

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 51 OF 2026

In the matter of application of wrong Multiplying Factor and Subsequent Recovery

Shri Sarpanch, Shri Devsthan GanapatipuleAppellant
(Cons. No. 210080001422)

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd., Ratnagiri Dn... Respondent
(MSEDCL)

Appearances

Appellant : 1. Jayant Biwalkar, Representative
2. Prakash Joshi, Representative

Respondent: 1. Jitendra Fulpagare, Executive Engineer, Ratnagiri Dn.
2. Ravindra More, Dy. Executive Engineer, Ratnagiri R II Sub./Dn.


Coram: Vandana Krishna. [IAS (Retd)]

Date of hearing: 5th June 2026

Date of Order: 16th June 2026

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 24th April 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 27^h February 2026 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MSEDCL, Ratnagiri Circle (the Forum) in Case No. 04 of 2025. The Forum, by its order, partly allowed the grievance application of the Appellant. The operative part of the order (originally in Marathi) is translated as follows:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



“2. The Appellant is directed to pay the supplementary bill amounting to Rs. 24,09,411.17 in 38 monthly instalments or within a shorter period, if so desired by the Appellant.

3. The Respondent is directed to withdraw the interest and delayed payment charges levied on the supplementary bill of Rs. 24,09,411.17. If the Appellant pays the instalments regularly and within the stipulated time, no interest or delayed payment charges shall be levied on the said amount.

4. The Appellant shall furnish an undertaking specifying the number of instalments in which it proposes to pay the supplementary bill amount of Rs. 24,09,411.17.

5. In the event of any default in payment of the instalments as per the undertaking furnished by the Appellant, the Respondent shall be entitled to levy interest and delayed payment charges on the defaulted amount in accordance with law.


6. The Respondent is directed to install a 3-phase, 40–200 A embedded meter, subject to the applicable rules and availability of the meter.

7. The disconnection notice dated 15.03.2026 stands cancelled.

8. The Appellant shall pay any outstanding bills pertaining to the preceding six months, calculated on the basis of the average consumption/billing of the said six-month period.”

2. PREAMBLE

A) The “Shri Sarpanch, Shridevsthan Ganpatipule” is a prominent *Swayambhu* ancient temple of Lord Gajanan in Maharashtra situated on the Konkan coast in Ratnagiri District. It is a renowned place of worship and a popular tourist destination, also known for its scenic natural surroundings. This Temple is maintained by the above Sansthan (Trust), which has filed the present representation. As per the records placed by the Appellant, Shri Sarpanch, Shridevsthan Ganpatipule is a Public Charitable Trust functioning within a broader cultural and spiritual framework. The Trust is registered under the provisions of the relevant law with the Office of the Assistant Charity Commissioner, Ratnagiri Division, vide Registration No. RTN-A-172 dated 22.05.1953. The temple attracts a large number of devotees, many of


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



whom contribute towards the maintenance of the temple and the conduct of its daily rituals, festivals, and other religious and charitable activities.

- B) The Devasthan Trust provides various services to these devotees, including accommodation at the Bhakt Niwas, meals at the Prasadalya, and the organisation of various rituals and daily puja ceremonies.
- E) Recently, the name of the Devasthan Trust was updated to 'Sansthan Shri Deo Ganapatipule,' effective from May 2026. This change was processed following on their application dated 17th April 2026, to correct a typographical error. The organization has been operating under the same mandate since 1985.


3. The Appellant has filed the present Representation challenging the order passed by the Forum. An e- hearing was conducted on 5th June 2026 through video conference. Both parties were heard at length. The Appellant's submissions and arguments are stated as below. *[The Electricity Ombudsman's observations and comments are recorded under 'Notes' where needed.]*

- (i) The Appellant, "Shri Sarpanch, Shridevsthan Ganpatipule", is a registered Public Charitable Trust. The particulars relating to Electricity Consumer No. 210080001422, including the service address, date of supply, date of Flying Squad inspection, and assessment details, are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1:

Name of Consumer in Bill	Consumer No.	Address on Bill	Sanc. Load / Contract Demand	Date of Supply	Solar Roof Top installed	Date of Inspection of Flying Squad	Assessment Details	Reason for Assessment
Shri Sarpanch, Shridevsthan Ganpatipule	210080001422	Ganapatipule, Ratnagiri	40 kW / 37 kVA	24.09.1985	36 kW Solar roof Top installed on 29.01.2022	10.03.2025	Rs. 24,09,411.17 (139391 units) for the period from Jan.2022 to Feb. 2025 (38 months)	Recovery towards Multiplying Factor as 20 instead of 1


- (ii) From the date of connection (24.09.1985), the Appellant has been billed as per actual meter readings, and all electricity bills have been paid regularly without any default. The Appellant applied for a 36 kW Solar Rooftop system with grid


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



connectivity on 24.11.2021. After statutory formalities, commissioning, testing etc. the Respondent synchronised the Solar Rooftop Net Metering system on 29.01.2022 with MSEDCL System.

- (iii) On 04.03.2025, the Respondent's Flying Squad carried out an inspection of the Appellant's installation, and issued a supplementary assessment bill dated 19.03.2025 for an amount of Rs. 24,72,850/- for 1,39,391 units, covering the period from January 2022 to February 2025 (38 months), on the basis of 'MF-20' multiplier. The said multiplier had neither been communicated to it nor applied in the earlier billing cycles, and no reference thereto was reflected in the monthly meter reading records. Subsequently, the assessment amount was revised and corrected to Rs.24,09,411.17.
- (iv) The meter is read monthly, yet for 38 months, MSEDCL failed to act upon the MRI data and never informed the Appellant of any MF discrepancy. This is nothing but gross negligence on the part of the Respondent. Under the MERC Supply Code and Standards of Performance Regulations, 2021, periodic inspection, testing are mandatory and must be shared with the consumer. In this case, no such testing was ever conducted, amounting to a violation of regulatory obligations.
- (v) The Appellant filed a grievance before the Forum on 29.12.2025. The Forum principally rejected the grievance. The Forum failed to appreciate that the **retrospective recovery should be limited to two years period** as per Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003, that the Electricity Act, 2003 is a special statute and constitutes a complete code in itself, and therefore its provisions, particularly Section 56(2), operate with full force and effect and cannot be diluted or ignored. The Trust lacks the financial capacity to pay such a large assessment. Had the actual situation been communicated earlier, the Appellant could have installed additional solar rooftop capacity to meet its energy requirements.
- (vi) The Appellant relied upon the judgment dated 18.02.2020 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 1672 of 2020 in the matter of *Assistant Engineer, Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd. & Anr. v. Rahamatullah Khan alias Rahamjulla*. The Hon'ble Supreme Court categorically observed that, in cases involving a bona fide mistake or billing error, the period of limitation of two years under Section 56(2)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




of the Electricity Act, 2003 is to be reckoned from the date on which the error is discovered by the licensee.

- (vii) The Appellant further relied upon the judgment dated 05.10.2021 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 7235 of 2009 in the matter of *M/s Prem Cottex v. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd.* and submitted that the Hon'ble Court observed that, in the facts of the said case, the assessment/demand was required to be confined to a period of two years, and that the principles laid down therein support restricting the assessment to the said period.
- (viii) The Appellant further relied upon the judgment dated 12.03.2019 of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in Writ Petition No. 10764 of 2011 along with connected writ petitions, wherein Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act was interpreted to the effect that a distribution licensee cannot recover electricity charges for a period exceeding two years prior to the date on which such charges are first demanded.
- (ix) In view of the above, the Appellant prays that the Respondent be directed to:
- Cancel the retrospective recovery of Rs. 24,09,411.17 of 1,39,391 units for the period from Jan.2022 to Feb. 2025 (38 months) towards MF.
 - Withdraw interest and delayed payment charges levied from March 2025 onwards.
 - Revise the assessment strictly for a period of two years retrospectively from **March 2023 to Feb. 2025.**
 - Provide a payment facility in suitable instalments, without any interest or delayed payment charges.

4. The Respondent's submissions and arguments are stated as below:

- (i) The Appellant is a consumer bearing Consumer No. 210080001422 from 24.09.1985. The details of the electricity connection are tabulated in Table 1. The Appellant is presently recorded in the name of " Shri Sarpanch, Shridevsthan Ganpatipule." The correction of the consumer's name to "Sansthan Shri Deo Ganapatipule", effected in May 2026, has no bearing whatsoever on the present dispute regarding assessment towards wrong Multiplying Factor.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (ii) The Appellant applied for a Solar Roof Top connection on 24.11.2021 for 36 KW load. Accordingly, MSEDCL sanctioned and commissioned the 36 kW Rooftop Solar Net Metering connection on 29.01.2022. During the installation and synchronization of the rooftop solar system, the existing embedded meter bearing Serial No. X1140571, having a current rating of 40–200 A, was replaced with a bidirectional net meter (Sr. No. X1676823) of Secure Make having a current rating of 5/5 A. The bidirectional meter was installed in conjunction with external Current Transformers (CTs) of ratio 100/5 A to facilitate measurement of both import and export of energy under the net metering arrangement.
- (iii) The Flying Squad of the Respondent inspected the Appellant’s electrical installation on 04.03.2025 in the presence of the Appellant. During the inspection, it was observed that the installed meter was a bidirectional net meter (Sr. No. X1676823) of Secure Make with a capacity of 5/5 A, while the external CTs connected to it were of 100/5 A ratio. However, the Appellant was being mistakenly underbilled with an MF of 1 (one) instead of the correct MF of 20 (twenty). The calculation of the Multiplying Factor (MF) in this case is as follows:


$$\text{MF} = \text{External CT Ratio} / \text{Meter CT Ratio} = (100/5) \div (5/5) = 20.$$

The current and voltage measured at the time of inspection are tabulated below:

Table 2:

Current & Voltage Measurement	R Phase	Y Phase	B Phase
Current measured at incoming Supply (A)	13	7.8	16.6
Current on Meter Display (A)	0.63	0.35	0.8
Voltage measured at incoming supply (V)	237	238	237
Voltage on Meter Display (V)	237	238	237
Note: The current measured on the incoming supply and the current displayed by the meter are nearly the same after applying the MF of 20.			

- (iv) The Respondent's Flying Squad detected discrepancies in the metering and billing arrangement and communicated the same vide letter dated 10.03.2025. During the inspection, the connected load of the Appellant was found to be 44 kW.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




Consequently, the Respondent initiated action for recovery of the differential charges corresponding to the actual energy consumption recorded through the metering system. The Respondent issued a provisional assessment bill of Rs. 24,72,850/- (approx. Rs.24.73 Lakhs) on 08.05.2025 for the period from January 2022 to February 2025 (38 months), on account of applying a Multiplying Factor of 20 instead of 1. However, the Appellant did not pay the said bill. Subsequently, after recalculation, the assessment amount was revised to Rs.24,09,411.17 (Rs. 24.09 lakhs) corresponding to 1,39,391 units for the period January 2022 to February 2025.

- (v) The Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 29.12.2025. The Forum's order is reasoned and speaking.
- (vi) The Respondent relies on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 05.10.2021 in Civil Appeal No. 7235 of 2009 (M/s Prem Cottex vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam), to argue that since the Appellant consumed electricity, he is liable to pay the assessed amount, treating the present case as one of **escaped billing**. The Respondent further contends that Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 does not apply as the Appellant continued to consume electricity throughout the relevant period and electricity is a costly and essential resource.
- (vii) In view of the above, the representation of the Appellant be rejected.

5. During the hearing, the Respondent was directed to submit a Joint Inspection Report of the electrical installations with its connected load within 7 days. The Respondent by its email dated 11.06.2026 submitted the Inspection Report, from which the load profile is reproduced below: -

Table 3:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Total Load (KW)
1	Darshan Mandap- Opp. Main Gate	2.43
2	Darshan Mandap- Inside Main Gate	6.32
3	Sabha Mandap	2.72
4	Office (New)	5.13
5	Kitchen	8.42
6	Office (Old)	1.50
7	Mandir	12.78
8	Prasadalya	0.25
9	Street Light	1.62
10	Sewerage Plant	3.02
	Total	44.20


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Analysis and Ruling:


6. Heard the parties and perused the documents on record. The current dispute arose because, unfortunately at the time of installation of solar net metering in January 2022, the proper multiplying factor was not applied, leading to gross underbilling, and a mistaken impression that the low bills were on account of solar generation.

7. The Respondent's Flying Squad inspected the Appellant's installation on 04.03.2025 and found that a bidirectional net meter (Sr. No. X1676823) of Secure Make with meter CT ratio 5/5 A was installed along with external CTs of 100/5 A. Accordingly, the applicable Multiplying Factor (MF) was 20, being the ratio of the external CT ratio to the meter CT ratio. However, due to inadvertent human error, billing was being carried out with MF 1 instead of MF 20.

8. The consumption pattern of the Appellant for the period from April 2019 (prior to installation of solar generation) to March 2026 is summarised as per Consumer Personal Ledger (CPL) below:

Table 4:

Year	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22			2022-23			2023-24			2024-25			2025-26		
Mth	Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Export Units	Total Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Export Units	Total Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Export Units	Total Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Export Units	Total Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Export Units	Total Cons. (Units)
Apr	6847	7572	3711	0	3711	126	53	179	146	49	195	251	2	253	7315	48	7363
May	8764	609	2607	0	2607	213	25	238	258	17	275	383	1	384	9053	62	9115
Jun	6502	4406	2187	0	2187	181	22	203	263	5	268	320	1	321	10852	0	10852
Jul	4801	2948	2566	0	2566	119	27	146	178	11	189	208	3	211	8654	13	8667
Aug	5039	2253	2582	0	2582	115	42	157	193	11	204	208	11	219	8296	54	8350
Sep	5228	2235	2676	0	2676	130	48	178	223	9	232	222	9	231	6808	131	6939
Oct	5315	2348	4551	0	4551	118	58	176	191	10	201	241	4	245	6766	283	7049
Nov	6436	3175	5116	0	5116	109	57	166	262	4	266	251	3	254	7475	185	7660
Dec	6762	3997	4629	0	4629	158	37	195	251	3	254	293	4	297	6514	331	6845
Jan	5404	5082	1998	40	2038	115	64	179	217	8	225	294	2	296	7647	202	7849
Feb	5284	4385	48	109	157	78	68	146	167	12	179	272	1	273	8896	38	8934
Mar	3699	5417	98	70	168	97	70	167	187	11	198	6965	23	6988	10079	50	10129
Total	70081	44427	32769	219	32988	1559	571	2130	2536	150	2686	9908	64	9972	98355	1397	99752
Avg/ Mth	5840	3702	2731	18	2749	130	48	178	211	13	224	826	5	831	8196	116	8313
Note:	The Solar Net Meter was installed on 29.01.2022 with a MF of 20. However, despite this, the energy bills were issued by applying MF-1 from the date of installation up to February 2025.																


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Before the solar installation, average consumption was 5840 and 3702 units per month. After installation, it seemingly dropped to only 178 and 224 units in 2022-23 and 2023-24, which should have immediately raised a red flag in the Respondent's system. Unfortunately, it remained undetected till March 2025. This pattern clearly indicates that the Respondent failed to apply the Multiplying Factor (MF) of 20 in the Appellant's billing from January/February 2022 onwards.


9. As per established practice, the Licensee is required to inspect all High-Tension consumers annually and, thereafter, to prioritise inspections of consumers with load above 20 kW. It is therefore surprising that the Respondent failed to detect the MF discrepancy for nearly 3 years. This lapse indicates a failure in the Respondent's own duty of due diligence, directly contributing to the prolonged under-billing.


10. The Section 56 (2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 is reproduced below:

“(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no sum due from any consumer, under this section shall be recoverable after the period of two years from the date when such sum became first due unless such sum has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrear of charges for electricity supplied and the licensee shall not cut off the supply of the electricity.”

This Section 56 (2) of the Act has been interpreted by the Bench of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in its Judgment dated 12.03.2019 in W.P. No. 10764 of 2011 with Other Writ Petitions. In accordance with this Judgment, a Distribution Licensee cannot recover electricity charges for a period exceeding two years prior to the date on which such charges are first demanded.

11. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its Judgment dated 18.02.2020 in Civil Appeal No.1672 of 2020 in case of Assistant Engineer, Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited & Anr. V/s. Rahamatullah Khan alias Rahamjulla has held that:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



“9. Applying the aforesaid ratio to the facts of the present case, the licensee company raised an additional demand on 18.03.2014 for the period July, 2009 to September 2011. The licensee company discovered the mistake of billing under the wrong Tariff Code on 18.03.2014. The limitation period of two years under Section 56(2) had by then already expired.

Section 56(2) did not preclude the licensee company from raising an additional or supplementary demand after the expiry of the limitation period under Section 56(2) in the case of a mistake or bona fide error. It did not however, empower the licensee company to take recourse to the coercive measure of disconnection of electricity supply, for recovery of the additional demand.” (Emphasis added)

12. The Respondent cited the Judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 7235 of 2009 in case of M/s. Prem Cottex V/s. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. for recovery of escaped billing. The important paras of this Judgement are reproduced below:

3. *The appellant is carrying on the business of manufacturing cotton yarn in Panipat, Haryana. The appellant is having a L.S. connection, which got extended from 404.517 KW to 765 KW with C.D 449 KVA to 850 KVA, on 3.08.2006.*

4. ***After 3 years of the grant of extension, the appellant was served with a memo dated 11.09.2009 by the third respondent herein, under the caption “short assessment notice”, claiming that though the multiply factor (MF) is 10, it was wrongly recorded in the bills for the period from 3.08.2006 to 8/09 as 5 and that as a consequence there was short billing to the tune of Rs.1,35,06,585/-. The notice called upon the appellant to pay the amount as demanded, failing which certain consequences would follow.***


.....


6. *By an Order dated 1.10.2009, the National Commission dismissed the complaint on the ground that it is a case of “escaped assessment “and not a case of “deficiency in service”. Aggrieved by the said Order, the appellant is before us.*

.....

.....


.....


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



-
21. *The raising of an additional demand in the form of “short assessment notice”, on the ground that in the bills raised during a particular period of time, the multiply factor was wrongly mentioned, cannot tantamount to deficiency in service. If a licensee discovers in the course of audit or otherwise that a consumer has been short billed, the licensee is certainly entitled to raise a demand. So long as the consumer does not dispute the correctness of the claim made by the licensee that there was short assessment, it is not open to the consumer to claim that there was any deficiency. This is why, the National Commission, in the impugned order correctly points out that it is a case of “escaped assessment” and not “deficiency in service”.*
22. *In fact, even before going into the question of section 56(2), the consumer forum is obliged to find out at the threshold whether there was any deficiency in service. It is only then that recourse taken by the licensee for recovery of the amount can be put to test in terms of the section 56. If the case on hand tested on these parameters, it will be clear that the respondents cannot be held guilty of any deficiency in service and hence dismissal of the complaint by the National Commission is perfectly in order.*
23.
-
26.
27. *Therefore, we are of the view that the National Commission was justified in rejecting the complaint and we find no reason to interfere with the Order of the National Commission. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. ”*

13. It is important to note that in the above Judgment, the assessment period for escaped billing towards recovery of multiplying factor is applied for about three years. In the instant case, the Respondent has issued supplementary bill towards application of wrong multiplying factor for a period of 38 months, which is comparable. However, adhering to the principles of the Limitation Act, recovery must be restricted to a period of 3 years retrospectively, i.e. from March 2022 to February 2025.


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



14. At the same time it must be emphasized that the Respondent failed to exercise the requisite degree of care in fulfilling its statutory and regulatory duties. As a Distribution Licensee, the Respondent is mandated to conduct periodic inspections of the meters of high-value consumers, typically at intervals of one to two years. Had the Respondent performed these mandatory inspections with reasonable diligence, the technical error (specifically, the application of a multiplying factor of 1 instead of 20) would have been detected and rectified expeditiously. The Respondent's failure to perform its duty resulted in the accumulation of an avoidable, substantial retrospective liability.

15. Wrong Applicability of Tariff Category:

The Commission issued a Tariff Order in Case No. 121 of 2014 dated 26.06.2015 (effective from 01.06.2015) wherein, for the first time, it subdivided the category LT-X: LT- Public Services, into two subcategories which are as follows: -

LT X (A): LT - Public Services - Government Educational Institutes and Hospitals


LT X (B): LT - Public Services – Others.

A lower tariff was applied to 'Public Services – Others.'

The activities under the second sub- category i.e., "Public Services – Others" are as follows: -

"Applicability I:

*This Tariff shall be applicable to Educational Institutions such as Schools and Colleges, and Hospitals, Dispensaries, Primary Health Care Centres and Pathology Laboratories and Libraries and Public reading rooms other than those of State or Central Government, Municipal Bodies, Zilla Parishads, Panchayat Samities or Gram Panchayat; all offices of Government/Municipal Bodies, Local Authority, local self-Government, Zilla Parishad, and Gram Panchayat; Police Stations, Police Chowkies, Post Offices, Defence establishments (army, navy and air-force), **Spiritual Organisations which are service oriented**, Railway/Monorail/Metro except traction, State transport establishments,; and State Transport Workshops, Transport Workshops operated by Local Authority, Fire Service Stations, Jails, Prisons, Courts, Airports*


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



(only activity related to aeronautical operations), Ports, Sports Club / Health Club / Gymnasium / Swimming Pool attached to the Educational Institution / Hospital provided said Sports Club / Health Club / Gymnasium / Swimming Pool is situated in the same premises and is primarily meant for the students /faculty/ employees / patients of such Educational Institutions and Hospitals.”


Subsequently, the Commission issued Tariff Orders in Case No. 48 of 2016 dated 03.11.2016, Case No. 195 of 2017 dated 01.09.2018, Case No. 322 of 2019 dated 31.03.2020, and Case No. 226 of 2022 dated 31.03.2023 along the same lines.

16. The Appellant is a public charitable trust, namely *Santhan Shri Deo Ganpatipule*, registered with the Office of the Assistant Charity Commissioner, Ratnagiri Division under Registration No. RTN-A-172 dated 22.05.1953. In view of its charitable status, public-oriented functions, and non-commercial activities, the Appellant squarely falls within the category of “Public Services – Others” under LT-VII (B) tariff. However, the electricity connection was initially categorized under the “Commercial” tariff category. Considering the nature and purpose of the activities carried out by the Trust, the appropriate tariff applicable from 1st June 2015 (MERC Tariff Order 121 of 2014 dated 26.06.2015) onwards ought to have been LT-VII (B) – Public Services–Others. The Trust manages and operates *Santhan Shri Deo Ganpatipule*, one of the most prominent pilgrimage centres in Maharashtra, providing services to devotees and the general public without any commercial motive.

Though a claim for tariff revision from 01.06.2015 is presently barred by limitation, the Appellant satisfies the eligibility criteria for LT-VII (B) – Public Services–Others. Accordingly, any assessment, billing, or recovery for the permissible period must be based on the applicable Public Services–Others tariff and not the Commercial tariff.

17. In view of the above, the Respondent is directed to: -

- a) Revise the supplementary bill amounting to Rs. 24,09,411.17, pertaining to 1,39,391 units for the period from March 2022 to February 2025, by applying the correct multiplying factor of 20 (twenty) instead of 1 (one). The revised assessment shall be worked out under the Public Services–Others tariff category applicable to consumers


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




having connected load above 20 kW and up to 50 kW. The Respondent shall also withdraw the interest and Delayed Payment Charges (DPC) levied on the said supplementary bill.

- b) Permit the Appellant to pay the revised supplementary bill in 20 equal monthly instalments. In the event of default in payment of any instalment on or before its due date, the Respondent shall be entitled to levy proportionate interest on the overdue amount and take such action as may be permissible under law.
- c) Compliance to be submitted within two months from the date of issue of this order.
- d) Other prayers of the Appellant are rejected.

18. The Representation is disposed of accordingly.

19. The secretariat of this office is directed to refund Rs.25000/- taken as deposit with the Respondent by adjusting in the Appellant's ensuing bill.

Sd/
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

