

# BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

## REPRESENTATION NO. 123 OF 2025

In the matter of refund of security deposit & reconnection charges

Maruti Mahadev Sanap .....Appellant  
(C. No. 155550713571)

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd. Sangamner Dn..... Respondent  
(MSEDCL)

Appearances:

Appellant : Ajinkya Sanap, Representative

Respondent : 1. Pradip Vattamwar, Executive Engineer, Sangamner  
2. Yogesh Chavan, Dy. Ex. Engineer  
3. M. P. Khadtale, Dy. Manager

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

Date of hearing: 27<sup>th</sup> January 2026

Date of Order : 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2026

## ORDER

This Representation was filed on 30<sup>th</sup> December 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 11<sup>th</sup> November 2025 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MSEDCL,

(Dilip Dumbre)  
Secretary

Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Nashik (the Forum). The Forum by its order (issued in Marathi) partly allowed the grievance application in Case No. 94 of 2025.


2. *The Respondent is directed to pay compensation of ₹500/- in accordance with the provisions of the MERC (Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees, including Power Quality) Regulations, 2021.*
3. *The Respondent is further directed to initiate appropriate action, in accordance with the applicable rules and regulations, against the concerned MSEDCL officials for negligent and irresponsible performance of duties.*

2. The Appellant has filed this representation against the order passed by the Forum. An online hearing was held on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2026 through video conference. Parties were heard at length. The Appellant's submissions and arguments are stated as below: *[The Electricity Ombudsman's observations and comments are recorded under 'Notes' where needed.]*

- (i) The Appellant applied for a new single-phase residential electricity connection to Sangamner – 1 subdivision in 2023 through the Web Self Service (WSS) portal. Pursuant to the demand notice issued by MSEDCL, the Appellant paid a Security Deposit of ₹1,500/- on 06.09.2023 and further paid ₹1,334/- towards 1.3% supervision charges on the estimate for power supply. Despite compliance with all formalities and payments, MSEDCL failed to release the said residential connection. The details of the application and payments made under various accounting heads are provided as below:

Table 1

Appellant	Consumer No.	Address	Sanctioned load	Alleged Date of Supply	Security Deposit Paid	Reconnection Charges paid	1.3 % Supervision Charges
Maruti Mahadev Sanap	155550713571	Gat No. 191, Marhal Nimon Road, Sangamner, Ahilya Nagar, Nimon, Pin 422605	0.49 KW	22.11.2023	Rs. 1500/- dated 06.09.2023	Rs. 366/- dated 21.05.2024	Rs. 1334/- dated 22.09.2023

  
(Dilip Dumbre)  
Secretary  
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




- (ii) As the said connection was subsequently reported to be not feasible by the Section Engineer, the Appellant applied for a fresh connection at Sinnar Sub-Division under Nashik Rural Division, which was duly sanctioned and released by MSEDCL. The particulars of the said connection are provided in Table 2.

Table 2.

Name of Consumer	Date of Application	Scheme	Provisional Demand Notice	Second Demand Notice	Consumer No.	Address	Date of Supply	Tariff Category
Maruti Mahadev Sanap	25.12.2024	New Service connection	Security Deposit of Rs. 3000/- & Processing Fee of Rs. 120/- paid on 25.12.2025	Service Connection Charges of Rs. 1840/- paid on 11.02.2025	076370004923	Pandav Mala, Gat No.191, At post Kankori, Tal. Sinnar, Dist Nashik	17.04.2025	Residential

- (iii) Although no residential connection was released in 2023 by MSEDCL, Sangamner-1 Sub-Division, it wrongfully initiated fictitious billing by treating the supply as having been released on 22.04.2023, as reflected in Table 1. Despite repeated requests by the Appellant, Sangamner-1 Sub-Division refused to refund the amounts paid by the Appellant towards the unrealized connection.
- (iv) Aggrieved thereby, the Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 14.07.2025 seeking refund of the Security Deposit, 1.3% supervision charges, and reconnection charges as detailed in Table 1. The Forum, by its order, partly allowed the grievance application and directed the Respondent to pay compensation of ₹500/- in accordance with the MERC (Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees, including Power Quality) Regulations, 2021. Pursuant thereto, the Respondent refunded ₹751/- to the Appellant's bank account, after deducting an amount of ₹749/- towards fictitious billing of Connection No. 155550713571.
- (v) In view of the above facts and circumstances, the Appellant respectfully prays that this Hon'ble Authority may be pleased to direct the Respondent to:
- (a) refund the balance amount of ₹749/- out of the Security Deposit of ₹1,500/-;


  
(Dilip Dumbre)  
Secretary  
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (b) refund reconnection charges of ₹366/- paid on 21.05.2024;
- (c) refund 1.3% supervision charges of ₹1,334/- paid on 22.09.2023; and
- (d) grant compensation at twice the prescribed rate in accordance with the Standards of Performance.

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

- (i) The Appellant applied for a new residential electricity connection. The particulars of the said application are tabulated in Table-1. It is an admitted fact that the Appellant paid an amount of Rs.1,500/- towards Security Deposit on 06.09.2023 while submitting the application through the New Connection (NC) portal.
- (ii) While processing the application in the NC portal, the concerned staff inadvertently entered "Infrastructure Not Required" instead of "Infrastructure required." Consequently, the connection was sanctioned considering only tapping/service connection, whereas in fact the release of supply required higher expenditure with erection of an LT line.
- (iii) In the year 2023, the Corporate Office had introduced a special programme for release of connections where no infrastructure was required. Due to the incorrect entry in the system, the Appellant's connection was released under this programme in the system. However, no physical service connection was actually released at site.
- (iv) Subsequently, a field survey was carried out, which revealed that infrastructure work was necessary for release of the said connection. Accordingly, the Appellant paid an amount of Rs.1,334/- on 22.09.2023 towards 1.3% supervision charges, and the **infrastructure work was to be carried out by the Appellant under the Dedicated Distribution Facility (DDF).**
- (v) The Appellant, however, did not carry out the required infrastructure work due to Right of Way (ROW) issues. It is further submitted that the **Appellant's premises is located on the boundary of Sangamner Division and Nashik Rural Division.**

  
(Dilip Dumbre)  
Secretary  
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai





Thereafter, the Appellant approached the Nashik Rural Division, and subsequently the Sinnar Sub-Division of Nashik Rural Division, which released a new electricity connection, the details of which are shown in Table-2.

- (vi) In view of the above facts, the **Appellant is not entitled to refund of the 1.3% supervision charges or reconnection charges**, as the same were levied in accordance with the applicable rules and procedure.
- (vii) It is further submitted that the Appellant was mistakenly billed towards fixed charges (with zero consumption) for a few months in 2023, but later the said amounts were adjusted by the system against the Security Deposit of Rs.1,500/-. The balance Security Deposit amount of Rs.751/- was thereafter refunded to the Appellant's account in the year 2025. There is no intention to harass the Appellant, however, the system (software) automatically deducted fixed charges.
- (viii) In view of the facts and circumstances stated hereinabove, the Respondent prays that the Representation filed by the Appellant be rejected.

4. During the course of the hearing, the Respondent was advised to refund, at the earliest, the balance amount of Security Deposit, along with the reconnection charges of Rs.366/- paid on 21.05.2024 and the 1.3% supervision charges of Rs.1,334/- paid on 22.09.2023. Pursuant thereto, the Respondent, by way of communication, informed the office of the Electricity Ombudsman that the aforesaid amounts of Rs. 2949/- have been refunded to the Appellant by cheque on 10.02.2026. The Appellant was also intimated telephonically on 10.02.2026 in this regard.

The details of the refunded amount are tabulated in Table-3 below.

  
(Dilip Dumbre)  
Secretary  
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




Sr. No.	Particulars	Amount (Rs.)
1	Balance amount of Security Deposit	749(=1500-751)/-
2	1.3 % Supervision Charges paid	1334/-
3	Reconnection Charges paid	366/-
4	Compensation as per Forum's order	500/-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2949/-</b>

The Respondent informed that a cheque amounting to Rs.2,949/-, drawn in the name of Maruti Mahadev Sanap, dated 10.02.2026, has been prepared and shall be dispatched to the Appellant forthwith.

### Analysis and Ruling

5. Heard the parties and perused the documents on record. The Appellant had applied for a new residential electricity connection and paid a Security Deposit of Rs.1,500/- on 06.02.2023. The details of the application are provided in Table-1.

6. The Respondent contended that, due to an inadvertent error while processing the application in the NC portal, the entry "Infrastructure Not Required" was made instead of "Infrastructure Required," and accordingly the connection was sanctioned in the system under a special Corporate Office programme (2023) applicable to cases not requiring infrastructure. However, no physical service connection was released at site. Subsequent field verification revealed that infrastructure work was required, pursuant to which the Appellant paid Rs.1,334/- on 22.09.2023 towards 1.3% supervision charges, with the infrastructure work to be executed under the Dedicated Distribution Facility (DDF). As the said work could not be carried out due to Right of Way (ROW) issues, and considering that the premises is located on the boundary of Sangamner Division and Nashik Rural Division, the Appellant thereafter obtained a new connection from Nashik Rural Division / Sinnar

  
 (Dilip Dumbre)  
 Secretary  
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




Sub-Division, as detailed in Table-2. The Appellant was billed towards fixed charges for a limited period, which were adjusted against the Security Deposit of Rs.1,500/-, and the balance amount of Rs.751/- was refunded in the year 2025.

7. From the material placed on record, we find that although the connection was sanctioned in the system, no physical electricity connection was released at the Appellant's premises. Hence, there was no justification to levy fixed charges, etc.

8. During the course of hearing, the Respondent was advised to refund the balance Security Deposit, along with the reconnection charges of Rs.366/- and the 1.3% supervision charges of Rs.1,334/-. The Respondent has complied with the said advice and informed that a total amount of Rs.2,949/- has been refunded to the Appellant by cheque dated 10.02.2026. The Appellant was also intimated telephonically on the same date. The said compliance is taken on record.

9. In view of the above compliance, the Representation stands disposed of accordingly. No further directions are required. The other prayers of the Appellant are rejected.

Sd/  
(Vandana Krishna)  
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)

  
(Dilip Dumbre)  
Secretary  
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

