

		Date	Month	Year
1	Date of Receipt	28	05	2021
2	Date of Registration	01	06	2021
3	Decided on	28	07	2021
4	Duration of proceeding	57 days		
5	Delay, if any.	—		

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. 22799528

Grievance No. N-GN-432-2021 dtd. 01/06/2021

Sulochana S. MehtaComplainant

V/S

B.E.S.&T. UndertakingRespondent

Present

Chairman

Coram : Shri S.A. Quazi, Chairman

Member

1. Shri S.S. Bansode, Member

On behalf of the Respondent : 1. Shri Sunil B. Yadav, AAM (G/N)

On behalf of the Complainant : 1. Miss Pooja Mehta

Date of Hearing : 14/07/2021(Through V.C)

Date of Order : 28/07/2021

Judgment

- 1.0 The complainant's grievance is that, since the months of June - July 2019 onwards, the Respondent has been charging her with inordinately high bills towards consumption of electricity. According to the complainant these bills are based either on faulty meter reading or miscalculation.
- 2.0 The case of the complainant as stated in the complaint and the documents annexed thereto and in the submissions made by the representative of the complainant in the course of hearing, may be stated as under:
 - a) According to the complainant, she is a consumer of electricity provided to her premises by the Respondent / Distribution Licensee. She is supplied electricity through consumer a/c no. 613-041-002. Upto 04/02/2021, she was provided electricity through meter no. L114218 installed at her premises. According to the complainant, this meter was recording consumption of electricity correctly only up to billing month May 2019 when the consumption shown by the meter used to be less than 150 units every month. But, suddenly and abruptly from the billing period of June 2019 onwards the bills have been showing inordinately and incorrectly high amount of consumption and consequently high charging of bills. Since June 2019 onwards, the bills were therefore wrong, according to the complainant. The complainant made repeated complaints to the Customer Care Ward of the Respondent. However, they did not respond as quickly as was expected from them under the rules and regulations. On the contrary, they kept on charging inordinately high bills to the complainant.
 - b) After much efforts made by the complainant, the Respondent's officials visited the site and found that the meter was not displaying the reading. On 04/02/2021, they replaced the old meter with new meter bearing no. 3201854. Therefore, for the billing period after 04/02/2021 the Respondent is charging the complainant on the basis of the readings of new meter no. 3201854.
 - c) According to the complainant, after change of the meter as above, she was charged for consumption of 105 units for billing period of February 2021. This was in the range of the amount of bills which she was charged prior to June 2019. However, again from the billing period of March 2021 onwards, the Respondent has been charging the high bills by showing wrong and incorrect consumption of units of electricity. This was also complained by the complainant to the Customer Care Ward of the Respondent as well as to the Internal Grievance Redressal Cell (IGRC).
 - d) Lastly on 06/05/2021, the complainant gave further complaint to the Respondent's IGRC. Therein she has given a chart about the record of consumption of electricity as per the bills of the Respondent for the period from January 2019 onwards up to May

2021. In the complaint letter dtd. 06/05/2021, the complainant has stated that her premises is used only by two people and the complainant is not using the electricity irresponsibly. The complainant's consumption of electricity used to be recorded less than 140 units per month even during the hottest summer seasons, but only from billing month of June 2019, the Respondent has shown high monthly consumption i.e. upto 396 units and above. To understand the reason of the hike from mid of year 2019, the complainant started monitoring units consumed from the beginning of year 2020, as the complainant and her family was out of town till mid of August 2020. However, during this period also the consumed units were shown more than 200 in each bill. According to the complainant this much hike in the consumption is impossible as no electricity was used in those 2 ½ months. The complainant visited GN Ward in Dadar T.T. where she met the official of the Respondent by name Ms. Manisha and discussed with her. The said official suggested the complainant to pay Rs. 5,000/- out of Rs. 10,810/- of the bill of July 2019 (correct year may be 2020). The complainant was given assurance that the issue of faulty meter reading and escalated bill would be sorted out immediately. Accordingly the complainant paid Rs. 5,000/- as suggested by said official. However, instead of attending the complaint of the complainant, the Respondent kept on charging with high bills to the complainant. Then the complainant visited another official Shri Tawade of the Respondent. According to his suggestion, the meter was changed because the old meter had no reading display. Thus, according to the complainant the meter was faulty since March 2019 and this was noticed by the complainant only when the meter was changed in her presence. Even after the meter being changed the problem remains as it is unresolved. The current bill of May 2021 is also high about 337 units. The complainant has removed most of the appliances except basic i.e. fridge, 2 LED lights and fan from the socket just to monitor the consumption of electricity. In spite of this, the electricity consumption shown in the bill is absolutely high.

e) Citing the aforesaid circumstances, the complainant's representative, in the course of hearing, has submitted that the Respondent has charged her inordinately high bills. Therefore, she has urged that the Respondent be directed to revise the bills and to charge her in the range of the consumption of electricity as shown prior to May 2019.

3.0 The Respondent has filed reply to the aforesaid complaint and opposed the allegations made by the complainant in respect of high billing etc. The case as pleaded by the Respondent and as submitted by their representative in the course of hearing may be stated as under:

a) The Respondent has not disputed that it supplies the electricity to the complainant. It is also not disputed that upto 04/02/2021 she was supplied with the electricity through old meter no. L114218 and on 04/02/2021 the said meter was found displaying no reading, and therefore, the same was replaced by new meter no. 3201854 on 04/02/2021. According to the Respondent, the old meter was changed due to it being defective i.e. it was not displaying the reading.

- b) According to the Respondent, the complainant had made the complaint for the first time on 19/04/2021 to the Respondent about the high bill. The Respondent had given reply the complainant on 20/04/2021. According to the Respondent, as per site testing report dtd. 10/06/2021 of meter no. 3201854, the meter was working satisfactorily as per accu-check test report. In the said site testing report it was also mentioned that the connected load was found as Tube Lights - 6, Fans - 7, TV-1, Washing Machine -1, Refrigerator (Big) - 1, Microwave -1, AC -2, PC-1, Geysers -1. The Respondent has annexed with its reply the copies of complaint dtd. 19/04/2021 and Work Order for site investigation dtd. 09/06/2021 in support of the aforesaid submission.
- c) It is further case of the Respondent that during the Covid-19 pandemic, lockdown was imposed in the city, and therefore, the outdoor activities were totally stopped as per the directives of MERC. Hence the meter reading was on estimated basis for three billing months i.e. April, May and June 2020. These bills were generated by computer system of the Respondent on complainant's estimated average basis of earlier months' consumption i.e. for this case 174 units for each of the months of April, May and June 2020 i.e. total consumption during these three months was estimated to 522 units. The actual consumption during the summer months is always higher than the system generated estimated consumption. The meter reading activity was then restored from July 2020. According to the physical meter reading recorded from July 2020, the bills generated in the month of July 2020 are as per the actual recorded consumption. Respondent's computerized System has divided it as 394, 451 and 451 units (Total 1296 units) for three months of April, May and June 2020 after giving the slab benefit. The initial reading on 24/02/2020 was 22758 and physical reading recorded on 24/06/2020 was 24450. This shows that total units consumed were 1692 from 24/2/2020 to 24/6/2020. This includes the units of 394, 451 and 451 for billing period of April, May and June 2020 as well as 396 units for the billing period of July 2020. The bill for July 2020 for 396 units and the difference of the April, May and June 2020, was calculated to the amount of Rs. 10,710/- Thus this total amount was payable in the month of July 2020. In support of this submission, the Respondent has produced the documents placed at pg. 49/C to 55/C with their reply. All these documents seem to be respondent's computer-system-generated in respect of the calculation for the aforesaid period and the amount paid by the complainant and also for the amount payable by the complainant for the billing period from April 2020 to July 2020 and also earlier and subsequent period's bills.
- d) According to the Respondent, the old meter no. L114218 was over read during the period from 21/08/2020 to 23/10/2020 and charged 331 units. Actual chargeable units were 219, thus net amount of Rs. 1,146.24 was credited to the complainant and the benefit was thereof given in the month of April 2021. In this regard the complainant has produced with the reply the calculation sheet generated by their computer system and the bill for the April 2020 dtd. 01/04/2021. Due to over reading, the consumer had received "0" units consumption in next month i.e. November 2020 as shown in the computer generated statement about billing months from April 2018 to

June 2021, which has columns of reading date, reading in KWH, billing units, reading type etc.

- e) According to the respondent, the old meter no. L114218 had last correct reading recorded was 25436 units. From 23/09/2020 to 25/01/2021 the consumer was charged with the bills on the basis of estimated reading. From 26/01/2021 to 04/02/2021 (date of meter replacement) broken period units were not charged. Hence amendment was done for the undercharged 71 units. It was worked out to net debit of Rs. 526/- and same was debited in the bill of June 2021 as shown in the copies of bills produced with the reply of the Respondent. The new meter no. 3201854 was updated on master folio in the March 2021. The same has been paid by the complainant regularly till June 2020. In July 2020 the consumer has paid Rs. 5,000/- i.e. 50% of total amount due. The Respondent has received last payment of Rs. 313.00 on 26/03/2021. The Respondent has produced a chart, showing the payment made by the complainant, which is at pg. 57/C with it's reply.
- f) The Respondent has further submitted that the complainant has been charged with correct units of consumption as recorded by the new meter from April 2021 and it is matching with the past consumption pattern recorded by the old meter.
- g) According to the Respondent, the arrears as on June 2021 is Rs. 24,690/- including the bill for June 2021.
- h) According to the Respondent, the complainant had disputed the above debit note vide letter and email dtd. 13/06/2020, 06/05/2021 and 15/05/2021 stating that she was wrongly charged in the electricity bills. Therefore, the case of the complainant is not acceptable. The complainant in her email has mentioned high bill complaint from pandemic lock-down period till date. Site testing report of new meter no. 3201854 was found working satisfactorily. Therefore, the complainant has no case at all and hence it is submitted by the Respondent that the present complaint is liable to be dismissed.

4.0 We have heard the submissions of the representative of the complainant as well as the representative of the Respondent. The submissions of the parties in the aforesaid hearing may be stated as under:

- a) The complainant's representative Ms. Pooja has pointed out the circumstances mentioned in the various complaints made by the complainant to the Respondent. She has also pointed out the record of the billing for the period from 2018 onwards. Pointing out these records, she has submitted that prior to the month of June 2019, the monthly consumption of electricity recorded by the old meter was not more than 140 to 150 units. In June 2019 bill, the reading was shown as 215 units, then in the next month it was shown 360 units, in the next month it was shown as 234 units and in the next month there of the consumption was shown as 203 units. Thereafter, the consumption was shown mostly high i.e. more than 250 units. She has submitted that the Respondent has found that the old meter was not recording the reading and

therefore the meter was changed on 04/02/2021. This shows that the old meter was defective and the aforesaid high billing was based on the defective meter. The new meter is also not recording correct reading as it does not tally with the consumption pattern recorded prior to June 2019. Therefore, it is submitted that the Respondent be directed to modify the bills so as to charge the complainant with the pattern of consumption shown prior to June 2019 i.e. not more than 140 or 150 units per month.

- b) The Respondent's representative, Mr. Yadav has opposed the contentions raised by the representative of the complainant. He has submitted that the grievance of the complainant is about the estimated bills given during the pandemic lockdown period from April to June 2020, due to the directions of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (hereinafter referred to as MERC). He has further submitted that during the period from April, May and June 2020, the bills were given on estimation, without taking physical reading of the meter. In this regard he has produced copy of practice directions dt. 9/5/2020 issued by MERC pursuant to the imposition of lockdown by government on account of Covid-19 pandemic. In the said practice directions, MERC has observed that it has already issued suspension of meter reading activities and issuing bills to the consumers based on actual meter reading, if available through AMR or based on average consumption as per provisions of Supply Code Regulations. In these directions dtd. 09/05/2020, the MERC had given further clarification to its earlier practice directions dtd. 26/03/2020. The Respondent's representative has further submitted that in the reply of the Respondent, the appliances being used by the complainant have been mentioned and in view of this, consumption being recorded by the meter cannot be said to be inordinately high. Moreover, the new meter has been tested and it is found to be correct in all respects. It is submitted that if the complainant wants to dispute the correctness of the meter then she can get the meter tested from appropriate authority. Till any such step is taken by complainant, the reading shown by the new meter will have to be presumed as correct and therefore the bills as have been charged by the Respondent are correct. As far as old meter is concerned, the representative of the Respondent has submitted that the bills issued by the Respondent cannot be said to be incorrect in the light of the reading taken by the Respondent's officials from time to time as noted in the computer generated statement from April 2019 to June 2021. He has submitted that immediately after noticing that the meter is not displaying reading in February 2021, the same has been replaced by new meter. Therefore, it is submitted by the representative of the Respondent that the complaint is liable to be dismissed.

- 5.0 We have heard the submissions of the parties and noted their submissions as above. In view of the above submissions of the parties and the case as pleaded by them, the following **points arise for determination**, on which we record our findings as under, for the reasons to follow :

Sr. No.	Points for determination	Findings
1	Whether the bills for the period from June 2019 till 04/02/2021 based on the old meter no. L114218 is correct?	In Negative
2	If it is not correct, then what directions should be given to the Respondent for proper billing for the aforesaid billing period from June 2019 to 04/02/2021?	Th respondent is directed to modify the concerned bills, as is being indicated in the operative order herein below.
3	Whether the bills for the billing period from 04/02/2021 to lastly served bill, based on reading of the new meter no. 3201854, are correct and is it necessary to give any directions about testing of this meter?	The bills based on new meter no. 3201854 for the billing period from 04/02/2021 to the lastly served bill, are correct and if the complainant wants to dispute the correctness of the new meter, she shall be at liberty to get it tested from appropriate authority as is being observed in operative order herein below.
4	What order should be passed?	The complaint is partly allowed as is being directed in operative order being passed hereinbelow..

6.0 We record reasons for aforesaid findings as under:

- a) As far as the point (1) & (2) posed for determination as above are concerned, they are in respect of billings based on the old meter no. L114218 for the period from June 2019 to 04/02/2021. According to the complainant during the said period, the billing was high and more than the average bills of the period prior to June 2019. In this regard there is a document produced by the Respondent at pg. 35/C along with their reply. This is respondent's computer-generated chart. It has the columns of reading date, reading in KWH, billing units, reading type etc. This chart shows the monthly consumption pattern between 42 to 136 in units for billing period from April 2018 to May 2019. Then from June 2019 to December 2019 the monthly consumed units are shown as between 316 to 185. Then in January 2020 and February 2020 the consumed units are shown as 185, 30 and 29 respectively and in the "Reading Note" column, it is mentioned that there is no display but still in the Reading Type column, estimated reading, periodic reading are recorded in respect of these three entries. Thereafter, for the month of March 2020 the reading is shown as 22758 and the bill units are shown as 174 and it is mentioned that periodic reading is taken. Then in April 2020 the reading is shown as 22932, bill units are 174 and in the "Reader Note" column, it is mentioned as "reading not taken" and bill was given on estimated reading. Same is about the month of May 2020 and June 2020. In June 2020, it is mentioned in this chart that reading is 23280 and bill units are 174 but in Reader Note, it is mentioned that

reading is not taken and it is Estimated Reading. Then in July 2020, the reading was shown as 23603 and reading is 451 units and it is mentioned that reading was not taken. In July 2020 there are further three entries in this chart showing the bill units as 394, 396 & 451 quoting that reading was not taken but in Reading Type it is mentioned that periodic reading is taken. In November 2020, it is mentioned that reading was 25324 and bill units are "0", Current reading less than previous. Then in December 2020, the reading is shown as 25611 and bill units are shown as 287 and in "Reader Note" column it is mentioned as Error Reading / Display Error and in "Reading Type" column it shows estimated reading. In January 2021 and February 2021 the bill units are shown as 290 and 314 respectively with entry as "No Display" and further mentioned in the Reading Type as estimated reading. Then in the "Reading Date" column, the date is 04/02/2021 and the reading is shown as 26215 and bill units are "0". Then for the month of April 2021 in the "Meter No. column" new meter number is shown and in "Reading Date column" the date of reading is mentioned as 24/03/2021 and in the "Reading column" it is mentioned as 338 units and in the "Bill Units" column 231 units consumption and in "Reading Note" column it is mentioned as "Everything Normal", "Periodic Reading". Similarly for the month of May and June 2021, the readings are shown as 337 and 310 respectively and it is mentioned that readings have been taken for these two months.

- b) From the aforesaid document and the chart of reading and bill units produced by the Respondent with their reply, it seems that in the month of January 2020 and February 2020 in the Reader Note it is mentioned that "There is no electricity / No Display" and the bill was given on estimated reading for these two months. Then again in December 2020, January 2021 and February 2021 it is mentioned that "There is no electricity / No Display" and "Error reading / display error" and bills were given on estimated reading. It appears that thereafter the old meter was changed on 04/02/2021.
- c) The question that arises from the aforesaid circumstances is that whether the old meter was defective and showing incorrect reading? To find out an answer to this question the aforesaid documents produced by the respondent are found relevant. The meter was not displaying reading at least for the month of November, December 2020 and January, February 2021 even as per the record of the Respondent. The aforesaid chart produced by the Respondent shows that for April, May and June 2020 the bills were given on estimation due to lockdown declared by the government on account of Covid-19 epidemic. Thereafter, the actual reading was taken according to the Respondent, and the meter showed the reading as 24054 and last reading taken on 24/02/2020 as 22758 and thus from April to June 2020 units were consumed by the complainant to the extent of 1296 and for the month of July 2020 the units consumed were 396 and thus total consumption of 1692 units was shown by the meter during the period from billing period 24/02/2020 to 22/07/2020. According to the Respondent, therefore the bills for the month of April, May, June and July were given, by adjusting the estimated bills earlier given. These adjusted bills were payable in July 2020.

- d) It appears that at that time when the bill was of Rs. 10,710/- in the month of July 2020, the complainant has paid Rs. 5,000/- out of this amount on the assurance given by the officials of the Respondent that her grievance about high bill will be addressed by the Respondent. Further, it appears from the documents produced by the complainant that she had been complaining to the Respondent about high bills at least from July 2020 as seen from the copy of complaint dtd. 13/07/2020 given by the complainant to the Respondent, as produced with the complainant. In that complaint she had stated that the problem of high bill is being raised since January 2020. In the complaint letter dtd. 06/05/2021, it is mentioned that high billing started from June 2019. From the chart of the meter reading and bill reading etc. produced by the Respondent at pg. 35/C it is seen that the meter was shown as “No electricity / No Display” in January 2020. This corroborates the contention of the complainant that the meter was not correctly recording the consumption of the electricity units. Thereafter, in the said document of the respondent it is mentioned that in February and March, reading taken from meter and similarly in the month of July 2020 to October 2020, the readings are said to have been taken as per this chart and in November, December 2020 and January as well as February 2021, the Respondent’s record shown that meter was not displaying the reading. This shows that the contention of the respondent is doubtful that the meter was in working condition and was showing correct record of consumption of electricity and the respondent could take the readings as tried to be shown in their bills in the months of February 2020 and March 2020 as well as June 2020 to October 2020. The reason for this inference is that when prior to this period, in January 2020 and February 2020, the meter was not displaying the reading, even as per respondent’s own document as discussed above, then how could have it displayed the reading for subsequent periods in March 2020 and July to November 2020. In this regard we do not find any explanation given by the respondent. If the meter was not displaying in January and February 2020 the burden was on the Respondent to show that the meter had started displaying the reading for subsequent period but this burden of proof is not discharged by the Respondent. Therefore, we will have to hold that the meter was defective from billing month of January 2020 till the replacement of the old meter i.e. on 04/02/2021. From January 2020 till the time of replacement of meter, the Respondent has charged the complainant as shown in their bills for these months. It may be noted that the old meter has not been tested by the Respondent even after its removal. In such circumstances for the period from January 2020 to 04/02/2021 the Respondent is entitled to charge the complainant only for the period and at the rate as provided under the 2nd proviso of clause 16.4.1 of the MERC (Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensee including Power Quality), Regulations, 2021. The said clause 16.4.1 reads as under.

16.4.1 Subject to the provisions of Part XII and Part XIV of the Act, in case of a defective meter, the amount of the Consumer’s bill shall be adjusted, for a maximum period of three months prior to the month in which the dispute has arisen, in accordance with the

results of the test taken subject to furnishing the test report of the meter along with the assessed bill:

Provided that, in case of broken or damaged meter seal, the meter shall be tested for defectiveness or tampering. In case of defective meter, the assessment shall be carried out as per clause 16.4.1 above and, in case of tampering as per Section 126 or Section 135 of the Act, depending on the circumstances of each case:

Provided further that, in case the meter is stuck, burnt, lost or has stopped recording, the Consumer will be billed for the period for which the meter is stuck or has stopped recording or for the period for which meter was not available due to burning or loss of meter, up to a maximum period of Three (3) months, based on the consumption during the corresponding period in the previous year when readings were taken or the average consumption of the previous Three (3) billing cycles for which the meter has been read by the Distribution Licensee, whichever is higher:

Provided further that if it is established in the licensee's enquiry that the loss of meter was due to act of the Consumer and/or with his connivance, the Consumer shall be billed as per Regulation 10.

- e) In the light of the aforesaid facts and the reasons and in view of the aforesaid proviso to clause 16.4.1 of the said supply code, we hold that the bills charged by the Respondent for the billing period from January 2020 to 04/02/2021 based on the readings of the old meter no. L114218 are not correct as the Respondent is not entitled to claim the bills for all these months based on the defective meter which was not displaying the reading. However, prior to the January 2020, the bills based on the reading of the old meter no. L114218 are correct and we do not find any defect in the said readings for these months and we do not find any reason to hold that meter was defective for these months prior to billing month January 2020. In this regard submission of the representative of complainant is not convincing that the reading between June 2019 to December 2019 was not as per the earlier period's consumption pattern. At least in May and June 2018, the consumption was respectively 226 and 529 units. When this was pointed out during the course of hearing, the representative of the complainant tried to explain by saying that there was marriage function and therefore there was hike in consumption during those two months. However we do not find any substance in this explanation, as it is without any support of pleading and document.
- f) As far as the bills for the bill-month of January 2020 to 04/02/2021 are concerned, as per the aforesaid 2nd proviso of 16.4.1 of the aforesaid Supply Code, the Respondent is entitled to claim the bills for three months only based on the consumption during the corresponding period in the previous year when the readings were taken or the consumption of previous three billing cycle for which the meter has been read (i.e. immediately previous to January 2020) by the Distribution Licensee / Respondent

whichever is higher. Therefore, we will have to give directions to the Respondent to modify / revise the bills so as to charge for billing period from January 2020 to 04/02/2021 based on the old meter no. L114218 as observed above and to give necessary credit to the complainant. Accordingly, we have recorded our findings on point No. 1 and 2.

- g) As far as point (3) is concerned, it is not disputed that from 04/02/2021 the new meter no. 3201854 has been installed and the bills are given based on the readings of this new meter from 04/02/2021 onwards. The contention of the complainant is that this meter is also showing high readings. However, the respondent has submitted that the new meter has been site tested and it was found correct as per the site testing report dtd. 10/06/2021. This report is produced with reply of the Respondent at pg. 37/C. It shows that the meter was found OK. Therefore, we do not find any reason to find any defect in the reading given by new meter. Therefore, we will have to hold that the bills given by the Respondent from 04/02/2021 onwards based on the new meter number 3201854 are correct. Accordingly we hold as such in this regard. However, we find it in the interest of justice that we should give liberty to the complainant to get the meter tested from appropriate authority under the relevant rules and regulations as per 2nd proviso to clause 15.6.2 of MERC (Electricity Supply code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees including Power quality) Regulations, 2021. The said proviso reads as under.

15.6.2. xxx xxx xxx

 xxx xxx xxx

Provided further that if a Consumer disputes the results of testing carried out by the Distribution Licensee, the meter shall be tested at a National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratory (NABL) accredited laboratory chosen by the Consumer at the cost of the Consumer:

In view of this we hold that the complainant shall have the aforesaid liberty. Accordingly, we have answered point (3).

- h) As far as point (4) is concerned, we hold that the present complaint will have to be partly allowed in view of the findings given on point (1) & (2) as noted herein earlier to the effect that the Respondent will have to be directed to modify / revise the bills so as to charge the complainant as indicated herein earlier as far as it is concerned to the period from January 2020 to 04/02/2021 which was based on reading of old meter L114218 in the light of the 2nd proviso to 16.4.1 of SOP and to give necessary credit to the complainant. As far as the bills based on the reading of new meter no. 3201854 is concerned, we will have to give liberty to the complainant as per rules and regulations laid in clause 15.6.2 of the SOP as noted herein earlier. In these terms, the complaint will have to be disposed off. Hence, we pass the following order.

ORDER

- 1.0 The grievance no. N-GN-432-2021 dtd. 01/06/2021 stands partly allowed in the following terms.
- 2.0 The Respondent is directed to modify / revise the bills so as to charge the complainant for the period from January 2020 onwards so as to charge the complainant for the billing period from January 2020 to 04/02/2021 as per the 2nd proviso to 16.4.1 of MERC (Electricity Supply code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees including Power quality) Regulations, 2021. These directions shall be complied within two months from the receipt of this order by the Respondent.
- 3.0 The complainant shall be at liberty to get the new meter no. 3201854 tested from competent authority under the rules and regulations as laid down in clause 15.6.2 of the MERC (Electricity Supply code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees including Power quality) Regulations, 2021.
- 4.0 For other reliefs the complaint stands dismissed.
- 5.0 With these directions, the complaint stands disposed off.
- 6.0 Copies of this order be given to all the concerned parties.

Sd/-
(Shri. Sanjay S. Bansode)
Member

sd/-
(Shri S.A. Quazi)
Chairman