

## STATE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

Thaanath Building Club Junction Pookkattupadi Road Edappally Toll

KOCHI 682024

[www.keralaeo.org](http://www.keralaeo.org)

Phone 04842575488 +919447226341 Email : info@keralaeo.org

---

### REPRESENTATION No: P 139/10

Appellant : Smt Rajamma George ,  
Maruthikkunnel House,  
Anikad (Po),Mallappally 689585

Respondent: Kerala State Electricity Board  
*Represented by*  
The Assistant Executive Engineer  
Electrical Sub Division, Mallappally 689585

### ORDER

Smt Rajamma George, Mallappally submitted a representation on 16.6.2010 seeking the following relief :

*Direct KSEB to issue bill dated 21.12.2009 based upon the readings in the parallel meter.*

Counter statements of the Respondent was obtained and hearing conducted on 13.10.2010.

The Appellant is a domestic consumer under Electrical Section Mallappally. The single phase service with connected load 1 KW was changed to 3 phase with connected load 6.44 KW on 19.10.2009. When an invoice amounting to Rs 16860/- was issued to her on 21.12.2009 for the consumption of 3129 units during the period 22.10.2009 to 21.12.2009 the Appellant made complaints to the Respondent . During inspection the meter was found to be working satisfactorily. The Appellant moved the CGRF . The Respondent got the meter tested on 24.3.2010 as per directions from CGRF . The meter had errors only within tolerable limits. The CGRF dismissed the complaint.

The representation with the pleas noted above is submitted to the under signed in the above back ground.

The Appellant points out that there was a spurt in meter reading after converting the service to three phase. A 'parallel meter' was installed by the staff of KSEB 02/11/2009 . The consumption in the original meter and 'parallel meter' during the period from

2/11/2009 to 17/12/2009 was 1594 and 576 respectively. The consumption in the 'parallel meter' was considerably less. The parallel meter was removed on 17/12/2009 and the bill for the period issued based up on the reading in the original meter. The Appellant claims that the consumption in the parallel meter should be considered for issuing bill. The original meter was removed for testing and the meter sent for testing without knowledge of consumer. The Appellant states that the 'parallel meter' should also have been tested. She also pointed out that the consumption recorded in the original meter for the period is excessively high. Hence the consumption for prior period and subsequent period should also be considered.

The Respondent informed that the field staff had no authorization to connect a 'parallel meter' in the premises. The parallel meter was not a calibrated test meter. The reading in the meter was not officially recorded. The consumption recorded in the parallel meter are not reliable and acceptable. The original meter was removed from the premises and packed in a box and sealed in the presence of the Appellant. The sealed box was handed over to the Electrical Inspector for testing the meter after the consumer remitted the testing fee. Hence the test reports are authentic and reliable. Hence the consumer has to pay the bill dated 21/12/2009.

It is surprising to note that the field staff had connected up a three phase meter in the premises of the consumer for 'testing purpose' without authorization from the officials concerned. The meter itself was not a calibrated test meter. The licensee KSEB is to decide on the action to be initiated against the employee concerned.

However the regulations and the specified standards do not prescribe for providing a series meter or 'parallel meter' in the consumer premises for evaluating the *accuracy* of a consumer meter under normal circumstances. Testing of a meter in the approved lab is the only method to decide the accuracy of a meter. In the instant case the original consumer meter had been tested and found correct in the lab of the Electrical Inspector who is the statutory authority to test and certify the energy meters. Hence the readings recorded in the 'original meter' have to be accepted as correct and reliable.

I have not come across any rules or regulations suggesting that the reading of the consumer meter is to be ignored and billing done based up on the reading of a 'parallel meter' under any circumstances.

Under the above circumstances I conclude that the reading recorded in the 'original meter' during 10, 11, and 12 of 2009 are correct and the invoice for Rs 16860 dated 21/12/2009 is payable by the consumer.

#### Orders:

Under the circumstances explained above and after carefully examining all the evidences, arguments and points furnished by the Appellant and Respondent on the matter, the representation is disposed off with the following orders:

- 1. The arguments/claims/points raised by the Appellant in support of the reliefs sought for are devoid of merit and hence the reliefs are not allowed and the representation is dismissed .*
- 2. No order on costs.*

Dated this the 14th day of October 2010,

P.PARAMESWARAN  
Electricity Ombudsman

No P 139 /2010/ 679 / dated 14.10.2010

Forwarded to: 1. Smt Rajamma George ,  
Maruthikkunnel House,  
Anikad (Po),Mallappally 689585

2. The Assistant Executive Engineer  
Electrical Sub Division, Mallappally 689585

Copy to :

1. The Secretary,  
Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
KPFC Bhavanam, Vellayambalam, Thiruvananthapuram 695010
2. The Secretary ,KSE Board,  
VaidyuthiBhavanam ,Thiruvananthapuram 695004
3. The Chairman , CGRF,KSE Board , Kottarakkara

---

Visit the website [www.keralaeo.org](http://www.keralaeo.org) for forms, procedures and previous orders

---