

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 33 OF 2025

In the matter of new electric connection

Maruti Mahadev SanapAppellant
(C. No. 076370004923)

V/s.

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

Appearances:

Appellant : Ajinkya Sanap, Representative

Respondent : Vithal P. Harak, Dy. Ex. Engineer, Sinnar 2 Sub.Dn.


Coram: Bhalchandra Khandaik

Date of hearing: 19th June 2025

Date of Order : 24th June 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 Order dated 28th April 2025 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MSEDCL, Nashik (the



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Forum). The Forum by its order (issued in Marathi) mainly rejected the grievance application in Case No. 05 of 2025.

2. The Appellant has filed this representation against the order passed by the Forum. An online hearing was held on 19.06.2025 through video conference; however, the representative of the Appellant attended the hearing in person. Parties were heard at length. The Respondent's submissions and arguments are stated first for easy understanding as below: *[Note: The Electricity Ombudsman's observations and comments are recorded under 'Notes' where needed.]*

- (i) The Appellant had applied for a new electricity connection on 25.12.2024 through the Web Self Service (WSS) portal for residential purposes. Subsequently, processing fee and Security Deposit amounting to Rs.3,120/- was generated and which was paid by the Appellant immediately. *[Note: This was the system generated payment for processing the application for a new connection.]*
- (ii) The Section Officer, Nandur Shingote visited the said premises and prepared a preliminary estimate and forwarded it to the Sub-Divisional Office on 30.12.2024. During scrutiny, it was noted that although the application was filed in the name of Maruti Mahadev Sanap, the submitted Property Document, Form 8 dated 29.07.2024 which was issued by Grampanchayat Kankori, was jointly held by Maruti Mahadev Sanap and Manda Maruti Sanap. However, a No Objection Certificate (NOC) from Manda Maruti Sanap was not on record and is required. Due to this discrepancy, the Deputy Executive Engineer, Sinnar-2 returned the estimate file for compliance on 06.01.2025.
- (iii) Meanwhile, the Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 15.01.2025, seeking
 - (a) Release of a new electricity connection, and


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




(b) Compensation for alleged non-compliance as per the Standards of Performance as prescribed under the relevant Regulations.

- (iv) The Appellant submitted the **No Objection Certificate (Sammatti Patra)** from **Smt. Manda Maruti Sanap on 07.02.2025**. During the subsequent site survey, it was observed that a 0.36 km LT line extension (Distribution Main Extension) was required to provide the electricity connection. A technical estimate under the New Service Connection (NSC) Scheme was prepared and sanctioned for **Rs.1,43,970/-** on 11.02.2025. **Accordingly, the electricity connection of the Appellant was sanctioned, and a Demand Notice for payment of Service Connection Charges of Rs.1,840/- was issued on the same day. The Appellant paid the said amount on 11.02.2025 of this demand notice.** The estimate work was awarded vide letter dated 11.03.2025 to M/s. Om Chaityan Kanifnath Electricals, the MSEDCL-approved electrical contractor. Upon completion of the work in March 2025, **the electricity connection was released on 17.04.2025**, following submission of the Test Report and completion of other required formalities.
- (v) The details regarding the date of application, allotted consumer number, work carried out under the NSC scheme, date of supply, etc., are provided in the table below:-

Table 1:

Name of Consumer	Date of Application	Consumer No.	Address	Processing Charges generated on WSS portal	Sanc. Estimate Amount / Scheme / Scope & Work completion	Sanctioned Demand Notice for SCC Issued / Payment done	Sanct. Load (KW)	Date of Connection	Purpose
Maruti Mahadev Sanap	25.12.2024	076370004923	Pandavmala, Ghat No. 191, At Post Kankori, Tal. Sinnar, Dist. Nashik.	Security Demand of Rs. 3,000/-, & Processing Fee of Rs. 120/- paid on 25.12.2024.	Rs.1,43,970/- under NSC on 11.02.2025 with scope of 7 poles LT Line - 0.36 km (Distribution Main Extension) & Work Completion in March 2025.	Demand Notice of Service Connection Charges of Rs.1840/- issued on 11.02.2025 which was paid on same day.	3	17.04.2025	Residential

- (vi) As per Annexure II of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees including Power Quality) Regulations, 2021 (Supply Code and SOP Regulations 2021), in cases where


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




extension of the distribution main is involved, the Distribution Licensee is mandated to effect the release of electricity connection within a period of three months from the date of payment of the demand note.

- (vii) In the present matter, the Appellant submitted the No Objection Certificate (NOC) on 07.02.2025 and made payment of the demand note towards service connection charges on 11.02.2025. The electricity connection was thereafter released on 17.04.2025, i.e., approximately within two months and one week (calculated as 17 days of February + 31 days of March + 17 days of April) which is well within the prescribed three-months period.
- (viii) The Forum, by its reasoned and speaking order dated 28.04.2025 principally rejected the grievance application. The order does not suffer from any legal infirmity or procedural irregularity, and therefore, does not warrant any interference.
- (ix) Since the connection was released within the stipulated regulatory timeframe, and hence, the issue of payment of compensation under the said Regulations does not arise. The Respondent prays that the representation of the Appellant be rejected with cost.

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

- (i) The Appellant applied for a new residential single-phase electricity connection on 25.12.2024 through the MSEDCL WSS portal (Online Application No. 59559445). A demand notice for Rs.3,120/- was generated and paid on the same day. Upon payment, MSEDCL registered him as a consumer (No. 076370004923).
- (ii) Then on 26.12.2024, the Appellant personally visited the office of the MSEDCL Assistant Engineer at Nandur Shingote and submitted a physical copy of the application along with the required documents. During this visit, he was informed that a 7/12 extract was needed due to his wife's name appearing alongside his on the Govt. Namuna (Form) 8A of land record. The Appellant immediately submitted the 7/12 extract on the same day. Thus, all necessary documents were promptly provided, well



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



within a reasonable time frame, in line with Clause 5.7(a) of the Supply Code & SOP Regulations 2021 (amended in 2024). The Appellant also took necessary follow-up steps to ensure procedural compliance.


(iii) **Deliberate Misrepresentation by MSEDCL Officials and Violation of Supply Code & SOP Regulations 2021:**

- a. Owing to the inordinate delay in releasing the electricity connection and based on prior negative experiences, the Appellant filed a grievance application before the Forum on 15.01.2025. The Appellant has cited violation of the 15-days timeline for release of new residential connection prescribed under the amended Supply Code & SOP Regulations 2024. The Forum forwarded the complaint immediately to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Sinnar 2 under whose jurisdiction the property falls.
- b. In response, the Sinnar-2 Sub-Division claimed that a letter had been issued on 08.01.2025 requesting a consent letter from the Appellant's wife, citing the joint ownership reflected in the Property Document—Form 8 dated 29.07.2024, issued by Grampanchayat Kankori, in the names of Maruti Mahadev Sanap and Manda Maruti Sanap. However, this claim is factually incorrect, as no such letter was issued or received. The Sub-Division's claim is misleading and amounts to a clear violation of the Standards of Performance (SOP) Regulations. *[Note: As per MSEDCL, the letter was issued by ordinary post. However, this was expected to be sent digitally also]*
- c. Firstly, the Appellant had already submitted the 7/12 extract on 26.12.2024 to the Assistant Engineer, Nandur Shingote, adequately addressing the ownership issue. Secondly, as per Clause 5.7(a) of the Supply Code and SOP Regulations 2021 (amended in 2024), any deficiency in the application must be communicated within two days via SMS or email. No such communication was received by the Appellant by 28.12.2024 or thereafter.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- d. Further, Clause 5.7(b) states that in the absence of timely communication regarding deficiencies, the application is deemed complete and must be processed accordingly. Thus, MSEDCL was legally bound to release the connection by 12.01.2025, but instead did so only on 17.04.2025, making a delay of over 100 days clearly violating both the letter and spirit of the Regulations.
- e. Moreover, the alleged letter dated 08.01.2025 requesting a consent letter from the Appellant's wife, falls outside the permissible period and appears to be a post-facto justification lacking evidentiary support. No proof of dispatch or delivery was provided despite requests. This reflects a deliberate attempt by MSEDCL officials to misrepresent facts and shift blame, in clear contravention of regulatory norms.
- (iv) The Forum, by its order dated 28.04.2025, rejected the grievance application. In doing so, it failed to appreciate the core issue—that the electricity connection was required to be released within 15 days under the Supply Code and SOP Regulations 2021(amended in 2024). The Forum erroneously attributed the delay to the alleged non-submission of a consent letter, overlooking the fact that no such deficiency was communicated to the Appellant within the prescribed two-days period. This reflects a lack of proper inquiry and efficiency.
- (v) However, the Respondent MSEDCL has not provided the new connection within the stipulated period of 15 days without sufficient cause. The Distribution Licensee has not followed the statutory provisions of Standards of Performance.
- (vi) In light of the foregoing, the Appellant prays that the Hon'ble Authority be pleased to direct the Respondent to:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




- (i) Provide a valid and detailed explanation for the delay of approximately 103 days beyond the stipulated 15-days period as per the Supply Code & SOP Regulations 2021 (amended in 2024).
- (ii) Award compensation for the said delay in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Supply Code & SOP Regulations 2021.
- (iii) Compensate the Appellant for financial losses incurred due to the inability to fully utilize the property during the delayed period.
- (iv) Grant a sum of Rs.5,000/- as compensation for mental harassment, inconvenience, and the unprofessional conduct of MSEDCL officials.

Analysis and Ruling

4. Heard the parties and perused the documents on record. The Appellant applied for a new residential electricity connection on 25.12.2024 through the WSS portal. A system-generated demand of Rs.3,120/- (Rs.120/- processing fee + Rs.3,000/- security deposit) was paid immediately. On scrutiny, it was observed that the property document Form 8 dated 29.07.2024 was jointly held by Maruti Mahadev Sanap and Manda Maruti Sanap. Hence, the NOC from Manda Maruti Sanap was not submitted. Thus, the Deputy Executive Engineer, Sinnar-2 returned the file for compliance on 06.01.2025. The Appellant then submitted the NOC (Sammatti Patra) on 07.02.2025.

5. A subsequent site survey revealed the requirement of a 0.36 km LT line (7 poles) extension under the NSC Scheme. A technical estimate of Rs.1,43,970 was sanctioned on 11.02.2025. A demand notice of Rs.1,840 towards Service Connection Charges was issued to the Appellant who paid on the same day. The work was allotted on 11.03.2025 to M/s. Om Chaityan Kanifnath Electricals. After completion in March 2025 and submission of the Test Report, the electricity connection was released on 17.04.2025.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



6. Relevant details such as application date, consumer number, NSC work, and date of supply are charted in Table 1.


7. The Appellant contended that the Appellant paid Rs. 3120/- on 25.12.2024 and MSEDCL had allotted a new Consumer number. This is nothing but official sanction. The Appellant visited the office of the Assistant Engineer, Nandur Shingote on 26.12.2024, and submitted physical documents of A1 Form and subsequently, the 7/12 abstract, thus completing all formalities in accordance with Regulation 5.7(a) of the Supply Code & SOP Regulations 2021 (amended 2024). Despite timely compliance, MSEDCL failed to release the connection within 15 days. The alleged letter dated 08.01.2025 requesting a consent letter from the Appellant's wife appears to be a post-facto justification without evidence, showing deliberate misrepresentation by MSEDCL officials. As per Regulation 5.7(a), any deficiency should have been communicated within two days (i.e., by 28.12.2024) via SMS or email. No such communication was made. Regulation 5.7(b) provides that in the absence of timely communication; the application is deemed complete. Therefore, MSEDCL was required to release the connection by 12.01.2025. Instead, the connection was delayed until 17.04.2025, over 100 days late, in breach of the Regulations.

8. **Following issue is framed for Consideration:**

Issue: Whether the Appellant was entitled to the release of new electricity connection within 15 days from the date of payment of the processing fee on 25.12.2024, and to the compensation under the Supply Code and SOP Regulations, 2021?

Finding: The issue is answered in the **NEGATIVE**.

The regulatory provision of Supply Code & SOP Regulations 2021 (amended in 2024) is as below:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




<i>Annexure - II: Level of Compensation Payable to Consumer for failure to meet Standards of Performance</i>			
<i>Supply Activity/Events</i>	<i>Standard</i>	<i>Compensation Payable</i>	<i>Automatic/Manual</i>
1. Provision of Supply (Including Temporary Connection)			
<i>Time period for provision of supply from the date of receipt of completed application and payment of charges:</i>		<i>Rs,50 per week or part thereof of delay subject to maximum of twice the service connection charges applicable for the Consumer category</i>	<i>Automatic</i>
<i>in case connection is to be from existing network without any augmentation.</i>	<i>(3) Rural Areas – Thirty (30) Days*</i>		<i>Automatic</i>
<i>where extension or augmentation of distributing main is required</i>	<i>Three (3) months</i>		<i>Automatic</i>
<i>* Note: 15 days as per amended Supply Code & SOP Regulations 2024 dated 05.07.2024.</i>			

As per Annexure II of the *Electricity Supply Code and Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees Regulations, 2021* (as amended in 2024), where extension of the Distribution Main is required, the electricity connection must be provided **within three months from the date of receipt of the completed application and payment of necessary charges.**

In the present case, the Appellant's connection involved not mere tapping from the existing line, but an extension of the Distribution Main by 0.36 km (7 LT poles). The Respondent sanctioned a technical estimate of Rs.1,43,970/- on 11.02.2025 and issued a demand notice of Rs.1,840/- towards Service Connection Charges, which the Appellant paid on the same day. Therefore, **11.02.2025 is the effective date of receipt of the complete application along with charges, in line with the regulatory definition.**

After submission of the Test Report and fulfilling all formalities, the connection was released on 17.04.2025, approximately **two months and one week** from the date of completed application which is well within the prescribed period of three months. Hence, the Appellant is **not entitled** for compensation. The issue is answered in the **NEGATIVE**.



 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



9. The Appellant pointed out that the Respondent communicated the deficiencies through the postal services that too on 6th Jan. 2025 i.e. after more than a week of submission of the Application. We are living in an age of modern technology where it is expected that the communication should be fast and effective. Particularly when you accept the applications through an online mode and seek mobile numbers and emails. This action of the Respondent is very difficult to understand and digest. The Respondent is directed to adhere to the Regulation and not to repeat such mistakes in future.

10. The Forum's order is well-reasoned and does not warrant any interference. The present Representation stands rejected and is hereby disposed of accordingly.

Sd/
(Bhalchandra Khandait)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

