

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 8 OF 2026

In the matter of illegal disconnection of electricity supply and shifting of meters

Late Omprakash Thakurdas GulatiAppellant
(Nutan Nadar – Power of Attorney holder)
(CA. No. 100728943)

V/s.

Adani Electricity Mumbai Limited (AEML)..... Respondent

Appearances:

Appellant: Rajendra Nadar, Representative

Respondent: 1. Mritunjay Jha, General Manager & Nodal Officer
2. Prashant P. Mane, Associate General Manager

Coram: Vandana Krishna [IAS. (Retd.)]


Date of hearing: 24th March 2026

Date of Order: 9th April 2026

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 11th February 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 29th January 2026 in Case No. 12014/2025-26 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, AEML (the Forum). The Forum, by its operative order, allowed the present grievance application as under:

- The Respondent is hereby directed to restore the electricity supply of the CA No:100728943 along with other 11 numbers of connections from the existing meter*


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



cabin, subject to the Applicant/Complainant fulfilling all requisite safety requirements in accordance with applicable Standards and Regulations.


2. *The Applicant/Complainant is hereby directed to undertake and complete all requisite safety measures at the existing meter cabin as per applicable standards, in coordination with AEML, within a period of seven days from the date of this order.*
3. *The Respondent is hereby directed to consider the Complainant's application submitted on 20.11.2025 for shifting of the existing meter cabin and to undertake all consequential steps, such as preparation of estimates and issuance of demand for shifting charges etc. The Respondent shall not insist on submission of an online application by the Applicant/Complainant at this stage.*
4. *The Applicant is hereby directed to carry out and complete all works within his scope, in the event of shifting of the meter cabin, through a duly licensed electrical contractor and to submit the requisite test report to AEML.*

2. Aggrieved by the order of the Forum, the Appellant has filed this representation. A physical hearing was held on 24th March 2026, during which both parties were present and 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.'*]

- (i) The present representation has been filed by the Appellant, Ms. Nutan Nadar, acting as the notarised Power of Attorney holder on behalf of the original consumer, Late Shri Omprakash Thakurdas Gulati, in respect of Consumer Account No. 100728943. The said representation pertains to the premises situated at Chawl No. 42, Road No. 2, Ramabai Colony, Ghatkopar (East), Mumbai – 400075, for which she is authorised to manage and attend to all related affairs.

Preliminary Submissions:

- (ii) The present grievance pertains to the shifting of a meter cabin comprising 12 meters, necessitated due to its dilapidated condition and the attendant safety concerns.
- (iii) At the outset, the grievance is liable to be rejected for non-joinder of necessary parties. The Appellant has failed to implead the other consumers whose meters are housed in


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



the subject meter cabin, in whose absence no effective or binding adjudication can be undertaken. In this regard, the Respondent places reliance upon the judgment of the Supreme Court dated 22 September 2022 in *Moreshar Yadarao Mahajan vs. Vyankatesh Sitaram Bhedi (D) Thr. Lrs. & Ors.* (Civil Appeal Nos. 5755–5756 of 2011), wherein the concept of a “necessary party” has been elaborately interpreted. The Supreme Court, in the said judgment, has described a “necessary party” as follows:


“18. It could thus be seen that a “necessary party” is a person who ought to have been joined as a party and in whose absence no effective decree could be passed at all by the court. It has been held that if a “necessary party” is not impleaded, the suit itself is liable to be dismissed.

20. It can thus be seen that what has been held by this Court is that for being a necessary party, the twin test has to be satisfied. The first one is that there must be a right to some relief against such party in respect of the controversies involved in the proceedings. The second one is that no effective decree can be passed in the absence of such a party. ...”

The Supreme Court has categorically held that in the absence of necessary parties, the proceedings/appeals are liable to be dismissed.

- (iv) Without prejudice to the foregoing, the subject matter of the present grievance, i.e., shifting of a meter cabin, does not fall within the ambit of “grievance” as defined under Regulation 2.1(e) of the CGRF & EO Regulations, 2020. The relevant definition of “grievance” is reproduced hereunder:

“Grievance” means any fault, imperfection, shortcoming or inadequacy in the quality, nature and manner of performance, which has been undertaken to be performed by a Distribution Licensee in pursuance of a licence, contract, agreement or under the Electricity Supply Code or in relation to Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees as specified by the Commission and includes inter alia Grievances in respect of non-compliance of any Order of


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




the Commission or any action to be taken in pursuance thereof, which are within the jurisdiction of the Forum or Electricity Ombudsman, as the case may be;”

The said provision contemplates deficiencies in the quality, nature, or manner of performance of obligations by a distribution licensee. The present issue does not constitute such a deficiency and is therefore outside the jurisdiction of this Forum. Consequently, the representation is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed. In this regard, the Respondent seeks to rely upon the order passed by this Authority in Representation No. 65 of 2019 (*Machindra Motiram Bhadange vs. Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited*).

The Appellant has concealed the material facts from this Hon’ble Authority and therefore the present representation is liable to be rejected.

Submissions on Merit:


- (v) On 10.11.2025, the Appellant, Ms. Nutan Nadar, raised concerns regarding dangerous meter board wiring of the 12-meter cabin. Pursuant thereto, **the Respondent conducted a site visit on 14.11.2025 and informed the Appellant about re-board wiring requirements, also affixing details on the meter box.** The Appellant was required to comply with prescribed norms, including outgoing wiring with licensed test report, weatherproof cabin, external MCBs with separate compartment, adequate meter space, and protective arrangements. However, the Appellant did not undertake the requisite compliance and instead expected the Respondent to execute the entire work, which led to the present grievance.
- (vi) In the interim, the Appellant demolished the wall, thereby exposing the meter cabin, and addressed a complaint to the Electrical Inspector on 12.12.2025 alleging dangerous board wiring. Based on the said complaint, **the office of the Electrical Inspector conducted a site inspection and, vide letter dated 16.12.2025, directed the Respondent to take appropriate action.** In compliance with the said directions, and considering the hazardous site conditions arising from the demolition, the Respondent, on 16.12.2025, disconnected the electricity supply to the meter cabin on safety


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



grounds. The said letter of the Electrical Inspector, along with photographs showing the earlier site condition and the meter cabin, are placed on record.

- (vii) Subsequent to the disconnection of electricity supply, the Respondent, vide letter dated 19.12.2025, informed the office of the Electrical Inspector about the prevailing site conditions and the action taken. A copy of the said communication is placed on record.
- (viii) On several occasions, the Respondent's personnel apprised the Appellant of the procedure and formalities required to be complied with for shifting of the meter. However, instead of fulfilling the requisite commercial and technical requirements, the Appellant continued to address letters and emails to the Respondent and other authorities. The Respondent, vide emails dated 19.12.2025 and 22.12.2025, specifically requested the Appellant to submit the statutory test report; however, the same was not furnished at the relevant time. Copies of the said emails are placed on record.
- (ix) The original meter cabin was in an unsafe and dilapidated condition; therefore, from a safety and technical standpoint, reconnection of electricity supply through the existing arrangement was not feasible. The photographs annexed to the present reply clearly demonstrate the hazardous condition of the meter cabin. It was incumbent upon the Appellant, along with other consumers, to submit an application and comply with the prescribed formalities, including submission of an online application, payment of applicable charges, and furnishing of the statutory test report.
- (x) Under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 (the Act) and the applicable MERC Regulations, including the Supply Code and Standards of Performance, 2021, consumers seeking removal or shifting of a meter cabin are required to approach the Respondent and comply with prescribed formalities, which, inter alia, include provision of suitable space for the meter/meter cabin. In the present case, no such application has been received from the concerned consumers in accordance with the applicable regulatory framework.
- (xi) The Appellant filed a grievance application in the Forum on 26.12.2025. The Forum directed restoration of electricity supply for CA No. 100728943 and 11 other connections from the existing meter cabin, subject to safety compliance. The Applicant must complete required safety measures within 7 days. The Respondent shall process


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



the meter shifting request dated 20.11.2025. In case of shifting, the Applicant must execute necessary works through a licensed contractor and submit a test report.


(xii) By letter dated 04.02.2026, the Respondent, in compliance with the Forum's order, informed the Appellant that certain provisions were required from his end for meter installation at the existing location, including re-board wiring as follows:

- a. Installation of outgoing wiring and Test Report issued by a licensed electrical contractor,
- b. Provision of a weatherproof meter cabin.
- c. 18 mm fiber cement sheet (IS: 14862).
- d. Consumer's side MCB's should be installed outside the meter cabin.
- e. Separate compartment and separate door should be provided for consumer side MCB.
- f. 1 feet × 1 feet space required for each meter.
- g. Aluminum Hardener door, and
- h. Rain shed should be provided to protect the meter cabin from rain (water).

(xiii) In addition, the Respondent stated that as per site visit, it was confirmed that provision of a new meter cabin had been made by the Appellant on the newly constructed wall. The copy of shifting charges dated 04.02.2026 along with the material required including cable for the proposed new meter cabin is as below:

Table 1:

Description	Amount (Rs.)
Application Registration & processing Charges	1,080
Recoverable Job Deposit	42,553
Total	43,633


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




Present Status:

(xiv) The Appellant filed a new grievance in the Forum on 04.02.2026 (Case No. CGRF 12017) and her husband Rajendra Nadar filed another grievance on 04.02.2026 (Case No.: 12018/2025-26), arising from the same cause of action with prayers as below:

- I. *Restoring power supply*
- II. *Precise safety inspection/assessment*
- III. *AEML to issue written disconnection notice specifying reasons*
- IV. *to provide clear restoration plan & time line*

The Forum passed a final combined order on 06.03.2026, with directions as stated herein.

- i. *Since the original location of the meter cabin no more exists, there is no question of Applicants/Complainants fulfilling all requisite safety requirements in accordance with applicable Standards and Regulations and subsequent restoration of electric supply.*
- ii. *The Respondent is hereby directed to undertake the shifting of the meter cabin to a technically appropriate location in coordination with the Applicants/Complainants and to carry out all the allied works up to the point of supply.*
- iii. *The Applicants/Complainants are hereby directed to undertake and complete all requisite safety measures at the proposed new meter cabin location as per applicable standards, in coordination with AEML (Reference: AEML's letter dated 05.02.2026), within a period of seven days from the date of this order.*
- iv. *The Applicants/Complainants are hereby directed to carry out and complete all works within his scope, in the event of shifting of the meter cabin, through a duly licensed electrical contractor and to submit the requisite test report to AEML.*


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




In compliance with the said order, the Respondent immediately issued letters to all consumers whose electricity meters are installed in the meter cabin.

- (xv) On 03.02.2026, the Respondent's personnel conducted a site survey to verify compliance with the Forum's order dated 29.01.2026. During the visit, it was observed that the meter cabin had been unauthorisedly shifted and illegally connected from meter cabin supply, and the licensee's works (cable/termination) were found damaged and temporarily extended to another place. Accordingly, appropriate action was taken under Section 135 & 138 of the Act.
- (xvi) Subsequently, to comply with the Forum's directions, the Respondent again issued letters to all concerned consumers calling upon them to fulfil the required conditions at their end. Copies of letters dated 04.02.2026 (to Omprakash Gulati) and 05.02.2026 (to other consumers) are on record.
- (xvii) On 04.02.2026, the Respondent issued an indicative estimate of ₹43,633/- for shifting and re-board wiring works.
- (xviii) During the hearing on 17.02.2026 in connected grievances, the Appellant expressed difficulty in coordinating with other consumers. Considering this, a revised estimate of ₹19,049/- was issued on 19.02.2026, reducing the deposit on humanitarian grounds.

Table 2:

Description	Amount (Rs.)
Application Registration & processing Charges	1,080
Recoverable Job Deposit	17,969
Total	19,049

- (xix) Despite the revised estimate, the Appellant paid ₹43,633/- immediately. Accordingly, on 20.02.2026, the Respondent deputed personnel to execute the work; however, the required consumer-side work was incomplete, and hence the work could not proceed.
- (xx) Vide letter dated 21.02.2026, the Respondent requested submission of bank details for refund of excess payment and completion of pending works.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




- (xxi) On 23.02.2026, the work was executed; however, due to non-submission of test reports, meters could not be installed. On 24.02.2026, test reports of eight consumers were received and supply was restored. Subsequently, two more meters were installed on 05.03.2026 upon completion of formalities. The meter cabin location identified by the Appellant was found technically suitable.
- (xxii) However, the following two consumers have still not complied with the required formalities, and hence restoration is pending:

Table 3:

Sr. No.	Consumer Account No.	Name	Test report submitted	Meter installed	Vigilance debit Rs.	Overdue Balance	Remarks
1	500337341	Angana Krishana Gaikwad	No	No	2,910	0	Vigilance fine paid
2	154097946	Nutan Rajendra Kumar Nadar	No	No	1,691	2,154.90	Vigilance fine not paid


The Respondent has already informed them to submit test reports and clear pending dues.

- (xxiii) The Forum's order was passed after due consideration of all facts and submissions. The meter cabin has since been relocated to the consumer-identified location and installed, with electricity supply restored to 10 consumers. The remaining 2 connections will be restored upon completion of requisite formalities.
- (xxiv) Accordingly, nothing survives for adjudication and the present representation has become infructuous. Photographs of the relocated meter cabin are on record.
- (xxv) In the circumstances, the present representation is untenable in law and on facts, and the Respondent prays that it be rejected with exemplary costs.
3. The Appellant's submission and arguments are stated as below: -
- (i) The Appellant, Mrs. Nutan Nadar is the Power of Attorney holder on behalf of the original consumer, Late Omprakash Thakurdas Gulati for CA. No. 100728943 at the address mentioned in para 2 (i).


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




- (ii) The Appellant, by written grievance dated 10.11.2025, brought to the Respondent's notice the hazardous and dilapidated condition of the meter cabin, posing serious risk of short circuit and electrocution. The urgency was reiterated via email dated 12.11.2025 and telephonic complaint dated 13.11.2025 (No. 1003449453).
- (iii) The Respondent conducted a site inspection on 14.11.2025 and was fully aware of the unsafe condition. Despite such knowledge, no corrective action, report, or communication was issued for over a month. Acting on the Respondent's advice, the Appellant submitted a written request for shifting of the meter cabin on 20.11.2025. The Respondent acknowledged the request telephonically on 04.12.2025 and discussed procedural aspects; however, no further steps were taken.
- (iv) Thereafter, the Respondent failed to conduct inspection, initiate shifting, or provide any written response despite follow-ups. Due to continued inaction and safety risk, the Appellant approached the Electrical Inspector on 12.12.2025. On 16.12.2025, the Respondent disconnected electricity supply on alleged safety grounds without prior notice or due process. No disconnection memo, inspection report, or restoration plan was provided even after disconnection. The first written communication from the Respondent was issued only on 19.12.2025.
- (v) Aggrieved, the Appellant filed a grievance application in the Forum on 26.12.2025. The Forum by its order dated 29.01.2026 partly allowed the grievance application of the Appellant. The operative part of the order is referred in the first para. The Forum failed to understand the basic issue that the Respondent illegally disconnected the supply of the Appellant on 16.12.2025 without considering relevant pleadings.
- (vi) The impugned Order is vitiated by the Respondent's prior negligence despite knowledge of hazard, illegal safety-based disconnection without due process, wrongful shifting of statutory obligations, violation of natural justice through reliance on undisclosed material and non-consideration of pleadings, and internally contradictory findings. The action is further aggravated by coercive demands, circulation to third parties, and initiation of criminal proceedings during pendency, rendering the process arbitrary, disproportionate, and in breach of MERC Regulations and Article 21. The Appellant is entitled to immediate restoration, with a finding of deficiency in service, while reserving rights for higher compensation.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (vii) The present Application seeks urgent interim relief during pendency of the accompanying Appeal challenging the Order dated 29.01.2026 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum.
- (viii) Pursuant to the impugned action, the Appellant's electricity supply has remained disconnected since 16.12.2025, causing severe hardship. The disconnection has been purportedly effected on alleged safety grounds under Regulation 21.1 of the Electricity Supply Code; however, the same is arbitrary, disproportionate and unsustainable. The Appellant had, prior to disconnection, specifically brought to the Respondent's notice the hazardous and dilapidated condition of the meter cabin, including exposed wiring and risk to life and property. Instead of rectifying the dangerous condition, the Respondent has penalized the Appellant by disconnecting supply, which defeats the very object of safety regulations.
- (ix) In view of the above, the Appellant prays that this Authority may be pleased to direct immediate restoration of electricity supply to the Appellant, pending final disposal of the Appeal.
- (x) Pursuant to the Order dated 31.01.2026, the Respondent, by communication dated 05.02.2026, demanded compliance with works and ₹42,553/- as "Recoverable Job Deposit" without disclosure of basis, making restoration contingent thereon, and circulated the same to non-party meter holders while allegedly misrepresenting facts to create pressure. The Appellant, without prejudice, sought clarification on 06.02.2026. Thereafter, the Respondent initiated criminal proceedings under the Electricity Act, summoning meter holders during pendency of the regulatory dispute. Without seeking adjudication on the FIR, these subsequent events demonstrate coercive escalation and directly justify interim protection, failing which the appellate remedy would be rendered illusory.
- (xi) The chronology of events are as follow:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




Date	Event
10.11.2025	The Appellant lodged a written grievance with the Distribution Licensee reporting a serious safety hazard in the common meter cabin, including exposed wiring and risk of electrocution.
12-13.11.2025	Follow-up email and telephone grievance made by the Appellant (Grievance No. 1003449453), reiterating urgency of safety risk.
14.11.2025	The Respondent conducted a site inspection, thereby acquiring full knowledge of the hazardous condition of the meter cabin.
20.11.2025	On advice of the Respondent's personnel, the Appellant submitted a written request for shifting of the meter cabin.
04.12.2025	Respondent's representative acknowledged the shifting request telephonically, discussed logistics, Licensed Electrical Contractor involvement, and applicable charges.
08.12.2025	Follow-up email sent by the Appellant due to absence of inspection, timeline, or written communication.
12.12.2025	Due to continued inaction despite known safety hazard, the Appellant approached the Electrical Inspector seeking statutory intervention.
16.12.2025	The Respondent disconnected electricity supply to the entire meter cabin citing safety grounds, without prior notice or defect memo.
19.12.2025	First written communication from the Respondent issued after the disconnection.
26.12.2025	Grievance filed before the CGRF (inwarded earlier by the Respondent).
08.01.2026	Hearing conducted before the CGRF.
12.01.2026	Application for Production of Document filed seeking Electrical Inspector's communication.
16.01.2026	Procedural Submissions Note filed by the Appellant.
29.01.2026	CGRF passed the impugned Order.
07.02.2026	FIR lodged by the Respondent under the Electricity Act; criminal process initiated while the matter was sub judice before the CGRF/Ombudsman to intimidate the consumer.
26.02.2026	Meter cabin shifted and energised.

(xii) The Appellant prays that the Electricity Ombudsman may be pleased to

- a) Set aside the Forum's order dated 29.01.2026;
- b) Direct immediate restoration of electricity supply;
- c) Fix responsibility on the Respondent for post-disconnection compliance;
- d) Hold the Respondent guilty of deficiency in service and abuse of process;
- e) Record malafide action in lodging FIR;
- f) Reserve right to claim compensation;
- g) Take note of FIR being based on a pending technical dispute;

Analysis & Ruling

4. Heard the parties and perused the record. The Appellant, Ms. Nutan Nadar is the notarised Power of Attorney holder of Late Shri Omprakash Thakurdas Gulati (CA No.


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




100728943), representing the affairs on the premises at Chawl No. 42, Ramabai Colony, Ghatkopar (East), Mumbai. The preliminary objection of the Respondent for non-joinder is not tenable, as the grievance pertains to disconnection and restoration falling within the jurisdiction under the applicable Regulations; however, the presence of other affected consumers would have been desirable, though not essential, being ancillary to the primary issue.

5. On the face of the matter, the meter cabin housing 12 consumers' meters was in a dilapidated and unsafe condition. The Appellant raised safety concerns on 10.11.2025; the Respondent inspected on 14.11.2025 and informed him about the re-board wiring requirements, including outgoing wiring with licensed test report, weatherproof cabin, and necessary protective arrangements to be undertaken by the Appellant. The Appellant failed to comply with these and instead expected the Respondent to execute the entire work, leading to the present grievance.

6. The Appellant thereafter approached the Electrical Inspector on 12.12.2025. Based on the Inspector's communication to 'take appropriate action' and site conditions, supply was disconnected on 16.12.2025 on safety grounds. The Appellant challenges the disconnection as illegal and alleges prior negligence and coercion, whereas the Respondent justifies the action on safety grounds, cites non-compliance by consumers, and submits that substantial compliance has since been achieved.

7. While disconnection on 16.12.2025 on safety grounds is permissible, the Respondent was required to follow a clear restoration plan, which is not adequately demonstrated. At the same time, the directions of the Forum requiring shifting of the meter cabin as per the Appellant's request and compliance through a licensed contractor are broadly consistent with safety requirements, though the statutory obligation of ensuring safe installation and coordinated restoration cannot be entirely shifted upon the consumers. It is observed that, by letter dated 04.02.2026 issued in compliance with the Forum's order, the Respondent informed the Appellant to undertake certain requirements for meter installation at the existing location, including re-board wiring, namely: installation of outgoing wiring with test report from a licensed electrical contractor; provision of a weatherproof meter cabin with 18 mm fibre


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




cement sheet (IS 14862); installation of consumer-side MCBs outside the cabin with a separate compartment and door; provision of 1 ft × 1 ft space per meter; and installation of an aluminum door and rain shed for protection.

8. It is observed that the Respondent, by letter dated 04.02.2026, issued an estimate of ₹43,633/- for shifting works, which was subsequently revised to ₹19,049/- on 19.02.2026 considering the Appellant's difficulty; however, the substantial variation in the recoverable job deposit remains unexplained and indicates lack of due care in the initial estimate.

9. Subsequent developments indicate that the meter cabin has been shifted to a technically suitable and safe location, and supply has been restored to most consumers, with 2 remaining connections pending on account of non-submission of test reports and clearance of dues. Allegations regarding initiation of criminal proceedings are taken on record as subsequent events.

10. It is observed that the work was executed on 23.02.2026; however, due to non-submission of test reports, meters could not be installed. Upon receipt of test reports from eight consumers on 24.02.2026, supply was restored, and subsequently two additional meters were installed on 05.03.2026 upon completion of formalities. The meter cabin location identified by the Appellant was found technically suitable. However, two consumers (including the Appellant) have still not complied with the requisite formalities, and restoration in their cases remains pending, for which the Respondent has already issued necessary intimation.

11. In view of the above, it is observed that the Forum's order has been substantially complied with, as the meter cabin has been relocated and electricity supply restored to 10 consumers, with the remaining connections pending only due to non-compliance of requisite formalities by the concerned consumers. Both the Appellant and the Respondent have distinct roles in re-board wiring and/or shifting of the meter cabin, requiring mutual cooperation and coordination. Instead of adopting an adversarial approach, both parties were expected to act in coordination to ensure timely compliance and restoration. The Appellant is therefore advised to take necessary steps in coordination with the Respondent for completion of pending



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



formalities. In these circumstances, no further intervention is warranted and the representation is rejected.

12. The representation is accordingly disposed of.

Sd/
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

