

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 12 OF 2026

In the matter of Refund of Security Deposit of previous consumer

Sunil Madhukar Patil Appellant
(Cons. No. 170017264136)

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co, Ltd..Respondent No.1
Rasta Peth (MSEDCL)

Prasad Shivram Jambhulkar...Respondent No.2

Appearances:

Appellant : None

Respondent No1.: Chandrakant Dighe, Executive Engineer, Rasta-Peth Dn.

Respondent No.2: None


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

Date of hearing: 27th March 2026

Date of Order : 30th March 2026

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 12th 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 17th December 2025 in Case No. 168 of 2025 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MSEDCL, Pune Zone (the Forum). The Forum partly allowed the grievance application of the Appellant. The operative portion of the order is as below:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



“2. The Respondent is directed to give detailed procedure for refund of the SD to the Complainant and after compliance from the Complainant, Refund the Security Deposit by following Regulation 13.9.”


2. The Appellant has filed this Representation against the order passed by the Forum. An e-hearing was held on 27th March 2026 through audio conference. The Respondent No. 1 attended the hearing which was heard at length. The Respondent No. 1 's submissions and arguments are stated as below. [The Electricity Ombudsman's observations and comments are recorded under 'Notes'.]

- (i) The Appellant is a three-phase residential LT consumer since 19.07.1995 having a bungalow premises. The particulars of the electricity connection are tabulated below.

Table 1:

Name of Original Consumer	Consumer No.	Address	Sanctioned load	Date of Supply	Name of New Consumer (After Transfer)	Security Deposit (₹)
Sunil Madhukar Patil	170017264136	Bungalow No. 1, Opp. Mahatma Phule, Sanskrutik Bhavan, Near Shivarkar Garden Pune-411048	6 kW	19.07.1995	Prasad Shivram Jambhulkar	Rs. 11,535.47 reflected in Jan.2026 bill

- (ii) After the sale of the premises by the Appellant to the Respondent No.2, the sale deed dated 26.02.2025 was registered on 04.03.2025 before the Joint Sub-Registrar, Haveli No. 6, Pune, upon payment of stamp duty of ₹29,75,000/- and registration fee of ₹30,000/-.
- (iii) Thereafter, Respondent No. 2, Prasad Shivram Jambhulkar, applied for change of name on 23.05.2025 by submitting the requisite documents, namely the Index-II document evidencing ownership of the premises and the prescribed 'X' Form



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



containing the consent of the original consumer for transfer of the Security Deposit (SD).

- (iv) The said X Form bears the signature of the Appellant, thereby evidencing his consent for transfer of the SD to the new consumer. Acting upon the documents so submitted and after due verification in accordance with the prescribed procedure, the Respondent effected the change of name and transferred the SD to the account of Respondent No. 2, in the ordinary course of business and in compliance with the applicable regulations.
- (v) The Respondent denies any error, arbitrariness, or unauthorized action in transferring the SD. Once valid consent is furnished through the prescribed form, the Respondent is bound to act upon the same, and no question of refund to the previous consumer arises thereafter. The Appellant's contention regarding absence of consent is incorrect and contrary to the documentary record. The grievance is devoid of merit and does not disclose any deficiency in service, as the Respondent has acted bona fide and in accordance with the applicable regulations and procedures.
- (vi) Being dissatisfied, the Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 15.07.2025 seeking refund of the security deposit after sale of the bungalow. The Forum partly allowed the grievance, and the operative portion of the order is set out in Para I above.
- (vii) In compliance with the said order, the Respondent No. 1, vide letter dated 07.01.2026, informed the Appellant of the procedure for refund of the security deposit through the Web Self Service (WSS) Portal of the Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited, as detailed hereinafter.

- A) The consumer is required to submit an online request for refund of Security Deposit on the WSS Portal.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




- B) The consumer must upload requisite documents, including identity proof, latest paid bill, and, where applicable, proof of sale (Index-II).
- C) The consumer is required to provide bank account details along with supporting proof (cancelled cheque) for refund.
- D) Upon submission, the Respondent verifies the request and documents.
- E) Any outstanding dues are adjusted against the Security Deposit.
- F) The balance amount, if any, is refunded to the consumer through electronic transfer in accordance with applicable regulations.

(viii) The issue relating to refund or transfer of the SD is fundamentally between the Appellant and Respondent No. 2 as the Appellant has duly consented to the change of name as well as transfer of the SD. Any dispute, if now raised, is a private dispute between the said parties, and the Appellant is unjustifiably seeking to involve MSEDCL in the same, which is not warranted and leads to avoidable use of administrative time and resources.

(ix) In view of the foregoing, the Respondent prays that the representation filed by the Appellant be rejected.

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


- (i) The Appellant, Sunil Madhukar Patil, is the original consumer bearing Consumer No. 170017264136, having availed electricity supply since 19.07.1995. The details of the connection are tabulated in Table 1. The Appellant's premises comprises of a 2650 sq. feet bungalow. He had initially paid a SD of ₹5,369/-, which remained credited in his account for several years. Subsequently, on 15.09.2024, the Appellant paid an additional security deposit of ₹10,000/- (Receipt No. 433836014), thereby making a total deposit of ₹15,369/-.
- (ii) Prior to sale of the said bungalow, the Appellant by his letter dated 22.10.2024 requested to adjust the bill amount against the security deposit of Rs. 15,369/-, or alternatively to advise regarding the procedure for online adjustment. The


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Appellant applied for refund of the entire SD by Reference ID 533958 dated 22.10.2024. After that the Appellant sold the bungalow to the Respondent No. 2 (Prasad Shivram Jambhulkar) for a cost of about Rs.4 Crores. The sale deed dated 26.02.2025 was registered at the office of Joint Sub- Registrar Haveli No. 6 Pune by paying stamp duty of Rs. 29,75,000/- and registration fee of Rs. 30,000/- on 04.03.2025. Accordingly Index II was generated in the name of Prasad Shivram Jambhulkar.

- (iii) The Respondent No. 2 applied for change of name on 23.05.2025. **The Appellant never authorized or instructed the Respondent No.1 to transfer the said security deposit to the new owner, Respondent No. 2.** However, the Appellant later discovered that the Respondent has erroneously transferred the security deposit to the account of the new consumer without his consent or authority. *[Note: In other words, the Appellant expects that Respondent No. 2 should pay fresh SD to MSEDCL.]*
- (iv) The said action of the Respondent is arbitrary, unauthorized, and contrary to the Appellant's explicit request for refund.
- (v) The Appellant filed a grievance application in the Forum on 15.07.2025 for refund of SD after the sale of his bungalow. The Forum has partly allowed the grievance of the Appellant and directed the Respondent to intimate the detailed procedure for refund of the SD to the Complainant and, upon compliance by the Complainant, to process and refund the security deposit in accordance with Regulation 13.9 of the MERC Supply Code & Standards of Performance, Regulations 2021.
- (vi) Prior to the change of name, the Respondent No. 2 consented that the deposit would be transferred after name transfer is executed, and the Appellant confirmed by telephonic call that the last bill of payment was 22.04.2025 before the transfer. This audio clip is available with the Appellant. This recording conclusively established that no valid consent was given for transfer of SD.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (vii) The security deposit is legally refundable only to the depositor. The Respondent No. 1 is fully aware of its obligation but has deliberately delayed compliance.
- (viii) In view of the above, the Appellant prays that the Respondent be directed to :
- I. refund the security deposit amount of ₹15,369/- to the Appellant;
 - II. Declare that the transfer of the Appellant's SD to the new consumer is illegal and without authority.


4. The Respondent No. 2 did not submit any reply for the purpose of hearing despite repeated follow-up, however participated in a settlement proposal in coordination with the office of the Electricity Ombudsman.

Analysis and Ruling

5. Heard the parties present and perused the documents on record. This Office facilitated an amicable resolution between the Appellant and Respondent No. 2 through telephonic discussions on 24.03.2026 & 25.03.2026. Pursuant thereto, the parties engaged in discussions and finally arrived at a settlement whereby it is confirmed that the Respondent No. 2 has refunded the security deposit amount to the Appellant on 25.03.2026, though the exact amount has not been disclosed. In view of the settlement, the Appellant has submitted a formal letter dated 25.03.2026 seeking withdrawal of the instant representation, with an intimation to Respondent No. 1.

6. Accordingly, the request for withdrawal of the representation is allowed, and the representation stands withdrawn.

Sd/
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

