



VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

First Floor 33/11 kV substation, Hyderabad Boats Club Lane
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

:: Present :: **R. DAMODAR**

Friday, the Twenty Ninth May 2015

Appeal No. 2 of 2015

Between

Sri. Mahavirji,
H.No. 13-3-690/3,
Anand Bhavan, Ranganath Nagar,
Jiayguda, Hyderabad.

... Appellant

And

1. The AE/Op/Karwan/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
2. The ADE/Op/Seetharambagh/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The AAO/ERO/Sultan Bazar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The DE/Op/Begum Bazar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
5. The SE/Op/Hyderabad/South Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 16.02.2015 coming up for hearing before the Vidhut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 26.05.2015 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. Maharavirji, the Appellant and Sri. P. Malliah ADE/Op/Sitarambagh, Sri. Mohd. Ibrahim Sr. Asst/ERO - II/ Sultan Bazar, K. Bhargavi AAO/ERO - Sultan bazar for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both the parties, the Vidhut Ombudsman passed the following;

AWARD

The Appellant has the Service Connection No 22037. He claimed that since the last two or three months, he has been getting abnormal bills and that the Respondents have issued a bill for Rs 12,000/- in September without any basis. He sought a direction for rectification of the abnormal bill.

2. The first Respondent, The Assistant Engineer/Op /Karwan, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad claimed before the CGRF on the allegation of abnormal bills that a proposal was sent to the third Respondent, AA0/Sultan Bazaar to revise the bill for Nov.2014. The Third respondent claimed that the bills were revised from 11/2013 to 11/2014 and an amount of Rs. 1,338/- was withdrawn towards excess billed amount.

3. The CGRF, on the ground that since there was no meter change and a revised bill was issued, observed that no further interference is called for.

4. Aggrieved and not satisfied with the impugned orders, the Appellant preferred the present Appeal.

5. Efforts made to get the matter settled through mediation could not succeed. Hence the matter is taken up for disposal on merits.

6. The point for determination is whether the appellant is entitled to further rectification of the bill to reduce the bill amount?

7. The Appellant claims that he got abnormal bill for Rs.12, 000/- for the Service Connection No L 4022037 for the months of September and October,2014 and on the threat of disconnection, he preferred a representation before the CGRF. He claimed that even though there is huge difference in the meter readings, the threat of disconnection was being given to him. The Respondents claimed that when the meter was tested, it was found normal and there was no meter change.

8. The ADE/Op/Sitarambagh claimed that a letter was addressed to AAO/ERO-II, Sultan bazar for bill revision from Nov, 2013 to Nov, 2014 lending credence to the allegation of the appellant that there was actually abnormal billing. The inference is that actual meter reading was not taken from time to time regularly and only a guess work based meter reading was taken leading to abnormal units when actual reading was

taken. It is clear that overall, the total consumed units would remain, however with the higher slab the total bill amount would increase. As against the total already billed amount of Rs. 32,391/-, the units were spread over the entire period allowing the benefit of slab rates and the total consumption is arrived at as follows:

<u>Total Consumption:</u>	
650 * 2.60 =	1690.00
650 * 3.25 =	2112.50
650 * 4.88 =	3172.00
650 * 5.63 =	3659.20
650 * 6.38 =	4147.00
650 * 6.88 =	4472.00
1165 * 7.38 =	8597.70
	27850.40

The revised bill after spreading the consumption units recoverable from the appellant is shown below:

Energy charges for consumption	27850.40
Subject to minimum Tariff slab	2062.26
FSA	
Customer charges 45 x 13	585.00
Electricity Duty	303.90
	1.80
Other charges	250.00
Less or gain in rounding off	0.36
To be booked	31033.00
Already billed	<u>32391.00</u>
Balance credit to the appellant	(-) 1338.00

9. The revision of the bills based on beneficial slabs could get relief of only Rs 1338/- to the appellant which was reduced from the total bill amount. The contention of the appellant that there was excess billing has substance only partly as decided supra. No further action could be taken in view of the action already taken and the revised bill was issued. Therefore the appellant is found not entitled to further reduction in the revised bill. The point is answered accordingly.

Corrected, signed and pronounced on this 29th day of May 2015.

Sd/-

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

To

1. Sri. Mahavirji,
H.No. 13-3-690/3,
Anand Bhavan,
Ranganath Nagar,
Jiyaguda, Hyderabad.
2. The Assistant Engineer, Operation, Karwan, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad.
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer, Operation, Seetharambagh, TSSPDCL,
Hyderabad.
4. The Assistant Accounts Officer, ERO, Sultan Bazar, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad.
5. The Divisional Engineer, Operation, Begum Bazar, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad.
6. The Superintending Engineer, Operation, Hyderabad, South Circle,
TSSPDCL, Hyderabad.

Copy to:

7. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Greater
Hyderabad Area, TSSPDCL, Vengal Rao Nagar, Erragadda, Hyderabad -
500 045.
8. The Secretary, TSERC, 5th Floor Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapool,
Hyderabad