



CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM
Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam
Shakti Bhawan, IInd Floor, Room No.317, Sector 6, Panchkula
E-mail: uhbv_n_forum2006@yahoo.com
Fax & Phone No. 0172-2583896

Complaint No. CGRF-522/11

To

The Managing Director,
UHBVN, Panchkula.

Memo No. Ch-⁹⁹ /UH/CGRF-522

Dated: 2.12.2011

Subject: - Order in respect of complaint of Sh. Darshan Singh regarding billing problem.

Enclosed please find herewith the order issued by Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum in respect of above complaint for its compliance.

DA/As above

Secretary,
UHBVN,
Panchkula

CC.

1. Secretary/HERC, Sec-4, Panchkula.
2. CE/OP, UHBVN, Panchkula.
3. SE/ 'OP' Circle UHBVN, Karnal.
4. SE/Commercial UHBVN, Panchkula.
5. ✓ XEN/IT, UHBVN, Panchkula. (for posting on UHBVN site)
6. XEN/OP S/U Division No.1, UHBVN, Karnal with a copy of order.
7. SDO/OP, S/Division, UHBVN, Taraori
8. Sh. Darshan Singh S/o Sh. Hajara Singh, K/10, Village Mangarh, Tehsil & Distt. Karnal.

For information & further necessary action with respect to order of Forum (copy enclosed).



CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam

Room No.317, IInd Floor, Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6, Panchkula

E-mail: uhbvn_forum2006@yahoo.com

Complaint No. UH/CGRF - 522 of 2011
Date of Institution 30.08.2011
Date of Hearing 16.11.2011
Date of Order 21.11.2011

Before the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, UHBVNL.

Present:-

1. Sh. R.K. Jain, Member-I.
2. Sh. D.C. Aggarwal, Member-II.
3. Sh. Raj Roop Jakhar, Member-III.

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Darshan Singh S/O Sh. Hajara Singh, Vill Shamgarh, Distt. Karnal regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

Vs

- (1) XEN, Sub-Urban Division No-1, UHBVN, Karnal.
- (2) SDO, Op Sub-Division, UHBVN, Taraori.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

Sh. Darshan Singh

For the Respondent:

Sh. Devender Singh, SDO, Op Sub-Division, UHBVN, Taraori.



ORDER

The complainant Sh. Darshan Singh S/O Sh. Hajara Singh, Vill Shamgarh, Distt. Karnal has got an electric connection bearing A/c No. ST 28 / 0720 under Op Sub-Division, UHBVN, Taraori and the Forum have the jurisdiction to try this suit.

It has been pleaded by the complainant that during March 2003 he started receiving bills on the negative side (showing minus figures). On enquiry from the office, he was told that he has paid amount in excess therefore he was not liable to pay the bills till negative billing is there. He did not deposit any amount till March 2005 as his Rs. 13986/- were due to him from Nigam. In March 2006, he received a bill of Rs. 22885/- . on enquiry from the office he was told that he has to pay this amount. As his wife was suffering from cancer, he could not pay this amount. His meter was removed in his absence during December 2007. On enquiry he was told that Rs. 132000/- were due to be paid by him but he was not given any reply on enquiry. His case was even not put under Bill Waiver scheme. The complainant has pleaded to set right his bill and to install meter.

The application of the petitioner was received in this office of the Forum on 30.08.11. The Forum considered the facts and found the petition feasible of acceptance and the same was admitted. Accordingly, notice of motion dated 7.9.11 was issued to both the parties asking complainant to submit affidavit and asking respondent to submit version. Further notice of motion dated 4.10.11 was issued.

The respondent did not submit the version so the matter was taken up for hearing. Summon were issued to both the parties for hearing on 24.10.11 when the respondent did not appear. On the next date of hearing on 9.11.11 the Commercial Assistant submitted the version dated 8.11.11 stating that the consumer paid Rs. 3233/- on 17.5.2002 but it was posed in the consumer ledger as Rs. 32339/- by mistake. The same amount was charged in the consumer a/c in Jan 2006. The audit party charges surcharge of Rs. 48127/- for the 5/2006. His bill was generated on average basis. The connection was disconnected vide PDCO No- 34/870 effected on 10.12.07. During the course of proceeding the Comml. Asstt. admitted before the Forum having inadvertently charged surcharge in excess from the consumer. On

Amo

Amo

2

Amo



enquiry, the Comml. Asstt. submitted that billing had been done on average basis because the meter was defective. He was directed to produce the evidence of meter being defective on the next date and the hearing was fixed on 16.11.11.

On 16.11.11 when the respondent SDO was personally present, he showed that during 6/2002 the meter reader had reported 'M' Code which reportedly meant seal broken he was asked then why theft case was not made out to which he replied that since only one seal out of two was broken there was no possibility of theft. It was observed that at no stage the meter was reported defective so it was wrong to bill the consumer on average basis. When the meter was OK the billing should have been done on actual consumption or MMC basis which ever is higher. The respondent SDO admitted that the average billing had been wrongly done and needs rectification. He submitted revised calculations for the period Sept. 2001 to July 2008 showing that Rs. 27479/- was payable by the complainant. This includes the surcharge for six month from the date of PDCO in 12/2007. The Forum found the revised calculations to be in order and as per the instructions of the Nigam which the complainant also agreed to deposit.

Forum considered the facts and decides that the complainant should first deposit Rs. 27479/- and thereafter complete all requisite formalities for getting the connection restored.

The petition is hereby disposed of without any cost on either side. File be consigned to the office record.

The order is signed and issued by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum on 21.11.2011.


(Raj Roop Jakhar)
Member-III


(D.C. Aggarwal)
Member-II


(R.K. Jain)
Member-I

