

**GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, GUJARAT STATE  
Polytechnic Compound, Barrack No.3, Ambawadi,  
Ahmedabad-380015**

**CASE NO. 49/2018**

**Appellant:** Managing Director  
Sabarkantha Jilla Sahkari Dudh Utpadak Sangh Ltd.,  
Sub Post: Boriya. Himatnagar-383006  
Dist. Sabarkantha

**Represented by:** Shri R.J.Desai, DGM  
Shri M.M.Patel, Asstt.Manager

**V/s.**

**Respondent:** Executive Engineer,  
Uttar Gujarat Vij Company Limited  
Division Office, Idar-383430. Dist.Sabarkantha

**Represented by:** Shri M.Z.Asari, EE, UGVCL, Idar

**:::PROCEEDINGS:::**

- 2.0. The Appellant had submitted representation aggrieving with the order No.5230 dated 18.05.2018 passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Uttar Gujarat Vij Company Limited, Sabarmati, in case No.UG-01-008-1028-19. The representation was registered at this office as Case No.49/2018. The hearing of this case was kept on 12.07.2018.
- 2.0.** Appellant has represented the case as under.
- 2.1. Appellant is Sabarkantha Jilla Sahkari Dudh Utpadak Sangh Limited, "Sabar Dairy." Appellant is having HT connection No. 33012 for milk chilling center at Idar.
- 2.2. Respondent had issued supplementary bill for the month of December,2014 and January,2015. Aggrieved by the supplementary bill, Appellant had filed grievance before CGRF. Aggrieved by the order issued by CGRF, Appellant has filed representation before Ombudsman.
- 2.3. The supplementary bill issued is for the period 15.11.2014 to 15.01.2015. The meter was checked with Accucheck and supplementary bill for 70962 units for the period 15.11.2014 to

15.12.2014 and for 8160 units for the period of 15.12.2014 to 15.01.2015 was issued.

- 2.4. Appellant has submitted details regarding production of milk and energy consumption for the year 2012 to 2015 as under:

Year:2012				Year:2013			
Month	Milk	Unit	Milk/Unit	Month	Milk	Unit	Milk/Unit
Oct.12	2537263	53424	47.49	Oct.13	2407980	52818	45.59
Nov.12	2707295	49086	55.15	Nov.13	2635100	51444	51.22
<b>Dec.12</b>	<b>3099152</b>	<b>50022</b>	<b>61.96</b>	<b>Dec.13</b>	<b>3012600</b>	<b>49944</b>	<b>60.32</b>
Jan.13	3276426	50382	65.03	Jan.14	3268300	52422	62.35
Feb.13	3075585	51918	59.24	Feb.14	3062200	52764	58.04
March,13	3228275	48888	66.03	March,14	3288400	50736	64.81
Total	17923996	303720		Total	17674580	310128	
Avg. Unit		50620		Avg. Unit		51688	
Milk/Unit		59.01		Milk/Unit		56.99	

Year:2014				Year:2015			
Month	Milk	Unit	Milk/Unit	Month	Milk	Unit	Milk/Unit
Oct.14	2524200	57792	43.68	Oct.15	2864300	59088	48.48
Nov.14	2847200	59856	47.57	Nov.15	3083000	62670	49.19
Dec.14	3239500	43218	74.96	<b>Dec.15</b>	<b>3625200</b>	<b>57069</b>	<b>63.52</b>
Jan.15	3409100	50898	66.98	Jan.16	4017600	64338	62.45
Feb.15	3064900	52224	58.69	Feb.16	3696600	68268	54.15
March,15	3230300	54450	59.33	March,16	3644800	60552	60.19
Total	18315200	318438		Total	20931500	371985	
Avg. Unit		53073		Avg. Unit		61998	
Milk/Unit		57.51		Milk/Unit		56.26	

- 2.5. It is stated that milk processing in Kg./Unit for the period 15<sup>th</sup> November to 15 December for the year 2012, 2013 and 2015 are 61.96, 60.32 and 63.52 respectively. It is submitted that if average 62 Kg. milk processing is considered then energy consumption of 13019 units would be more to pay by the Appellant during the period covered in supplementary bill.
- 2.6. It is submitted that as per the Supply Code Notification No. 4 of 2015, Clause No.6.58 in case of faulty meter average unit consumption for the period of previous three months would be recoverable.
- 2.7. It is submitted that in case of one phase missing theoretically meter would record less energy by 33%. Therefore, Respondent should have issued supplementary bill for 33% slowness of meter only, while Respondent has issued supplementary bill for 61.64% slowness of meter, which is technically not justified.

- 2.8. Appellant has paid full amount of energy bill along with interest thereon.

The unit of Appellant is for milk processing/chilling and various milk products. Appellant has never utilized electricity for any other purpose. Appellant has reiterated to consider the data of milk processing for the year 2012 to 2014 and to decide the energy consumption during the period of supplementary bill. Appellant has requested to refund/adjust the amount of energy bill for 13019 units which is recovered more.

- 3.0.** Respondent has represented the case as under.

- 3.1 Appellant is having HT connection, bearing consumer No.HT-33012 for 200 KVA contracted demand, for milk chilling purpose.

- 3.2. It is submitted that on 15.12.2014 reading of meter was not available through AMR while taking meter reading for the purpose of issue of energy bill. It was also observed that B-phase PT was missing.

- 3.3. On 20.12.2014 the connection of Appellant was checked with Accucheck vide checking sheet No. 390. The details of meter are as under:

Make:	L&T.	Sr.No.:	09222515
PT Ratio:	11KV/110V.	CT Ratio:	-/5 A.

	<u>CTPT details(Old)</u>	<u>CTPT details (New)</u>
Make:	Nikson.	Nikson
CT Ratio:	30/5A.	15/5A
PT Ratio:	11KV/110V	11KV/110V

The percentage error of meter was found -61.64%. It is observed that in meter display parameter B-phase voltage is Zero.

During checking, HT meter side present KW was 31.968, while LT side as per Accucheck result connected load was 77.1KW.

Meter MRI data was retrieved and faulty CTPT unit was replaced.

- 3.4. It is submitted that as per MRI report, from dated 19.11.2014 at 13:18 hours, B-phase voltage recorded below the standard voltage due to internal technical fault of CTPT unit. Thus, meter has recorded less energy of 61.64% from 19.11.2014 to 20.12.2014 i.e. till replacement of CTPT unit.

Supplementary bill for 35904 units amounting to Rs. 2,32,097.74 was issued to Appellant on 03.01.2015.

- 3.5. As per the contentions raised by Appellant by mentioning milk process (in Kg.) per unit consumption for the year 2012, 2013 and 2014, there is discrepancies observed for milk processing and therefor calculation made by Appellant for energy consumption (units) cannot be considered.
- 3.6. In the case of meter slowness, the supplementary bill issued is as per provisions, and the amount of supplementary bill is recoverable.

**::: ORDER :::**

- 4.0.** I have considered the contentions of the Appellant and the contentions of Respondent and the facts, statistics and relevant papers, which are on record, and considering them in detail, my findings are as under.
- 4.1. Appellant has filed the representation against the Forum order. The main issue involved in the representation is for recovery of supplementary bill assessed for the slowness of meter. Meter was inspected on 20.12.2014 as per checking sheet No.390 and meter was found running slow by 61.64%. B-phase PT was found missing by officer of Respondent at the time of inspection of meter. Here it is to note that the static meter installed at the location of Appellant is having facility to read the parameters through AMR while getting meter reading on 15.12.2014 for the month of December,2014 for billing purpose.
- 4.2. It is observed from the MRI data retrieved by Respondent that Sequential Storage Events during the period 19.11.2014 to 20.12.2014, B-phase voltage recorded below the standard value and/or often missing.
- 4.3. In this grievance issue of supplementary bill dated 03.01.2015 Appellant had asked meter MRI report vide letter dated 09.01.2015, in reply to that Respondent had issued meter MRI report along with checking sheet vide letter dated 15.01.2015 to Appellant. Again vide letter dated 22.01.2015 Appellant had requested to revise the

supplementary bill for the slowness of meter. Respondent had issued notice vide letter dated 31.01.2015 for payment of supplementary bill amount. Thereafter, Respondent had issued notice for payment of supplementary bill amount in the month of August,2017. On 21.03.2018 Respondent had issued duplicate supplementary bill of Rs. 3,54,203.95 including Delay Payment Charges. Aggrieved by the same, appellant had filed complaint before Executive Engineer, Idar and CGRF, and thereafter Appellant has paid the amount of supplementary bill on 26.03.2018.

From above evidence it is on record that meter slowness bill was issued on 03.01.2015, which was later on paid by appellant on 26.03.2018 and raised the issue against the slowness of meter and submitted the data of milk processing and energy units consumption, and requested to revise the supplementary bill for the period 15.12.2014 to 15.01.2015. The grievance is filed by Appellant after lapse of two years, after development of original cause, i.e after issue of supplementary bill on 03.01.2015,

- 4.4. While deciding the grievance by CGRF, it is observed that the grievance/complaint has been registered after two years from the cause of action taken by the Respondent and the grievance was disposed of by Forum as per Clause No.2.30(iii) of Notification No.2 of 2011, Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum & Ombudsman, 2011. Forum has rightly decided the grievance.
- 4.5. Looking to the above observations, order of Forum is acceptable.
- 4.6. I order accordingly.
- 4.7. No order as to costs.
- 4.8. With this order, representation/Application stands disposed of.

(Dilip Raval)  
Electricity Ombudsman  
Gujarat State

Ahmedabad.  
Date: 20.07.2018.