

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, JHARKHAND

4th floor, Bhagirathi Complex, Karamtoli Road, Ranchi-834001

Appeal No. EOJ/03/2015

Dated- 21st September, 2015

Smt. Lali Devi Petitioner
Versus
JUVNL & Ors. Respondent

Present:

Electricity Ombudsman - Shri Ramesh Chandra Prasad
Advocate for the Petitioner - Shri. N.K.Pasari
- Smt. Ranjana Mukherjee
- Shri. Vishal Singh
Counsel for the Respondent - Shri. Rahul Kumar
- Shri. Prabhat Singh

J U D G E M E N T

1. This Review Petition is filed on 20.07.2015 for execution of order passed in Case No. 06/2009 on 3rd May, 2011 by the Vidyut Upbhokta Shikayat Niwaran Forum, Jamshedpur (herein after referred to as V.U.S.N.F.) upheld by the order dated 31st October, 2011 passed in Appeal No. EOJ/12/2011 by the Electricity Ombudsman.
2. The Electricity Ombudsman by its order dated 3rd October, 2011 in Appeal No. EOJ/12/2011, has directed the Respondent to issue energy bills treating connected load of 5KW from the period of first inspection i.e. from 17.11.1997 to 31.12.2003 and from 01.01.2004 and onwards treating connected load of 4KW, without charging D.P.S. for the past period from 17.11.1997 and onwards till the issuance of revised bills.

3. In pursuance of the order, the Respondent issued revised energy bill from November, 1997 up to December, 2013 which is annexed with memo of execution petition.
4. The learned Counsel for the petitioner raised the issue of double billing and pointed out the discrepancies in the revised computation of energy bill issued by the respondents. On perusal of the said energy bill (annexure-5) it is observed that for the period from November, 1998 to October, 2000 meter reading has not been shown in the respective column but Rs. 390 has been booked on the basis of monthly minimum unit charge at the rate of Rs. 50 per KWh based on prevalent 1993 Tariff Order of erstwhile Bihar State Electricity Board.
5. The learned Counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the respondents have wrongly prepared revised energy bill against February, September and December, 2004 and also January & February, 2005 as there was no Electricity Duty in terms of Tariff Schedule, as also the Capacitor Charge and MCB Charge prevalent at that point of time causing thereby double billing. Moreover, the amount deposited has not been shown in the ledger sheet and, therefore, requires verification and due adjustment in the revised energy bill.
6. The learned counsel for the respondents submitted that due diligence will be given to rectify the discrepancies in the impugned energy bill with amicable solution to the satisfaction of the consumer.
7. Having heard the learned counsels for both the parties and considering the materials placed on record, I find no ground to interfere with the said concurrent findings and judgement of VUSNF and Ombudsman. Therefore, the discrepancies pointed out by the Learned Counsel for the petitioner in the impugned energy bill's computation requires rectification within the ambit of Rules and Regulation framed by the Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission. In the result, I pass the following orders:-
 - a) The execution petition is allowed.
 - b) The Respondents are directed to revise the impugned energy bill of the petitioner for the entire disputed period without charging D.P.S. and serve

the bill upon the petitioner within 30 days from the date of issue of this order.

- c) Compliance be reported within one month.
- d) No order as to costs.

Let a copy of this order be served on both the parties for compliance.

Sd/-
Electricity Ombudsman