

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

(Appointed by the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission
under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003)

REPRESENTATION NO. 31 OF 2026

In the matter of delay in revision of high billing

Vikram Sumerlal Jain
(Cons. No. 082044224085)

..... Appellant

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.
(MSEDCL) Nandurbar Dn

..... Respondent

Appearances:

Appellant : Dishank Vikram Jain, Son

Respondent : 1. Manisha Kothari, Addl. Executive Engineer, Nandurbar Dn.
2. M.D. Bagal, Dy. Manager, Nandurbar Dn.


Coram: Bhalchandra Khandait

Date of hearing: 24th April 2026

Date of Order : 28th April 2026

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 23rd March 2026 under Regulation 19.1 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (CGRF & EO Regulations 2020) against the Order dated 12th February 2026 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MSEDCL, Nandurbar Circle (the Forum) in Case No. 1 of 2025. The Forum observed that the Appellant was billed as per actual reading up to July 2025. However, wrongly billed under faulty status from August 2025 to October 2025. The bill of the Appellant was revised on a month-to-month


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



basis. The Appellant paid the revised bill; the issue of the excess bill was resolved. The Forum disposed of the grievance.

2. The Appellant has filed this Representation against the order passed by the Forum. An e-hearing was held on 24th April 2026 through video conference. The Appellant and the Respondent attended the hearing through video conference. Parties were heard at length. The Respondent's submissions and arguments are stated as below: - *[The Electricity Ombudsman's observations and comments are recorded under 'Notes' where needed.]*

3. The Respondent's submissions and arguments are as below.


- (i) The Appellant is a commercial consumer of the Respondent since 13.05.2019. The particulars of the electricity connection are as follows:

Table 1: Consumer Details

Name of Consumer	Consumer No.	Address	Sanctioned Load	Date of Supply	Activity
Vikram Sumerlal Jain	82044224085	C.S. NO 72/A Behind Ganpati Mandir Nandurbar Nandu Rbar Nandurbar (MCI) Pin-425412	9 kW	13-May-19	Commercial

The Appellant is a cloth merchant.

- (ii) A 3-phase meter (Sr. No. 0E045132 of Genus make) was installed at the premises of the Appellant. The Appellant was billed on the basis of actual meter readings up to July 2025, when the meter reading was 4843 kWh. The consumption pattern of the Appellant during the relevant period ranged from 250 to 450 units per month.
- (iii) For the months of August, September and October 2025, the bills were billed under "Faulty" Status for 360 units, 1081 units, and 1081 units respectively. It is stated that the meter was in working condition during this period, however Faulty Status of August 2025 was marked by the Reading Agency. Once the meter declared "Faulty", the system did not accept "Normal" Status billing further.
- (iv) The premises of the Appellant was inspected by the Assistant Engineer on 15.09.2025, the meter reading was recorded as 5341 kWh and the meter was found


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




to be working. A subsequent inspection was carried out on 13.10.2025, when the meter reading was 5606 kWh. The connected load at the Appellant's premises was found to be 10 LED lights, 2 air conditioners, 6 ceiling fans, 2 CCTV cameras, and other miscellaneous electrical appliances.

- (v) The existing meter, having a final reading of 5609 kWh, was replaced on 16.10.2025 with a smart meter bearing serial no. MCM10329560 (Sinhala Udyog Make), having an initial reading of 0 kWh. Thereafter, the Appellant has been billed on the basis of actual readings recorded by the new meter.
- (vi) The bills for the months of September, October, November, and December 2025 were revised, and credit of Rs. 12,360.99; Rs. 11,036.07; Rs. 76,543.23; and Rs. 67,804.91 respectively were passed to the account of the Appellant.
- (vii) The Appellant paid the revised bill amount as follows:
- Rs. 2,430/- on 17.09.2025
 - Rs. 4,210/- on 14.10.2025
 - Rs. 4,710/- on 15.11.2025
 - Rs. 4,650/- on 19.12.2025
- (viii) In view of the inspections conducted, replacement of meter, revision of bills, and adjustment of credits, the grievance of the Appellant has been duly addressed and resolved.
- (ix) The Respondent has contended that the Appellant had only sought disciplinary action against its staff before the Forum and that no prayer for compensation was made; it is further urged that the Appellant cannot, at the appellate stage, introduce a new prayer.
- (x) On this basis, the Respondent submitted that no cause of action survives for consideration and prayed to reject the Representation.

4. The Appellant's submissions and arguments are as below.

- (i) The Appellant is a commercial consumer of the Respondent since 13.05.2019 for running a cloth shop and has regularly paid bills based on actual consumption, which normally ranged from 250 to 450 units per month. A 3-phase Genus meter


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




bearing serial no. 0E045132 was installed at the premises and billing was carried out on actual readings up to July 2025, when the meter reading was 4843 kWh.

- (ii) However, for August, September, and October 2025, the Respondent issued bills under “Faulty” status for 360 units, 1081 units, and 1081 units respectively, despite the meter being in proper working condition. Inspections conducted on 15.09.2025 and 13.10.2025 recorded readings of 5341 kWh and 5606 kWh respectively and confirmed that the meter was functional, thereby disproving the faulty classification. The connected load at the premises was limited and did not justify such excessive billing.
- (iii) The meter was replaced on 16.10.2025 with a smart meter after recording a final reading of 5609 kWh. Thereafter, the Respondent revised the bills for September to December 2025 and granted substantial credits, which shows that the earlier bills were incorrect.
- (iv) The Appellant made bona fide payments and repeatedly visited the Respondent’s office for nearly six months, causing loss of business time and hardship without any fault on his part. The Appellant therefore requested compensation of Rs.1,80,000/- and action against the concerned staff and agency responsible for the erroneous billing.

Analysis & Ruling:

5. Heard the parties at length and perused the material placed on record. It is an admitted position that the Appellant is a commercial consumer of the Respondent since 13.05.2019. Billing was regularly done on the basis of actual meter readings up to July 2025 and the consumption pattern ranged between 250 to 450 units per month.

6. Suddenly for the months of August, September and October 2025, bills were issued under “Faulty” status for 360 units, 1081 units and 1081 units respectively. The Respondent has itself admitted that the “Faulty” status for August 2025 was erroneously entered by the meter reading agency and, once such status was recorded in the system, subsequent bills also continued under the same ‘faulty’ status.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



7. The record further shows that inspections were carried out on 15.09.2025 and 13.10.2025, wherein meter readings were recorded as 5341 kWh and 5606 kWh respectively, and the meter was found to be in working condition. Thereafter, the meter was replaced on 16.10.2025 and bills for the subsequent period were revised on the basis of readings recorded by the old meter. Thus, the Appellant got substantial credits against earlier average bills billed on 'Faulty' status. This clearly establishes that the earlier billing under "Faulty" status was erroneous and required correction.


8. The grievance regarding erroneous billing thus stood substantially redressed by revision of bills and adjustment of credits. However, the Respondent cannot be absolved of deficiency in service, as incorrect billing continued for multiple months and the consumer was compelled to repeatedly visit the office for rectification.

9. The Appellant has claimed compensation of Rs.1,80,000/- towards loss of business time, hardship and consequential losses. Such a claim cannot be granted in view of Regulation 18.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees including Power Quality) Regulations, 2021, which excludes liability towards indirect, consequential, incidental or punitive damages. Accordingly, the said claim is rejected.

10. However, there is no doubt that the continued error on the part of the Respondent caused inconvenience and hardship to the Appellant. The Appellant deserves a token compensation by way of costs. Further, the lapse of the meter reading agency in not recording proper reading and wrongly entering faulty status also deserves to be noted and fined suitably so as to serve as deterrent against future negligence.

11. In view of the above, the Representation is partly allowed in the following terms:

- a) The Respondent is directed to pay Rs.1,000/- as costs towards deficiency in service. The said amount shall be adjusted as credit in the Appellant's ensuing bill.



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- b) The Respondent shall recover a penalty of Rs.500/- upon the concerned meter reading agency.
- c) The remaining prayers of the Appellant stand rejected.
- d) The Respondent shall submit a compliance report within a period of two months from the date of this Order.

12. The Representation stands disposed of.

Sd/
(Bhalchandra Khandait)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

