

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

**Sr.No. 12/2016 Mr. Ganesh D. Baravkar, A-4, Dattaram Patil Wadi, Govandi Road,
Near Hanuman Mandir, Chembur, Mumbai 400 071. Tel. 9867134496.**

A/c.No. 151969851, LT-1, East Division

Minutes of the Meeting dated. 20th October, 2016.

PRESENT

1. Mr. Vilas S Dixit- Chairman
2. Mr. Rajiv Nakhare, Vice President (Rlnfra) - Member
3. Mr. Satyanarayan Rajhans, Member

On behalf of M/s. Reliance Infrastructure Limited

1. Mrs. Poornima Niralay, Asst. Vice President, East Division
2. Mr. Mritunjay Jha, Dy. General Manager (Corporate Legal) Nodal Officer

On behalf of Applicant / Complainant

Ganesh Baravkar

Being aggrieved by the order passed by IGR Cell of Rlnfra the Applicant / Complainant Ganesh D. Baravkar filed the present grievance application before this forum.

It is the grievance of the Applicant / Complainant that in the month of December'2015, he was asked to pay Rs.19,200/- towards the electricity bill stating that there was some defect in the electric meter. The Utility-Reliance Infrastructure Ltd .(Reliance Energy-Rlnfra) was pressurizing him to pay the said bill and told him that they will disconnect the electric supply in case he fails to pay the outstanding amount.

It is his contention that till December'2015 he was paying the accurate bills in spite of that the Utility-Rlnfra pursuing him to pay Rs.19,200/- . He wrote number of letters to Rlnfra but no action was taken on those letters.

"TRUE COPY"

Sonali

SECRETARY
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL
OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

He also filed the application before the IGR Cell but no relief was granted to him. It is his contention that he is ready to pay the current bill by keeping aside the disputed bill. It is also his contention that Rlnfra has not adjusted the amount in his bill which he had paid at various times. He has just prayed to do justice at the earliest.

The Nodal Officer filed the reply. It is his contention that the electric meter installed at the premises of the Applicant / Complainant developed error in the display and hence, the old meter bearing number 5894547 was replaced with the new meter bearing number 7488683 on 15/12/2015. According to him, although there was defect in the display of the meter. It can not be said that there was a fault in the meter to record the actual consumption.

The replacement of the meter was done as per the process as the defect was developed in the display. The old meter was sent to the laboratory for testing and after testing the meter the laboratory submitted it's report that the meter was OK i.e, it was working within permissible limit of accuracy.

It is also his contention that the Applicant / Complainant was at fault and he has explained about the said facts i.e. about the error in the display but he is not willing to understand the problem and kept on writing the letters. On 03/05/2016, Rlnfra wrote a letter to the Applicant / Complainant explaining the facts.

It is also the contention of the Nodal Officer that from 28/11/2014 to 14/12/2015 the Applicant / Complainant was billed on estimated basis i.e up till the reading 21466 Units. However, upon downloading the reading from the meter it was found that the actual reading recorded 23636 Units and accordingly the Applicant / Complainant was billed for the difference of 2395 Units in the billing month of December'2015. In order to give maximum tariff benefit to the Applicant / Complainant, the amended bill was given to the Applicant / Complainant. It is also the contention of the Nodal Officer that for the satisfaction of the Complainant Rlnfra was ready to send the meter to any Government

TRUE COPY

Donah

SECRETARY
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL
OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

approved NABL accredited laboratory subject to Applicant / Complainant making appropriate arrangement for the same.

It is also the contention of the Nodal Officer that the meter no. 5894547 installed at the premises of the Applicant / Complainant was the electronic meter having memory capacity to store reading for six months. As the meter of the complainant was replaced in the month of December'2015 the actual consumption stored available in the meter was for five months period from August'2015 onwards.

In short, it is the contention of the Nodal Officer that there is no any illegality or irregularity in raising the said bill.

Heard the Applicant / Complainant in person, the Nodal Officer and the representative of Rlnfra. It is the contention of the Applicant / Complainant that he was paying the bill regularly till December'2015 but in the month of December'2015 he was sent the bill for Rs.19,200/- which he ,according to him , is not liable to pay the same.

On the other hand, the Nodal Officer contended that the mistake arose due to the error in the display and the Applicant / Complainant was given the estimated bill and subsequently he was given the bill on the basis of the units recorded in the memory of the meter. The said meter after tested in the laboratory was found correct and as such the Applicant / Complainant is liable to pay the said amount.

After hearing both the parties, Forum has observed following facts :

- 1) The bills to the consumer were raised on estimated basis for almost 13 months as there was defect in the display

TRUE COPY"



SECRETARY
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL
OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

- 2) The display defective meter was replaced with new meter and the old meter was tested in the laboratory
- 3) The old meter was found working within the permissible accuracy limits except the display was defective.
- 4) The readings of the old meter were downloaded from the memory of the meter.
- 5) Knowing that the display of the meter is defective, utility took a very long period to replace the meter.
- 6) This Forum feels that such type of problem is arising as no steps are taken at the earliest to replace the meter after fault is detected in the display of the meter.

Hence, this Forum feels it necessary to direct the Nodal Officer / Legal Counsel to direct the person concerned to take the appropriate steps to replace the meter after fault is detected.

In view of the above observations the Forum feels that the problem arose due to error in display and there was no any defects in meter. If this is so, this Forum feels that the Applicant / Complainant is liable to pay the bill raised.

"TRUE COPY"
[Signature]
SECRETARY
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL
OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

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

ORDER

The grievance application stands disposed off.

Forum directs Nodal Officer / Legal counsel to direct the person concerned to take the appropriate steps to replace such display defective meters at the earliest.

No Order as to cost.

Dated: 20.10.2016
MIDC, Mumbai

sd/-

Vilas S Dixit
Chairman - CGRF

sd/-

Rajiv Nakhare
Member - CGRF

sd/-

Satyanarayan Rajhans
Member - CGRF

"TRUE COPY"

S. S. Joshi
SECRETARY
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL
OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES