

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 50 OF 2026

In the matter of load reduction

Sangita Suryakant NaleAppellant
(Cons. No. 118160002108)

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.Respondent
Bhusawal (U & R) Dn (MSEDCL)\

Appearances:

Appellant : Suryakant Nale, Representative (Husband)

Respondent: 1. Jayantilal Bhamre, Executive Engineer, Bhusawal (U & R) Dn.
2. D. D. Mahajan, Dy. Ex. Engineer, Bhusawal Rural S/Dn.

Coram: Vandana Krishna [I.A.S. (Retd.)]

Date of hearing: 27th May 2026

Date of Order: 15th July 2026

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 7th 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 9th February 2026 in Case No. 91 of 2025 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MSEDCL, Nashik Zone (the Forum). The Forum partly allowed the grievance


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



application of the Appellant. The operative portion of the order is in Marathi, which is translated into English as under:

The Respondent is directed to issue a revised plain assessment bill to the Appellant by considering the sanctioned load as 10 HP for the period from July 2023 to June 2025 (i.e., two years preceding June 2025). No delayed payment charges (DPC) or interest shall be levied on the revised assessment bill.

2. Aggrieved by the order by the Forum, the Appellant has filed this representation. An e-hearing was held on 27th May 2026 through video conference. 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 is an agricultural consumer bearing Consumer No. 118160002108, having an electricity connection at Gat No. 21, Pimpri Sekam, Taluka Bhusawal, with effect from 21.01.2000. The particulars of the connection are set out in Table 1 as below:

Table 1

Appellant	Consumer No.	Address	Sanct. Load	Date of Supply	Date of Application for load Reduction	Load Reduction as per Forum's order
Nale Sangita Suryakant	118160002108	Gat. No. 21, Pimpri Sekam. Tal: Bhusawal Pin-425201	15 HP	21.01.2000	By letter dated 27.11.2017 & 17.03.2025	15 HP to 10 HP from July 2023 onwards

- (ii) The electricity supply is used exclusively for agricultural purposes on approximately 0.05 hectare of land where 10 HP water pump was installed. The Respondent has recorded the sanctioned load as 15 HP, resulting in excessive and erroneous billing. The


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Appellant, therefore, sought correction of the sanctioned load to 10 HP and consequential revision of the electricity bills.

- (iii) The Appellant had first raised the issue by submitting a written application dated 27.11.2017 to the Deputy Executive Engineer, MSEDCL, Bhusawal (Rural) Sub-Division, requesting correction of the sanctioned load from 15 HP to 10 HP and revision of the quarterly bills. Thereafter, by further applications dated 17.03.2025 and 17.06.2025, she reiterated the request for reduction of the sanctioned load and revision of the bills.
- (iv) Despite the electricity supply being used solely for agricultural purposes, the Appellant was billed by considering a load of **15 HP** instead of the actual connected load of **10 HP**, resulting in an accumulated bill of ₹ 7,72,014.27 in the quarter ending June 2025. The Appellant is billed under *LT IV-A: LT-Agriculture Un-metered Tariff – Pumpsets*. Agricultural electricity consumption varies from year to year depending upon climatic conditions, crop pattern, irrigation requirements, and other agricultural factors. The Respondent failed to produce any technical evidence establishing unauthorized extension of load or misuse of electricity.
- (v) As no action was taken on the repeated requests for correction of the sanctioned load, the Appellant filed Grievance before the Forum on 01.07.2025, seeking:
 - a) Reduction of the sanctioned load from 15 HP to 10 HP with retrospective effect; revision of the electricity bills accordingly;
 - b) Withdrawal of interest and delayed payment charges levied on the disputed bills; and
 - c) Compensation of ₹50,000/- for the alleged deficiency in service.
- (vi) By an interim order dated 13.08.2025, the Forum directed the Appellant to furnish an undertaking under Regulation 9.9 of the CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman Regulations, 2020 and to pay 50% of the disputed principal amount, excluding interest and delayed payment charges. The Forum also directed the Respondent to conduct a site inspection


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



in the presence of the Appellant, consider the application for reduction of sanctioned load, and file a point-wise reply before the Forum.

- (vii) Pursuant to the aforesaid directions, the Respondent issued a revised bill amounting to ₹2,71,112/-, representing 50% of the disputed principal amount, excluding interest and delayed payment charges, which the Appellant paid on 20.08.2025. Subsequently, the Respondent carried out a site inspection during which the agricultural pump and connected installation were verified. According to the Appellant, the inspection confirmed that the installed pump capacity was 10 HP.
- (viii) By its final order dated 09.02.2026, the Forum directed the Respondent to revise the electricity bills by treating the sanctioned load as 10 HP and to issue a revised bill on a plain assessment basis, without levying interest or penalty, for the period from July 2023 to June 2025 (24 months)
- (ix) The Appellant contended that the Respondent has failed to implement the Forum's order in its true spirit. According to the Appellant, the Revision Bill Report dated 23.02.2026 is technically and administratively incorrect and does not comply with the directions issued by the Forum.
- (x) The Forum had directed that no interest or penalty should be levied for the period from July 2023 to June 2025; however, **interest aggregating ₹1,51,631.31 was levied for the period from July 2023 to December 2025, whereas only ₹25,020/- was waived without any explanation.** The Revision Bill Report considers only the September 2025 billing cycle and does not reflect complete implementation of the Forum's order. The amount of ₹2,71,112/-, paid pursuant to the Forum's interim order, ought to have been adjusted entirely towards the revised principal amount, **but the Respondent has wrongly appropriated the payment towards interest and penalty.** Since the principal amount has not been reduced correctly, further interest has been levied on an inflated principal amount, thereby defeating the purpose of the Forum's order. The Respondent has not furnished a detailed quarter-wise calculation of the revised electricity charges and interest for the period from July 2023 to June 2025, thereby


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



rendering the implementation neither transparent nor in accordance with the Forum's directions.

(xi) Accordingly, the Appellant prays that the Respondent be directed to:

- (a) Implement the Forum's order dated 09.02.2026 in its true letter and spirit;
- (b) Waive the entire interest of ₹1,51,631.31, or such higher amount as may have been levied, for the period from July 2023 to June 2025;
- (c) Adjust the payment of ₹2,71,112/- entirely towards the revised principal amount; Rectify the errors in the Revision Bill Report dated 23.02.2026;
- (d) Furnish a detailed quarter-wise calculation of electricity charges and interest for the period from July 2023 to June 2025 and the subsequent period until issuance of the revised bill.

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

- i. The Appellant is an agricultural consumer (Consumer No. 118160002108) having a sanctioned load of 15 HP since 21.01. 2000. The particulars of the electricity connection are set out in Table 1. The Appellant is an established cultivator in the locality and carries on agricultural operations on lands situated in and around Fulgaon, including agricultural land bearing Gat No. 257, which is also the subject matter of Representation No. 49 of 2026.

Maintainability of the Representation:

- ii. The Appellant has not challenged any finding or direction contained in the impugned order of the Forum. On the contrary, the Appellant is substantially satisfied with the Forum's order and has principally sought its implementation. The grievance raised in the present Representation pertains only to the alleged non-compliance or improper implementation of the Forum's order, apparently arising from a misunderstanding of the manner in which the order was complied with. Under the CGRF & EO Regulations, 2020, the Electricity Ombudsman exercises appellate jurisdiction against orders of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and is not vested with the jurisdiction to


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



adjudicate disputes relating to the implementation or compliance of such orders. Consequently, in so far as the present Representation seeks adjudication on the alleged non-compliance with the Forum's order rather than challenging the correctness or legality of the order itself, the Representation is not maintainable before the Electricity Ombudsman.

Submissions on Merit:

- iii. The Appellant has an agricultural electricity connection situated at Group No. 21, Pimprisekam for irrigation purposes. However, while submitting the grievance, the Appellant did not produce the 7/12 extract and village Form No. 8A pertaining to Group No. 21. The sanctioned load of the Appellant is 15 HP. As per the Consumer Personal Ledger (CPL), the sanctioned load has been recorded as 15 HP since the year 2013. However, due to migration of old records to the online system, CPL data prior to 2013 is not available on the MSEDCL portal.
- iv. The electricity connection was originally released on 21.01.2000. In recent years, owing to reduced rainfall and depletion of groundwater levels, the water levels in wells and bore wells have declined considerably. Consequently, Appellant is required to operate their pumps for longer durations to draw water for irrigation, resulting in a gradual increase in electricity consumption.
- v. Upon inspection, it was found that the Appellant's agricultural electricity connection at Gat No. 21, Pimprisekam is used for operating an electric pump to lift water from the Tapi River. The lifted water is transported through the pumping system to the Appellant's agricultural land at Fulgaon, Gat No. 257, Taluka Bhusawal, District Jalgaon, situated approximately **3 to 3.5 km away**, for irrigation purposes. The Respondent contended that, considering the distance involved, **irrigation over such a length is not technically feasible with a 10 HP pump under normal operating conditions, indicating the use of a higher-capacity pump.** The Appellant operates the pump whenever electricity supply is available, and that periodic field inspections have consistently confirmed that water lifted through the agricultural connection at Gat


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



No. 21, Pimprisekam is conveyed for irrigation of the Appellant's agricultural land at Fulgaon, Gat No. 257. MSEDCL pointed out that, despite this factual position, the Appellant has nowhere disputed or addressed this aspect in either Representation No. 49 of 2026 or the present Representation No. 50 of 2026.

[Note: The Appellant has not dealt with or disputed this factual position in either Representation No. 49 of 2026 or the present Representation No. 50 of 2026, despite MSEDCL's consistent stand, based on periodic field inspections, that water lifted through the agricultural connection at Gat No. 21, Pimprisekam is utilized for irrigation of the Appellant's agricultural land at Fulgaon, Gat No. 257.]

- vi. The Assistant Engineer, Phekari Section, inspected the Appellant's agricultural pump on 21.04.2025 and found a 12.5 HP pump installed. However, during the subsequent spot inspection conducted on 22.07.2025, the installed pump was found to be of 10 HP capacity. **MSEDCL contended that the change in the installed pump between the two inspections indicated that the Appellant had replaced the 12.5 HP pump with a 10 HP pump before the later inspection to present a lower-capacity pump during inspection.** The Appellant was billed considering the sanctioned load of 15 HP under the LT IV-A: LT Agriculture (Unmetered) – Pumpset Tariff. The billing was based on the Agricultural Index (Ag. Index), calculated by MSEDCL on the basis of the readings of the incomer HT feeder meter and the total agricultural HP connected to the feeder. The Appellant was in arrears of ₹3,81,033.70 as of the quarter ending March 2023, which accumulated to ₹7,72,014.27 by the quarter ending June 2025.
- vii. To verify the correctness of the inspection report, the Deputy Executive Engineer personally inspected the Appellant's agricultural premises on 25.07.2025. During the inspection, it was noticed that the pump previously observed had been removed by the Appellant and another pump had been installed. This gave rise to a suspicion that the Appellant had been repeatedly changing the pump. The Assistant Engineer had also taken photographs during the inspections conducted on 21.04.2025 and 22.07.2025.
- viii. Due to the declining groundwater level and dependence on river and other water sources, larger quantities of water are required for irrigation. To lift water from deeper


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



levels or to convey it over long distances, higher-capacity pumps are generally used, resulting in increased electricity consumption.

- ix. During the joint inspection carried out on 06.10.2025, it was again found that the Appellant was using a 10 HP water pump.
- x. In compliance with the interim directions of the Forum, the Appellant paid ₹2,71,112/- on 20.08.2025 (excluding Delayed Payment Charges and interest). Thereafter, the Forum passed its final order directing that, with effect from January 2025, the Appellant's bills for the preceding two years should be revised considering the agricultural pump load as 10 HP, by issuing a plain assessment bill, without levying any penalty or interest, and by giving adjustment for the units already billed during the relevant period.
- xi. **In compliance with the Forum's order and based on the spot inspection report dated 06.10.2025, the Deputy Executive Engineer, Bhusawal Rural Sub-Division, revised the Appellant's electricity bill by granting a total credit of ₹1,16,211/-, comprising ₹76,987/- towards principal and ₹39,223/- towards interest, through Revision ID Nos. 19216955 and 103989.**
- xii. **The Appellant never submitted any application through MSEDCL's Web Self Service (WSS) Portal for reduction of the sanctioned load from 15 HP to 10 HP, which is the prescribed statutory procedure under the applicable Supply Code and Standards of Performance Regulations. Despite the absence of any such application, the Forum directed MSEDCL to grant a retrospective refund for a period of two years by treating the sanctioned load as 10 HP. The Forum failed to appreciate that retrospective reduction of sanctioned load cannot be granted without a valid application and compliance with the prescribed statutory procedure. Nevertheless, MSEDCL complied with the Forum's order in its true spirit. The revised billing was carried out strictly in accordance with the Forum's directions, and the calculations are transparent, accurate, and fully verifiable. Being a public utility undertaking, MSEDCL is committed to maintaining transparency and accountability in all billing and related processes.**


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- xiii. It is therefore requested that the Appellant be directed to pay the revised electricity bill prepared in accordance with the Forum's order.
- xiv. The Respondent contended that, according to information available to it, **the Appellant had sold the subject property to third parties at least two years ago**. It was further contended that the present owner is pursuing clearance of the outstanding dues pertaining to the electricity connection as part of an internal arrangement between the parties. The Appellant did not disclose or furnish the relevant documents relating to the transfer of the property. The Appellant had consumed the electricity and, therefore, remains liable to pay the outstanding dues in accordance with the provisions of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees including Power Quality) Regulations, 2021.
- xv. As per the applicable tariff under the MERC Tariff Order, the Appellant's quarterly electricity bill for the billing period of July 2025 would ordinarily have been ₹30,799. **The record further reveals that the Appellant has not paid the outstanding electricity dues any on account amount since 04.03.2015, despite continuously availing electricity supply. The unpaid arrears of the Appellant increased by 3,90,980.57 from ₹3,81,033.70 as of the quarter ending March 2023 to ₹7,72,014.27 by the quarter ending June 2025.** During this period, the Government of Maharashtra introduced various schemes, including the *Abhay Yojana*, for the benefit of agricultural consumers to facilitate settlement of outstanding dues. However, the Appellant neither availed the benefit of any such scheme nor made any substantial payment towards the outstanding arrears, while continuing to avail electricity supply throughout the period.
- xvi. In view of the above, the Respondent prays that the representation of the Appellant be rejected.

Analysis and Ruling

4. Heard the parties and perused the documents on record.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



5. The first and foremost issue that arises for consideration is whether the present Representation is maintainable under the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020.

The Appellant has not challenged any finding, direction or conclusion recorded by the Forum in its order dated 09.02.2026. On the contrary, the Appellant expressly accepts the relief granted by the Forum, namely, revision of the electricity bills by considering the sanctioned load as 10 HP for the relevant period without levy of interest or penalty. The grievance raised before this Authority is confined to the allegation that the Respondent has not correctly implemented the Forum's order while preparing the revised bill and that the calculations made in the Revision Bill Report dated 23.02.2026 are erroneous.

The jurisdiction of the Electricity Ombudsman under the CGRF & EO Regulations, 2020 is appellate in nature. The Ombudsman is empowered to examine the legality, propriety and correctness of an order passed by the Forum. However, the Regulations do not confer jurisdiction upon the Ombudsman to supervise, monitor or adjudicate disputes relating to the implementation or execution of an order already passed by the Forum. Such issues of compliance cannot be converted into an appeal where the order itself is not under challenge. Consequently, the present Representation, being one which substantially seeks enforcement or computation of the Forum's order rather than its reversal or modification, is not maintainable.

6. Even otherwise, the material placed on record indicates that the Respondent has acted upon the Forum's directions. Pursuant to the spot inspection conducted on 06.10.2025 and the Forum's order, the Respondent revised the Appellant's bills through Revision ID Nos. 19216955 and 103989 and granted a total credit of ₹1,16,211/-, comprising ₹76,987/- towards principal and ₹39,223/- towards interest. Whether the calculations are mathematically accurate or whether a larger amount ought to have been adjusted involves examination of implementation of the Forum's directions and not adjudication of any independent consumer grievance falling within the appellate jurisdiction of this Authority.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



7. Another significant aspect emerging from the record is that the Appellant has admittedly not made regular payment of electricity bills since **05.03.2015**, despite continuously availing electricity supply. During this period, the Government of Maharashtra introduced various schemes for settlement of agricultural electricity arrears. The **Agricultural Pump Power Connection Policy, 2020**, framed pursuant to the Government Resolution dated 23.12.2020, provided substantial concessions to agricultural consumers, including complete waiver of delayed payment charges, recalculation of interest at a concessional rate, and additional incentives ranging from 20% to 50% on payment of arrears over the prescribed period. The Appellant did not avail the benefits available under the Agricultural Policy, 2020 and allowed the arrears to continue accumulating while continuing to consume electricity. This conduct cannot be ignored while considering the equities of the matter. The important points of **Agricultural Pump Power Connection Policy, 2020** is as below:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



कृषीपंप वीज जोडणी धोरण २०२० अंतर्गत कृषी वीज देयकाची थकबाकी वसुली:

(अ) कृषीपंप वीज देयक सवलत धोरण २०२० ची ठळक वैशिष्टे-

- १) सर्व उच्चदाब, लघुदाब कृषी ग्राहक तसेच उपसा जलसिंचन योजनेतील चालू व कायमस्वरूपी वीज पुरवठा खंडात असलेले ग्राहक या योजनेत भाग घेण्यासाठी पात्र आहेत.
- २) सदरील धोरणानुसार देण्यात येणारी सवलत दिनांक १८/१२/२०२० पासून दिनांक ३१ मार्च २०२४ पर्यंत असेल.
- ३) लघुदाब कृषीपंप ग्राहकांच्या वीज बिलाबाबत तक्रारी असल्यास त्या कृषीपंप ग्राहकांचे मागील कमाल ५ वर्षांपर्यंतचे (सप्टेंबर २०१५ पर्यंत) वीज बिल दुरुस्ती उपविभागीय स्तरावर करण्यात येईल. अशा ग्राहकांनी भरलेली वीज बिलांची रक्कम सुधारीत देयकामध्ये समायोजित करण्यात येईल अशा बिल दुरुस्तीसाठी उपविभागीय अधिकारी रु.एक लाख पर्यंत व त्यापुढील रक्कमेकरीता कार्यकारी अभियंता हे सक्षम अधिकारी असतील.
- ४) महावितरण संचालक मंडळाच्या बैठकीमध्ये कृषीपंप ग्राहकांच्या थकबाकीवरील विलंब आकार व व्याज दराबाबत खालीलप्रमाणे (मुद्दा क्रं.५ व ६) निर्णय देण्यात आला.
- ५) या धोरणात सहभागी होणाऱ्या सर्व कृषी ग्राहकांच्या मागील ५ वर्षांपर्यंतच्या म्हणजेच माहे सप्टेंबर २०२५ पर्यंतचा थकबाकीवरील विलंब आकार पूर्णपणे (१००%) माफ करण्यात येऊन, सदर थकबाकीवर व्याज १८ टक्क्यांपर्यंत न आकारता मा. वीज आयोगाने मान्यता दिलेल्या खेळत्या भांडवलावरील (WORKING CAPITAL) व्याजदरानुसार आकारणी करून थकबाकी निश्चित केलेली आहे - (थकबाकी-P)
- ६) पाच वर्षांपूर्वीच्या म्हणजेच माहे सप्टेंबर २०१५ पूर्वीच्या थकबाकीवरील विलंब आकार व व्याज १००% माफ करून केवळ मुळ थकबाकीच वसुलीसाठी ग्राह्य धरण्यात येईल. (थकबाकी-Q)
- ७) त्यानुसार सुधारीत नवीन थकबाकी (थकबाकी $A=P+Q$) अशी निश्चित करून सुधारीत थकबाकी ३ वर्षासाठी दिनांक ३१/०३/२०२४ पर्यंत (वीज बिल दुरुस्ती लागू असल्यास) गोठविण्यात येईल व ग्राहकांच्या वीज बिलामध्ये ती वेगळी दर्शविण्यात येईल. अशा प्रकारे सुधारीत थकबाकीची रक्कम महावितरणच्या मोबाईल ॲपवर उपलब्ध राहील व ती महावितरणच्या सर्व अधिकाऱ्यांना / कर्मचाऱ्यांना त्यांच्या कार्यक्षेत्रानुसार दिसेल व सर्व वीज ग्राहकांना सुधारीत थकबाकी देण्यात येईल.

(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



8. The Appellant has also sought complete waiver of interest and adjustment of the payment of ₹2,71,112/- exclusively towards the principal amount. Such reliefs essentially require scrutiny of the manner in which the Respondent has given effect to the Forum's order. Since this Authority lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate disputes relating to implementation of the Forum's order, no direction can be issued in that regard in the present appellate proceedings.

9. In view of the above discussion, we hold that the Representation is not maintainable before the Electricity Ombudsman. No ground has been made out warranting interference with the order of the Forum dated 09.02.2026.

10. Nevertheless, for our satisfaction, have verified the calculations submitted by the Respondent and found them to be in accordance with the directions contained in the Forum's Order.

Table 2

Period of Quarter	Sanct. Load (HP)	Actual Billed Unit	Consumer Agri. Motor Load On Spot (Load in HP)	Assessment of Billing for a 10 HP Pump Using the Index Units per HP	Diff in Units	Bill Revision Credit (Rs.)	Interest (Rs.)
July 2023 to Sep. 2023	15	8775	10	5850	2925		
Oct. 2023 to Dec. 2023	15	9900	10	6600	3300		
Jan 2023 to Mar.2024	15	9900	10	6600	3300		
Apr. 2024 to Jun. 2024	15	9900	10	6600	3300		
July 2024 to Sep. 2024	15	9900	10	6600	3300		
Oct.2024 to Dec.2024	15	9900	10	6600	3300		
Jan.2025 to Mar.2025	15	10050	10	6700	3350		
Apr.2025 to Jun. 2025	15	10050	10	6700	3350		
		78375		52250	26125	76,987.40	14,203.99
In addition Manual interest Refund (Claimed as double refund)							25,020.78
					Total	76,987.40	39,224.77

The Respondent's billing system is programmed to automatically credit interest on the refunded amount, and accordingly an amount of ₹14,203.99 was credited as auto-calculated interest. In addition, the Respondent also credited interest calculated manually on the same


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



amount, resulting in a duplicate grant of interest. The Respondent has acknowledged that the manual credit led to a double payment of interest. However, the duplicate interest has neither been reversed nor has the Respondent indicated any intention to recover or reverse the excess credit.

In view of the above, the representation is dismissed as not maintainable. No interference is called for with the order dated 09.02.2026 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum. The Appellant is at liberty to pursue such remedy as may be available in law in respect of the alleged implementation or compliance of the Forum's order. The Respondent is advised to audit the calculations as per compliance of Forum's order, and call the Appellant for discussion to maintain transparency.

11. The Representation is disposed of accordingly.

12. The secretariat of this office is directed to refund the amount of Rs.25,000/- taken as deposit to the Respondent to adjust in the Appellant's ensuing bill.

Sd/
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

