found defective, current coil found burnt. Hence meter could not be tested in laboratory. Amendment for the same will be preferred to the consumer in due course.
- 6.0 New meter No C091098 has recorded average monthly consumption of 292 units from March 2014 to September 2014. This meter has recorded 505 units in May 2014 and 621 units in June 2014. Hence consumer has registered high bill complaint in June 2014.
- 7.0 During site testing on 14/07/2014, meter No C091098 ( EMCO ) make found working fast. Both body seals of meter found O.K. Meter No C091098 was replaced by meter No A148025 on 12/08/2014 under LBT. During testing meter no C091098 found O.K.
- 8.0 Meter A148025 has recorded average monthly consumption as 77 units for the period September 2014 to February 2015. Therefore, there is no need for debit / credit adjustment against the high bill complaint and bill issued to the complainant consumer is payable by him.

**REASONS**

- 7.0 We have heard the argument of Shri I.A. Shaikh representative of the complainant and Shri S.M. Deshmukh, Supdt. CC(G/N) for the Respondent BEST Undertaking. We

have perused the documents annexed with the complaint as well as documents annexed by the Respondent BEST Undertaking marked as Appendix 'A' to 'O'.

- 8.0 After going through the documents and arguments advanced by the representative of the complainant it appears that the grievance of the complainant is in respect of meter no. C091098, which was replaced by the Respondent BEST Undertaking. According to the complainant the said meter was off load blinking and running fast, therefore he was required to pay more electricity charges and for that period the Respondent BEST Undertaking has not given him any credit in the electricity bill. It is the contention of the Respondent BEST Undertaking that the said meter was standing in the name of deceased Shri Sher Khan and the complainant Shri Piroz Khan has not applied for change in name and therefore he has no *locus-standi* to raise the dispute. After going through the record, this Forum finds that the electricity connection was given in the name of Shri Sher Khan and therefore it was obligatory on the part of his son Shri Piroz Khan to apply for change in name and he has not chosen the recourse of change in name and approached the Forum. This circumstance to some what extent is fatal to the grievance of the complainant.
- 9.0 Apart from the above said observation, this Forum is required to see whether the grievance of the complainant is well founded or not. It appears that old meter no. A422411 was replaced by meter no. C091098 on 06/02/2014. The said new meter was recorded average consumption of 292 units in March 2014 to September 2014. It appears that the said meter has recorded 505 units in the month of May 2014 and 621 units in June 2014 and therefore the complainant has filed this complaint for high bill as according to him the units recorded for the month of May and June 2014 are very high. Considering the units recorded by the said meter in the month of May 2014 and June 2014, this Forum observes that due to summer season the said meter must have recorded high units and that cannot be sole ground to hold that the meter was running fast.
- 10.0 It appears after perusal of Appendix 'O' that after removal of the meter no. C091098 it was tested in the Meter Department's testing section on 12/08/2014 and it was found OK. It reveals that it was for the complainant to approach the BEST and apply for lab test with a request to test the meter in his presence and with a view to remove his doubt of running the meter fast. That has not been done by the complainant and even if he wants to get the meter tested in the lab, he can proceed with the said mode and if there is any lacuna or defect in the said meter, in that case the Respondent BEST Undertaking would make correction in the bill as per test report of the meter. If the complainant disputes about the authenticity of the meter test report i.e. Appendix 'O', he is at liberty to get the said meter verified in his presence and as per the test report the Respondent BEST Undertaking is under obligation to issue revised bill during the period of installation of said meter. This Forum is making the above said observation in view of submission made by the Respondent BEST Undertaking in their written statement at para 1.14 that the meter no. C091098 was tested at site on 14/07/2014 when it was found working fast. However, it appears that the said site report, Appendix 'N' does not reflect any criteria for observing that the said meter

was running fast but the fact remains proved that the meter tested in lab was found OK and one has to rely upon the lab test report, Appendix 'O'.

11.0 Having regard to the above said discussion really this Forum does not find any grievance in the complaint of high bill filed by the complainant in respect of recording high units for only two months i.e. May and June 2014 as considering the hot or summer season the meter ought to have recorded high bill in these two months and that itself is not a sufficient proof to hold that the meter was running fast when lab test report shows it is OK. This Forum observes that if the complainant has any doubt in his mind about the test report, Appendix 'O', he is at liberty to get the meter tested in lab or in government lab, IDEMI by paying the requisite charges.

12.0 Thus the complaint deserves to be dismissed. In result we pass the following order.

**ORDER**

1. The complaint No. N-G(N)-251-2015 dtd. 03/03/2015 stands dismissed.
2. The complainant is at liberty to get the meter verified or tested in government lab i.e. IDEMI in his presence by paying requisite charges. In that case the Respondent BEST Undertaking is under obligation to issue revise electricity bill on the basis of test report.
3. Copies to be given to both the parties.

(Shri S.M. Mohite)  
Member

(Shri S.S. Bansode)  
Member

(Shri V.G. Indrale)  
Chairman