

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 52 & 53 OF 2026

In the matter of disconnection of electricity supply

Rep. No.	Appellant	Consumer No.
52 of 2026	Nutan Rajendra Nadar	154097946
53 of 2026	Mrs. Kamla Omprakash Gulati : POA Holder, Rajendra Nadar	152394613

.....Appellants

V/s.

Adani Electricity Mumbai Limited (AEML)..... Respondent

Appearances:

Appellant: Rajendra Nadar

Respondent: 1. Mritunjay Jha, General Manager & Nodal Officer
2. Prashant P. Mane, Associate General Manager


Coram: Vandana Krishna [IAS. (Retd.)]

Date of hearing: 8th June 2026

Date of Order : 16th June 2026

ORDER

These two Representations were filed on 4th May 2026 under Regulation 19.1 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (CGRF & EO Regulations 2020) against the Common Order dated 4th February 2026 in Case No. 02017 & 02018 /2025-26 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, AEML (the Forum). The Forum, vide its common order, has observed and issued the following directions:


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



“1. Since the original location of the meter cabin no more exists, there is no question of Applicants/Complainants fulfilling all requisite safety requirements in accordance with applicable Standards and Regulations and subsequent restoration of electric supply.

2. The Respondent is hereby directed to undertake the shifting of the meter cabin to a technically appropriate location in coordination with the Applicants/Complainants and to carry out all the allied works up to the point of supply.

3. The Applicants/Complainants are hereby directed to undertake and complete all requisite safety measures at the proposed new meter cabin location as per applicable standards, in coordination with AEML (Reference: AEML’s letter dated 05.02.206), within a period of seven days from the date of this order.

4. The Applicants/Complainants are hereby directed to carry out and complete all works within his scope, in the event of shifting of the meter cabin, through a duly licensed electrical contractor and to submit the requisite test report to AEML.”

2. Aggrieved by the common order of the Forum, the Appellants have filed these representations. A physical hearing was held on 8th June 2026, during which both parties were present and were heard at length. The subject matter involved in both these representations is common in nature; therefore, they are clubbed together for this common order. The Respondent’s submissions and arguments are stated as below: *[The Electricity Ombudsman’s observations and comments are recorded under ‘Notes.’]*

- (i) The present representations have been filed by Ms. Nutan Nadar in respect of Consumer Account No. 154097946, and by Mr. Rajendra Nadar, acting as the notarized Power of Attorney holder of the original consumer, Mrs. Kamla Omprakash Gulati, in respect of Consumer Account No. 152394613. Both Appellants are of one family and have raised substantially similar issues. The particulars of the two representations are tabulated below:



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Table 1:

Rep. No.	Appellant	Consumer No.	Address
52 of 2026	Nutan Rajendra Nadar	154097946	Shop No. 383/1, Chawl No. 42, Road No. 2, Ramabai Colony, Ghatkopar (East), Mumbai-400075
53 of 2026	Mrs. Kamla Omprakash Gulati : POA Holder, Rajendra Nadar	152394613	Shop No. 383/2, Chawl No. 42, Road No. 2, Ramabai Colony, Ghatkopar (East), Mumbai-400075

- (ii) The Appellants filed complaints before the Forum in Schedule A form which were duly registered as Grievance Case Nos. CGRF 02017 and 02018 of 2025-26 respectively. In the said Form-A, the 'Types of Grievance' at Point No. 9 mentioned is "No Supply/Reconnection-Disconnection." At Point No.10 relating to the "Nature of Relief Sought from the Forum," the Appellants stated "Details Enclosed." Upon perusal of the details furnished under the nature of grievance, the Appellants specifically contended as follows:

"Prolonged wrongful disconnection of electricity supply (No Supply) since 16/12/2025 without written notice/order, safety reports or restoration plan – request for immediate restoration."


Further, the Appellants sought the following reliefs before the Forum. A sample prayer clause is reproduced below:

Reliefs / Prayer: The Complainant respectfully prays that the Hon'ble Forum may be pleased to:

- a) Direct AEML to restore electricity supply forthwith to CA No. 154097946;*
- b) Direct AEML to issue a written disconnection order/notice (if any), specifying reasons and basis;*
- c) Direct AEML to provide a written safety inspection/assessment report;*
- d) Direct AEML to provide a clear restoration plan and timeline;*
- e) Grant interim relief for immediate restoration pending final disposal;*
- f) Pass any other orders/directions as deemed fit.*

(Compensation, if any, is expressly reserved for appropriate proceedings.)"

The issues raised in the present representations are substantially identical to those already considered and adjudicated by the Forum and subsequently by this Hon'ble Authority in its Order dated 09.04.2026 passed in Representation No. 8 of 2026 (CA No. 100728943) Late OmprakashThakurdas Gulati (Nutan Nadar – Power of Attorney holder) V/s AEML. The Appellants are now seeking to re-agitate and revive issues that have already attained finality upon adjudication by the Electricity


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




Ombudsman, Mumbai. **The present representations are, in essence, a repetition of the issues raised in Representation No. 8 of 2026 and constitute an attempt to reopen matters that stand conclusively decided.** As such, the representations are not maintainable and deserve to be dismissed at the preliminary stage.

Facts of the Case:

- (iii) A total of 12 electricity meters were installed in the original common meter cabin, including the Appellant's meter. On 10.11.2025, the Appellant raised concerns regarding dangerous meter board wiring of the 12 meters in cabin. Pursuant thereto, the Respondent conducted a site visit on 14.11.2025 and informed the Appellant about re-board wiring requirements, also affixing details on the meter box. A sample notice indicating the requirements for reboard wiring, as affixed on the meter box, is reproduced below:

- (a) *Installation of outgoing wiring and Test Report issued by a licensed electrical contractor,*
- (b) *Provision of a weatherproof meter cabin.*
- (c) *18 mm fiber cement sheet (IS: 14862).*
- (d) *Consumer's side MCB's should be installed outside the meter cabin.*
- (e) *Separate compartment and separate door should be provided for consumer side MCB.*
- (f) *1 feet × 1 feet space required for each meter.*
- (g) *Aluminum Hardener door, and*
- (h) *Rain shed should be provided to protect the meter cabin from rain (water).*

The Appellant was required to comply with prescribed norms, including outgoing wiring with licensed test report, weatherproof cabin, external MCBs with separate compartment, adequate meter space, and protective arrangements. However, the


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Appellant did not undertake the requisite compliance and instead expected the Respondent to execute the entire work, which led to the present grievance.

- (ii) Subsequently, the Appellants demolished the wall surrounding the meter cabin and lodged a complaint before the Electrical Inspector regarding the dangerous wiring condition on 12.12.2026. Acting on the complaint, the Electrical Inspector inspected the site and directed the Respondent to take appropriate action, as recorded in letter dated 16.12.2025 addressed to Divisional Head, AEML Tilak Nagar. The contents of letter (in Marathi language) are reproduced as below:

विषय : सौ. नुतन नादार यांची विद्युत संच मांडणी धोकादायक असल्याची केलेल्या तक्रारीबाबत.

संदर्भ : १ सौ. नुतन नादार यांची तक्रार दिनांक १२/११/२०२५


२. मे. अदानी इलेक्ट्रिसिटी, मुंबई यांचे पत्र दिनांक १६/१२/२०२५

उपरोक्त संदर्भाकित विषयानुसार सौ. नुतन नादार यांची रम नं. ३८३, चाल ४२, रोड २, रमाबाईनगर, घाटकोपर (पु), मुंबई येथील वीज संच मांडणी अतिशय धोकादायक असल्याची तक्रार या कार्यालयास प्राप्त झाली आहे. आपले संदर्भ क्रमांक २ चे पत्रानुसार सदरील ठिकाणचे वीज मीटर बोर्डचे रियायरींग करणेबाबतची नोटीस आपण या अगोदरच सदरील मीटर केबिनवर चिटकवून संबंधित ग्राहकांना सचित केले असल्याचं कळविले आहे.

याबाबत में अदानी इलेक्ट्रिसिटी, मुंबई यांच्या प्रतिनिधीसोबत या कार्यालयाकडून दिनांक १६/१२/२०२५ रोजी सदरील ठिकाणचे प्रत्यक्षात निरीक्षण करण्यात आले. या निरीक्षणादरम्यान तक्रारीत नमुद केल्याप्रमाणे त्या ठिकाणची वीज संच मांडणी अतिशय धोकादायक स्थितीत असल्याचे आढळून आले आहे. त्यामुळे आपणास कळविण्यात येते की, सदरील धोकादायक वीज संच मांडणीमुळे कोणताही विद्युत अपघात होऊ नये याकरीत, योग्य ती कारवाई करण्यात यावी.

(यशवंतराव गावडे)
सहाय्यक विद्युत निरीक्षक, कक्ष-६
सांताक्रूज निरीक्षण विभाग,
कुर्ला, मुंबई.


- (iii) In view of the hazardous site conditions caused by the demolition and in compliance with the directions of the Electrical Inspector, the Respondent disconnected the electricity supply to the meter cabin on 16.12.2025 on safety grounds. Thereafter, the Respondent informed the Electrical Inspector of the



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



prevailing site conditions and the action taken vide letter dated 19.12.2025. Photographs depicting the site condition and meter cabin, both at the relevant time and as existing presently, have been placed on record.

- (iv) **On several occasions, the Respondent's representatives informed the Appellants about the procedure and requisite commercial and technical formalities for shifting the meter.** However, instead of complying with the prescribed requirements, the Appellants continued to address letters and emails to the Respondent and various authorities. The Respondent, vide emails dated 19.12.2025 and 22.12.2025, specifically requested the Appellants to submit the requisite test report. Copies of the said communications have been placed on record.
- (v) Due to demolition of the walls surrounding the original meter cabin, the installation became unsafe and unsuitable for restoration of supply. Accordingly, a new meter cabin was installed at a suitable location identified by the Appellants/representative, and supply has already been restored to 10 consumers who completed the requisite formalities.
- (vi) The Appellant and her husband, Mr. Rajendra Nadar, have filed multiple grievances arising from the disconnection of supply effected on safety grounds pursuant to the directions of the Electrical Inspector. Despite different grounds being cited, the core issues raised in all such grievances remain substantially the same.
- (vii) In one of the Grievance No. CGRF12014/2025-26, the Forum, after considering the facts and circumstances of the case, passed a Final Order dated 29.01.2026 issuing various directions relating to restoration of supply, compliance with safety requirements, and shifting of the meter cabin.
- i. *The Respondent is hereby directed to restore the electricity supply of the of CA No:100728943 along with other 11 numbers of connections from the existing meter cabin, subject to the Applicant/Complainant fulfilling all requisite safety requirements in accordance with applicable Standards and Regulations.*
- ii. *The Applicant/Complainant is hereby directed to undertake and complete all requisite safety measures at the existing meter cabin as per applicable*


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




standards, in coordination with AEML, within a period of seven days from the date of this order.

- iii. *The Respondent is hereby directed at considering the Complainant's application submitted on 20.11.2025 for shifting of the existing meter cabin and to undertake all consequential steps, such as preparation of estimates and issuance of demand for shifting charges etc. The Respondent shall not insist on submission of an online application by the Applicant/Complainant at this stage.*
- iv. *The Applicant is hereby directed to carry out and complete all works within his scope, in the event of shifting of the meter cabin, through a duly licensed electrical contractor and to submit the requisite test report to AEML.*
- v. *Both parties are directed to submit compliance reports before this Forum within 30 days of completion of the respective actions ordered above.*

In view of the order, and with an intent to comply with the same, the Respondent has issued letter/s to all the consumers, whose electricity meter is installed in the meter cabin. Copies of letters dated 04.02.2026 & 05.02.2026 are kept on record.

- (viii) As on date, electricity supply has been restored to 10 consumers who have completed the requisite technical and commercial formalities, including submission of test reports and payment of applicable charges. As on 12.06.2026, the remaining two consumers have also completed the requisite formalities, and their meters have since been installed and energized in the newly erected meter cabin.
- (ix) It is pertinent to mention that the Appellant had filed a Representation before this Hon'ble Authority bearing Representation No.8 of 2026 titled as Late Omprakash Thakurdas Gulati (Nutan Nadar – Power of Attorney holder) (CA. No. 100728943) V/s. Adani Electricity Mumbai Limited (AEML) allegedly for illegal disconnection of electricity supply and shifting of meters. In the said representation, the Respondent submitted its reply with the entire facts in detail and the chronology of events. On 09.04.2026, a final order was passed by this Hon'ble Authority, as follows:

“7. While disconnection on 16.12.2025 on safety grounds is permissible, the Respondent was required to follow a clear restoration plan, which is not adequately demonstrated. At the same time, the directions of the Forum requiring shifting of the meter cabin as per the Appellant's request and compliance through a licensed contractor are broadly consistent with safety requirements, though the statutory obligation of ensuring safe installation


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




and coordinated restoration cannot be entirely shifted upon the consumers. It is observed that, by letter dated 04.02.2026 issued in compliance with the Forum's order, the Respondent informed the Appellant to undertake certain requirements for meter installation at the existing location, including re-board wiring, namely: installation of outgoing wiring with test report from a licensed electrical contractor; provision of a weatherproof meter cabin with 18 mm fibre cement sheet (IS 14862); installation of consumer-side MCBs outside the cabin with a separate compartment and door; provision of 1 ft × 1 ft space per meter; and installation of an aluminum door and rain shed for protection.

Further in para no. 10 & 11 of the order this Hon'ble Authority observed the following and rejected the representation.

"10. It is observed that the work was executed on 23.02.2026; however, due to non-submission of test reports, meters could not be installed. Upon receipt of test reports from eight consumers on 24.02.2026, supply was restored, and subsequently two additional meters were installed on 05.03.2026 upon completion of formalities. The meter cabin location identified by the Appellant was found technically suitable. However, two consumers (including the Appellant) have still not complied with the requisite formalities, and restoration in their cases remains pending, for which the Respondent has already issued necessary intimation.

11. In view of the above, it is observed that the Forum's order has been substantially complied with, as the meter cabin has been relocated and electricity supply restored to 10 consumers, with the remaining connections pending only due to non-compliance of requisite formalities by the concerned consumers. Both the Appellant and the Respondent have distinct roles in re-board wiring and/or shifting of the meter cabin, requiring mutual cooperation and coordination. Instead of adopting an adversarial approach, both parties were expected to act in coordination to ensure timely compliance and restoration. The Appellant is therefore advised to take necessary steps in coordination with the Respondent for completion of pending formalities. In these circumstances, no further intervention is warranted and the representation is rejected.

- (x) Despite the issues having been fully considered and decided by both the Forum and this Hon'ble Authority, the Appellant continues to pursue multiple grievances and representations on the same subject matter. The present representation is therefore liable to be rejected with exemplary costs. The present representation is frivolous, vexatious and devoid of merit, as it seeks to reopen issues already adjudicated and concluded by the Final Order dated 09.04.2026. The Respondent relies upon


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Regulation 19.25 of the MERC (CGRF & EO) Regulations, 2020, which empowers the Electricity Ombudsman to reject representations that are frivolous, vexatious, malafide or without sufficient cause. The relevant provision reads as under:

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

(a) frivolous, vexatious, malafide;

(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.”

- (xi) The averments made by the Appellant are denied as false, misleading, misconceived and unsupported by facts. The disconnection was effected on safety grounds pursuant to the directions of the Electrical Inspector after the Appellant's actions rendered the meter cabin unsafe. The issues raised have already been considered and adjudicated by the Forum and this Hon'ble Authority in earlier proceedings. The present representation merely seeks to re-agitate settled issues and constitutes an abuse of the process of law, warranting dismissal with costs.
- (xii) In the circumstances, the present representation is untenable in law and on facts, and the Respondent prays that it be rejected with exemplary costs.

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


- (i) The Appellants, by written grievance dated 10.11.2025, brought to the Respondent's notice the hazardous and dilapidated condition of the meter cabin, posing serious risk of short circuit and electrocution. The urgency was reiterated via email dated 12.11.2025 and telephonic complaint dated 13.11.2025 (No. 1003449453).
- (ii) The Respondent conducted a site inspection on 14.11.2025 and was fully aware of the unsafe condition. Despite such knowledge, no corrective action, report,



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



or communication was issued for over a month. Acting on the Respondent's advice, the Appellant submitted a written request for shifting of the meter cabin on 20.11.2025. The Respondent acknowledged the request telephonically on 04.12.2025 and discussed procedural aspects; however, no further steps were taken.


- (iii) Thereafter, the Respondent failed to conduct inspection, initiate shifting, or provide any written response despite follow-ups. Due to continued inaction and safety risk, the Appellant approached the Electrical Inspector on 12.12.2025. On 16.12.2025, the Respondent disconnected electricity supply on alleged safety grounds without prior notice or due process. No disconnection memo, inspection report, or restoration plan was provided even after disconnection. The first written communication from the Respondent was issued only on 19.12.2025. **They submit that their grievances were confined to the legality of the disconnection and continued non-restoration of supply, and not to issues relating to shifting of the meter cabin.**
- (iv) Aggrieved, the Appellants filed grievance applications in the Forum on 04.02.2026. The Forum by its common order dated 06.03.2026 has disposed the grievance applications. The Forum failed to understand the basic issue that the Respondent illegally disconnected the supply of the Appellant on 16.12.2025 without considering relevant pleadings. The impugned orders suffer from jurisdictional error as the Forum failed to adjudicate **the core issues raised in the grievances, namely the legality of the disconnection of electricity supply dated 16.12.2025** and the continued non-restoration thereof. According to the Appellants, despite specific issues being framed and placed on record, the Forum neither examined the applicable statutory framework governing disconnection and restoration of supply nor recorded any findings on the legality of the Respondent's actions.
- (v) The Appellants further contended that the impugned orders are non-speaking and unreasoned, as the Forum merely summarized the submissions of the parties


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



without addressing the statutory obligations and issues specifically raised in the rejoinder.


- (vi) It was further argued that the Forum erroneously treated the grievances as arising from the same cause of action as an earlier proceeding. According to the Appellants, each consumer account constitutes an independent legal relationship with distinct rights and obligations, and therefore the grievances relating to their respective consumer accounts required independent adjudication. The Forum, according to the Appellants, failed to establish identity of issues, parties or reliefs before invoking the principle of "same cause of action".
- (vii) The Forum improperly decided the grievances on considerations relating to meter cabin relocation and compliance, although the grievances were confined to the legality of disconnection and continued non-restoration of electricity supply. It was contended that **the Forum thereby adjudicated issues not raised by the Appellants** and failed to determine whether there was any deficiency in service on the part of the Respondent.
- (viii) The Appellants further contended that even assuming the disconnection was effected on safety grounds, **the Respondent failed to comply with the mandatory procedural requirements governing disconnection** and restoration of supply. According to the Appellants, no written notice, defect memo, inspection report, communication of reasons for disconnection, or restoration conditions were provided to them. It was submitted that continued non-restoration of supply without such communication was arbitrary, disproportionate and contrary to the applicable regulatory framework.
- (ix) On these grounds, the Appellants prayed that the impugned orders be set aside and that this Hon'ble Authority adjudicate the grievances on merits by determining whether the disconnection and continued non-restoration of supply were in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions and whether the Respondent was deficient in rendering service.
- (x) The Appellants filed rejoinders on 05.06.2026. The Respondent's Reply largely revisits issues relating to the meter cabin, Electrical Inspector proceedings,



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Section 135 proceedings, FIR and earlier CGRF proceedings, **which are not the subject matter of the present Appeal. The limited issue is whether the Respondent communicated the reasons for disconnection, defects requiring rectification, conditions for restoration of supply** and complied with its obligations regarding restoration of supply.

- (xi) While the Appellants do not dispute the existence of safety concerns or the Respondent's authority to disconnect supply on safety grounds, such concerns do not absolve the Respondent from its obligation to communicate restoration requirements and facilitate restoration in accordance with applicable regulations. The Respondent has failed to produce any contemporaneous document showing that the present Appellants were informed of the defects requiring rectification, corrective measures to be undertaken or conditions for restoration of supply. Correspondence with the Electrical Inspector and post-disconnection communications cannot substitute proof of consumer-specific communication.
- (xii) The Respondent's own letters dated 04.02.2026 and 05.02.2026 show that detailed **restoration requirements were formally specified only after the CGRF Order dated 29.01.2026**. Restoration of supply on 24.02.2026 does not render the Appeal infructuous, as the issues relating to communication, restoration procedure, prolonged non-restoration and deficiency in service remain to be adjudicated. Significantly, neither the CGRF Order nor the Respondent's Reply addresses or establishes communication of disconnection reasons, rectification requirements, restoration conditions or compliance with restoration obligations during the period from 16.12.2025 to 24.02.2026. The Appeal, therefore, deserves to be allowed.
- (xiii) In view of the above, the Appellants pray that the Electricity Ombudsman may be pleased to
- a) Set aside the Forum's order dated 06.03.2026;
- b) Adjudicate the grievance on merits and record clear findings on:



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (i) Whether the disconnection of electricity supply dated 16 December 2025 was carried out in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions;
- (ii) Whether the Respondent complied with the mandatory procedure governing disconnection of electricity supply;
- (iii) Whether the continued non-restoration of electricity supply constituted a violation of the Respondent's statutory obligations;
- (iv) Whether the conduct of the Respondent amounts to deficiency in service;
- (v) Record such findings as may be necessary to determine the Respondent's compliance with its statutory obligations;

Analysis & Ruling

4. Heard the parties and perused the record. The Appellant first raised a complaint about unsafe meter board wiring on 10.11.2025. The meter cabin housing 12 consumers was in a dilapidated and unsafe condition. After the Appellant raised safety concerns, the Respondent inspected the site on 14.11.2025 and informed the consumers in detail of the re-board wiring requirements. The Appellant was required to carry out the installation of outgoing wiring and submit a Test Report issued by a licensed electrical contractor. Further, the Appellant was required to provide a weatherproof meter cabin, and the consumer-side MCBs had to be installed outside the meter cabin. The meter cabin had to be fitted with an aluminium hardener door, and a suitable rain shed to be provided to protect the meter cabin from rainwater and adverse weather conditions. Instead of complying with the requisite formalities, the Appellant sought shifting of the meter cabin by the Respondent and subsequently approached the Electrical Inspector. Considering the dangerous site conditions and the directions of the Electrical Inspector on record, the Respondent disconnected the supply on 16.12.2025 on safety grounds. While the Appellant challenges this disconnection as illegal, the Respondent justifies the action (and its procedural aspects) on safety considerations, and submits that restoration has already been effected for consumers who complied with the prescribed requirements.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai





5. The issues raised by the Appellant pertaining to electrical safety are matters that actually fall within the statutory jurisdiction of the Electrical Inspector. Such issues involve technical assessment of electrical installations, safety standards, inspection of electrical infrastructure, and determination of compliance with prescribed safety regulations. The Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and the Electricity Ombudsman are empowered to adjudicate only those disputes that qualify as a “grievance” under the applicable Regulations, primarily relating to billing, metering, supply, service deficiencies, and allied consumer service matters. However, in the interest of expeditious addressal of the grievance, the Forum and this authority did consider and adjudicate this grievance. Unfortunately, the Appellant continues to raise the same (or related) issues repeatedly.

6. The principal contention of the Appellants is that the Forum failed to adjudicate the **legality of the disconnection dated 16.12.2025** and the continued non-restoration of supply. The legality or illegality of disconnection would depend on how dangerous the situation was at that point of time. To determine this primarily falls within the jurisdiction of the Electrical Inspector. Considering the directions of the inspector on record (page 5), it can safely be concluded that the wiring situation was dangerous enough to warrant immediate disconnection. No further notice would be required in these circumstances, especially because a prior notice had already been affixed on 14.11.2025. The reasons for disconnection were well known to the Appellants, and so were conditions for restoration of supply.

7. This Authority, by Order dated 09.04.2026 in Representation No. 8 of 2026, has already recorded findings regarding the circumstances leading to disconnection, the obligations of the parties, the shifting of the meter cabin, and restoration of supply. The said order has attained finality.

8. Though the present representations are filed in respect of different consumer accounts, the issues sought to be raised substantially arise out of the same set of facts, namely the disconnection of supply from the common meter cabin, the subsequent shifting thereof, and restoration-related formalities. **The reliefs now sought would necessarily require**


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



reconsideration of issues already examined and decided by this Authority in its earlier order.


9. The Forum has considered the factual background, the safety concerns, the directions of the Electrical Inspector, and the steps required for restoration of supply. Merely because the Forum has not framed the issues in the manner suggested by the Appellants would not render the order without jurisdiction.


10. The record further shows that the Respondent repeatedly informed the consumers regarding the technical (Standard meter cabin as described in reboard wiring) and commercial requirements (payment of theft charges) which were necessary for restoration of supply and installation of meters in the new meter cabin. Supply was restored to consumers who complied with such requirements. The Appellants have not demonstrated any material circumstance warranting a departure from the findings already recorded by this Authority in Representation No. 8 of 2026.

11. The present representations substantially seek to re-agitate issues which have already been considered and decided by this Authority. Entertaining repeated proceedings on the same subject matter would defeat the principle of finality and result in unnecessary expenditure of judicial time and resources.

12. Regulation 19.25 of the MERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 empowers the Electricity Ombudsman to reject representations which are frivolous, vexatious, malafide or without sufficient cause. Having considered the entirety of the record, we are satisfied that the present representations fall within the ambit of the said provision.

13. The Forum's order is reasoned and speaking. The impugned common Order dated 06.03.2026 passed by the Forum is upheld and did not warrant any interference. In view of the


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




above, Representation No. 52 of 2026 and Representation No. 53 of 2026 are hereby rejected. In exercise of powers under Regulation 19.25 of the MERC (CGRF & EO) Regulations, 2020, and considering the repeated institution of proceedings on issues already adjudicated by this Authority, a cost of **Rs.4,000/- (Rupees Four Thousand only)** is imposed on **each** Appellant.

14. The amount of cost shall be deposited in this office within a period of 30 days from the date of this Order.

15. The representation is accordingly disposed of.

Sd/-
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

