

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM  
KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD LTD- SOUTHERN REGION  
VYDYUTHI BHAVANAM, KOTTARAKKARA**

---

Present: 1. Smt.Laila.N.G,Deputy Chief Engineer, Chairperson  
2. Sri. Sanjeev Koshy,Executive Engineer, Member II  
3. Sri.C.K.Harikumar,Advocate,Member III

Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> June, 2024

**OP No.17/2024**

Between

Petitioner: Kurian Antony ,  
New Galaxy Theatre,  
Mundakkayam -686513

And

Respondents : (1) The Assistant Executive Engineer  
Electrical Sub Division, Kanjirappally.  
  
(2) The Assistant Engineer,  
Electrical Section, Mundakkayam.

**ORDER**

**1. Grievance of the petitioner**

The petitioner Sri. Kurian, Antony, Owner of the New Galaxy Theatre is a consumer under Electrical Section Mundakkayam having consumer number 1156384002439. The electric Connection is VII C tariff, with a connected load of 30 KW. While being so, the petitioner was aggrieved with the exorbitant bill issued by the licensee for Rs.1,11,265/- on 01/2024. The petitioner contented that he has been receiving monthly electricity bill in the range of 4000/- and he is regular in making these payments. Therefore the amount in the aforesaid bill is excess and need to be verified. Even though the petitioner had lodged complaint to the officials of the licensee for cancellation of exorbitant bills, his grievance was not redressed. So he prays the Forum for relief.

## **2. Version of the respondent**

The petitioner is having a three phase service connection under VII C tariff with consumer number 1156384002439, with a connected load of 3000 watts. The said service connection is solely for running a Cinema Theatre and currently, it is not functioning. The energy meter reading in the petitioner's premises could not be taken during 12/2023, since the aforesaid premises were locked. Hence an average bill was issued for 12/2023, by considering the previous consumption. However on subsequent month (01/2024) a total of 12,862 units were recorded during the period from 01/11/2023 to 06/01/2024. Subsequently the door lock bill was revised and an amount of Rs.1,11,265/- was served to the petitioner. Subsequently, the petitioner has made a written complaint to the officials of Licensee. Pursuant on the complaint, the meter at consumer's premises was sent to meter testing Laboratory, TMR Pallom. The test report dated 27/01/2024 indicate that the 3 ph LCD meter is working in good condition without any defects and the error is found within the permissible limits. Further it is found that the meter recorded the highest maximum Demand of about 16 KW on 05/11/23 & 06/12/23 and a Maximum Demand of 6.23 KW on 24/01/2024 So it is clear that the huge consumption recorded was actually used on these days by the petitioner and petitioner is liable to pay the bill amount. Hence the licensee prays the Forum to dismiss the petition.

## **3 Analysis and Findings**

The hearing of the case was conducted on 17/05/2024. Both the petitioner and licensee were present and heard the matter in detail. On examining the petition, the arguments filed by the petitioner, the Statement of facts of the respondent, perusing the documents attached and considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, the Forum comes to the following findings and conclusion leading to the decision thereof.

On going through the petition and other documents in the file , it is seen that the case is with regard to an excessive bill issued to petitioner during 01/2024 amounting to Rs.1,11,265/-. Energy meter reading could not be taken in the petitioner premise during 12/2023, and the petitioner was issued a door lock bill of Rs.5,215/- towards the current charge for the consumption of 244 units, and the same was remitted by the petitioner. When the reading was taken consumption on two billing Cycles is 12862 units. When divided into two, the energy consumption for 12/2023 is 6431 units amounting to 59,610/- and the energy consumption for 01/2024 was 6431 units amounting to 59,610/-. Therefore the door lock bill for 12/2023 was revised on the basis of actual consumption. Thus the bill issued to the petitioner during 01/2024 is Rs.55,607.15/-, (Regular bill 59,610-4,002.85(Paid amount) =55,607.15/-) and the door lock adjustment bill of Rs.55,657/-. (Regular bill of R.S 59,610-3,953(Paid Amount)=55657/-). These amount together constitute the total bill for 01/2024, amounting to R.s 1,11,265/-.

**Regulation 110 (11) of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014 stipulates that “ In case, for any reason, the meter is not read during a billing cycle, the licensee shall prepare a provisional bill based on the average consumption of previous three billing cycles, when readings were taken.**

Further more, the **Regulation 110 (13) of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014 states that the amount paid as per the provisional bill shall be adjusted against the bill raised on the basis of actual meter reading during the subsequent billing cycles. Here in the subject case bill is served on the basis of aforementioned regulation.**

Hence the Forum found that the arrear amount shown in the bill for 01/2024 was door lock adjustment, for 12/2023 and there is no abnormality in the bill. Hence the arrear bill issued by the licensee is sustainable.

On hearing, the licensee alleged that the petitioner has exhibited a world cup match on the aforesaid theatre, but the petitioner has

dismissed the argument. The forum granted two weeks time for for both parties for providing substantial evidence in this regard. The petitioner has provided some pamphlets in social media as supporting evidence for establishing their arguments. However these pamphlets pertains to the Foot ball world cup match in 2022 and it has no relevance on the subject case. The fact whether the world cup match is exhibited or not in the said theatre is not able to establish by both petitioner and licensee. Therefore Forum is on the view that energy is consumed in the premises.

Furthermore forum also observed that no abnormality was identified by the licensee or by the petitioner, which led to higher consumption. The consumption recorded on the above said period is not found as a consumption by way of any leakage of electricity, Since both the petitioner and the respondent could not find any evidence for the same. Therefore the bill served by the petitioner is sustainable.

**DECISION**

Considering the facts and the circumstances of the case mentioned above the Forum ordered as follows.

1. The petitioner is liable to remit the arrear amount of R.s 1,11,265/-.
2. No order as to cost.

If the petitioner is not satisfied with the above order of this Forum, he is at liberty to prefer appeal before the Electricity Ombudsman within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.

The address of the Electricity Ombudsman is furnished below.

'The State Electricity Ombudsman, D.H & Foreshore Road Junction, Near Gandhi Square, Ernakulam, Kerala - 682 016. Phone: 0484 2346488'.

*Sd/-*

C .K.HARIKUMAR  
ADVOCATE  
MEMBER III

*Sd/-*

SANJEEV KOSHY  
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER  
MEMBER II

*Sd/-*

LAILA.N.G  
DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER  
CHAIRPERSON

Forwarded

*Sd/-*

CHAIRPERSON  
(DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER)

No: CGRF/KTR/OP No. 17/2024/188

Dated :24/06/2024

Delivered to:

1. Sunil Thomas, Devagiri Estate, Kollamkulam House, Parathode.P.O, Kanjirappally - 686512.
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Kanjirappally.
3. The Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Mundakkayam.

Copy to:-

1. The Secretary, KSERC, KPFC Bhavanam, Vellayambalam, Thiruvananthapuram.
2. The Deputy Chief Engineer, Electrical Circle, Pala.
3. The Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Ponkunnam