

D-719

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

9/2, 6th Floor, Mahalakshmi Chambers, M.G Road, Bangalore – 560 001

Present: B.N.Krishnaiah
Electricity Ombudsman

Case No.OMB/C/G-248/2016

Dated : 30.06.2016

M/s. Veneer Mills,
Plot No.1 and 2, 5th Main,
Yadavagiri Industrial Estate,
Mysuru – 20

... Appellant

(By its Authorised Representative)

V/S

1. The Assistant Executive Engineer(El),
O&M, Sub-Division,
Chamundeshwari Electricity Supply Corporation,
Hootagally sub-division,
Mysuru

(Party in person)

2. The Chairperson
CGRF & Superintending Engineer,
Chamundeshwari Electricity Supply Corporation
Jodi Basaveshwara Road,
Kuvempu Nagar, Mysuru

... Respondents

1. This is an appeal under clause 21.02 of KERC (CGRF & Ombudsman)

Regulations, 2004 against the orders passed by CGRF, CESC, Mysuru (here in after referred to as the 2nd Respondent) dated 30.11.2015.

2. Comments were called vide letter dated 12.02.2016 from the respondent AEE and he has submitted the reply vide letter dated 24.03.2016.

3. Both the appellants and the 1st respondent were informed vide letter dated 26.04.2016 regarding availability of sub-section 20(1) of KERC (CGRF & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2004.

4. The matter relates to electricity bills at Rs.34,205-00 for the month of October 2014 and Rs.24,145-00 for the month of November 2014.

5. The case of the appellant is as follows :

(a) The appellant's is old HT installation VVHT 26 commissioned in 2006-2007;

(b) The installation was serviced for 100 KVA;

(c) As the unit could not obtain licensee to operate a wood based industry, the unit had been closed down;

(d) The power was reduced to 25 KVA and is only used for security lighting purpose;

(e) The average power energy consumption has been around 400 units and average bill of Rs.5,000 to Rs.6,000;

(f) The recorded maximum demand has been between 10 – 15 KVA and never reached the 75% of contract demand of 25 KVA. The power factor recorded also has been between 0.9 to unity;

(g) The RT Division visited the premises for a routine check up on 14th October 2014 and noticed that the supply to the installation is only on

2 phases with the primary fuse which had blown out. Hence rating not done and the parameters were recorded on the earlier rating report. Subsequently, the 3 phase supply was restored after checking the HT pot head;

- (h) The RT division has again visited the premises on 13th November 2014 and rated the meter and reckoned the parameters of readings;
- (i) When the bill for consumption for October 2014 was received, the appellant found that the energy units consumed showed an abnormal increase in recording 5110 units and a final bill of Rs.34,205;
- (j) The appellant received the bill for consumption for November 2014 which had recorded energy consumption of 3429 units and a bill total of Rs.24,145;
- (k) Any excess energy (units) consumption can occur with a direct reflection of the load parameters or duration of usage of higher loads which will be directly reflected by a higher amperage load or a higher demand load for a definite duration or period. Any variation in KVRH and KVAH will be directly reflected in the change in power factor recorded and a power factor penalty would be payable in the corresponding months of October and November 2014 which is not the case. Even if there is a total failure of the capacitors installed, the recording will reflect the same in the power factor;
- (l) The CESC Authorities have totally overlooked the fact that a 3 phase supply was not there to the installation during October 2014 when the RT Division has visited the installation during October 2014 and when

the RT Division has visited the installation and is clearly recorded on the previous rating report;

- (m) When the Rating Reports with data, the download data of the meter where data is recorded every half hour is available on record for October 2014, why the Department is hesitant and shy of substantiating the parameters if any to establish higher energy (units) consumption during October and November 2014.

6. The Assistant Executive Engineer, vide his reply dated 06.05.2016 has submitted as under :

- (a) The installation was serviced on 03.11.2006 with a contract demand of 100 KVA under HT-2(A) category. The meter was manufactured by L&T, with 3 phase 3 wire, 0.5 Class, 110 Voltage, 5 Amps;
- (b) Subsequently, on 02.11.2010 the contract demand was reduced to 25 KVA;
- (c) The consumer has no grievance whatsoever from 03.11.2006 (date of service) to September 2014, with respect to the condition of the meter nor the consumption of electricity;
- (d) The HT reading division visited the installation on 13.11.2014 and rated the meter and found that the meter is working in good condition;
- (e) As per the request of the consumer, the data for the month of October 2014 and November 2014 were down loaded and was sent to L & T the meter manufacturer and requested them to submit the report;

(f) The L & T submitted a report of the abnormal recording due to external capacitor failure and not due to meter functioning;

(g) Further, the HT reading sub-division on 03.06.2015 has opined that the meter for the month of October 2014 and November 2014 was functioning properly and recorded correctly the power consumption, but the capacitor bank in the installation was malfunctioning and has drawn excess power.

7. The consumer is aggrieved by the bills for the month of October 2014 and November 2014. Since the correctness of the bill amounts were disputed, the down loaded data of the month of October 2014 and November 2014 were sent to the Meter manufacturer L & T, and they have opined that “the abnormal recording is due to external capacitor failure and not due to meter functioning”. Further, the HT reading sub-division on 03.06.2015 has opined that the meter for the month of October 2014 and November 2014 was functioning properly and the power consumption recorded correctly, but the capacitor bank in the installation was malfunctioning and has drawn excess power. Considered oral and written submissions made by both the parties. This Authority finds no vital and sufficient reasons to interfere with the proceedings made by the AEE and also the orders passed by the CGRF.

ORDER

The appeal is dismissed.

Sd/-

(B.N. Krishnaiah)
Electricity Ombudsman

To :

1. M/s. Veneer Mills, Plot No.1 and 2, 5th Main, Yadavagiri Industrial Estate, Mysuru – 20
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer(EI), O&M, Sub-Division, Chamundeshwari Electricity Supply Corporation, Hootagally sub-division, Mysuru
3. The Chairperson, CGRF & Superintending Engineer, Chamundeshwari Electricity Supply Corporation, Jodi Basaveshwara Road, Kuvempu Nagar, Mysuru
4. Managing Directors of ESCOMs.
5. PS to Hon. Chairman, KERC
6. PS to Hon. Member (A), KERC
7. PS to Hon. Member (M), KERC
8. PS to Secretary, KERC
