

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN (MUMBAI)

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

REPRESENTATION NO. 121 OF 2025

In the matter of tariff slab difference in Commercial Tariff Category

Mr. Mohammed Ameen.....Appellant
[Akshay Loke, Tenant – User / Occupier]
(Consumer No. 028611253887)

V/s.

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

Appearances:

Appellant : 1. Akshay Loke, User / Occupier
2. Suraj Chakraborty, Representative

Respondent: 1. Jitendra Mane, Exe. Engineer
2. Anil Mhaske, Addl.Exe. Engineer, Panvel-1 S/Dn.
3. S.S. Sandbor, Dy. Manager
4. Tanvir Hindurao, AE/Flying Squad- Incharge Dy.EE


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

Date of hearing: 28th January 2026

Date of Order :26th February 2026

ORDER

This Representation was filed on 24th 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 20th November 2025 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MSEDCL,


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



Bhandup (the Forum). The Forum by its order disposed of the grievance application in Case No.39 of 2025-26 by giving the operative order as below.

“2. The Respondent is directed to recover the amount as per the procedure & rules of Utility.

3. The Respondent should give facility of installments as per rules.

4. The interim order dated 04.07.2025 is revoked.”

[Note: We find this part of the Forum’s order to be vague; it should be more specific.]


2. Aggrieved by the order passed by the Forum, the Appellant has filed this present representation. The Appellant appeared for the hearing in person, while the Respondent participated through video conference on 28.01.2026. Parties were heard at length. The Respondent’s submissions and arguments are stated as below: - [The Electricity Ombudsman’s observations and comments are recorded under ‘Notes’.]

- (i) The Appellant is a three-phase commercial consumer located at Plot No. 15, Sector-24, Panvel. The particulars of the Appellant are tabulated below:

Table 1:

Appellant	Consumer No.	Address	Sanctioned load	Date of Supply	Activity	Date of Flying Squad Inspection	Supp. Bill towards Tariff Difference	Contract Demand Recorded (KVA)
Mohammed Ameen	028611253887	Office-1&2, Plot No. 15, Sector-24, Panvel, Raigad, Navi Mumbai, Panvel, Raigad.	19 KW	01.12.2022	Gym	26.03.2025	Rs. 10,67,130/-for 92880 units from Apr.'24 to Mar' 25	36.49 KVA with 0.87 PF i.e. 31.75 KW

- (ii) At the time of release of supply, i.e., on 01.12.2022, Meter No. 088-08191410 of Avon make, having a capacity of three-phase, 10–40 A, was installed at the Appellant’s premises. The applicable tariff at the relevant time was LT-II A. As per the MERC MYT Tariff Orders in force, the LT-II Commercial category is classified


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



into three slabs load wise, namely: LT-II A (< 20 kW), LT-II B (> 20 kW & up to 50 kW) and LT-II C (> 50 kW).

- (iii) The Flying Squad inspected the consumer's premises on 26.03.2025. During the inspection, it was observed that the Appellant was operating a modern gym equipped with advanced facilities, including treadmills and a fully air-conditioned environment. The total connected load was found to be 39.264 kW, and recorded kVA MD was 36.49 kVA at 0.87 Power Factor. The current & voltage measurements are as below:

Table 2

Sr. No.	Current & Voltage Measurement	R Phase	Y Phase	B Phase
1	Current measured at incoming supply (A)	42.82	48.73	69.92
2	Current on energy meter display (A)	42.93	47.28	70.01
3	Voltage measured at incoming terminal points (V)	233	223	226
4	Voltage on energy meter display (V)	233	223	226


The details of connected load was found as below:

Table 3:

Sr. No.	Description	Nos.	Capacity (Watts)	Total Connected Load (Watts)
1	Tube Light Fixtures	26	80	2080
2	LED Lights	40	50	2000
3	Fans	16	80	1280
4	Tread Mills	8	2238	17904
5	Air Conditioners	8	2000	16000
Total connected Load (Watts)				39264

The inspection was carried out in the presence of the Appellant; however the Appellant refused to sign the inspection report.

- (iv) The Appellant extended his connected load from 19 kW to 39.26 kW without any sanction of additional load by the Respondent. The Appellant was billed as per sanctioned load under LT-II A concessional tariff category i.e. from 0 to 20 kW tariff category. Further examination of the consumer's consumption pattern revealed a


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




sudden increase in consumption commencing from April 2023, with the MD and load consistently reaching 20 kW and above.

- (v) The consumption pattern of the Appellant from Jan. 2023 to Jan.2026 is tabulated as below:

Table 4:

Year	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2025-26		
Month	Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Cons. (Units)	Recorded Demand	Billing PF	KW recorded
Apr		13601	7363	3977	34	1.000	34.00
May		6179	7729	10543	35	0.890	31.15
Jun		6720	8091	8199	27	0.890	24.03
Jul		5258	7254	7533	32	0.889	28.45
Aug		6307	7574	8537	29	0.897	26.01
Sep		6449	7559	7771	32	0.897	28.70
Oct		6752	7688	5725	32	0.899	28.77
Nov		7153	8442	8320	31	0.899	27.87
Dec		6841	7673	9261	21	0.985	20.69
Jan	39	6371	7429	7499	27	0.979	26.43
Feb	39	6750	8122				
Mar	39	6730	7956				
Total	117	85111	92880	77365			
Avg/Mth	39	7093	7740	7737			

- (vi) From the above table, it is evident that excess load utilization commenced from April 2023 onwards. After the Flying Squad inspection in March 2025, the Respondent revised the tariff category to LT-II B with effect from April 2025. Accordingly, the Respondent issued a tariff differential between LT-II A and LT-II B amounting to Rs. 10,67,130/- retrospectively for one year for the period from Apr.'24 to Mar' 25 for 92880 units. [The meter reading recorded on 22.03.2024 was 85,338 kWh, and on 22.03.2025 was 1,78,218 kWh. Accordingly, the total consumption during the said


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



period works out to 92,880 units (kWh).] The recovery is within the limitation of 24 months; therefore, it is legal and proper

(vii) Reason why excess load did not come to notice earlier: -


Consumers having a sanctioned load exceeding 20 kW are billed under Processing Cycle “PC-0”, wherein meter data is retrieved through AMR/AMI systems. Such data retrieval is not carried out for ordinary consumers having load less than 20 kW. In the present case, the consumer was billed under PC-7 instead of PC-0. Had the consumer been billed under PC-0, the meter readings would have been captured through AMR, and the consumer would have been automatically billed under the appropriate tariff category of LT-II B, as applicable, in accordance with the recorded MD for the relevant months. There was an error in retrieving the past record in the meter, hence the data of MRI was not retrieved.

(viii) After billing at PC “0”, the recorded Maximum Demand (MD) and Power Factor were duly considered, and the corresponding load in kW was calculated as set out in Table 4. The said calculation clearly establishes that the Appellant was correctly billed under the “> 20 kW” slab, strictly on the basis of the MRI reports. The consumption pattern remained substantially the same during FY 2024–25 and thereafter. Hence, assessing the consumer under LT II B is fully justified for the period from April 2024 to March 2025.

(ix) The Hon'ble MERC in its Midterm Review order dated 31.03.2023 in Case No.226 of 2022 has categorically laid down that,

Penalty for exceeding Contract Demand: -

In case a consumer (availing Demand-based Tariff) exceeds his Contract Demand, he will be billed at the applicable Demand Charge rate for the Demand actually recorded, and also be charged an additional amount at the rate of 150% of the applicable Demand Charge (only for the Demand in excess of the Contract Demand).


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




In case a LT consumer with a sanctioned demand/ contract demand less than 20 kW records actual contract demand above 20 kW, he will be billed at the tariff applicable for the respective load slab approved by the Commission, in which recorded demand falls for that billing cycle only and also be charged an additional amount at the rate of 150% of the applicable charge for the Demand in excess of the Contract Demand.

Further, Distribution licensee can enhance the Contract Demand of the consumer when the consumers exceeds the Contract Demand on more than three occasions during a calendar year, irrespective whether the Consumer submits an application for the same or otherwise. However, before such revision of Contact Demand, Distribution Licensee must give 15 days' notice to such consumer. Also, the Consumer is liable to pay necessary charges as may be stipulated in the approved Schedule of Charges for the revised Contract Demand.

Under these circumstances, the consumer shall not be liable for any other action under Section 126 of the EA, 2003, since the penal additional Demand Charge provides for the penalty that the consumer is liable to pay for exceeding his Contract Demand. In case a consumer exceeds his Contract Demand on more than three occasions in a calendar year, the action to be taken would be governed by the provisions of the Supply Code Regulations.

- (x) MSEDCCL issued notices dated 03.04.2025 and 21.05.2025, respectively, directing the Appellant to apply for additional Contract Demand (CD). Copies of the said notices are placed on record. However, the Appellant has failed to apply for extension of load till date. Despite the said irregularity, the Respondent has refrained from taking stringent action, including disconnection of supply, though the applicable rules and regulations permit such action. [Note: As pointed out earlier, the Respondent did


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




apply 150% penalty while computing the supplementary bill. This fact was not clearly mentioned in its bill or submissions, which lends credence to the Appellant's grievance regarding lack of transparency in billing.]

- (xi) The present case is an instance of “escaped billing” arising due to unauthorized increase of load of more than 20 kW.
- (xii) In this regard, MSEDCL places reliance on the judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court dated 05.10.2021 in Civil Appeal No. 7235 of 2009, Prem Cottex v. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. & Ors., wherein the Hon’ble Court has clearly distinguished between cases of “escaped assessment” and “deficiency in service” under Section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003. The Hon’ble Supreme Court has categorically held that past recovery is permissible in cases of escaped billing caused by a bona fide mistake of the licensee, and that the limitation under Section 56(2) is not applicable to such escaped billing.
- (xiii) Further, reliance is also placed on the decision of the Hon’ble Electricity Ombudsman dated 12.01.2023 in Representation No. 176 of 2022, M/s Ansuk Polymers Pvt. Ltd. v. MSEDCL, wherein recovery of three years’ charges towards escaped billing was expressly upheld. MSEDCL relies upon the said decision.
- (xiv) The Forum has considered the matter correctly and has passed a reasoned and well-founded order, which calls for no interference whatsoever. The present Representation is therefore not maintainable and devoid of merit. In view of the above, the Appellant prays that representation of the Appellant be rejected.

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

- (i) The Appellant is a commercial consumer engaged in the business of operating a modern gymnasium comprising treadmills and other fitness equipment, which is presently managed by the tenant, Mr. Akshay Loke (details set out in Table-1). The Appellant has been regular and punctual in payment of electricity bills.



(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- (ii) The Respondent's Flying Squad conducted an inspection of the premises and, thereafter, unilaterally issued a supplementary bill dated April 2025 for an amount of ₹10,67,130/-, alleging excess demand above 20 kW and computing 92,880 units for the period from April 2024 to March 2025. The Appellant submits that no such excess load existed at the premises, as alleged in the inspection report.
- (iii) Aggrieved thereby, the Appellant filed a grievance before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum on 23.06.2025. By order dated 20.11.2025, the Forum rejected the grievance application without properly appreciating that the Appellant had never utilized load exceeding 20 kW, and mechanically upheld the Respondent's action, contrary to statutory provisions and settled principles of law.

Grounds of Appeal


- (iv) There is no provision under the Electricity Act, 2003, the applicable MERC Regulations, or the Tariff Orders which permits retrospective reclassification or reassessment on the basis of assumed or inferred demand. Consequences of excess demand, if any, can be applied only to the billing cycle in which such demand is actually recorded, and not retrospectively for an entire year.
- (v) Regulation 7.6 of the MERC Supply Code clearly provides that excess demand shall be billed at applicable demand charges, and the additional 150% charge is leviable only on the excess portion of demand. In the case of LT consumers below 20 kW, application of a higher tariff slab, if at all, can be only for the relevant billing cycle in which such excess is recorded. The Respondent has illegally applied the said provisions retrospectively and raised a lump-sum supplementary bill, which is wholly impermissible.
- (vi) As per MERC Guidelines and MSEDCL Circular Nos. 316, 318 and 323, any enhancement of contract demand or change in tariff category requires prior notice of at least 15 days. In the present case, no such prior notice was served before issuance


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



of the supplementary bill. Any subsequent notice cannot cure this fundamental defect and is violative of the principles of natural justice.

- (vii) The Respondent further threatened disconnection of supply, compelling the Appellant to deposit 50% of the supplementary bill amount under coercion and worry of disconnection.
- (viii) As per MERC Tariff Order No. 226 of 2022 dated 31.03.2023, penal demand charges are applicable only to the excess portion of demand and in accordance with the applicable billing mechanism, including TOD billing, and cannot be retrospectively imposed in the manner adopted by the Respondent.
- (ix) The Appellant places reliance upon the order dated 01.07.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman, Nagpur, in the case of Ravindra Agrawal v. Executive Engineer, MSEDCL, Latur, wherein recovery was restricted strictly to the recorded contract demand (kVA) exceeding 20 kW and retrospective or assumed assessment was disallowed.
- (x) The present case does not constitute "escaped billing" as alleged by the Respondent. Therefore, reliance placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 7235 of 2009 (Prem Cottex v. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. & Ors.) is misplaced and inapplicable to the facts of the present case. It is well settled that arbitrary supplementary bills without statutory backing are violative of Articles 14 and 265 of the Constitution of India.
- (xi) The Appellant has been saddled with a supplementary demand of ₹10.67 lakhs without prior notice, without affording an opportunity to regulate the load or seek enhancement of contract demand, and without furnishing a transparent computation of the alleged excess demand.
- (xii) The impugned order of the Forum has mechanically accepted the Respondent's contentions without proper appreciation of facts, law, and documentary evidence on record, and is therefore liable to be set aside.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



(xiii) In view of the foregoing facts and grounds, the Appellant most respectfully prays that this Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman may be pleased to:


- a) Set aside the Final Order passed by the CGRF, Bhandup in Case No. 122 of 2024 - 25;
- b) Quash and cancel the Supplementary Bill dated 31.01.2025 amounting to ₹10,67,130/-;
- c) Direct the Respondent to undertake billing strictly in accordance with the MERC Tariff Orders and the Supply Code Regulations; and
- d) Declare that any action in respect of alleged excess demand, if at all warranted, can be taken only prospectively and after due notice in accordance with law.

Analysis and Ruling

4. Heard the parties and perused the documents on record. The Appellant is a commercial consumer operating a modern gymnasium. The sanctioned load of the Appellant was below 20 kW, and the earlier consumer was billed under LT-II A Commercial Tariff Category.

5. The Flying Squad of the Respondent inspected the premises on 26.03.2025, when it was observed that the Appellant was operating on a much higher load than sanctioned. It was a fully air-conditioned modern gymnasium equipped with treadmills and other electrical equipment. The total connected load was found to be 39.264 kW. The Maximum Demand (MD) recorded in the meter was 36.49 kVA at a Power Factor of 0.87. The inspection was carried out in the presence of the Appellant; however, the Appellant refused to sign the inspection report.

It was further noticed that the Appellant had enhanced the connected load from 19 kW to 39.26 kW without obtaining prior sanction for additional load from the Respondent. As the higher load did not come to the Respondent's notice, the consumer continued to be billed under the LT-II A Commercial Tariff Category (0–20 kW slab).


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




6. The consumption pattern from January 2022 to January 2026 reveals a substantial increase from April 2023 onwards, with monthly consumption ranging between 7,500 and 10,500 units, clearly indicating that the Maximum Demand/connected load consistently exceeded 25 kVA / 20 kW. Accordingly, the Respondent issued a supplementary bill dated 31.01.2025 for ₹10,67,130/- towards tariff differential for the period from April 2024 to March 2025, covering total consumption of 92,880 units. This bill includes tariff difference + 150% contract demand penalty.

7. The Appellant contended that no retrospective reassessment is permissible under the Electricity Act, 2003 or the MERC Regulations. It was argued that Regulation 7.6 of the MERC Supply Code permits billing of excess demand only for the relevant billing cycle and not retrospectively for an entire year. The Appellant further contended that no prior 15 days' notice was issued before tariff reclassification and that the supplementary bill was raised arbitrarily.

8. The following issues are framed for consideration:

- A. Whether it is established that the Appellant utilized load exceeding 20 kW without sanction from April 2024 to March 2025?
- B. Whether the supplementary bill for tariff differential from April 2024 to March 2025 is legally sustainable?
- C. Has the amount of Rs.10.67 lakhs of the supplementary bill been calculated correctly and transparently?

- From the inspection report dated 26.03.2025 and the recorded Maximum Demand (MD) of 36.49 kVA at 0.87 Power Factor, corresponding to approximately 31.75 kW load, it is evident that the Appellant was consistently utilizing load substantially more than the sanctioned limit of 20 kW. The consumption pattern from April 2023 onwards reflects demand above 20 kW. Therefore, the Appellant was liable to be billed under the LT-II B tariff.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- The contention of the Appellant that retrospective billing is impermissible cannot be accepted in the facts and circumstances of the present case. The record reveals that since the sanctioned CD was < 20 kW, the consumer was billed under Processing Cycle (PC-7) instead of PC-0, which resulted in non-capture of the appropriate Maximum Demand (MD) data through the AMR system. [Note: Several such cases have come to notice where the load crosses 20 kW while billing continues in the lower tariff category. The Respondent should learn from this experience, and keep a watch on all such consumers with sanctioned CD < 20 kW, especially those near the border of 20 kW, by classifying them under PC-0.]


9. The Section 56 (2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 is reproduced below:

“(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no sum due from any consumer, under this section shall be recoverable after the period of two years from the date when such sum became first due unless such sum has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrear of charges for electricity supplied and the licensee shall not cut off the supply of the electricity.”

This Section 56 (2) of the Act has been interpreted by the Larger Bench Judgment dated 12.03.2019 of the Bombay High Court in W.P. No. 10764 of 2011 with Other Writ Petitions. The Court has allowed 24 months’ recovery retrospectively in cases of mistake or oversight.

The Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in its Judgment dated 18.02.2020 in Civil Appeal No.1672 of 2020 in case of Assistant Engineer, Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited V/s. Rahamatullah Khan has held that:

“9. Applying the aforesaid ratio to the facts of the present case, the licensee company raised an additional demand on 18.03.2014 for the period July, 2009 to September, 2011.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



The licensee company discovered the mistake of billing under the wrong Tariff Code on 18.03.2014. The limitation period of two years under Section 56(2) had by then already expired.

Section 56(2) did not preclude the licensee company from raising an additional or supplementary demand after the expiry of the limitation period under Section 56(2) in the case of a mistake or bona fide error. It did not however, empower the licensee company to take recourse to the coercive measure of disconnection of electricity supply, for recovery of the additional demand.”


10. In this case, the recovery has been restricted to one year (April 2024 to March 2025), which is well within the permissible 24 months’ period. Hence, the recovery cannot be time-barred.

11. The circumstances of this case point to a deficiency in service on the part of the Respondent. The MIS reports generated by the Respondent reflected a lower connected/sanctioned load, whereas the actual electricity consumption recorded was significantly higher. Such high consumption (in the range of 6000 – 8000 units p.m.) would not be physically possible with a load < 20 kW. This discrepancy should have been identified and examined by the Respondent through its internal monitoring and verification mechanisms.

12. The Commission, by its various Tariff Orders, has decided the tariff for various categories of consumers. The load slabs for Commercial Consumers are nearly the same, as specified in the Commission’s Mid-Term Review order in Case No. 226 of 2022 dated 31.03.2023. The relevant portion of the tariff order is quoted below:

“LT II: LT – Non-Residential or Commercial

D. LT II (A): 0 - 20 kW


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



This tariff category is applicable for electricity used at Low/Medium voltage in non-residential, non-industrial and/or commercial premises for commercial consumption meant for operating various appliances used for purposes such as lighting, heating, cooling, cooking, entertainment/ leisure and water pumping in, but not limited to, the following premises:

a) Non-Residential, Commercial and Business premises, including shopping malls and Showrooms, Exhibition Centres;

b)....


E. 20 kW and ≤ 50 kW and (C) > 50 kW Applicability: As per the applicability described in LT II (A) and for the Sanctioned Load in the range applicable in this sub- category, i.e., LT II (B) and LT II (C).

Tariff w.e.f. 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2024			
Category	Fixed / Demand Charges	Energy Charges (Rs./kWh)	Wheeling Charges (Rs./kWh)
<i>LT II A: 0 to 20 kW</i>	<i>Rs. 470 per month</i>	<i>8.27</i>	<i>1.17</i>
<i>LT II B: > 20 kW and ≤ 50 kW</i>	<i>Rs. 470 per kVA/month</i>	<i>12.63</i>	<i>1.17</i>
<i>LT II C: > 50 kW</i>	<i>Rs. 470 per kVA/month</i>	<i>14.93</i>	<i>1.17</i>

Note: - As per Tariff Order of the Commission in force, there is no KVA Contract Demand (per KVA) for tariff category slab of “0 to 20 KW”; there are only fixed charges. However, Contract Demand tariff (per kVA) is applicable in LT II (B) and LT II (C) tariff category.

.....

Penalty for exceeding Contract Demand:


 (Dilip Dumbre)
 Secretary
 Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




In case a consumer (availing Demand-based Tariff) exceeds his Contract Demand, he will be billed at the applicable Demand Charge rate for the Demand actually recorded, and also be charged an additional amount at the rate of 150% of the applicable Demand Charge (only for the Demand in excess of the Contract Demand).

In case a LT consumer with a sanction demand/ contract demand less than 20 kW records actual contract demand above 20 kW, he will be billed at the tariff applicable for the respective load slab approved by the Commission, in which recorded demand falls for that billing cycle only and also be charged an additional amount at the rate of 150% of the applicable charge for the Demand in excess of the Contract Demand.

Further, Distribution licensee can enhance the Contract Demand of the consumer when the consumers exceed the Contract Demand on more than three occasions during a calendar year, irrespective whether the Consumer submits an application for the same or otherwise. However, before such revision of Contact Demand, a notice should be issued to such consumer. Also, the Consumer is liable to pay necessary charges as may be stipulated in the approved Schedule of Charges for the revised Contract Demand.

In this case MSEDCL has pointed out that it simply did not come to its notice that Contract Demand was being exceeded on more than 3 occasions in a year, because its software did not track low KW consumers (< 20 KW). As this consumer had a sanctioned load of only 19 KW, it did not fall under their radar. An inspection was carried out later, and the high load was discovered.

The Appellant consumed electricity with an average of 7,500 to 10,500 units per month for the period from April 2024 onwards for which retrospective recovery was done. The Appellant was enjoying unsanctioned additional load which falls under the higher tariff category LT- V B (20 to 50 KW) but was paying lower tariff rate. This amounts to


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai




unauthorized use of higher load for gaining undue benefit. The Respondent has issued a tariff difference recovery with 150% penalty of unauthorized KVA Demand.

13. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Authority holds that the Appellant had utilized connected load in the range of 25 to 35 kW, exceeding the sanctioned load of 19 kW in the Tariff Slab of 0 to 20 kW, without obtaining prior approval from the Respondent. The Respondent has raised the supplementary bill retrospectively for a period of one year, i.e., from April 2024 to March 2025. Accordingly, Issue A and Issue B are answered in the **Affirmative**.

14. Regarding Issue C, we hold that the bill amount has not been calculated or submitted in a transparent manner. Examining the calculations and considering the deficiency in service, we hold that including 150% penalty in the bill is not justified.

15. The order passed by the Forum is modified to the limited extent indicated herein below:
The Respondent is directed as under: -


- a) To revise the supplementary bill of Rs. 10,67,130/-for 92880 units from Apr.'24 to Mar' 25 by withdrawing KVA contract demand penalty of Rs. 28298/- per month which is levied while calculating bill. The interest and DPC levied if any be withdrawn till the date of this order while revising the bill.
- b) To allow the Appellant to pay the revised supplementary bill in twelve equal monthly instalments without any interest and Delayed payment charges. If the Appellant fails to pay any instalment, proportionate interest will accrue, and the Respondent has the liberty to take action as per law.
- c) The Appellant has to apply for additional load for regularization of unauthorized load on Web Self Service Portal with processing fee and all other necessary requirements. The Respondent is directed to release the applied load within 15 days after payment of statutory charges and formalities of test report etc.


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai



- d) Compliance to be submitted within two months from the date of issue of this order.
- e) Other prayers of the Appellant are rejected.
16. The Representation is disposed of accordingly.
17. The Secretariat of this office is directed to refund Rs. 25000/- paid by the Appellant to the Respondent for adjusting in the ensuing bill.

Sd/
(Vandana Krishna)
Electricity Ombudsman (Mumbai)


(Dilip Dumbre)
Secretary
Electricity Ombudsman Mumbai

