



CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam

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

E-mail: uhbvn_forum2006@yahoo.com

Fax & Phone No. 0172-2583896

Complaint No. CGRF-665/12

To

The Managing Director,
UHBVN, Panchkula.


Memo No. Ch- 32 /UH/CGRF-665

Dated: 19/3/2013

Subject: - Order in respect of complaint of M/S Bansal Rice Mills regarding wrongly withdrawal of TDCO facility.

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

DA/As above


Secretary,
CGRF, UHBVN,
Panchkula

CC.

1. Secretary/HERC, Sec-4, Panchkula.
2. CE/OP, UHBVN, Panchkula.
3. CGM/Commercial, UHBVN, Panchkula
4. Chief Auditor, UHBVN, Panchkula.
5. SE/ 'OP' Circle UHBVN, Karnal.
- ✓ 6. XEN/IT, UHBVN, Panchkula. (for posting on UHBVN site)
7. XEN/OP Sub-Urban Division No. 1, UHBVN, Karnal with a copy of order.
8. SDO/OP, S/Division, UHBVN, Taraori, Karnal.
9. M/s Bansal Rice Mills, Shakhempur, Taraori, 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 – 665 of 2012
Date of Institution 22.11.2012
Date of Hearing 26.02.2013
Date of Order 26.02.2013

Before the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, UHBVNL.

Present:-

1. Sh. Rajbir Singh, Member-I.
2. Sh. D.C.Aggarwal, Member-II.

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Ramesh Kumar, Bansal Rice Mills, Taraori,
Karnal regarding wrongly withdrawal of TDCO facility.

.....Complainant

Vs

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

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

Sh. Ramesh Kumar Bansal

For the Respondent:

Sh. H.V. Sharma SAO o/o Chief Auditor UHBVN, Panchkula and Sh.
Rajinder Kumar o/o SDO, Op Sub-Division, UHBVN, Taraori



ORDER

The complainant Sh. Ramesh Kumar, Bansal Rice Mills, Taraori, Karnal has got an electric connection bearing A/c No. LS-89 under Op Sub-Division, UHBVN, Taraori and the Forum has the jurisdiction to hear this complaint.

It has been pleaded by the complainant that in March 2010 they deposited TDCO fee Rs. 1000/- and requested the SDO for TDCO from 18.4.10 to 18.9.10 and the billing started accordingly. But in August 2010 the facility was wrongly withdrawn by showing consumption wrongly on higher side. After they took up the matter with the SDO/XEn the facility was restored but in 7/2012 the Audit disallowed the facility and demanded MMC for 4 months. They have requested the SDO number of times but no solution has been done. Earlier also under the Order No- 410 of 2010 of the CGRF the matter was decided in their favour.

The application of the petitioner was received in this office of the Forum on 20.10.12. The Forum considered the facts and found the petition feasible of acceptance and the same was admitted. Accordingly, notice of motion dated 30.11.12 was issued to both the parties asking complainant to submit affidavit and asking respondent to submit version.

The respondent SDO submitted the version dated 18.12.12 stating that as per the decision of the CGRF under Order No- 410 of 2010 the reading base was corrected and TDCO facility restored. But subsequently the Internal Audit vide HM No- 152 dt 6.7.12 raised an observation taking the base consumption of only 3-1/2 months which comes to 655 units. Actual average consumption for six month for both LS and MS category comes to 926 units. So audit has disallowed 926 units and disallowed TDCO facility and raised charges of Rs. 149640/-.

The complainant vide his application dated 29.1.13 implicated Chief Auditor, UHBVN as respondent party on the ground that the amount had been charged as per the audit observation and notice of motion was issued to Chief Auditor on 29.1.13.

Summons were issued to both the parties for hearing on 19.1.13, 12.2.13, and 26.2.13.

Amo



Chief Auditor vide his reply dated 11.2.13 submitted that in this case Rs. 109704/- was pointed out by the audit under HM No- 152 dt 6.7.12 on a/c of withdrawal of TDCO facility in view of the SC No- 4/2010 allowed previously for the period 18.4.10 to 18.9.10 as the consumption for six months exceeded 5% in 6/2010. The RA took 4 months (1/2010 to 4/2010) as base instead of 6 months because the consumer had got his load extended during 11/2009. Average consumption of 4 months comes to 599 units whereas actual consumption during 6/2010 was 870 units. The XEn Suburban Division No-1, Karnal referred the matter to his office seeking concurrence for refund of amount on the plea that average consumption of six months should be considered. Before reaching a conclusions the matter has been referred to CGM/Comml vide memo dt 3.1.2013 for clarification whether consumption of MS category prior to extension of load should be considered for availing of TDCO but no response had been received. A reminder was issued on 28.1.13. The Chief Auditor vide his subsequent memo dt 19.2.13 submitted that clarification had since been received from GM/Comml that consumption of entire period of 6 months should be taken for calculating the units for availing the benefit of TDCO. Accordingly concurrence has been given for withdrawal of the HM No-152 raised by the audit party.

The Forum considered the facts and observed that the audit para has been withdrawn and the grievance of the complainant has been redressed. The amount charges should therefore been withdrawn as per the decision of the Chief Auditor.

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

The order is signed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum on 26.02.2013.

The compliance of the order be informed to the Forum with fifteen days from the date of receipt of the Order.


(D.C. Aggarwal)
Member-II


(Rajbir Singh)
Member-I

