

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 34 of 2025

In the matter of disconnection of electricity to another consumer within the same premises

Kiran Ganpat Sandaw.....Appellant
(Cons. No. 234840001777)

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd. Kankavali Dn.....Respondent No.1
(MSEDCL)

Suhas Vasudev Sandaw.....Respondent No.2

Appearances:

Appellant : 1. Kiran Ganpat Sandaw
2. Vijay Ganpat Sandaw

Respondent No. 1: 1. Sachin Mhetre, Dy. Executive Engineer, Malvan Sub-dn.
2. Arjun Bhise, Jr. Engineer, Chouke Section Office

Respondent No. 2: 1. Suhas Vasudev Sandaw
2. Mahendran Vasudev Sandaw


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

Date of hearing: 17th July 2025

Date of Order : 4th August 2025

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 19th May 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


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Order dated 28th March 2025 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Kolhapur Zone (the Forum). The Forum, by its order rejected the grievance application of the Appellant.

2. Preamble:

(i) Family Tree in this Case:

The late Shivram Raghoji Sandaw was the grandfather of both, the Appellant and Respondent No. 2. Ganpat Shivram Sandaw, son of Shivram Raghoji Sandaw, was the father of the Appellant, Kiran Ganpat Sandaw, who has three siblings. Vasudev Shivram Sandaw, also a son of Shivram Raghoji Sandaw, was the father of Respondent No. 2, Suhas Vasudev Sandaw, who has four siblings. Thus, the Appellant and Respondent No. 2 are paternal cousins.

- (ii) Ganpat Shivram Sandaw was an original residential consumer (No. 234840001777) from 17.05.1980 at House No. 6. This connection was transferred to his Son Kiran Ganpat Sandaw (the Appellant) in October 2016, as shown in Table 1.


Table 1:


Details of Name Change on Electric Connection No. 234840001777

Change of Name from Ganpat Shivram Sandav to Kiran Ganpat Sandaw						
Old Consumer Name	Old Consumer Adrees on Bill	Consumer No.	Date of Supply	New Consumer Name	New Consumer Adrees on Bill	Month of Change of Name
Ganpat Shivram Sandav	At Post Chouke, Tal. Malvan, Chouke 416606	234840001777	07.05.1980	Kiran Ganpat Sandaw	Mandkholwadi T. Malvan. Pin- 416605	Oct. 2016

This electricity connection is currently live, and the Appellant is regularly paying the electricity bills.

- (iii) Subsequently, Suhas Vasudev Sandaw (Respondent No. 2), the cousin brother of the Appellant, applied for a second electricity connection at House No. 6 (B1), which was sanctioned and released on 15.02.2020, as shown in Table 2. This second connection is also currently live, and the Respondent No. 2 is regularly paying the electricity bills.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Although the addresses on record are slightly different, both connections are physically located within the same house.


3. Aggrieved by the order of the Forum, the Appellant has filed this representation. A physical hearing was held on 17th July 2025 where all the parties were heard at length. The Respondent No.1, MSEDCL submissions and arguments are stated as below: - *[The Electricity Ombudsman's observations and comments are recorded under 'Notes' where needed.]*


- (i) The Appellant is a residential consumer (No.234840001777) from 07.05.1980. The details of this consumer's address, sanctioned load, date of supply etc., are provided in Table 1.
- (ii) Another electricity connection, having Consumer No. 234840009573, stands in the name of Mr. Suhas Vasudev Sandaw (Respondent No. 2) at 6(B1) nearly identical to the Appellant's address. The details of this connection, including the sanctioned load and address, are provided in Table 2.

Table 2.

Name of Consumer in Bill	Consumer No.	Address on Bill from Oct. 2016	San. Load	Date of Supply	Cosumption Pattern of last year	Remarks
Kiran Ganpat Sandaw	234840001777	Mandkholwadi T-Malvan. Pin-416605	0.50 KW	07.05.1980	2 to 123 units from Aug. '24 to July'25	Change of name on 15.10. 2016 from Ganpat Sandaw to Kiran Sandaw
Suhas Vasudev Sandav	234840009573	6B1, Chouke (Mandkhol Wadi) Malwan, Sindhudurg, Chouke, 416606	1. 90 KW	15.02.2020	0 to 30 units from Aug. '24 to July'25	Parrellal wirng done in house


- (iii) This 2nd connection was sanctioned on 18.02.2020, based on the submission of the following documents:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



1. **A1 Form** – Online application for a new service connection submitted via MSEDCL’s Web Self Service (WSS) portal dated 27.01.2020.
2. **Test Report** – Issued by Koteswar Electricals (License No. M.C. 10727), certifying that the internal wiring complies with standard norms.
3. **Grampanchayat Namuna No. 8** – Issued by the Gramsevak of Grampanchayat Chouke, certifying the ownership of the property in the name of Suhas Vasudev Sandaw for Property No. 6(B1), with details of construction (chirebandi walls and koularu roof) and plot dimensions (38 x 40), along with Gharpatti details. *[Note: Dimensions provided are numerical only and do not include specific measurement units such as feet or meters.]*
4. **Property Tax Receipt (Namuna No. 10)** – Dated 23.01.2020, reflecting a tax payment of Rs. 86/- for House No. 6(B1) in the name of Suhas Vasudev Sandaw.
5. **Parishisht 1 & 2**
6. **Survey Report** – As part of the connection documentation.
7. **Firm Quotation** – Issued by MSEDCL on 31.01.2020 for Rs. 3,275/-, subsequently paid on 01.02.2020.
8. **New Service Connection Release Report** – Dated 15.02.2020, confirming the release of electricity connection.

(iv) Vijay Ganpat Sandaw (brother of the Appellant) first lodged a complaint on 02.06.2022, requesting disconnection of an allegedly unauthorized electricity connection held by Suhas Vasudev Sandaw (Respondent No. 2) (Consumer No. 234840009573). In response, a spot inspection was promptly conducted, during which it was observed that both electricity connections (as detailed in Table 2) shared common internal wiring within the premises, with the electrical load being managed through a changeover switch. The Deputy Executive Engineer, by letter dated 02.02.2023, informed Vijay that the changeover switch had been removed and requested both parties to submit test reports for their respective connections (as


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




mentioned in Table 2). However, as per available records, proper test reports were not submitted by either party. Both parties have continued to regularly pay their electricity bills. The supply to Respondent No. 2 was not disconnected, as there were no outstanding dues.

- (v) Between 2022 and 2024, there was substantial correspondence among the Appellant, Respondent No. 2 and senior officials of MSEDCL. The Appellant persistently pressed for the disconnection of the second connection, alleging it was issued illegally. In response, Respondent No. 2 asserted that the Appellant had kept the supply switch under lock and key, causing inconvenience during occasional family visits, particularly during festivals. He further claimed that adequate safety measures had been ensured by installing separate parallel wiring where necessary.
- (vi) The Appellant filed a grievance application on 26.12.2024. The Forum by its order dated 28.03.2025 rejected the grievance application of the Appellant.
- (vii) In view of the above, Respondent No. 1 respectfully seeks appropriate guidance and directions in the matter, considering the peculiar circumstances of the case.

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

History of the Case:


- (i) House No. 6 was constructed by his late father, Ganpat Shivram Sandaw, around the year 1954. In 1980, he obtained a low-tension (LT) electrical connection from MSEDCL and completed internal wiring for all **nine** rooms of the house, including installation of tube lights and fans. For the last 45 years, this connection is being used regularly by family members of late Ganpat Shivram Sandaw & Late Vasudev Shivram Sandaw, and the monthly bills are paid regularly.
- (ii) The Appellant applied for change of name from Ganpat Shivram Sandav to Kiran Ganpat Sandaw in 2016 and the change of name was effected in Oct. 2016 as tabulated in Table 1.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Submissions:

- (iii) In 2006, when his father Shri Ganpat Shivram Sandaw, then aged 85, was physically and mentally unwell, his cousin, Suhas Vasudev Sandaw (Respondent No. 2), took advantage of his vulnerable condition. Without informing the Appellant and his siblings, Suhas deceitfully prepared a document on stamp paper and obtained his father's signature to falsely claim a 50% ownership share in House No. 6.
- (iv) Immediately after, Suhas submitted this so-called "Sammati Patra" to the Gram Panchayat Office at Chouke to obtain an amended Assessment Extract (From 8A) in his name in the year about 2015. Upon discovering this, the Appellant filed an objection with the BDO, Panchayat Samiti, Malvan, requesting the cancellation of changes made to the records of House No. 6 and revert the name to original name of Ganpat Shivram Sandaw. (Note: the House was divided as 6A and 6B on paper, but not physically)
- (v) After further follow up, the BDO Malvan organized a meeting on 22/01/2017 with the Gram Sevak and the Appellant. After examining the documents presented, the BDO concluded that the alterations made by the Gram Sevak to Namuna 8A, in favor of Suhas Vasudev Sandaw, were not in accordance with official rules. Consequently, the BDO issued a written order directed that the record be restored to its original form in the name of Shri Ganpat Shivram Sandaw. (Letter No. 97/2017 dated 10.04.2017). However, the Gram Sevak of Chouke Gram Panchayat failed to comply with this order and did not correct Extract 8A.
- (vi) In 2020, Suhas Vasudev Sandaw obtained a new LT electricity connection from MSEDCL, Sub-Division Malvan, by submitting an incorrectly filled Namuna 8A form in his own name. This connection was sanctioned without any new electrical wiring in the designated area of Room 6B1 (152 sq. ft.). Instead, a changeover switch was unlawfully installed and linked to the existing internal


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



wiring of the house. This strongly suggests that the government-licensed electrical contractor involved fraudulently issued the mandatory certificates—namely, A-1, D-1, and Parishista 1 & 2—which are prerequisites for the release of a new connection. The electricity connection was ultimately commissioned on 15.02.2020, a fact that came to light only afterward.

(vii) Throughout this process, MSEDCL Subdivision Malvan failed to conduct a site inspection to verify:


- The actual area shown in Extract 8A (152 sq. ft.),
- The presence or absence of new wiring,
- The KW load calculations, and
- Compliance with MSEDCL's prevailing rules and regulations.

This clearly shows that the new meter installation was in violation of MSEDCL norms.

(viii) The BDO, Malvan, by his letter dated 08.12.2022, directed the Gram Panchayat Chouke to update the property records in Namuna 8, restoring the name of the original owner, Ganpat Shivram Sandaw. However, this directive has not been complied with to date.


(ix) The Appellant's brother, Vijay Ganpat Sandaw made a complaint on 02.06.2022, requesting disconnection of an allegedly unauthorized electricity connection held by Suhas Vasudev Sandaw (Respondent No. 2) (Consumer No. 234840009573).

(x) Despite submitting all necessary documents and evidence to the Executive Engineer, MSEDCL Malvan, no action was taken to remove the illegally obtained electric connection. Therefore, the Appellant escalated the matter to the Chief Engineer, MSEDCL Konkan Zone, Ratnagiri, who sent multiple letters to both the Superintending Engineer, Divisional Office Sindhudurg, **and the** Executive Engineer, Divisional Office Kankavli. Unfortunately, neither office responded or took action, compelling the Chief Engineer to issue three reminders.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (xi) After exhausting these options with no result, the Appellant filed a grievance application in the Forum on 26.12.2024. During the Forum proceedings, two video conferences were conducted. In the first video conference (VC), the Dy. Engineer, Malvan, Sachin Mehtre, stated that the Gram Panchayat Chouke had admitted that the Extract 8A issued in the name of Suhas Vasudev Sandaw was a mistake. The Forum directed Mr. Mehtre to obtain a written undertaking from Gram Panchayat Chouke regarding this correction and to physically inspect Room 6B1. This direction was recorded in the first VC.
- (xii) However, MSEDCL failed to submit any inspection report, stating instead that both consumers were residing in Mumbai and that during their claimed visit on 27.02.2025, the rooms were locked. A spot inspection was eventually carried out on 13.03.2025 for both the Appellant and Suhas. The inspection revealed that Suhas had installed parallel wiring, and also confirmed the existence of only seven rooms within the premises, not nine as previously claimed. This discrepancy further casts doubt on the legitimacy of Suhas's claim and the accuracy of the documentation submitted for his connection.
- (xiii) Despite these findings, the Forum rejected the Appellant's grievance application by its order dated 28.03.2025. The Forum failed to address the core issue, as to how a second electricity connection has been sanctioned for the same premises where an existing valid connection was already live in the Appellant's name, especially considering the illegal use of a changeover switch and subsequent parallel wiring. Although the Appellant submitted detailed documents and clarifications, the Forum's decision appears to have been made without proper evaluation of the submissions. The Appellant observed that none of his key arguments were acknowledged or recorded in the Forum's final decision. This constitutes a serious miscarriage of justice and raises significant concerns regarding the fairness and impartiality of the grievance redressal process.
- (xiv) The Appellant, by his letter dated 17.07.2025, informed that Respondent No. 2 should either use the existing electricity connection as previously arranged, or,


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




if not agreeable, must physically separate House No. 6 into two distinct units with independent entrances. He further requested that Respondent No. 2 carry out separate wiring exclusively within their portion and remove any electrical wiring laid in the Appellant's area. The Appellant made it clear that he does not consent to any form of parallel connections and was willing to allow a reasonable time limit for compliance. [During the hearing, the Respondent No. 2 argued that a physical division of rooms was not practical, as there is only one kitchen]

- (xv) In light of the above facts and circumstances, the Appellant prays that the Respondent be directed to disconnect the electricity connection (Cons. No. 234840009573) in the name of Suhas Vasudev Sandaw (Respondent No. 2) immediately.

5. The Respondent No. 2 submitted his reply on 21st June 2025. His submissions and arguments are stated as below: -


- (i) The Respondent No. 2 has been a residential electricity consumer (Consumer No. 234840009573) since 15.02.2020. The relevant details regarding address, sanctioned load, date of supply, etc., are provided in Table 1.
- (ii) Ownership History: Since 1954, his family has been residing at the above-mentioned house. He is one of the joint owners by inheritance. As per the will of his grandfather, Late Shri Shivram Raghoji Sandaw, his father, Late Shri Vasudev Shivram Sandaw was named as a joint owner in House No. 6, Chouke (Mandkhoh Wadi), Malwan, Sindhudurg establishing 50% ownership of the house in their favour.
- (iii) Legal Documentation: Late Ganpat Shivram Sandaw, uncle of the Respondent No. 2 and aged 79 years, executed a Will dated 24.10.2001, stating that he and his brother, Late Vasudev Shivram Sandaw, were joint owners of their ancestral property located in Chouke Village. This Will was duly signed and witnessed by Mr. Nitin Mahadev Dalvi and Mr. Vivek Kolharkar, and remains on official


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



record. In addition, Late Ganpat Shivram Sandaw executed a Sammati Patra (consent affidavit) on ₹100/- stamp paper, in the presence of the Karyakari Dandadhikari, wherein he expressly affirmed that his nephew, Suhas Vasudev Sandaw (Respondent No. 2), is also a joint legal owner of House No. 6.

- (iv) Tax Bifurcation: In 2007, House No. 6 was bifurcated into Units 6A and 6B for taxation purposes. Since then, both units have paid separate property taxes, with receipts duly maintained on record. Between 2007 and 2019, both parts of the property were used peacefully and without dispute.
- (v) Harassment Incident: Disputes began in 2020, when Shri Vijay Sandaw, son of Late Shri Ganpat Shivram Sandaw, locked the shared water pump room, cutting off the water supply and leading to the death of coconut and other trees. Additionally, electricity access was denied by keeping the meter keys inaccessible. As a result, Respondent No. 2 and his family were unable to stay at the property due to lack of power.
- (vi) Meter Installation Justification: Due to these obstructions, Respondent No. 2 applied for a new electricity connection in House No. 6B, based on the legal documents referenced in Para 3 (iii), all of which are available on record.
- (vii) Connection Status: Respondent No. 2 received a new electricity connection (No. 234840009573) on 15.02.2020, as detailed in Table 2. All necessary documents, including test reports, were submitted to MSEDCL in compliance with their requirements. There is no ambiguity in the wiring or procedural compliance.
- (viii) Grampanchayat Intervention: Due to continued harassment by Shri Vijay and Smt. Kiran Sandaw, the Gram Panchayat Chouke reverted the ownership name to Late Shri Shivram Raghoji Sandaw. In response to the Gram Panchayat's letter dated 28.03.2025, a "Waras Tapas" (legal heir verification) inquiry was submitted immediately.
- (ix) Cultural Significance and Utility Use: Respondent No. 2's family regularly celebrates traditional festivals such as Ganesh Chaturthi, Gudhi Padwa, and Nag Panchami at the premises. During these occasions, access to electricity and a


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



functioning water pump connected to a well located at some distance is essential.


(x) Ongoing Obstruction: Despite having a separate sanctioned meter and making regular electricity bill payments, Shri Vijay and Smt. Kiran Sandaw continue to file baseless complaints to various authorities, solely to harass Respondent No. 2.

(xi) Prayer:
Electricity and water are essential human needs. Denying Respondent No. 2 access to these basic amenities causes unnecessary hardship. Therefore, it is prayed that the electricity connection (Consumer No. 234840009573) should not be disconnected, as it was duly sanctioned in 2020 and the bills are being paid regularly. The Appellant's allegations are unfounded and intended only to harass.

Analysis and Ruling:

7. Heard the parties and perused the documents on record. The details of the original consumer (No. 234840001777) in the name of the Appellant and second connection (Cons. No. 234840009573) in the name of the Respondent No. 2 are tabulated in Table 2.


8. The Appellant stated that House No. 6 was constructed by his late father, Shri Ganpat Shivram Sandaw, around 1954. An LT electricity connection was obtained from MSEDCL in 1980 for all nine rooms of the house. The family of Late Ganpat and Vasudev Shivram Sandaw has been using this connection regularly, with bills paid consistently for over 45 years. In 2016, the name on the electricity account was officially changed to the Appellant, Kiran Ganpat Sandaw. In 2006, when Shri Ganpat was 85 years old and in poor health, Respondent No. 2, Suhas Vasudev Sandaw, deceitfully prepared a "Sammati Patra" to claim 50% ownership of the house, without informing other heirs. Based on this document, he got the 8A Extract amended at Chouke Gram Panchayat in 2015. The Appellant raised objections


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



and requested the BDO to cancel the changes. On 10.04.2017, the BDO Malvan found the amendment to be invalid and ordered the record to be restored. However, the Gram Panchayat did not act on the directive. In 2020, Suhas obtained a new LT electricity connection using the disputed 8A Extract. MSEDCL failed to verify critical parameters such as area, wiring, KW load, and regulatory compliance before issuing the connection. This amounted to a clear violation of MSEDCL procedures. An inspection on 13.03.2025 confirmed the presence of unauthorized parallel wiring installed by Suhas. In a letter dated 17.07.2025, the Appellant demanded that Suhas either use the existing shared connection or physically divide the premises and lay independent wiring. He now requests immediate disconnection of the alleged illegal electricity connection (Consumer No. 234840009573) issued in the name of Suhas Vasudev Sandaw.

9. The Respondent No. 2 contended that he is entitled to a joint ownership through inheritance from his father, Late Vasudev Shivram Sandaw, as per the Will of Late Shivram Raghoji Sandaw. A separate Will dated 24.10.2001 by Late Ganpat Shivram Sandaw further confirms joint ownership between Ganpat and his brother Vasudev. Additionally, a "Sammati Patra" executed by Late Ganpat acknowledges Respondent No. 2's joint ownership. Both documents are officially recorded. Since 2007, the property has been divided into Units 6A and 6B for tax purposes, and separate property tax payments were made until 2019. In 2020, Shri Vijay Sandaw allegedly locked the common pump room and meter box, cutting off water and electricity. This compelled Respondent No. 2 to vacate the premises. Due to this obstruction, Respondent No. 2 applied for a separate LT electricity connection, which was duly sanctioned based on valid documents. The Respondent No. 2 and his extended family continue to use the property during traditional festivals. Electricity and water access are essential for these cultural functions. Despite having a valid connection and making regular bill payments, the Appellants have been filing repeated, false complaints to harass him. The connection was legally obtained and is currently live. The Respondent No. 2 asserts that there is no basis for disconnection, and the Appellant's objections are baseless.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




10. The Regulation 2.1 (c), (d) and (e) of the CGRF & EO Regulations 2020 defines a Complainant, Complaint & Grievance as below: -

- c) **“Complainant”** means any Consumer as defined in Section 2 (15) of the Act and includes prospective Consumer, who files the Complaint or Grievance or Representation against the Distribution Licensee;
- d) **“Complaint”** means a submission made by a consumer expressing dissatisfaction with the electricity supply service provided by the Distribution Licensee;
- e) **“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 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 Section 2(15), of the Electricity Act, 2003 defines a Consumer as below:
"consumer" means any person who is supplied with electricity for his own use by a licensee or the Government or by any other person engaged in the business of supplying electricity to the public under this Act or any other law for the time being in force and includes any person whose premises are for the time being connected for the purpose of receiving electricity with the works of a licensee, the Government or such other person, as the case may be;

11. In view of the above definitions, the Complaint/Grievance of the Appellant does not constitute a complaint/ grievance as per the CGRF & EO Regulations 2020. The Appellant did not raise any complaint /grievance regarding his own connection (Cons. No. 234840001777), but he has complained about disconnection of supply of another consumer (Cons. No. 234840009573). Hence, we confirm that the Appellant does not have any locus standi to file this representation. Based on the applicable definitions, the Appellant's grievance does not fall within the scope of a valid complaint under the CGRF & EO Regulations, 2020.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




12. We find that this is basically a family property dispute of a civil nature. The issue arose around 2020 when the second connection was given in the name of the Respondent No. 2 at the address House No. 6 (B). The Appellant has the liberty to approach the competent civil court which deals with such property disputes if he desires. This is not the proper adjudicating authority to deal with such civil matters.

13. The Respondent No. 1 MSECL is advised to examine how the government-licensed electrical contractor certified the parallel wiring, and how MSEDCL conducted the site survey for a second, distinct premise. It is a fundamental rule that only one electricity connection is permitted per premises. Both parties should be given reasonable time to physically separate the premises. If separation is not feasible, appropriate action should be taken as per the prevailing rules and regulations.

14. The present representation is rejected and disposed of accordingly.

Sd/
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

