

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 70 OF 2026

In the matter of retrospective recovery towards under billing

Jayashri Prakash Jadhav Appellant
(Con. No. 211100008859)

V/s.

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

Appearances:

Appellant : 1. Jayshree Jadhav
2. Pooja Jadhav
3. Diven Anant Kamble, 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: 1st September 2026

Date of Order : 17th September 2026

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 30th June 2026 under Regulation 19.1 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (CGRF & EO Regulations 2020) against the order dated 30th April 2026 in Case No. 06 of 2026 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Ratnagiri Circle (the Forum). The Forum partly allowed the grievance of the Appellant. The operative part of the order was issued in Marathi, and the English translation thereof is reproduced below:

- The Appellant is directed to pay the revised supplementary bill of Rs. 4,95,665.45 in 34 equal monthly instalments, or in a shorter period, if feasible.*


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



2. *The Respondent shall not levy any interest or delayed payment charges on the aforesaid instalments, provided the instalments are paid regularly within the stipulated period.*
3. *The Appellant shall submit an undertaking to pay the aforesaid supplementary bill as per the approved instalment schedule and shall furnish post-dated cheque towards the instalments.*
4. *In the event of default in payment of any instalment, proportionate interest and applicable charges shall accrue on the outstanding amount, and the Respondent shall be at liberty to take appropriate action in accordance with law.*
5. *If the Appellant seeks a demonstration regarding the alleged loose connection of the stud or absence of voltage at the meter, and machineries are working, the Respondent shall conduct such demonstration/testing in the presence of the Sarpanch, Police Patil and authorized representative of MSEDCL, and the observations shall be duly recorded.*
6. *The Notice of Disconnection of Supply dated 09.02.2026 shall stand cancelled.*

2. Aggrieved by the order of the Forum, the Appellant filed this Representation against the order of the Forum. An e-hearing was held on 1st September 2026 through video conference where all the parties were heard at length. The Respondent's submissions and arguments are as below. *[The Electricity Ombudsman's observations and comments are recorded under 'Notes' where needed.]*

- (i) The Appellant is an Industrial Consumer (No. 211100008859) from 20.03.2018. The details of the electric connection, sanctioned load, retrospective recovery towards R & B phase voltages missing, etc. are tabulated as below:

Table 1:

Name of Consumer	Consumer No.	Address on Bill	San. Load/ Contract Demand	Date of Supply	Purpose	Date of Inspection	Irregularities observed in MRI Report	Suppl. Bill & Period
Jayashri Prakash Jadhav	211100008859	261/5, At-Post- Ori, Ratnagiri	30 HP/ 302 kVA	20.03.2018	Stone cutting of ancient rock	14.10.2025	The R-Phase voltage was missing at the meter from Dec. 2022 to Jan. 2024, while the B-Phase voltage was missing from Feb. 2023 to 14.10.2025.	Suppl. Bill of Rs. 4,95,665.45 for 30,093 units for the period from from Dec. 2022 to 14.10.2025.


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



The Appellant is engaged in the business of extraction, cutting and processing of natural stone/ancient rock from its land, using electrical machinery for carrying out such activities.

- (ii) The consumer's existing Secure make, 3-phase, 4-wire, 40–200 Amp CT-embedded meter (No. X0460592) was installed around 2019 and is presently functioning. MSEDCL introduced such meters for LT consumers having connected load above 20 kW from 2019 onwards as part of its Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) Programme for automated meter data collection.
- (iii) The Chief Engineer (Billing & Revenue) of Corporate Office of the Respondent by its letter dated 06.10.2025 informed that

“During verification of MDAS (Meter Data Acquisition System) billing data for LT consumers, it was observed that voltage readings for one or two phases have remained consistently missing over an extended period. This technical anomaly has led to chronic under billing, resulting in significant revenue loss to MSEDCL. Alarming, the MR9 reading sheets containing these discrepancies were approved by the concerned SDO in charge without verifying voltage data. Despite clear evidence of missing voltages, approvals were granted without proper assessment or corrective action – indicating a serious oversight in operational diligence.

The issue has surfaced with 08 cases identified amounting to an estimated loss of Rs.59.61 Lakhs. Such recurring negligence has severely impacted MSEDCL's financial integrity.

....

Case III

Consumer Name: Jayashri Prakash Jadhav

Consumer No.: 211100008859

Meter No.: No. X0460592 (40-200 A, Embedded meter without smart PT function)

Voltage missing leading to under – billing and Revenue loss

1. *The R phase Voltage found very low from **Dec-2022 to Jan – 2024** and B Phase voltage found very low from **Feb 2023 to Sep 2025***


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



2. *Approx. 55000 units loss having billing amount Rs.5,50,000/-. Please verify MRI data before assessment.*
3. *The voltage missing was observed in MR9 sheet for reading, but still was approved in every month without needful action by concerned SDO."*

(iv) Accordingly, the Assistant Engineer (QC) of the Respondent visited the Appellant's premises on 14.10.2025 for further inspection. When inspected, it was observed that the said unit was functioning for extraction, cutting and processing of natural stone. However, the meter display observed during the inspection was as follows:

Table 2:

Description	R Phase	Y Phase	B Phase
	Voltage (V)	Voltage (V)	Voltage (V)
Display on Meter	255	254	34
After Tightening of B phase voltage piercing screw, Voltages on meter	255	254	254

After tightening piercing screws of voltages where they were tapped, normalcy was restored on the meter display on 14.10.2025. The Consumer's representative was called upon to sign the Spot Inspection Report so that the inspection team could explain the observations and findings. However, the Consumer's representative refused to sign the Spot Inspection Report. Accordingly, the Site Inspection Report has been placed on record.

(v) The meter data was analysed through the MDAS (Meter Data Acquisition System), which recorded PT voltage-missing events. The analysis revealed that the R-Phase PT voltage was completely missing from 20:20 hrs. on 1.12.2022 to 17:45 hrs. on 24.01.2024 i.e. for about 14 months. Similarly, the B-Phase voltage was completely missing from 18:56 hrs. on 11.02.2023 to 15:53 hrs. on 14.10.2025, i.e. for about 32 months, up to the date of inspection. *[Note: As observed from the MRI Report, from July 2025 to 14.10.2025, the B-Phase PT voltage showed residual voltage ranging between 20 V and 40 V.]*


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (vi) The Respondent issued a supplementary bill of ₹4,95,665.45 in October 2025 towards recovery of under-recorded consumption for the period from December 2022 to 14.10.2025. The supplementary bill was served by hand and the amount was included in the October 2025 monthly energy bill.
- (vii) The Consumer's complaint was attended to from time to time, and all relevant details were personally explained to the Consumer at the Sub-Division Office in October 2025. The Consumer sought time to arrange payment; however, the outstanding bill remained unpaid till December 2025. Accordingly, a notice under Section 56(1) of the Electricity Act, 2003 for payment of Rs. 5,44,620/- was issued vide letter dated 12.12.2025. However, supply was not disconnected.
- (viii) The Respondent stated that, vide its letter dated 23.12.2025, it was observed that the meter box had been shifted without prior permission for processing of natural stone. The Appellant, however, contended that the meter cabin had been damaged due to a tree falling on it during a storm, and denied having unauthorizedly shifted or relocated the meter cabin due to working. The Respondent further stated that the Appellant was seriously warned against shifting or relocating the meter cabin in future without prior permission, so as to avoid any further complications.
- (ix) Thereafter, the Consumer declined/failed to accept correspondence sent to the address mentioned on the Energy Bill through Line Staff and Speed Post. The Speed Post was returned with the remark "Post cannot be delivered as the consumer is outside of town." Since the premises was not locked and the Consumer was reportedly working at the site, the correspondence was again sent by Speed Post to the Consumer's native address on 02.02.2026. Copies/photos of the returned and acknowledged Speed Post correspondence have been kept on record.
- (x) The Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 04.03.2026. The Appellant has alleged that the technical data was not cross-checked before finalizing the assessment. However, the MRI data for the period from December 2022 to 15.10.2025 was duly analysed, and the assessment was finalized accordingly. As requested by the Consumer during the hearing of the Forum, the Load Survey data and Voltage Missing Event data (Meter No. X0460592) for the said period were submitted


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



in soft copy to the Consumer. Accordingly, the recovery towards the recorded voltage-missing events was finalized on the basis of the analysis of the said meter data.

- (xi) To further satisfy itself regarding the metering and supply-voltage issue, the Forum, suo motu, sought expert opinion from Asst. Prof. Shri Milind Narayan Tagare, Electrical Department, Finolex Academy of Management and Technology, Ratnagiri.
- (xii) The Forum raised the following questions before the Expert:

1. *If meter terminal phase/phases are loose, can machines operate?*
2. *The electricity bill of the Consumer shows multiplying factor 01. The Consumer's meter is a 40-200A embedded meter without smart PT function. Considering these points, can machines operate if meter terminal phase/phases are loose?*

The Expert, in response, stated as follows:

1. *In such type of meter, the cable used is directly connected to the load. The CT used to measure current are in built in the meter. For voltage measurement the potential screws pierce through the insulation of the cable and make connection with the conductor through which they make the measurement of the voltage. Using these two inputs, power and hence energy measurement is carried out.*
2. *In the case concerned, if the potential connections were loose, then the meter will not read/measure the power and hence energy, but the load will continue to receive full voltage available at source that time.*
3. *In view of the above, I am of the following opinion*
 - a) *The meter is of 40-200A with multiplying factor 01 and even if the connections screws were loose, the load will receive full supply, and machines can operate without any problem. At the same time, meter will not record the concerned energy used by the machine with which the connections were loose.*
 - b) *I have checked the connections of similar meters, and I believe there is no relation of meter connection and voltage received by the machines. So even though meter terminal phase/phases are loose, still machines will receive full supply, and they will work property but recording of the power and energy will be hampered.*

In view of the above expert opinion, it is evident that the load/machinery can continue to operate satisfactorily even in case of loose phase connections, while the meter may fail to record the corresponding energy consumption. The suo motu expert opinion


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



sought by the Forum further demonstrated that the technical aspect of the Consumer's grievance was duly examined. The Forum disposed of the grievance, and the operative part of the order is contained in Para 1.

- (xiii) The present meter is not defective; however, PT, namely the "R" Phase & "B" Phase (as per period given in Table 1) were missing, resulting in the meter recording consumption of only R & Y phases or Y & B phases. Accordingly, Regulation 16.4.1 of the defective meter of the MERC Supply Code, 2021 is not applicable in the present case. There was nothing intrinsically wrong with the meter. The Appellant has consumed the electricity and is, therefore, liable to pay the supplementary bill, which has been raised on the basis of actual consumption.
- (xiv) The Respondent submitted the CPL for the period from December 2021 to July 2026, which shows a substantial reduction in recorded consumption and corresponding billed amounts during the voltage-missing period from December 2022 to 14.10.2025, indicating under-recording of consumption. The said data was explained to the Consumer in person by the Section Officer.
- (xv) The Respondent placed a reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 7235 of 2009 (M/s Prem Cottex v. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd.), which unequivocally upholds the licensee's right to recover escaped billing. The said judgment is squarely applicable to the facts of the present case.
- (xvi) The Respondent further relies upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court, Aurangabad Bench, in Writ Petition No. 8613 of 2017, wherein it was held that under-recording due to wiring or phase-related issues does not amount to a defective meter, and that the licensee is entitled to recover charges for electricity actually consumed, especially when the meter itself is otherwise intact.
- (xvii) It is also observed from the CPL that **the Appellant has not paid the current bills since 30.03.2026, resulting in accumulated outstanding dues of ₹5,92,207.10.**
- (xviii) In the circumstances, the Respondent prays that the representation be rejected.

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


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (i) The particulars of the electricity connection are set out in **Table 1**. The Appellant is engaged in the extraction, cutting and processing of natural stone/ancient rock from its premises and uses electrically operated machinery for carrying out these activities.
- (ii) The Appellant is regular in payment of bills and was/is billed under “Industrial” tariff category.
- (iii) Vide letter dated 06.10.2025, the Respondent’s Chief Engineer (Billing & Revenue) reported prolonged low/missing phase voltages causing under-billing. In Case III, concerning the Appellant, the estimated under-billing was about 55,000 units (Rs. 5.50 lakh), subject to verification of MRI data. However, no assessment based on the actual MRI data was carried out, **and the estimated figure is purely hypothetical**. Therefore, regularization of the case ought to be undertaken prospectively from date of inspection and not retrospectively.
- (iv) The Respondent inspected the Appellant’s premises on 14.10.2025. The said inspection was conducted unilaterally, without preparing any Panchnama and without associating the Appellant with the inspection. Further, a copy of the inspection report was not furnished to the Appellant. Consequently, the Appellant submits that the said inspection report cannot be relied upon as having any legal evidentiary value.
- (v) The electricity bill for September 2025 was Rs. 6,535.58, whereas the October 2025 bill amounted to Rs. 5,38,150/-, including a debit adjustment of Rs. 4,95,665.45. The Appellant contends that the said adjustment was based on an incorrect interpretation and approached the Respondent seeking clarification of the technical basis and reason for the demand. However, despite the Appellant’s request for an explanation, no satisfactory clarification was provided. The Appellant was issued a notice dated 12.12.2025 under Section 56(1) of the Electricity Act, 2003, demanding payment of Rs. 5,44,620/-. The Appellant contends that the said demand was based on an erroneous assumption and was therefore illegal and liable to be withdrawn.
- (vi) The Respondent, vide its letter dated 23.12.2025, alleged that the Appellant had shifted the meter box without permission. The Appellant submits that a storm had caused a tree to fall on the meter cabin; however, the Appellant had never unauthorizedly shifted or relocated the meter cabin.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (vii) Aggrieved by the actions and demand raised by the Respondent, the Appellant filed a grievance application before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum on 04.03.2026, seeking appropriate relief in respect of the disputed supplementary bill and the issues raised by the Respondent. After considering the submissions and material placed on record by both parties, the Forum passed its order and principally rejected the grievance of the Appellant.
- (viii) The Forum failed to appreciate that the Respondent should check the technical data every month, however, they failed to do so. How is the Appellant responsible for such under recording of the meter? The responsibility and financial impact should be borne by the Respondent.
- (ix) The Appellant has never been involved in or indulged in any act of theft or unauthorised consumption of electricity and has maintained a bona fide conduct throughout. The alleged under-billing, if any, was neither intentional nor attributable to any act or omission on the part of the Appellant. Therefore, the Appellant contended that retrospective recovery of a substantial amount, particularly on the basis of an alleged technical discrepancy for the past period, is not justified in the absence of any evidence of malpractice, theft or deliberate interference with the metering system.
- (x) The energy meter belongs to the electricity distribution company and the responsibility of maintaining it lies solely with it. As per MERC Supply Code & SOP Regulations 2021, 'Periodic Testing of Meters' is the responsibility of the Respondent. The Respondent failed to test the meter periodically and hence the Appellant is not responsible for the same. His business is dependent on the detailed summary of every income and expense incurred by his organization in a specific financial year prepared on an accrual basis.
- (xi) The case laws and judicial precedents relied upon by the Appellant are distinguishable on facts and circumstances and are not applicable to the present case. The principles laid down in the said judgments relate to specific factual and legal situations which are materially different from the issues involved in the present matter.
- (xii) The Appellant prays that the Respondent be directed to:
- a) Quash the supplementary bill of Rs. 4,95,665.45 included in the October 2025 electricity bill.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- b) Waive the interest and delayed payment charges levied from October 2025 onwards.
- c) Cancel the disconnection notices issued from 12.12.2025 onwards and restrain the Respondent from disconnecting the electricity supply.

Analysis and Ruling

4. Heard the parties and perused the documents on record. The details of the electricity connection, the respective periods of R-Phase PT voltage missing and B-Phase PT voltage missing/intermittently missing from December 2022 to 14.10.2025, and the retrospective recovery proposed for the corresponding periods are tabulated in Table 1. The Appellant is engaged in the business of extraction, cutting and processing of natural stone/rock and utilizes electrical machinery for carrying out the said activities.

5. The existing meter is of Secure make (Meter No. X0460592), of 3-Phase, 4-Wire type, with a CT-embedded capacity of 40–200 Amps. The meter has been in service since around 2019 and continues to remain in service. Upon inspection on 14.10.2025, the meter screws were tightened and normal functioning of the meter was restored.

6. The Respondent inspected the Appellant's installation on 14.10.2025 and observed that the B-Phase voltage was missing at the meter terminal due to a loose screw connection, resulting in under-recording of approximately 33%. As per the MRI/MDAS data, R-Phase PT voltage was totally missing from 31.12.2022 to 31.01.2024, while B-Phase voltage was totally missing during the period from February 2023 to June 2025 and remained at residual levels of 20–40 volts from July 2025 to 14.10.2025. Since the meter was not equipped with PT Smart Future functionality, assessment for the corresponding PT voltage missing periods was carried out.

7. The Appellant contended that the energy meter belongs to the electricity distribution company and the responsibility of maintaining it lies solely with it. The Respondent failed to test the meter periodically and hence the Appellant is not responsible for the same. Her business


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



is dependent on the detailed summary of every income and expense incurred by her organization in a specific financial year prepared on an accrual basis. At present, it is very difficult to adjust (recover from customers) such a huge amount.

8. The Respondent contended that, as per the MDAS/MRI data, R-Phase PT voltage was totally missing from 31.12.2022 to 31.01.2024, while B-Phase voltage was totally missing from February 2023 to June 2025 and remained at residual levels of 20–40 volts from July 2025 to 14.10.2025. Since the meter was not equipped with PT Smart Future functionality, the Respondent carried out an assessment for the corresponding periods of PT voltage missing. Accordingly, the Respondent raised a supplementary bill of ₹4,95,665.45 in October 2025 towards recovery of the alleged under-recorded consumption for the period from December 2022 to 14.10.2025. This is based on the data retrieved from MRI. The supplementary bill was served upon the Appellant by hand and the amount was incorporated in the October 2025 energy bill.

The relevant abstract of the Appellant's **CPL (Consumer Personal Ledger)**, as available on record, is set out herein below:

Year	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
Month	Cons. (units)	Cons. (units)	Cons. (units)	Cons. (units)	Cons. (units)	Cons. (units)
Apr		5401	912	2835	1200	2767
May		3851	246	2387	321	2473
Jun		0	0	53	0	337
Jul		0	0	186	0	0
Aug		0	0	116	0	
Sep		0	5	2	118	
Oct		1839	559	860	1283	
Nov		2907	1158	1382	2759	
Dec	7017	3105	1371	1732	3936	
Jan	5963	1557	2014	1754	2976	
Feb	5502	905	3664	1491	1963	
Mar	7468	1021	3438	1365	1673	
Total	25950	20586	13367	14163	16229	5577
Avg/Mth	6488	1716	1114	1180	1352	1394
Note	The R-Phase voltage was missing at the meter from Dec. 2022 to Jan. 2024, while the B-Phase voltage was missing from Feb. 2023 to 14.10.2025.					


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



It is evident from the record that there was a sudden and substantial decline in the consumption from 2022-23. While the average was 6488 units per month during 2021-22, it fell to 1716 units per month in 2022-23 and continued in the same range thereafter.

9. The Judgment dated 18.12.2018 of Hon'ble Bombay High Court, Bench at Aurangabad in W.P. No. 8613 of 2017 is squarely applicable in the instant case. The relevant part of the Judgment is reproduced below:

“33 it is therefore, obvious in the present case that there was nothing intrinsically wrong with the meter. As under-recording of electricity consumed was associated with the act of the electrician in wrongly attaching the wires to the R, R & B phases. I am, therefore, of the view that such a wrong attachment of wiring by the electrician would not amount to a defect in the meter. Consequentially, due to the under recording of the meter, the Appellant has consumed such energy as was normally required to be consumed and the Petitioner has lost the revenue for such under recording.

34. Clause 3.4.4 of the Regulations, 2005 enables the Petitioner to recover the charges for the electricity actually supplied, which would include a fixed charge as per the prescribed rates. The Appellant, therefore, has to pay full charges for the electricity actually consumed.

35. In the Municipal Corporation case (supra), this court has sustained the supplementary bill raised by the Electricity Company and this Court has upheld the recovery of the amount mentioned in the supplementary bill.”

This Judgment is applicable in the instant case. As such the meter was not defective which is evident from the fact that the same meter is still operating satisfactorily, after the screws were tightened on 14.10.2025.

10. The recovery should be within the limit of 24 month as stipulated in Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 which fulfils the statutory requirement of Section 56(2) of the Act in case of deficiency in service. 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


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



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 Larger Bench Judgment dated 12.03.2019 of the Bombay High Court in W.P. No. 10764 of 2011 with Other Writ Petitions. The Court has allowed 24 months' recovery retrospectively in cases of mistake or oversight.

11. In the present case, although the Appellant's monthly meter readings were regularly recorded, the Respondent failed to detect and analyse the PT voltage-missing events during the relevant period. Accordingly, the assessment is restricted to **24 months preceding the date of inspection, i.e., from 15.10.2023 to 14.10.2025**. The failure to identify and address the PT voltage missing at the meter, despite regular recording of meter readings, amounts to **deficiency in service** on the part of the Respondent.

12. The assessment/recovery shall be worked out in the following sequence, based on the extent of PT voltage missing:

1. R-Phase and B-Phase PT Voltage Missing: (overlap of the 2 phase missing periods.) Recovery towards 2/3rd of the under-recorded consumption, considering that only 1/3rd of the actual consumption was recorded, for the period from 15.10.2023 to Jan.2024.
2. B-Phase PT Voltage Missing: Recovery towards 1/3rd of the under-recorded consumption, considering that 2/3rd of the actual consumption was recorded, for the period from Feb. 2024 to June 2025.
3. B-Phase PT Voltage Missing: For the period from July 2025 to 14.10.2025, during which residual B-Phase PT voltage in the range of 20–40 V was recorded, the recovery shall be restricted to 30% of the under-recorded consumption, considering that approximately 70% of the actual consumption was recorded. The benefit of limiting the recovery to 30%, instead of 33.33%, is allowed considering the residual voltage and its weighted average during the said period.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



13. The above assessment shall, in any event, be confined to the permissible **24-month assessment period from 15.10.2023 to 14.10.2025.**

14. The order passed by the Forum is hereby set aside, in view of the findings recorded hereinabove and the consistent approach adopted by the Electricity Ombudsman in similar matters involving PT voltage missing. Accordingly, the Respondent is directed to revise the assessment and recover the amount as follows:

- a) R-Phase and B-Phase PT Voltage Missing: Recovery of 2/3rd of the under-recorded consumption, considering that only 1/3rd of the actual consumption was recorded, for the period (15.10.2023 to Jan.2024).
- b) B-Phase PT Voltage Missing: Recovery of 1/3rd of the under-recorded consumption, considering that 2/3rd of the actual consumption was recorded, for the period (Feb 2024 to June 2025).
- c) B-Phase PT Voltage with Residual Voltage: For the period from July 2025 to 14.10.2025, during which residual B-Phase PT voltage in the range of 20–40 V was recorded, the recovery shall be restricted to 30% of the under-recorded consumption, considering that approximately 70% of the actual consumption was recorded.
- d) The Appellant shall be permitted to pay the revised bill in 10 equal monthly instalments, without levy of interest and Delayed Payment Charges (DPC). In the event of default in payment of any instalment along with the current bill, the Respondent shall be at liberty to levy interest proportionately for the period of default and take further action in accordance with law.
- e) The Respondent shall submit compliance of this Order within two months from the date of its issuance.
- f) All other prayers of the Appellant stand rejected.

15. The representation of the Appellant is disposed of accordingly.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



16. 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

