

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 31 OF 2025

In the matter of Change of Name in the electricity bill

Anil G. Panchal (Occupier)Appellant
Techno Metal Works
(No. 639-420-005)

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Dist. Co. Ltd.....Respondent No. 1
Wagle Estate Dn. (MSEDCL)

Ani Anu Developers Private Ltd..... Respondent No. 2

Appearances:

Appellant : Not Present

Respondent No. 1: Satish Jadhav, Executive Engineer,

Respondent No. 2: Not Present

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

Date of hearing: 7th October 2025

Date of Order : 14th October 2025

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 15th May 2025 under Regulation 19.1 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum &


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (CGRF & EO Regulations 2020) against the Order dated 8th May 2025 in Grievance No. GN-508-2024 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Bhandup (the Forum). The Forum by its order has dismissed the grievance.

2. The Appellant, being aggrieved by the Forum's order dated 08.05.2025, has filed the present representation. An e-hearing was held on 07.10.2025 through video conference. The Respondent No. 1, MSEDCL attended the e-hearing. However, the Appellant and Respondent No. 2 did not attend the e-hearing on the provided link, despite due notices having been served via email as well as WhatsApp. The Appellant has not responded to any calls during the past one month, nor has he communicated anything through email. Hence, the matter was proceeded ex parte, and MSEDCL was heard at length.

3. The written submissions of the Appellant (Anil G. Panchal, Occupier) are summarized as under: – *[The Electricity Ombudsman's observations and comments are recorded under 'Notes' where needed.]*

(i) The Appellant, Anil G. Panchal, is the tenant and lawful occupier of the said premises, where his firm Techno Metal Works has been operating since 2003. Techno Metal Works (Proprietor Anil G. Panchal) is the original consumer (No. 000132070237) holding an electricity connection since 22.08.2004. The relevant details of the connection are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Original Name of Consumer	Cons. No.	Address on bill	Sanct. Load / Contract Demand	Date of Supply	Date of application (13.08.2024) & proposed change of name		Objection raised	Month in which Change of Name effected
					From	To		
Techno Metal Works	000132070237	V-Godown, Gupta family Trust, 27 Acres, Kothari Ware House, Thane (W)	21.30 HP/ 17 KVA	22.08.2004	Techno Metal Works	Ani Anu Developers Private Ltd.	Anil Panchal, Tenant submitted a written objection to the said Change of Name request vide letter dated 13.08.2024.	10.03.2025


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (ii) The Appellant, as the tenant, has been regularly paying the electricity bills pertaining to the said connection. There exists a tenancy dispute between the Gupta Family Trust (the purported owners of the premises) and the Appellant, in respect of which Civil Suit No. 133/2013 was instituted by the Appellant before the Hon'ble City Civil Court on 08.02.2013. The said civil proceedings, concerning the Appellant's tenancy rights and continued occupation, are sub-judice. The Appellant has consistently expressed willingness to pay the rent, but the owners have refused to accept the same.
- (iii) Subsequently, Mrs. Sushama Gupta (Member of Gupta Trust) filed Special Civil Suit No. 436/2014, dated 23.07.2014, before the competent Civil Court, claiming that the ownership of the subject gala had been transferred to her name by the said Trust, and seeking possession of the same from the Appellant. However, as the said proceedings were not diligently pursued, the Hon'ble Court, by its order dated 04.03.2023, dismissed the suit.
- (iv) In the meantime, "Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.", claiming to be the new owner of the said premises, submitted an application dated 13.08.2024 to the Respondent–Licensee (MSEDCL) seeking change of name of the said electricity connection from Techno Metal Works to its own name. On the same date, the Appellant lodged a written objection before the Respondent opposing the said proposed change of name.
- (v) Despite the pendency of the civil disputes and the Appellant's lawful possession of the premises, Respondent No. 1 failed to consider the Appellant's objection on merits, and, instead, issued a notice dated 08.10.2024, intimating that the connection would be transferred to the name of "Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd." within seven days, and further calling upon the Appellant to submit ownership documents of the said premises.
- (vi) **The Appellant submits that he has never claimed ownership of the said premises, but is a lawful tenant in possession thereof.** The alleged purchaser "Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.", has not produced any authentic ownership documents evidencing purchase or lawful acquisition of the said V–Godown gala. **Even assuming that such a transaction had taken place, the Appellant's tenancy rights remain**


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



protected under law, and the purported new owner cannot seek possession or interfere with his lawful occupation except through due process of law and a valid court order.

- (vii) The Appellant has been in continuous, peaceful, and lawful possession of the said premises and has been conducting his business therefrom for several years. Therefore, the electricity connection cannot be lawfully transferred to the name of the alleged purchaser in violation of the Appellant's subsisting tenancy and without affording due opportunity of hearing or following due legal process.
- (viii) "Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd." has made the said application with malafide intent to evict the Appellant and to disrupt his lawful business activities by securing the change of name in its favour. The Appellant further submits that despite being apprised of the pending civil litigation, Respondent No. 1 acted in undue haste and under influence, and has proceeded in favour of the said company, disregarding the Appellant's lawful objection.
- (ix) Consequently, the Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 21.10.2024, seeking cancellation of the notice dated 08.10.2024 issued by the Additional Executive Engineer, Kolshet, and praying for restraint against MSEDCL from proceeding with the change of name in favour of "Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd." The Forum heard the parties on 21.10.2024, and by its order dated 08.05.2025, dismissed the grievance, failing to appreciate that the Appellant has been a lawful tenant of the said premises for the last approximately twelve years.
- (x) The Appellant further submits that he was constrained to lodge Non-Cognizable (NC) complaints on 24.10.2024, 28.10.2024, and 18.03.2025 with the local police authorities regarding threats issued by goons allegedly engaged by "Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.", attempting to forcibly take possession of the said property. However, by communication dated 04.11.2024, the police closed the said complaints without taking appropriate action. The Appellant thereafter addressed a further representation to the Police Authorities on 18.03.2025, which is still pending for consideration.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (xi) Meanwhile, Mrs. Nita Anil Panchal, wife of the Appellant, filed R.C. Suit Application No. 141 of 2025, dated 02.04.2025, before the Civil Court, Thane, against the Additional Executive Engineer, MSEDCL, seeking a temporary injunction restraining the change of name of the said electricity connection in favour of “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.”
- (xii) Notwithstanding the pendency of the above proceedings, MSEDCL proceeded to effect the change of name in favour of “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.” in April 2025, thereby acting in contravention of the principles of natural justice and without awaiting the outcome of the pending civil and grievance proceedings.
- (xiii) In view of the foregoing facts and circumstances, the Appellant prays that this Hon’ble Authority may be pleased to:
- Set aside the order dated 08.05.2025 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum;
 - Direct the Respondent–Licensee (MSEDCL) to restore the electricity connection and billing for the said premises in the name of the original consumer, Techno Metal Works, in place of. “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.”
4. The Respondent No. 1 submitted its reply dated 19th March 2025. Its submissions and arguments are stated as below:
- The Appellant is a Low Tension (LT) consumer, bearing Consumer No. 000132070237, in the name of Techno Metal Works, having been granted electricity supply with effect from 22.08.2004. The sanctioned load of the said connection is 20 HP under the LTV (B1) (Industrial Tariff) Category, and the connection is metered under Meter No. 06206993. The relevant particulars of the connection are presented in Table 1.
 - The Respondent No. 1 received a Change of Name application from “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.” vide Application ID No. 56877666 dated 13.08.2024. On the same date, the Appellant, Anil G. Panchal, the tenant of Techno Metal Works, submitted a written objection to the said Change of Name request.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (iii) Upon scrutiny of the said application, the Respondent directed “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.” to submit either a No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the existing consumer, i.e., Techno Metal Works, or, in the alternative, a duly signed Form “X” along with the SSI Certificate of the Appellant Company. As the requisite NOC was not furnished, Respondent No. 1 rejected the Change of Name application and communicated the rejection to the Appellant vide its letter dated 16.09.2024.
- (iv) Thereafter, “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.” resubmitted its application for Change of Name along with the following documents:
- (a) Registered Agreement for Sale dated 07.12.2023 executed in favour of “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.”, represented by its Director Mr. Akshat Gupta, showing a market value of ₹4,73,69,000/–, with e-Challan dated 07.12.2023 for stamp duty of ₹33,16,000/–, registration fee of ₹30,000/–, and document handling charges of ₹1,600/–;
 - (b) NOC of Kothari Ware House No. 3 Premises Co-operative Society Ltd., undated;
 - (c) Current Maintenance Receipt for the premises; and
 - (d) An Undertaking for Change of Name dated August 2024, wherein the Appellant declared that “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.” is the sole owner of the said property.
- (v) In order to decide the issue, the Respondent, vide letter dated 08.10.2024, sought ownership documents/details from the Appellant in connection with the said premises.
- (vi) The matter was thereafter referred to the Legal Adviser of MSEDCL on 28.10.2024 for obtaining a legal opinion, and further action was kept in abeyance pending receipt of such opinion. Upon receipt of the legal opinion, the Respondent, vide its internal submission dated 24.12.2024, recorded that **there exists no statutory requirement to obtain a No Objection Certificate from the previous consumer (Techno Metal Works) in cases of Change of Name, provided that the Appellant produces valid proof of ownership of the premises where the electricity connection exists.**


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (vii) The Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 21.10.2024 for restraint against MSEDCL from proceeding with the change of name in favour of “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.” The Forum by its order dated 08.05.2025, rightly dismissed the grievance.
- (viii) Meanwhile, Mrs. Nita Anil Panchal, wife of the Appellant, filed R.C. Suit Application No. 141 of 2025 dated 02.04.2025 before the Civil Court, Thane, against the Additional Executive Engineer, MSEDCL (as Defendant), seeking a temporary injunction restraining the proposed Change of Name in favour of “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.” A Vakalatnama appointing Advocate Mrs. Rupali Desai was filed before the Hon’ble Civil Court on 11.04.2025. The said civil proceedings are still pending adjudication.
- (ix) The Respondent No. 1 duly processed and effected the transfer of the electricity connection in the name of “Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd.” from the erstwhile consumer Techno Metal Works in April 2025, after completion of all requisite formalities.
- (x) **Subsequently, the Appellant, vide his letter dated 25.07.2025, submitted a No Objection Certificate for transfer of the said electricity connection** (Consumer No. 000132070237). The contents of the said letter are reproduced below:

“We hereby confirm that we have no objection to the transfer of the said electricity connection in the name of Ani Anu Developers or Mr. Vijay Jain, as may be requested by them, as we have vacated the premises.

We further state that the legal matters pertaining to the said premises are under process of resolution before the appropriate courts, and this No Objection is being issued to facilitate the transfer of the electricity connection for administrative and operational purposes only. This shall not be construed as relinquishment of any rights, claims, or legal remedies available to Techno Metal Works in relation to the premises. Techno Metal Works shall have no further liabilities hereafter in respect of any outstanding bills, deposits, etc.

This certificate is issued at the request of Ani Anu Developers / Mr. Vijay Jain and may be submitted to the Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited (MSEDCL) for the purpose of effecting the Change of Name of the said electricity connection.”


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (xi) The Appellant has no locus standi to challenge the Change of Name since he has vacated the premises, and further issued the above No Objection Certificate.
- (xii) The present Appeal filed by the Appellant is not maintainable, being devoid of merit, misconceived in law and facts, and filed with the intention of obstructing the lawful process of Change of Name effected in accordance with the applicable MSEDCL Rules and Regulations.
- (xiii) All actions undertaken were strictly in compliance with the Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance Regulations, 2021, as well as internal MSEDCL guidelines governing Change of Name applications.
- (xiv) In light of the above sequence of events and the documents submitted, the Respondent No. 1 prays that the representation filed by the Appellant be dismissed.

5. The Respondent No. 2, Ani Anu Developers Pvt. Ltd., despite being a party to the present matter, has not filed any written submissions or response and has remained non-cooperative in the communication process with the Office of the Ombudsman. It may be inferred that the matter has been settled out of court by the disputing parties.

Analysis and Ruling

6. The relevant provisions of the CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman (EO) Regulations, 2020 are as follows:

19.21 Where any person who is a party to the proceedings before the Electricity Ombudsman fails to appear on the date of hearing as may be fixed in this behalf, the Electricity Ombudsman may decide the representation ex-parte:

Provided that no adjournment shall ordinarily be granted by the Electricity Ombudsman unless sufficient cause is shown and the reasons for the grant of adjournment have been recorded in writing by the Electricity Ombudsman.

.....

19.25 The Electricity Ombudsman may reject the representation at any stage, if it appears to him that the representation is:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (a) frivolous, vexatious, mala fide;
(b) without any sufficient cause;
(c) there is no prima facie loss or damage or inconvenience caused to the Complainant:

Provided that the decision of the Electricity Ombudsman in this regard shall be final and binding on the consumer and the Distribution Licensee: Provided further that no representation shall be rejected in respect of sub-clauses (a), (b), and (c) unless the Complainant has been given an opportunity of being heard.

In addition, in Regulation 19.22 of CGRF & EO Regulations 2020 specifically mention that :-
19.22 The Electricity Ombudsman shall entertain a representation only if all the following conditions are satisfied:

- g. The representation by the Complainant, in respect of the same Grievance, is not pending in any proceedings before any court, tribunal or arbitrator or any other authority, or a decree or award or a final order has not already been passed by any such court, tribunal, arbitrator or authority;*

7. In the present case, civil proceedings relating to the premises are still pending. Furthermore, the Appellant, by letter dated 25.07.2025, submitted a No Objection Certificate (as detailed in Para 4(x)), confirming that he has vacated the premises and has no objection to the transfer of the electricity connection (Consumer No. 000132070237). All actions undertaken by Respondent No. 1 were in compliance with the Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance Regulations, 2021, as well as internal MSEDCL procedures governing Change of Name applications.

8. The Appellant has also failed to respond to communications from this office and did not attend the hearing. In view of the above, the representation of the Appellant is rejected and the matter is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

