

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 81 OF 2026

In the matter of incorrect billing of solar rooftop generation

Savita Santosh Jadhav..... Appellant
(Con. No. 049432163023)

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd., Nashik Urban 2... Respondent
(MSEDCL)

Appearances

Appellant : Santosh Jadhav, Representative

Respondent: 1. B.V. Mundhe, Acting Executive Engineer, Nashik Urban 2.
2. D.V. Ingle, Addl. Executive Engineer, B & R Sub Dn.

Coram: Vandana Krishna [IAS (Retd.)]

Date of hearing: 18th September 2026

Date of Order : 23rd September 2026

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 3rd August 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 10th July 2026 in Case No. 18 of 2026 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Nashik Circle (the Forum). The Forum rejected the grievance of the Appellant, observing that the Respondent MSEDCL had already revised the bill, and necessary credit of Rs. 19281.93 was given in April 2026 monthly bill.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



2. Aggrieved by the order of the Forum, the Appellant has filed this Representation. An e-hearing was held on 18th September 2026 through video conference where the parties were heard at length. The Appellant's submissions and arguments are as below. *[The Electricity Ombudsman's observations and comments are recorded under 'Notes' where needed.]*

- (i) The Appellant is a Residential Consumer (No. 211100008859) from 20.03.2018. The details of the electric connection, sanctioned load, solar rooftop commissioning/extension and bill revision are tabulated below:

Table 1:

Name of Consumer	Consumer No.	Address on Bill	San. Load	Date of Supply	Purpose	Grid Connected Rooftop Solar Commissioned	Rooftop Solar Load Extension	Bill Revision
Savita Santosh Jadhav	049432163023	Shree Hari R/B No.01, S.No.79/1/2-35, Near Metkar Hospital, Nashik (M Corp.) Pin-422003	6 kW	27.05.2021	Residential	3 kW from 16.10.2022	Load enhanced from 3 kW to 6 kW on 16.05.2025, installed and sanctioned immediately, but regularised only in the Feb. 2026 bill.	Total credit: Rs. 23,001.93 (Rs. 19,281.93 in Apr. 2026 + Rs. 3,720/- in Sep. 2026)

- (ii) The Appellant had installed a grid-connected rooftop solar system under the applicable MERC Regulations, which was sanctioned/commissioned on 16.10.2022. Subsequently, considering the expected increase in electricity consumption, the Appellant applied for extension of the rooftop solar system additional 3 kW load on 16.05.2025, pursuant to which the total capacity of the rooftop solar system was increased to 6 kW.
- (iii) The Appellant stated that, in the electricity bill for February 2026, MSEDCL unjustifiably levied an amount of ₹17,712.33/- towards excess energy/export adjustment and denied the corresponding export credit. According to the Appellant, when he approached the MSEDCL office on 23.02.2026, **he was informed that a consumer could not export more than 66% of the solar generation to the grid.** No


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



such restriction had been communicated to him at the time of sanctioning and commissioning of the rooftop solar system or execution of the net-metering arrangement. He further submitted that the alleged 66% restriction is neither provided for in the applicable MERC Regulations nor in the tariff order or net-metering agreement governing the connection.

- (iv) Relying upon the provisions of the MERC (Net Metering for Roof-top Solar Photo Voltaic Systems) Regulations, 2015 and the MERC (Grid Interactive Rooftop Renewable Energy Generating Systems) Regulations, 2019, particularly Regulations 6.2, 6.3 and 11.4, the regulatory mechanism provides for adjustment of exported energy against imported energy and carry-forward of surplus credited units, subject to the applicable settlement provisions. According to the Appellant, there is no provision therein prescribing a percentage-based restriction limiting the export of solar energy to 66% of the generation.
- (v) The Appellant had lodged a written complaint with MSEDCL on 14.02.2026 seeking clarification regarding the alleged restriction and the consequential billing. However, according to him, MSEDCL did not furnish any written clarification identifying the regulatory provision under which the 66% restriction had been imposed.
- (vi) The denial of export credit and consequential levy of ₹17,712.33/- were contrary to the applicable regulatory framework. The Appellant contended that an internal administrative instruction or billing practice of MSEDCL could not override the Regulations framed by the Commission under the Electricity Act, 2003, and prayed that the disputed charges be set aside and the eligible export credit be restored in accordance with the applicable MERC Regulations.
- (vii) The Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 06.03.2026 challenging the 66% restriction and seeking refund of the consequential amount. Meanwhile, MSEDCL revised the bill and credited ₹19,281.93/- in the monthly bill for April 2026 and informed the Appellant accordingly vide letter dated 08.06.2026. The Forum, vide its order dated 10.07.2026, disposed of the grievance observing that MSEDCL had already revised the bill and credited ₹19,281.93/- in the April 2026 bill.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



The Forum further recorded that the Appellant had submitted a letter dated 08.07.2026 stating that his grievance had been resolved. However, the Appellant contends that he had not submitted any letter withdrawing his grievance or stating that the grievance stood resolved.

- (viii) In view of the above, the Appellant prays that the Respondent be directed to
- (a) provide a complete month-wise, unit-wise, tariff-wise and formula-wise statement of calculations, duly explaining the basis and manner of adjustment of Rs. 11,929/-.
 - (b) produce the legal and regulatory basis for applying the alleged 66% limit on exported units, including the relevant provisions of the applicable Net Metering Arrangement, MERC Regulations, Tariff Orders, Government Resolutions, notifications or any other statutory instrument authorizing such restriction. In the absence of any such legal authority, the billing adjustment made on the basis of the alleged 66% export limit be declared unsustainable and set aside.

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

- (i) The Appellant is a residential consumer bearing Consumer No. 049432163023, with supply commencing on 27.05.2021 and an original sanctioned load of 6 kW. A 3 kW grid-connected rooftop solar system was commissioned on 16.10.2022. The rooftop solar capacity was subsequently enhanced from 3 kW to 6 kW on 16.05.2025, which was installed and sanctioned immediately, though the enhancement was regularised in the billing system only in the February 2026 bill. The particulars of the electricity connection and rooftop solar installation are set out in Table 1.
- (ii) The delay in reflecting the enhanced rooftop solar capacity in the billing system was an issue of billing/record updating and did not amount to rejection or cancellation of the sanctioned solar capacity. The Respondent has later carried out the necessary billing adjustment/reconciliation. *[Note: During the hearing the Respondent accepted that not updating the solar capacity to 6 KW in the system / software in May 2025 was a mistake,*


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



which ultimately led to the wrongful charging of Rs. 17,712/- in the bill of February 2026.]

- (iii) After the review of the solar generation situation in the state, the Corporate Office observed that, in certain rooftop solar residential consumer's extension cases, consumers were drawing higher electricity during peak hours, particularly in the evening, when the cost of electricity in the market is relatively high, while their solar generation was during non-peak / day hours. This led to an unequal burden on the MSEDCL during night hours.
- (iv) The Corporate Office developed a filter for certain selected residential rooftop solar consumers whose load had been enhanced, whereby the export units were provisionally restricted to 66% instead of 100%, although 100% of the export units had already been considered in the earlier bills, for the period from April 2023 to February 2026. *[Note: This decision was an internal decision of MSEDCL, without consent of the Commission.]* In the case of the Appellant, application of the said filter resulted in a recovery/adjustment of Rs. 15,882.18, reflected in the February 2026 bill. **Subsequently, the said measure was withdrawn by the Corporate Office**, and the field offices were verbally instructed to revise the bills, wherever feasible, to restore the admissible credit.
- (v) The Appellant filed a grievance application in the Forum on 06.03.2026 for withdrawal of the said recovery of Rs. Rs. 15,882.18.
- (vi) The Respondent further stated that the bill of the Appellant was revised upon reconciliation of the applicable rooftop solar credits, as detailed in Table 2 below.

Sr. No.	Particulars	Amount (Rs.)
1	B80 Adjustment – Credit towards correction of meter reading	-11,381.51
2	Credit towards Solar Bank Credit Units	-7,560.42
3	Interest on Security Deposit	-340.00
	Total Credit / Deduction	-19,281.94


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (vii) Accordingly, a total credit of Rs. 19,281.93 was extended to the Appellant, thereby reconciling the billing account following regularisation of the enhanced rooftop solar capacity and accounting for the admissible rooftop solar credits.
- (viii) The Forum disposed of the Appellant's grievance, observing that the Respondent, MSEDCL, had already revised the bill and granted the necessary credit of Rs. 19,281.93 in the April 2026 monthly bill.
- (ix) As per the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, dated 28.04.2022, a 1 kWp solar power plant can generate approximately 4 to 5.5 units of electricity per day on a clear sunny day. Based on the said indicative generation range, **MSEDCL has provisionally scrutinized certain rooftop solar consumers where the exported units appeared to be prima facie higher than the expected generation corresponding to the installed solar capacity. Accordingly, debit adjustments were made in cases where the recorded generation appeared to exceed the said indicative limit.** However, where, upon verification, the recorded generation is found to be appropriate, the corresponding credit adjustment is required to be passed under the head "Adj. of Credit of Unadjusted Unit of Solar Rooftop."
- (x) In the present case, the debit adjustment was initially made on the basis that the recorded solar generation exceeded the indicative maximum generation of 5.5 units per kWp per day, considering the solar capacity of 3 kW as reflected in the records. *[Note: Actually the solar capacity at that time was 6 KW; hence the solar generation was not excessive.]*
- (xi) Consequently, a credit adjustment of Rs. 3,720/-, calculated as 1,319 units × Rs. 2.82 per unit, comprising 789 banked units for January 2026 and 530 banked units for March 2026, has been passed in favour of the Appellant under the aforesaid head. The effect of the said credit adjustment will be reflected in the subsequent electricity bill of Sep. 2026.
- (xii) The rooftop solar capacity was duly sanctioned, the enhanced capacity was subsequently regularized in the billing system, and the corresponding billing credits have been given to the Appellant. The total credit presently extended is Rs. 23,001.93.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



(xiii) As per latest bill of Aug. 2026, the Appellant has outstanding dues as below:

Table 3:

Month	Jun-26	Jul-26	Aug-26
Net Arrears (Rs.)	0	141.75	283.5
Net Bill Amount (Rs.)	140	281.75	423.5

- (xiv) The Respondent stated that the aforesaid arrears represent fixed charges. Further, the credit adjustment of Rs. 3,720/- passed in September 2026 is expected to result in a net credit of approximately Rs. 3,000/- in the subsequent bill.
- (xv) The Respondent accordingly prays that, in view of the aforesaid billing adjustments and credits already extended to the Appellant, the grievance stands duly redressed and does not survive for further consideration and, therefore, be rejected. *[Note: During the hearing the Respondent accepted that fixed charges should not be levied, considering the surplus units generated (banked units). It assured that fixed charges would not be levied during the current financial year, as long as there are surplus solar units.]*

Analysis and Ruling

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

5. The Appellant contended that her 3 kW grid-connected rooftop solar system, commissioned on 16.10.2022, was enhanced to 6 kW on 16.05.2025 and regularised in the billing system only in February 2026. MSEDCL levied ₹17,712.33/- towards excess export adjustment, allegedly applying a 66% export limit, without any such restriction being communicated or prescribed under the applicable MERC Regulations or net-metering arrangement. Although MSEDCL subsequently credited ₹19,281.93/- in April 2026 and ₹3,720/- in September 2026, aggregating to ₹23,001.93/-, the Appellant contended that no legal or regulatory basis for the 66% restriction had been established and sought restoration of the eligible export credit.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



6. The Respondent stated that the Appellant's 3 kW rooftop solar system was commissioned on 16.10.2022 and enhanced to 6 kW on 16.05.2025, with the enhancement regularised in the billing system in February 2026. However, there was a delay in updating the billing records. The reason for this delay has not been explained satisfactorily by the Respondent. Meanwhile, MSEDCL Corporate Office had provisionally restricted solar export credits to 66% in certain cases based on scrutiny of solar generation and peak-hour consumption. There is no legal basis for this decision, nor was the Commission's approval taken for this measure. In the Appellant's case, this resulted in a debit adjustment, which was subsequently withdrawn and reconciled. MSEDCL thereafter granted ₹19,281.93/- credit in April 2026 comprising billing/meter and solar bank adjustments, followed by a further ₹3,720/- credit in September 2026 towards verified solar units. Thus, the total credit extended was ₹23,001.93/-. The remaining arrears were stated to represent fixed charges. Again, it is not clear why fixed charges should be levied in the bill if the consumer has, in his credit, surplus solar units. MSEDCL contended that the grievance had been fully redressed and no further relief survived.

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

Table 4:

Year	2023-24				2024-25				2025-26				2026-27			
Mth	Import Units	Export Units	Billed Units	Bank units	Import Units	Export Units	Billed Units	Bank units	Import Units	Export Units	Billed Units	Bank units	Import Units	Export Units	Billed Units	Bank units
Apr	0	0	0		391	400	-9	9	515	784	-269	1356	544	784	-240	321
May	0	0	0		438	235	194	0	0	0	0	0	504	762	-258	579
Jun	332	848	-516	516	373	235	138	0	0	0	0	0	494	572	-78	657
Jul	150	161	-11	527	325	157	168	0	1348	1352	-4	1360	456	382	74	583
Aug	179	282	-103	630	361	223	138	0	410	382	28	1332				
Sep	175	267	-92	722	441	396	45	0	418	357	61	1271				
Oct	159	279	-120	842	343	557	-214	214	414	534	-120	1391				
Nov	202	272	-70	912	0	0	0	0	424	526	-102	1493				
Dec	180	231	-51	963	0	0	0	0	408	485	-77	1570				
Jan	191	277	-86	1049	1234	1569	-335	549	451	310	141	1429				
Feb	189	344	-155	1204	355	617	-262	781	408	280	128	1301				
Mar	382	412	-30	1234	416	722	-306	1087	131	212	-81	81				
	2139	2525	-1234		4677	5111	-443		4927	5222	-295		1998	2500	-502	

8. The dispute primarily concerns the debit/adjustment made by MSEDCL on the basis of a purported **66% restriction on export of solar energy**. MSEDCL has stated that the said


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



restriction was introduced as an internal provisional filter for certain consumers based on scrutiny of solar generation and was subsequently withdrawn. We find that MSEDCL has not placed on record any provision of the applicable MERC Regulations, net-metering arrangement, tariff order or other statutory instrument authorising a **66% ceiling on export units**. The applicable MERC regulatory framework provides for accounting and settlement of energy generated under the net-metering arrangement. Therefore, an internal billing filter or administrative instruction cannot, by itself, constitute a basis for curtailing the export credit otherwise admissible under the applicable regulatory framework.

9. The record shows that MSEDCL subsequently withdrew the said adjustment and carried out reconciliation of the Appellant's account. A credit of ₹19,281.93/- was granted in April 2026 and a further credit of ₹3,720/- was subsequently granted in September 2026, aggregating to ₹23,001.93/-. Thus, the disputed billing adjustment has substantially been reversed and the admissible solar credits have been restored.

However, in view of the unjustified initial billing, and its withdrawal only after the consumer filed a grievance in the Forum, we think levy of a penalty on the Respondent is justified. Accordingly, the Respondent is directed to pay cost of Rs.1000/-to the Appellant.

10. The compliance report to be submitted by the Respondent within 2 months from the date of this order.

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

Sd/
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

