

**BEFORE THE FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
RELIANCE INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED**

Sr.No. 10/2016 Mrs.Aruna Umakant Agrawal, Flat No.4(104), 1st Floor, A Wing, Dindoshi Ekta CHSL, Shivdham, Malad (East) , Mumbai 400 097. Tel : 9892540276.

C.A.No. 151993281 , Central Division, LT-II(a)

Order : Dtd.: 19thSeptember, 2016.

PRESENT

1. Mr. Vilas Dixit - Chairperson
2. Mr. Rajiv Nakhare, Vice President (RInfra) - Member
3. Mr. Satyanarayan Rajhans - Member

On behalf of M/s. Reliance Infrastructure Limited

1. Mr. Mritunjay Jha, Dy.General Manager (Corporate Legal) Nodal Officer
2. Mr . Lokesh R. Raut, General Manager, Central Division
3. Mr. Suresh A. Patil, Dy.General Manger, Central Division

On behalf of the Consumer

Mr. Umakant Agrawal (Representative of the Applicant)

By this grievance application, it is his contention that his tenant was occupying the premises and he did not pay the outstanding bill of Rs.71,650/- The Applicant is not disputing this outstanding bill. It is his contention that he paid the outstanding amount in the month of February'2016. It is his contention that his connection was never disconnected and as such he never requested for the reconnection of the electric supply.

He further contented that in the month of March'2016 he received SMS informing him that he consumed 1836 units of electricity and the new bill for the same was generated which was for Rs.27,540/-. The Applicant is disputing this amount of bill. It is his contention that this bill was raised although the premise was vacant.

He further submitted that thereafter he lodged the first complaint on 14/03/2016 on phone. He lodged the second complaint on 27/03/2016 and the third complain on 06/04/2016 at

1 of 5

"TRUE COPY"

Sonali

SECRETARY
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL
OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

Dindoshi office. He submitted that if at all the said amount was outstanding against him then why was he not informed on 14/03/2016 when he lodged the first complaint on phone. It is his contention because of this there is suspicion in his mind about the raising of the subsequent bill for 1836 units. It is his contention if at all the utility would have informed him about the outstanding amount after he lodged the first complaint on 14/03/2016.

The Applicant also submitted that when his representative had gone to Dindoshi office on 06/04/2014 to submit the complaint letter, the staff member concerned did not accept the same and asked his representative to send the registered consumer. The Applicant expressed his displeasure over this conduct of the staff member of Dindoshi office who did not accept his complaint.

Thereafter, he filed the application before the IGR but he did not get any relief and hence, he has filed the present application before this Forum.

After the perusal of the papers and the submission made before us it appears that in IGR he was explained that his supply was disconnected on 05/11/2015 for non-payment and the bill of 1836 Units for Rs.27,540/- was raised for the period between last reading on 07/10/2015 to 05/11/2015 i.e. the date of disconnection of supply and hence, it remained unbilled due to disconnection of supply. The same consumption was billed in the month of February'2016 after reconnection of supply.

On the other hand, it is the contention of the Nodal Officer as well as the representatives of the company that the supply of the said consumer was disconnected for non-payment of dues on 05/11/2015 under due process of law. The representative of the company also submitted a copy of notice issued to the consumer. The Nodal officer objected the contention of the Applicant that his application was not accepted at the Dindoshi office. It is also contended by the representative of the company that they have time and again responded to all complaints lodged by the consumer.

The representatives of the utility further claimed that of Rs.71,650/- was received in two installments on 12/02/2016 and hence, as per the procedure of the Company the consumer's supply was restored on the same day. He further submitted that the last actual

2 of 5

"TRUE COPY"

Doshi
SECRETARY
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL
OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

meter reading was taken on 07/10/2015, which was 58503 while the next reading was due on 06/11/2015. However, the meter reader could not take the reading as supply was disconnected one day prior to the date of meter reading i.e. on 05/11/2015.

He further submitted that as the supply found disconnected by the meter reader and hence zero consumption bill was generated and sent to the consumer Therefore, the consumption from the last actual reading .i.e. 07/10/2015 to the date of disconnection i.e.05/11/2015 for 1836 units amounting to Rs.27,540/- remained unbilled.

He further submitted that once the supply is disconnected the meter reading display goes blank and as such the meter reading was not available to the meter reader till the reconnection was done. He further submitted that after the reconnection of supply on 12/02/2016 the meter reader brought the actual reading during next meter reading date on 06th,March,2016 and as such the bill for earlier unbilled consumption was generated and was sent to the consumer.

The representative of the utility also informed the Forum that they replied to the complaint dated 22/03/2016 on 26/03/2016, complaint dated 27/03/2016 was replied on 01/04/2016 and the complaint received on 07/04/2016 was replied on 14/04/2016.

The representative of the Utility further submitted that the above matter was explained to one Mr.Chandan who claimed to be the representative of the consumer during his two visits to Dindoshi office after first 2 complaints were lodged.

The representative of the utility also produced the copies of the replies sent to the consumer and also the copy of the intimation of disconnection of supply.

No doubt the Applicant is disputing amount of bill for the consumption of 1836 units. It appears that he is disputing this amount only because he did not receive the satisfactory answers after he lodged the first 2 complaints. In this connection, the explanation given by the representative of the utility appears to be satisfactory.

The Applicant also submitted that in fact his electric supply was not disconnected as alleged

by the representative of the utility. On the other hand it is the contention of the

representative of the utility that in fact the electricity supply was disconnected for non-payment of electricity bill and hence the meter reading display was blank and therefore, the meter reader could not take the reading and informed the utility that the supply is disconnected for consecutively for four months and there does not appear any reason for the meter reader to submit any wrong report.

Under these circumstances, this Forum is of the opinion that the problem arose because of communication on the part of the representative of the utility but there is no any error in raising the bill.

While disposing of the present application this Forum feels it necessary to express it's opinion on certain irregularities came to their notice. It appears that the utility / representative of the utility / recovery inspector has not followed the proper procedure. It is expected that the intimation of the disconnection is required to be given at least at the time of the electricity supply disconnection and acknowledgement is taken but this is not complied by the representative / the recovery inspector in this case. It is important to note that such intimation of disconnection of supply is generated and the representative of the utility has produced the same at the time of the argument. But unfortunately there is nothing on the record to show that such intimation of disconnection of supply was served to the Applicant at the time of the disconnecting the supply. If the recovery inspector would have taken the little care of taking acknowledgement at the time of issuing such intimation of disconnection of supply, the problem would not have cropped up. Hence, this Forum is of the opinion that the Nodal Officer is directed to bring this lapse to the notice of all the divisions of utility to take care to comply the procedure.

In view of the above observation this Forum feels that there is no any irregularity in raising the bill except it was delayed for the period of about four months.

"TRUE COPY"



SECRETARY
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL
OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

In view of these above observations, the following order is passed.

Order

The application stands disposed off.

No order as to cost.

The Secretary of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum is directed to give the copies of the replies to consumer complaints and the copy of intimation of disconnection of supply sent by the utility to the consumer along with this Order for his information.

The Nodal Officer is directed to ensure the compliance as observed in this Order.

Dated: 19.09.2016
MIDC, Mumbai

"TRUE COPY"

Sonal

SECRETARY
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL
OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

sd

Vilas Dixit
Chairperson - CGRF

sd

Rajiv Nakhare
Member - CGRF

sd

Satyanarayan Rajhans
Member - CGRF