

**ODISHA ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
BIDYUT NIYAMAK BHAWAN
PLOT NO.-4, CHUNUKOLI, SHAILASHREE VIHAR
BHUBANESWAR - 751 021**

**Present: Shri U. N. Behera, Chairperson
 Shri S. K. Parhi, Member
 Shri G. Mohapatra, Member**

Case No. 64/2019

Sri Ganesh Prasad Swain

..... **Petitioner**

Vrs.

**The Junior Engineer (Elect.), NESCO Utility,
Bhandaripokhari and Others**

.....

Respondents

In the matter of: **Application under S. 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for violation of the guidelines/ regulations/ provisions of law in billing process by issuing a wrong bill for the month of September, 2019.**

For Petitioner: Nobody is present on behalf of the Petitioner.

For Respondent: The Executive Engineer (Elect.), BSED, NESCO Utility

ORDER

Date of hearing: 01.09.2020

Date of order: 08.09.2020

Sri Ganesh Prasad Swain, Narayanpur, Bhadrak has filed the above case under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against the Junior Engineer (Elect.), Bhandaripokhari and the S.D.O(Elect.) Dhamnagar, NESCO Utility for issuance of wrong bill to the petitioner-consumer.

2. Due to Covid-19 pandemic situation the Commission had decided to hear the matter through Video Conferencing in the Virtual Court on 01.09.2020. Accordingly the parties had been intimated.
3. During hearing through video conferencing, the Petitioner is absent on repeated calls. The Executive Engineer (Elect.), BSED, NESCO Utility submits that the bill has been revised and after revision of the disputed bill an amount of Rs.40,170.75 has been withdrawn from the bill of the consumer. The same has been communicated to the consumer vide letter No.25 dated 17.01.2020 of the SDO (Elect.), Dhamanagar. The consumer –

Petitioner has already paid Rs.5,000 after revision of the bill in the month of March, 2020 and also has requested the authority of NESCO Utility to allow two/ three installments for the remaining arrear amount of Rs.19,000/- vide his letter dated 31.03.2020. The power supply to his premises is now continuing. Therefore, he prays that as the grievance of the Petitioner has been redressed by the Respondent there is no need to proceed further in the above matter and the same may be dropped.

4. Heard the Respondent. We understand that the erroneous bill of the Petitioner has been revised by the Respondents and intimated to the petitioner. In addition, the petitioner-consumer has directly approached this Commission for redressal of his grievance for which other forums are available and the Commission does not have original jurisdiction. Due to all the above consideration there is no need to proceed further in the matter and S.142 proceeding is dropped.
5. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Sd/
(G.Mohapatra)
Member

Sd/
(S. K. Parhi)
Member

Sd/
(U. N. Behera)
Chairperson