

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 99 OF 2025

In the matter of new connection and billing

Manju Rajesh Gupta Appellant

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd. Bhandup (MSEDCL) Respondent

Appearances:

Appellant : 1. Rajesh Gupta
2. Santosh Gupta, Representative

Respondent: 1. Appasaheb Khandekar, Executive Engineer, Bhandup Dn.
2. Pramod Kshirsagar, Addl. Executive Engineer

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

Date of hearing: 30th October 2025

Date of Order: 3rd November 2025

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 29th September 2025 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 24th September 2025 in Grievance No. 22 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Bhandup Urban Zone (the Forum). The Forum has partly allowed the grievance application. The operative part of the order is as below:

- The Respondent is directed to restore the electric connection and reinstate the Security Deposit of Rs. 3200/- of the consumer.*


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



3. *The Respondent is directed to withdraw the bills generated from 16.11.2024 to 18.04.2025 as there was no connection.*
4. *The Respondent is directed to issue reading bills from 18.04.2025 onwards. If date of supply on electricity bill cannot be changed, then a letter showing actual date of supply should be given to the Applicant.*

2. The Appellant has filed the present representation against the order passed by the Forum. The physical/e-hearing was held on 30th October 2025, wherein the Appellant remained present in person and the Respondent participated through Video Conference. Both 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, Smt. Manju Rajesh Gupta, applied online for a new electricity connection on 29.10.2024 (Consumer No. 000051354745). Upon submission of all required documents on 09.11.2024, the connection was sanctioned for a load of 0.5 KW and meter No. A8528797 (L&T make) was issued on 16.11.2024 for installation. The connection details are as below:

Table 1

Name of Consumer	Address on Bill	Date of Application	Demand Notice of Security Deposit & Process Fee & Service Connection Charges paid	Date of Supply as per Bill	Supply Temporarily Disconnected	Meter was installed (as per Appellant)
Manju Rajesh Gupta	Gala no. 5, Ram Rahim Udyog Nagar, Dargah Cross Road, Sonapur, Bhandup (W), 400078.	29.10.2024	1. Security Deposit: Rs. 3100/- & Process Fee: Rs. 120/- paid on 29.10.2024 2. Service Connection Charges with GST of Rs. 4,342/- was paid on 16.11.2024	16.11.2024	24.02.2025 due to non payment of bill by the Respondent	18.04.2025

- (ii) For releasing supply, underground cable laying was required. However, excavation of the concrete road constructed by the Municipal Corporation was resisted by local


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



residents. On 16.11.2024 and again on 19.11.2024 and 20.12.2024, the technician attempted to install the meter through a service wire, but the Appellant did not permit it and insisted on underground cable supply. Since road excavation required MCGM permission, temporary supply was later arranged by fixing the cable on the wall with clips, and the meter was installed around January 2025. *[Note : This is denied by the Appellant, who claims that the meter was installed in April 2025.]*

- (iii) **Monthly bills were raised from 16.11.2024 (the date of supply). Due to non-payment of arrears amounting to ₹1,515.88 by February 2025, the supply was temporarily disconnected on 24.02.2025 after issuing a digital notice under Section 56(1) of the Electricity Act, 2003.**
- (iv) The Appellant filed a grievance before the Forum on 21.05.2025 seeking action in the matter and against the concerned field staff.
- (v) By July 2025, the outstanding dues increased to ₹3,527.68. The Security Deposit of ₹3,100/- was adjusted, leaving a balance arrears of ₹427.68 payable by the Appellant.
- (vi) The Forum, by order dated 24.09.2025, partly allowed the grievance. It directed reversal of fixed charges up to 18.04.2025 on the basis of the Appellant's statement regarding the date of meter installation. A bill revision of ₹2,336.30 was approved for credit in the upcoming bill. Due to billing software limitations, the date of supply could not be altered; however, as per the Forum's directions, the same was presumed as 18.04.2025 and duly communicated to the Appellant.
- (vii) **The Appellant had not sought compensation before the Forum but introduced, for the first time before the Electricity Ombudsman, a claim of ₹1,000/- per day for alleged delay in supply. It is submitted that no such provision exists under the MERC Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance Regulations, 2021.**
- (viii) Though supply has already been reconnected pursuant to the Forum's directions, the Appellant has not taken load on the meter for reasons best known to him and continues to act uncooperatively with the Respondent's field staff.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (ix) A fresh prayer cannot be entertained at the appellate stage. In view of the above, the Representation filed by the Appellant is liable to be rejected.

3. The submissions and arguments of the Appellant are summarized as under: –

- (i) The Appellant applied for a new connection on 29.10.2024 through the MSEDCL WSS Portal. Statutory charges of ₹3,220/- were paid on 29.10.2024 and Service Connection Charges of ₹4,342/- (including GST) were paid on 16.11.2024, as detailed in Table-1.
- (ii) **The Appellant submits that, since the new service connection charges were paid for an underground system, the Respondent was duty-bound to release supply through underground cable. No meter was installed but bills were issued, leading the Appellant to send protest letters on 17.12.2024 and 24.12.2024. No response was received from the Respondent.**
- (iii) On 18.04.2025, the Respondent's staff visited the premises and connected the meter without providing any protective meter box.
- (iv) The Appellant approached the Forum on 21.05.2025. The Forum, vide order dated 24.09.2025, partly allowed the grievance by directing reversal of fixed charges up to 18.04.2025.
- (v) It is the Appellant's grievance that the Security Deposit of ₹3,100/- was adjusted in the July 2025 bill without ensuring proper supply.
- (vi) As the meter has been installed without a safety meter box, there is a risk of damage during rains. Therefore, the Appellant has not taken any load on the meter. The conduct of the Respondent's field staff has also been unsatisfactory.
- (vii) During the hearing the Appellant stated that the reason why he did not allow connection of the meter was that he wanted a dated receipt with his signature showing that day as the date when the meter was installed, so that fixed charges would not be recovered / applied for the previous period. However, the Respondent was not willing to waive off the previous fixed charges; hence the stalemate.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



(viii) In view of the above, the Appellant prays that the Respondent be directed:

- (a) To install a proper meter box to enable safe loading of supply;
- (b) To waive fixed charges till actual commencement of supply;
- (c) To grant compensation @ ₹1,000/- per day for non-availability of supply;
and
- (d) To take appropriate action against the concerned staff.

4. During the hearing on 30.10.2025, the Respondent was directed to install the meter cabin immediately, and the Appellant was directed to commence supply through the meter from 01.11.2025. Both parties agreed to comply with these directions.

Analysis and Ruling

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

6. The Appellant contended that she applied on 29.10.2024 and paid all required charges for an underground supply. However, meter installation was delayed, bills were issued without supply, and when installed on 18.04.2025, it lacked a protective box. She approached the Forum, which partly allowed her grievance by reversing fixed charges up to 18.04.2025. She also objects to adjustment of the ₹3,100/- Security Deposit and alleges unsafe installation and negligence.

7. The Respondent contended that they confirm the application and payment, but states that underground work was delayed due to local objections and MCGM permission. The supply was given around January 2025. Bills were raised from 16.11.2024, and supply was disconnected due to non-payment. The Forum's order dated 24.09.2025 is being complied with through reversal of charges and credit of ₹2,336.30. The compensation claim is new, without legal basis, and the Appellant has still not taken load. The Representation is liable to be rejected.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



8. We find that the Respondent was clearly at fault in trying to recover fixed charges from 16.11.2024 when the meter was not installed on that day. Even on 18.04.2025 when the meter was actually allegedly installed, had the Respondent given a dated receipt with the Appellant's signature on that date, i.e. had the Respondent accepted that as the actual date of connection and thus waived off previous fixed charges, the dispute would not have arisen, and consumption could have started on that date. There is no reason for the Respondent to take such a rigid stand for a small amount of fixed charges.

At the same time, there is no provision to provide compensation as claimed by the Appellant. During the hearing, the Respondent was directed to install the meter cabin immediately, and the Appellant was directed to commence supply through the meter from 01.11.2025. Both parties agreed to comply with these directions.

9. In view of the facts and circumstances, the Forum's order is modified as under:

- (a) The Respondent is directed to waive off fixed charges till 31st October 2025.
- (b) Other prayers of the Appellant stand rejected.
- (c) The compliance report be submitted within a period of two months from the date of issue of this order.

10. The representation is disposed of accordingly.

11. The secretariat of this office is directed to refund the amount of Rs.1,500/- taken as deposit to the Respondent to adjust in the Appellant's ensuing bill/ security deposit.

Sd/
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

