

GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
6th FLOOR, GIFT ONE, GIFT CITY, GANDHINAGAR

Minutes of the 17th Meeting of the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forums of different utilities held on 15th May, 2014 at 11:30 AM in Conference Room, GERC, Gandhinagar.

The following were present in the meeting.

Commission

Shri Pravinbhai Patel : Chairman, GERC.
Dr. M.K. Iyer : Member (Finance), GERC.

Electricity Ombudsman

Shri V.T. Rajpara : Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad

Chairperson / Members / Representatives of Forums

1. Shri P.J.Patel, Chairperson, MGVCL Forum.
2. Shri D.J.Parekh, Chairperson, PGVCL (Bhavnagar) Forum.
3. Shri A.M.Dhebar, Chairperson, PGVCL (Bhuj)
4. Shri R.N.Jadeja, Chairperson, PGVCL (Rajkot) Forum
5. Shri A.C.Panwala, Chairperson, DGVCL Forum.
6. Mrs. M.Y. Shah, Chairperson, UGVCL Forum.
7. Shri M.G.Patel, Chairperson, TPL (Ahmedabad) Forum.
8. Shri V.R.Vyas, Chairperson, TPL (Surat) Forum.
9. Smt. Harsha S.Chauhan, Independent Member, MGVCL Forum.
10. Mrs. Medha M. Marathe, Technical Member, MGVCL Forum.
11. Shri P.C.Adhia, Technical Member, PGVCL (Rajkot) Forum.
12. Unnati H. Juthani, Independent Member, PGVCL (Rajkot) Forum
13. Shri D.J.Dhandhukiya, Independent Member, PGVCL (Bhavnagar) Forum.
14. Shri B.J.Dave, Independent Member, PGVCL (Bhuj) Forum.
15. Shri J.J.Patel, Independent Member, DGVCL Forum
16. Shri S.R.Patel, Technical Member, UGVCL Forum.
17. Mrs.Y.H.Upadhyia, Independent Member, TPL (Ahmedabad) Forum.
18. Shri Vipul R. Kakadia, Technical Member, TPL (Ahmedabad) Forum.
19. Shri Bimal D. Mistry, Technical Member, TPL (Surat) Forum.
20. Shri M.N.Dave, Convener, MGVCL Forum
21. Shri K.D. Viradia, Convener, PGVCL (Rajkot) Forum.
22. Shri P.P.Pandya, Convener, PGVCL (Bhavnagar) Forum.
23. Shri B.K.Maheshwari, Convener, PGVCL (Bhuj) Forum.
24. Shri B.R. Icecreamwala, Convener, DGVCL forum.
25. Shri P.D.Halani, Convener, UGVCL Forum.
26. Shri N.G.Shah, Convener, TPL (Ahmedabad) Forum
27. Shri Dipak Panirwala, Convener, TPL (Surat) Forum

Officers of the Commission:

1. Shri D.R. Parmar, Joint Director
2. Shri M.N. Khalyani, Dy. Director (A & A)
3. Shri Gopal Dayalani, Dy. Director (Technical)
4. Shri Apurva Adhvaryu, Dy. Director (Tariff)

Officer of the Ombudsman:

Shri B.J. Shah, Staff Officer, Ombudsman.

Shri M.N. Khalyani, Dy. Director (A & A) welcomed the Chairpersons and Members of all the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forums (CGRF) and Ombudsman and requested Chairman to preside over the meeting.

Shri Pravinbhai Patel, Chairman of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission presided over the meeting and welcomed the Ombudsman and all Members of Forum. He stated that the meeting of Forum is generally held on a quarterly basis. However this time it was delayed due to tariff work. He also welcomed New Member Shri Vipul Kakadia, Technical Member of TPL (Ahmedabad) Forum who was attending the meeting for first time. Thereafter, the agenda items were taken up for discussion.

Item No.1: Confirmation of Minutes of the last Meeting:

The Minutes of Sixteenth Meeting of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forums held on 19-Nov- 2013 were circulated to all the Forums/Members vide the Commission's letter No. GERC/ADMIN/2413/1632 dated 15-Dec- 2013. Since, no comments were received by the Commission from any of the members, the Minutes of the meeting were confirmed.

Item No.2: Action Taken Report of the last meeting

The Commission considered and discussed the Compliance Status Report i.e. Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Sixteenth Meeting of Forum.

While perusing the Compliance Report, chairpersons of all the Forums informed that they are regularly reviewing implementation of Forum Orders.

On query regarding two pending cases for implementation, Technical Member, UGVCL informed that these cases were also implemented.

Forum members apprised the Commission that there are some time delays in implementation of some of Forum orders having financial implication as these are being referred to Managing Director of the Company.

The Commission directed that, this may be discussed with Managing Director of companies in State Co-ordination Forum Meeting for timely implementation of such Forum orders.

Item No.3: Review of Performance

While reviewing the quarterly performance report of CGRF for 4th quarter of 2013-14, Chairman appreciated that almost all the Forums have arranged adequate no. of meetings in the quarter for redressal of grievances.

Regarding, instances of pending cases for more than 45 days, the representatives of Forum stated that generally pending cases were due to requirement of more details from license and some time limit extension asked by consumers.

Chairman directed that implementation of orders of CGRF shall be reviewed every month by the Chairperson of Forum and status of licensee's compliance against

each order that specifies direction to licensee shall be submitted to the Commission alongwith quarterly report.

Item No.4: Presentation on cases by Forums :

Presentations were made by the member of MGVCL, DGVCL, PGVCL-Bhavnagar and TPL Ahmedabad Forums and Ombudsman on typical cases.

Gist of the cases is as under:

MGVCL Forum

Shri C.S.Prajapati applied for new agriculture connection of 10 HP under Dark zone Scheme 1998. The applicant had submitted necessary documents for MIS system on 21.06.2012 and same was sent to GGRC on 19.07.2012. The GGRC had issued the work order to agency for MIS work, which was cancelled due to nonpayment of GGRC estimate within time limit of 180 days by the applicant. Based on GGRC cancellation of work order, Kapadwanj REC Sub division had communicated to applicant for cancellation of his application. As the applicant was not aware about GGRC work order, he was unable to deposit the estimate amount. Aggrieved by cancellation of the work order, he registered complaint at CGRF for reconsideration of his application. Forum collected the details and observed that due to lacuna on the part of GGRC Communication system, the complainant was not aware of the work order and as such he was not in fault for nonpayment of work order. The Forum directed the respondent to revoke the cancellation of application and initiate process to provide agriculture connection with new work order of GGRC.

While discussing this case, it was observed that copy of GGRC work order is marked only to the concerned licensee and not to the applicant. It was, therefore,

suggested that immediately after receipt of the GGRC work order, the licensee should forward a copy of the order to the applicant, to avoid such cases in future.

DGVCL Forum

The Forum in their presentation indicated that the number of grievances received and redressed by Forum have increased due to increase in awareness among consumers regarding functioning of CGRF.

In the specific case being discussed, the Complainant i.e. Shree Sai Shradhdha Enterprise bearing consumer no 39882 was having HT Connection with contract demand of 275 KVA. The connection was checked by H.T. I/C Squad in presence of complainant's representative, Shri Nilesh Savani on 8.03.2013 and meter was found slow by 31.29% due to lower voltage available in 'Y' phase PT. The defective CTPT was replaced on 19.03.2013 by new CTPT of appropriate size. The respondent had issued the supplementary bill for the period from 28.09.2012 to 19.03.2013 [till defective CTPT was replaced] for 172 days by considering the average consumption of 34 days after replacement of CTPT unit and bill amounting to Rs.6,98,839.64 was paid by the complainant on 31.12.2013 vide M.R. No. 919722. The complainant filed complaint on 20.12.2013 with CGRF with a request to provide natural justice in the matter and forum registered it as case no 101/2013-14. Both the parties were heard by Forum on 22.01.2014, 18.02.2014 & 21.02.2014 and forum analysed the case in detail. Based on analysis, Forum observed that supplementary bill was issued on the basis of average per day consumption, worked out for 34 days after replacement of CTPT Unit instead of 31.29 % of slowness of the meter for the period from Oct-2012 to March-2013, the defective CTPT was replaced by the respondent after 4.5 months and monthly consumption was uneven. Also, the respondent calculated KVAH and KVARH on the basis of units recorded in 34 days after replacement of CTPT and accordingly Power Factor Adjustment Charges

amounting Rs.268173.98 was included in the supplementary bill. The forum observed that the meter was found slow by only 31.29% and if same %age slowness units are added in KVAH and KVARH units, the Power Factor [revised] remains same. Hence Power Factor penalty should not have been levied. Forum directed the respondent to revise the supplementary bill for 140 days on the basis of units recorded during this period and slowness of 31.29 %. As per Forum order, the respondent has issued the revised bill amounting to Rs. 3,07,338.02 and refunded an amount of Rs. 3,91,501.62 in the month of May 2014 to the complainant.

PGVCL - Bhavnagar Forum

8 Nos of applicants applied at Mamsa Sub Division for agriculture connection in 1990 and their estimates were issued on 15-09-2001 with the group of 9 applicants in 'D' category, which was paid by the above group (applicants) on 10-10-2001. After payment of FQ, neither the line work was carried out nor connections were given by respondent. On enquiring, the sub-division office informed these applicants, that the line work for their work will be taken up when other prior applicant's group pay their estimate. Plaintiff also informed that, there is no other revised estimate was issued by Respondent. Respondent informed that, the above applicants did not correspond with the utility regarding their connection. Forum indicated that if the applicants who were prior to above applicants had not paid their estimates, it is the duty of respondent to inform applicants regarding the facts and revise the estimate. Shri Lakhabhai Jivabhai Kantariya (one of applicant's among group of nine applicants) had also registered his grievance to CGRF earlier on 29-11-12 for new agriculture connection, but at that time forum has not accepted his grievance and issued order on 29-12-2012. But, based on above order of 8 applicants, Forum also reviewed its earlier order and directed the utility to

provide connections to all the applicants. Accordingly all connections were provided by PGVCL on 9-05-2014.

TPL (Ahmedabad) Forum :

The complainant registered his grievance on 08/01/2014 at CGRF objecting the supplementary bill issued for stopped meter. The complainant submitted that TPL had considered the average of summer months for assessment period instead of winter months, which was very high and unjustified. TPL should have considered the consumption of corresponding months of last 2 years. The respondent informed the Forum that "No display" on meter was found at the time of meter reading taken on 25/12/2013 and meter was replaced on 26/12/2013. The faulty meter was brought to Meter Testing Laboratory where the meter reading data could not be retrieved. Hence, stop meter assessment bill was prepared. As per sections 6.1.8 and 6.1.11 of GERC -Supply code; TPL had considered previous two cycle average consumption to prepare the stop meter assessment bill and issued a supplementary bill for 63 days for 569 units amounting to Rs. 3695/-. The Forum recognized the difference in consumption pattern of summer season (including cooling load like AC) and winter seasons. Forum directed TPL to submit the report regarding type of load connected in the premises. Considering type of load and consumption pattern of corresponding months of last 3 years, Forum directed TPL to consider the following provision of clause no 6.1.8 of supply code...

"...Any evidence provided by consumer about conditions of working and / or occupancy of the concerned premises during the said period(s), which might have had a bearing on energy consumption, may be considered."

TPL has revised the average bill considering the base of the corresponding months of last 2 years. The complainant submitted pursis dated 18-01-2014 for withdrawing the complaint on amicable settlement. Forum passed an order accordingly. The matter was treated as closed and settled.

During the discussion, it was informed that TPL has already raised this issue in Supply Code Review Panel, requesting that the average consumption of previous 12 months should be considered for assessment and Clause 6.1.11 of the Supply Code may be amended accordingly.

Ombudsman:

The Complainant was having an electric connection in his father's name at his residential premises since 30 years. The complainant's father died in 2007 and the cousin brother of complainant had applied for disconnection of said connection with a forged signature in name of consumer, and at the same time he got a new electric connection in adjoining premises in his name. When the complainant approached the sub-division office for reconnection, the sub division asked for reconnection and meter refixing charges, which was paid by the complainant. However, the said connection was not restored by the respondent for reasons unknown. The complainant approached the Forum, where the forum members and chairperson had difference of opinion for reconnection and hence based on majority, ordered the respondent not to reconnect supply. The representation of the complainant was registered at Ombudsman. As per clause no. 2.21 and 2.45 of GERC Notification No. 2 of 2011, Ombudsman issued a speaking order to restore supply of complainant within 24 hours as the order of the CGRF was not in

MINUTES OF 17th MEETING OF CGRF

accordance with the regulations. The respondent has restored supply as per directive of Ombudsman.

Chairman appreciated the presentation made by representative of Forums. Further it was decided that in the next meeting, the members of UGVCL, PGVCL- Rajkot, Bhuj and TPL-Surat Forums would make presentations.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.


SECRETARY

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum MGVCL

A case Study

Consumer Grievances Complaint
No. MG-IV-144-2013.14

Regarding New Agriculture Connection
In Dark Zone Area
At Bhailakui, Ta. Kapadwanj, Dist. Kheda

May-14

CGRF MGVCL

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum MGVCL

Case presented by: Shri P. J. Patel, Chairperson.

Complainant:

Shri Chimanbhai Shankarbhai Prajapati At &
Post : Bhailakui,

Ta: Kapadwanj, Dist: Kheda

Respondent:

Deputy Engineer, Kapadwanj Rural S/Dn
MGVCL

on behalf of MGVCL

May-14

CGRF MGVCL

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum MGVCL

Case History

- ❖ Shri Chimanbhai Shankarbhai Prajapati applied for new vij connection of 10 HP in LS No.101 at village Bhailakui under dark zone scheme on 10.03.1998.
- ❖ MIS consent with necessary documents was received on 21.06.2012.
- ❖ Sent to GGRC on 19.07.2012.
- ❖ The GGRC issued work order No.KH 4144 to agency M/s Parikshit Ind. Co. Ltd for installation of MIS.
- ❖ GGRC had auto cancelled work order No.KH 4144 due to non payment within time limit of 180 days.
- ❖ So complainant's application was cancelled by Kapadwanj REC sub-division office vide letter no. KRC/Tech/136 dated 04.01.2014

May-14

CGRF MGVCL

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum MGVCL

Contention by the Complainant

The complainant contended that

- ❖ He is unknown for the WO No.KH 4144 issued by GGRC.
- ❖ Neither the agency nor GGRC/MGVCL had informed him regarding the work order.
- ❖ Agency M/s Parikshit Ind. Co. Ltd informed complainant that time limit of his work order KH-4144 is over.
- ❖ Now he has to contact GGRC, Vadodara if new work order is to be generated.

May-14

CGRF MGVCL

Prayer of Complainant

❖ To consider his application for agriculture vij connection under Dark Zone Yojna as not informed by agent/GGRC/MGVCL for payment of MIS estimate within time limit of 180 days and his work order was cancelled.

May-14

CGRF MGVCL

Contention by the Respondent

The respondent contended that

❖ As per procedure, after generation of work order for MIS by GGRC it is directly given to agent and auto cancelled if payment is not made within time limit of 180 days.

❖ GGRC issued work order No.KH 4144.

❖ GGRC had auto cancelled work order No. KH-4144 on dated 24.01.2013 due to non payment.

❖ List of auto cancelled applications is mailed to MGVCL by GGRC.

❖ Accordingly complainant's application was cancelled on 04.01.2014.

CGRF MGVCL

CGRF OBSERVATION

❖ Due to lacuna on the part of GGRC communication system, the complainant was unaware of GGRC work order and subsequent action leading to cancellation.

❖ GGRC had given work order no. KH-4144 to M/s Parikshit Ind. Co. Ltd and copy to MGVCL and same was auto cancelled after lapse of 180 days where complainant was not at fault.

May-14

CGRF MGVCL

THE FORUM'S OPINION

❖ To give an opportunity to the complainant.

❖ GGRC may be requested to continue present work order or generate new work order and process it to give new Ag connection

May-14

CGRF MGVCL

FORUM's ORDER

The Forum directed Respondent Company to revoke the cancellation of application and process to give Ag connection to complainant Shri Chimanbhai Shankarbhai Prajapati in LS No.101 of village Bhailakui, Tal: Kapadwanj, Dist: Kheda.

May-14

CGRF MGVCL

ACTION TAKEN BY MGVCL

MGVCL HAD ISSUED CIRCULAR NO.MGVCL/CE (PROJ)/ RE/615 DTD 26TH FEB 2014 AND DIRECTED NOT TO TREAT THE APPLICATION AS CANCELLED WHICH ARE AUTO CANCELLED BY GGRC. ALSO, IT IS DIRECTED TO CONVEY THE APPROVAL RECEIVED FROM GGRC TO THE APPLICANT BY RPAD.

May-14

CGRF MGVCL

Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum



May-14

11

CGRF, DGVCL SURAT

THE COMPLAINANT

- M/S. Shree Sai Shraddha Enterprise, H.T. connection bearing consumer No. 39882.

THE RESPONDANT

- The Executive Engineer (O&M), DGVCL Ankleshwar (Rural) & Bardoli Division

May-14

12

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The H. T. installation of Shree Sai Shradhdha Enterprise bearing consumer no 39882 contract demand 275 KVA was checked by H.T. I/C Squad in presence of complainant's representative, Shri Nilesh Savani on dated 08.03.2013.
- The meter was found slow by 31.29% due to less voltage available in 'Y' phase PT at Trivector meter terminal. The defective CTPT was replaced on 19.03.2013 by new CTPT of appropriate size.
- The respondent had issued the supplementary bill for the period from 28.09.2012 to 19.03.2013 [till defective CTPT replaced] for 172 days by considering as per average consumption of 34 days after replacement of CTPT unit and bill amounting to Rs.6,98,839.64 was paid by the complainant on dt.31.12.2013 vide M.R. No. 919722.

May-14 13

- The complainant filed complaint with CGRF Corporate Office Surat with request to Forum to provide natural justice in the this matter on 20.12.2013 and forum registered it as case no 101/2013-14
- Both the parties were heard by CGRF DGVCL Surat on 22.01.2014, 18.02.2014 & 21.02.2014

May-14 14

Findings of the Forum: CGRF-DGVCL- SURAT

- On checking date i.e. 08.03.2013, meter was found slow by 31.29% and MRI data was collected at the time of checking. In the checking report, it is stated that said meter was getting 'R' phase voltage 5576.5, 'B' phase voltage 5398.8 and 'Y' phase getting only 2350.5 voltages as a result, meter was found slow by 31.29%.
- At the time of monthly reading of Sept-2012 on dated 28.09.2012 and Oct-2012 dated 31.10.2012, the meter was getting R- 6555.9, Y-6592.13 and, B-6532.0 voltages, but it was noticed that meter was getting as R-6011.4, Y-2570.5 and B-5793.3 voltages respectively.

May-14 15

- supplementary bill was issued on the basis of average per day consumption, worked out for 34 days after replacement of CTPT Unit instead of 31.29 % of slowness of the meter for the period from Oct-2012 to March-2013 amounting to Rs.6,98,839.64 for 64044 units on dt. 04.12.2013.
- As meter was getting low voltage in 'Y' phase the defective CTPT was replaced by the respondent after 4 1/2 months on 19.03.2013.
- The complainant has been using the H.T. power supply for quarry unit and their monthly consumption is uneven.

May-14 16

• The respondent had also calculated KVAH and KVARH on the basis of units recorded in 34 days after replacement of CTPT and accordingly Power Factor Adjustment Charges amounting Rs.268173.98 was included in the supplementary bill.

• Meter was found slow by 31.29% and if same %age slowness units are added in KVAH and KVARH units, the Power Factor [revised] remains same, hence Power Factor penalty shall not be levied.

• The supplementary bill calculated by the respondent on average basis after replacement of CTPT is absolutely wrong and such bill shall not be issued to the complainant.

May-14 17

• The slowness period considered by the respondent for supplementary bill is also not correct. The period taken by the respondent as mentioned above, shall not be 172 days.

• The meter getting 'Y' phase voltage on 28.09.2012 was O.K. but voltage was found reduced while taking meter reading on 31.10.2012. The meter has reduced voltage in 'Y' phase from 31.10.2012 to till the date of replacement of CTPT i.e. 19.03.2103, therefore, it is crystal clear that meter must be getting low voltage in 'Y' phase in between 28.09.2012 to 31.10.2012.

May-14 18

• Now to decide exact date, Forum has referred MRI report and it is noticed that voltage failure in 'Y' phase is for 129 days, 10 hours, 10 minutes and MRI data shows 'Y' failure status as "event on" when MRI data dumped on 08.03.2013. This shows that the meter was getting 'Y' phase low voltages for 129 days, prior to 08.03.2013 i.e. from 30.10.2012 to 08.03.2013. After this, defective CTPT was replaced on 19.03.2013, hence 11 [eleven] more days are to be added while giving the supplementary bill, i.e from 30.10.2012 to 19.03.2013 for 140 days supplementary bill for slowness of 31.29% shall be issued to the complainant on the basis of recorded units during this period.

May-14 19

• GERC Electricity Supply Code & Related Matters Regulations, Notification No. 11 of 2005, Section 6.1.8 is applicable in this case and accordingly 31.29% slowness of the meter shall be calculated for 140 days

May-14 20

ORDER OF CGRF

- The respondent is directed to cancel the supplementary bill issued on the basis of average consumption amounting to Rs.6,98,839.64.
- The respondent is further directed to issue bill for 31.29% slowness for 140 days as mentioned above, for the period from 30.10.2012 to 19.03.2013, on the basis of units recorded during this period and balance refund amount shall be given to the complainant within 15 days.
- As per CGRF order, the respondent has issue bill of amounting Rs307338.02 and refund has been given to complainant amounting of Rs391501.62 in the month of May 2014.
 - No order as to cost & With this order complaint is disposed off.
- Further with this order complaint is disposed off.

May-14

**Consumer's Grievances Redressal Forum
Bhavnagar Forum of PGVCL**

**PASCHIM GUJARAT VIJ CO. LTD.,
Zonal Office,
Chavdigate, Old Power house Compound,
Bhavnagar-364 001.**

Phone No.(0278) 2521760/2521761/2521762
Fax (0278) 2521763
E-mail: forumbhavnagar.pgvcl@gebmail.com

May-14

CGRF Case No. 116/13-14
CGRF Meeting-Hearing Dtd. 25/09/2013.
CGRF Decision Dtd. 05/10/2013.

➤ **Nature of Grievance** :-Regarding New AG connection not given after payment on 10-10-2001 for FQ (in group) under SPA Scheme.

➤ **Representative** :- 1) Shri Dhirubhai Dayalbhai Baraiya & 2) Shri Madhubhai Vitthalbhai Chudasama At- Koliyak, Ta. & Dist.-Bhavnagar.

➤ **DISCOM** :- PGVCL – Ghogha Sub Division
PGVCL – Bhavnagar City-2 Division
PGVCL – Bhavnagar Circle

May-14

Plaintiff's Representation

1. There are 8 applicants who had applied at Mamsa Sub Division for New AG connection under SPA Scheme in the month of September-1990. As per norms Respondent's had issued FQ to all these applicants in group.
2. There are 8 applicants namely 1) Sadabhai Galabhai, 2) Hirabhai Galabhai, 3) Mohanbhai Vitthalbhai, 4) Dhanabhai Bijalbhai, 5) Laljibhai Hirjibhai, 6) Ramjibhai Bhanabhai, 7) Khimabhai Valabhai & 8) Tapubhai Naranbhai have paid FQ on dtd. 10-10-2001.
3. But, after payment of FQ, neither line work done nor connection given by respondent. Applicants informed Forum that PGVCL released other AG connections which are cited against their connections.
4. Applicants represented orally at Mamsa Sub division 3 to 4 times, but they had not given any application in writing. Sub division office informed these applicants at that time, that when other applicants paid their estimate, thereafter work will be taken on hand for their AG connections.
5. Plaintiff also informed that, there is no any other revised estimate was issued by Respondent.

May-14

PGVCL's (Respondent) Representation

1. Applicant Shri Ramjibhai Bhanabhai & other 8 applicants had paid Registration charge and applied for New AG connection under SPA Scheme in month of September-1990. These registration was registered in G.P. register vide No. 2542-43-46-48-59-61-69-76 & 77.
2. As per norms and priority of applicants, survey work done and Technical Sanction given by 1924/2-8-2001. As per approval Estimates were issued on Dt. 15-09-2001 with the group of 9 applicants in 'D' category, which was paid by the above group (applicants) on Dt. 10-10-2001.
3. Respondent has informed that, the above applicants had not made any correspondence regarding their connection.
4. Respondent had also produced all the records in which they informed him that the T.S. for above is 650 Mtrs. of HT Line & 1800 Mtrs. f LT Line and also informed that now only 200 Mtrs. of HT & 460 Mtrs. of LT & 63 KVA X'mer is required.

May-14

PGVCL's (Respondent) Representation

5. Payments details are under :-

Sr. No.	G.P. No.	Detail of Payment FQ			Name of Applicant	Village	Load
		Date	Receipt No.	Rs.			
232	2542	10-10-01	45959	675+440	Ramjibhai Bhanabhai	Koliyak	3.0
233	2543	10-10-01	45960	675+440	Khimabhai Valabhai Makwana	Koliyak	5.0
234	2546	10-10-01	45961	675+440	Laljibhai Harjibhai	Koliyak	3.0
235	2561	10-10-01	45962	675+440	Hirabhai Galabhai Ladva	Koliyak	5.0
236	2569	10-10-01	45963	675+440	Dhanabhai Bijalabhai	Koliyak	5.0
237	2576	10-10-01	45964	675+440	Lakhabhai Jivabhai	Koliyak	5.0
238	2577	10-10-01	45965	675+440	Tapubhai Naranabhai	Koliyak	5.0
239	2559	10-10-01	45966	675+440	Sadabhai Galabhai Ladva	Koliyak	5.0
240	2548	10-10-01	45967	675+440	Mohanabhai Vitthalbhai Chudasama	Koliyak	5.0

May-14

Conclusion of Forum

1. As per application of Shri Ramjibhai Bhanabhai & other 8 applicants had applied for New AG connection at Vill. Koliyak under SPA Scheme in September-1990.
2. All these applicants had paid the FQ on dtd. 10-10-2001 issued by Respondent in D-9 group, but till date means after 11 years the said connections are not released by Respondent.
3. Respondent informed to Forum that no any correspondence done by these applicants. Forum is not agreed with this and believes that, it is duty of Respondent that they should not wait for any applicants for paid pending applicants but Company/GEB has to carry out the work as per paid pending applicants.
4. Forum also believes that if the payment of applicants who were prior to above applicants not done in that circumstances, it is a duty of Respondent to inform applicants regarding the facts and revised estimate should be sent to them. But here Respondent has not done any thing and remained silent.

May-14

Conclusion of Forum

5.As per Respondent now the HT – LT line work is very less i.e., only 200 Mtrs. HT & 460 Mtrs. LT while in T.S. it was 650 Mtrs. HT & 1800 Mtrs. LT & 63 KVA X'mer.

Order of CGRF

It is ordered that all 8 nos. of applicants should be given AG connection without further loss of time.

May-14

Order of CGRF

A) Further Shri Lakhbhai Jivabhai Kantariya, At. Koliyak had also applied applied for his AG connection and his estimate was issued by GEB with the above group.

He has applied also to C.G.R.F. on Dt. 29-11-12 vide Case no. 128/12 for his AG connection, but at that time his hearing was on dt. 22-12-12 and forum has not accepted his grievance and issued order on dt. 29-12-12 as per Clause no. 2.30(3) of GERC Notification of 2/2011.

For above, C.G.R.F. has reviewed and by suo moto his application to be considered with above applicants (so the total 8 + 1 = 9 applicants).

B) 9 applicants are as under, who are in D-9 group.

1) Ramjibhai Bhanabhai, 2) Khimabhai Valabhai Makwana, 3) Laljibhai Harjibhai, 4) Hirabhai Galabhai Ladva, 5) Dhanabhai Bijalbai, 6) Lakhbhai Jivabhai, 7) Tapubhai Naranbhai, 8) Sadabhai Galabhai Ladva & 9) Mohanbhai Vitthalbhai Chudasama.

May-14

*Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum
Torrent Power Ltd., Ahmedabad*

Presentation of Case Study

15th May 2014

May-14

Case Study

Complaint No. 06/2014

Ms. Radhika Soni
C/o Moneta Resource & Consulting Pvt. Ltd.
v/s.
Torrent Power Limited, Ahmedabad

May-14

Overview of Complaint

- Ms. Radhika Soni - business consultant- registered a complaint on 08/01/2014 at CGRF objecting the supplementary bill for stopped meter

May-14

Complainant's Plea

- Although the assessment period was for winter months, TPL has considered average of summer months which is very high and unjustified
- TPL should consider consumption of corresponding months of last 2 years
- TPL has given an explanation that the assessment is as per the Supply Code

May-14

TPL's Response

- "No display" on meter was found at the time of meter reading done on 25/12/2013
- Meter was replaced on 26/12/2013
- Meter Testing Laboratory could not retrieve reading and data from the meter
- Stop meter assessment bill was prepared as per sections 6.1.8 and 6.1.11 of GERC –Supply code; based on the average of preceding two cycles

May-14

34

TPL's Response

Meter Reading Date	Reading on meter	Diff. Units	Days	Unit per day
25/12/2013	No Display	0	62	0
24/10/2013	10874	577	63	9.16
22/08/2013	10297	543	61	8.9
22/06/2013	9754	1115	57	19.6
26/04/2013	8639	611	60	10.18
25/02/2013	8028	108	61	1.77
26/12/2012	7920	239	64	3.73

May-14

35

Forum's Observation

- TPL had considered previous two cycle average consumption to prepare stop meter assessment bill.
- Supplementary bill issued for 63 days and 569 units amounting to Rs. 3695/-
- During hearing, Forum recognized the difference in consumption pattern of cooling load like AC during summer and winter seasons

May-14

36

Forum Order

- Forum directed TPL to submit the report regarding type of load connected in the premises
- Considering type of load and consumption pattern of corresponding months of last 3 years, Forum directed TPL to consider the point mentioned in clause no 6.1.8 of supply code...

"...Any evidence provided by consumer about conditions of working and / or occupancy of the concerned premises during the said period(s), which might have had a bearing on energy consumption, may be considered."

May-14

37

Conclusion of the case

- TPL revised the average bill considering the base of the corresponding months of last 2 years
- Complainant submitted **pursis** dated 18-01-2014 for withdrawing the complaint on amicable settlement.
- Forum passed an order in accordance.
- Matter is treated as closed and settled.

May-14

38

Our suggestion

- TPL has already registered this issue in Supply Code Review Panel
 - TPL has requested that the average consumption of previous 12 months should be considered for assessment
 - Clause 6.1.11 of the Supply Code may be amended accordingly

May-14

39

OMBUDSMAN CASE NO.34/2013

- (1) શ્રી મહમુદ અબ્દુલના નામે 30 વર્ષથી RGPR tariff category નું વીજ જોડાણ છે, જેનો ઉપયોગ સંયુક્ત પરિવાર કરતા હતા.
- (2) શ્રી મહમુદ અબ્દુલનું વર્ષ ૨૦૦૭ માં અવસાન થયું.
- (3) સદર સ્થળે સંયુક્ત કુટુંબના પિતરાઈ ભાઈ યાહયા સુરતીએ પોતાના નામે તેજ સ્થળે વીજ જોડાણ લીધું.
- (4) સદર વીજ ગ્રાહકના કાયદેસરના વારસદાર પુત્ર સીદીક મહમુદ જ્યા રહેતા હતા ત્યા પેરા-1 મુજબ જૂનું વીજ જોડાણ હતું તે વીજ જોડાણ યાહયા સુરતીએ મૂળ ગ્રાહકની ખોટી સહી કરાવી રદ કરાવ્યું.
- (5) સીદીક મહમુદ દક્ષિણ ગુજરાત વીજ કંપની પાસે ગયા તા રીકનેક્શન ચાર્જ ભરવા જણાવ્યું. જે અનુસંધાને તા. 1૨.1૨.૨૦1૨ના રોજ રુપિયા 100/- રીકનેક્શન ચાર્જ તથા 100/- મીટર ગ્રીડીટીંગ ચાર્જ ભરવાઈ કર્યા.
- (6) At field level EE and DE : Reconnection not done and informed- યાહયા સુરતીનો વાધો ફોવાનો પત લખ્યો. યાહયા સુરતીનો સદર વીજ જોડાણ ઉપર કાયદેસરનો કક્ક ન હતો.

May-14

(3) CGRFના ચુકાદામાં બે સભ્યોએ નીચે મુજબ મંતવ્યો આપ્યા.
 “સદર વીજ જોડાણના કાર્યકેસરના વારસદાર દ્વારા વીજ જોડાણ રદ કરવાની અરજી કરવામાં આવી નથી. અરજીમાં સહી કરનાર સદર વીજ જોડાણના કાર્યકેસરના વારસદાર નથી. વીજ જોડાણ કાપતી વખતે દક્ષિણ ગુજરાતવ વીજ કંપની દ્વારા કોઈ કાળજી રખાઈ નથી તે ગેંભીરતાનો વિષય છે” (વીજ પુરવઠો ચાલુ કરવો કે નહી તે જાણાવ્યુ નહીં).
 (૯) ચેરમેનને નીચે મુજબ મંતવ્ય આપ્યું.
 “સદર મિલકતના બેંક ભાગમાં અરજદાર રહે છે. બીજા ભાગમાં વાકયા સુરતી રહે છે. સદર વીજ જોડાણ કંપાયા બાદ વાકયા સુરતીને DGVCL દ્વારા તાત્કાલીક નવુ વીજ જોડાણ આપી દેવાયુ. જુનુ વીજ જોડાણ ૩૦ વર્ષથી ચાલુ છે અને વીજ બીલ નિવિગિત ભરાય છે. માટે સદર વીજ જોડાણને તાત્કાલીક ચાલુ કરવા મંતવ્ય આપ્યું.
 Forum final order “cannot reconnect power supply, hence Rs. 200/- of reconnection charges to be refunded with 6% interest”.
 ચુકાદામાં જાણવાયુ કે DGVCL ને ફોરમ તરફથી તા. ૦૭.૦૨.૨૦૧૩ના રોજ જાણ કરી હતી છતાં કોઈ લેખીત જવાબ રજૂ કરેલ નથી.

May-14

Clause 2.35:- “The Licensee shall furnish parawise comments to Forum on the grievance within 15 days of its receipt.”
 Clause 2.36:- “The Forum may call for any record from the Licensee or Appellant”.

- (૯) ફોરમના ચુકાદામાં DGVCL તરફથી કોણ કાજર રહ્યુ તે જણાવેલ નથી.

May-14

OMBUDSMAN CASE NO.34/2013 (CONTINUED)

(10) 2.21(Notification 02 of 2011)નું ચોક્ક પાલન થયું નથી.
 “Forum while dealing with grievances shall follow the principles of natural justice including following
 (i) It shall protect the interest of consumer.
 (ii) It shall inform consumers of their rights.
 (iii) It shall facilitate and expedite the redressal of grievances.
 (iv) It shall ensure that consumer can also have remedy in the event of failure or delay on part of the Distribution Licensee in redressing their grievances.

May-14

(11) 2.45(i) (Notification 02 of 2011):
 The grievances shall be prioritized for redressal on following priority order:
 (i) Disconnection of supply.
 (ii) Meter related issue.
 (iii) Billing related issue.
 (iv) Other issues.
 Representation registered by Ombudsman on 25.03.2013.
 Case heard on 09.04.2013. Order issued on 09.04.2013 to restore the power supply within 24 hours.
 Order of Ombudsman implemented and power supply restored on 10.04.2013.
 ઓમ્બુડસમેન દ્વારા ચોવીસ કલાકમાં વીજ પુરવઠો ચાલુ કરવા સ્પીકીંગ ઓર્ડર અપાયો. વીજ પુરવઠો ચાલુ કરાયો.

May-14