



Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Kalyan Zone
Behind "Tejashree", Jahangir Meherwanji Road, Kalyan (West) 421301
Ph: – 2210707 & 2328283 Ext: - 122

IN THE MATTER OF GRIEVANCE NO. K/ E/272/299 OF 2009-2010 OF
M/S.PRISHI ENTERPRISES, VASAI REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER
GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN ABOUT
EXCESSIVE BILLING.

M/s. Prishi Enterprises,
Gala No.24B,Shivam IndustrialEstate,
Village-Sativali,
Vasai(E),Dist.Thane

(Here-in-after
referred
as Consumer)

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution
Company Limited through its
Dy. Executive Engineer
Vasai Road (East) Sub-Dn.
Vasai, Dist. Thane.

(Here-in-after
referred
as licensee)

- 1) Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum has been established under "Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulation 2006" to redress the

grievances of consumers. This regulation has been made by the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission vide powers conferred on it by Section 181 read with sub-section 5 to 7 of section 42 of the Electricity Act, 2003. (36 of 2003).

- 2) The consumer is a L.T.-V > 20 KW consumer of the licensee with C. D. 54 KVA. The Consumer is billed as per Industrial tariff. Consumer registered grievance with the Forum on 26/06/2009 for Excessive Energy Bills. The details are as follows: -

Name of the consumer :- M/s.Prishi Enterprises

Address: - As given in the title

Consumer No : - 002170781654

Reason of dispute: Excessive Energy Bills.

- 3). The batch of papers containing above grievance was sent by Forum vide letter No EE/CGRF/Kalyan/588 dated 26/06/2009 to Nodal Officer of licensee. The licensee filed reply vide letter No. DYEE/VSI/(E)/B/5482, dated 13/07/2009.
- 4) The consumer has raised these grievances before the IGRC and the Executive Engineer (O&M) Division, MSEDCL, Vasai Division, on 13/04/2009. The said Internal Redressal Cell did not give any hearing to the consumer & also did not send any reply resolving the said grievances to the consumer. Therefore, the consumer has registered the present grievance before this forum on 26/06/2009.
- 5). The forum heard both the parties on 13/07/2009 @ 15.00 Hrs. in the meeting hall of the Forum's office. Shri Harshad Sheth, representative of the consumer & Shri S. B. Hatkar, A.A. representative of the licensee, attended hearing. Minutes of the hearing including the submissions made

by the parties are recorded and the same are kept in the record. Submissions made by each party in respect of each grievance shall be referred while deciding each of the grievances to avoid repetition.

- 6). The following grievances raised by the consumer in its letter dated 11/04/09 sent to the concerned Executive Engineer of which copy the consumer has attached with the grievance made before this forum, arise for consideration, and considering the reply dtd. 13/07/09 filed by the licensee, record produced by the parties, and submissions made by the parties, the finding or resolution on each of such grievance is given against it, for the given reasons.
- 7) As to grievance No. (1) (a) and Grievance No. (1) in Rejoinder dt. 15/07/09 – Regarding refund of P.F. penalty recovered in the bill for Sept. 08 : The consumer claims that in the bill for Aug. 08, KVAH reading is shown as Zero and then in the bill for Sept. 08, reading of KVAH for two months is shown and it resulted in reduction of PF to half i.e. 0.37 and wrong PF penalty of Rs. 19,629.64 is recovered and therefore, the licensee be directed to refund the said amount of PF penalty. As against this, the licensee claims that it will take review of the said PF penalty imposed on the consumer and action will be accordingly taken. It is clear from the bill for Aug. 08 that previous KVAH reading as on 05/07/08 was 355613.000 and the current KVAH reading as on 05/08/08 was 355613.000 and thus the total consumption in KVAH was zero and no PF penal charges were charged to the consumer. It is also clear from the bill for Aug. 08 that previous KVAH reading as on 05/08/08 was 355613.000 and the current KVAH reading as on 05/09/08 was 373166.000 and thus the total consumption in KVAH was 17553.000 and PF penal charges of Rs.

19,629.64 were charged to the consumer. It is thus clear that the licensee considered total consumption in KVAH of two months i.e. Aug. 08 and Sept. 08 for imposing PF penal charges in the bill for Sept. 08. Therefore, the possibility of excess charging of PF penal charges (penalty) cannot be ruled out. Therefore, the licensee is directed to retrieve the MRI report of the concerned meter of two months i.e. Aug. 08 and Sept. 08 and find out the correct consumption in KVAH in each of the said month and then recalculate the PF penal charges to be charged in each of the said month, and refund the excess PF penal charges recovered if any, together with interest at the Bank rate of RBI to the consumer by giving credit of such amount in the ensuing bill after a period of 30 days from the date of decision in this case.

- 8) As to grievance No. (1) (b) and Grievance No. (1) in Rejoinder dt. 15/07/09 – Regarding refund of excess fix charges and charges for excess demand penalty recovered in the bill for Sept. 08 : The consumer claims that the Officer of licensee did not reset the MD button and therefore, KVA reading continued to be higher and it resulted in charging of Rs. 1400 excess in fix charges, and licensee also recovered excess demand charges of Rs. 300, in the bill for Sept. 08 and therefore, the licensee be directed to refund the said total amount of Rs. 1700 recovered in excess. As against this the licensee claims that the MRI report will be retrieved and action will be taken accordingly. Therefore, the licensee is directed to retrieve the MRI report of the concerned meter for the month of Sept. 08, find out correct KVA reading of the said month and accordingly recalculate the fix charges for the said month and refund excess amount recovered if any, together with interest at the Bank rate of RBI to the consumer by giving credit of such

amount in the ensuing bill after a period of 30 days from the date of decision in this case.

- 9) It is clear from the bill for the month Sept. 08 that the licensee has charged Rs. 300 as charges for excess demand to the consumer. It is clear from the circular dt. 05/02/09 issued by the licensee that the licensee has directed refund of MD penalty imposed and collected till the date of the said circular. Therefore, the licensee is directed to refund the said amount of Rs. 300 recovered as excess MD penalty from the consumer in Sept. 08, together with interest at the Bank rate of RBI to the consumer by giving credit of such amount in the ensuing bill after a period of 30 days from the date of decision in this case.
- 10) As to grievance No. (1) (c) – Regarding the bills for Nov. 08 and Jan. 09 :
The consumer claims that the bills for Nov. 08 and Jan. 09 issued by the licensee are on the blank proforma without mentioning the details and therefore, it could not verify such charges. The licensee has given copy of the CPL of the period from May 04 to March 09 including the above referred two months to the licensee at the time of hearing in this case and therefore, the consumer can very well verify the correctness of the charges recovered in the said two months from the CPL of the concerned months. Therefore, this grievance stands resolved.
- 11) As to grievance No. (1) (d) and Grievance No. (1) in Rejoinder dt. 15/07/09 – Regarding refund of excess fix charges as per MD based tariff, PF penalty and demand penalty recovered during the period from Aug. 08 to March 09 : The consumer claims that the licensee has recovered total excess fix charges of Rs. 6500, PF penalty of Rs. 25,103.47 and demand penalty of Rs. 300, during the period from Aug. 08 to March 09, by illegally

applying MD based tariff from 1st Aug. 08 without completion of 100% work of installation of MD meters and therefore, the licensee be directed to refund the said above referred amount together with interest to the consumer. The consumer relies on order dt. 20/06/08 passed by MERC in case No. 72 of 2007, circular No. 81, dt. 07/07/08 and the order dt. 12/09/08 passed by MERC in case No. 44 of 2008 in support of its such contention. As against this, the licensee claims that on completion of 100% TOD metering and as per directions given in circular No. 81, dt. 07/07/08, MD based tariff is applied to the consumer from Aug. 08 i.e. at the rate of Rs. 100 per KVA per month for 65% of maximum demand or 40% of contract demand whichever is higher and charging of such charges is correct and hence the consumer is not entitled for any refund on this count.

- 12) As far as the consumer's prayer for refund of alleged excess fix charges and PF penalty charged by the licensee during the period from Aug. 08 to March 09 is concerned, it is an admitted fact that this Forum vide order dt. 18/03/09 in grievance application No. K/E/159/181 M/s. Crystal Industries V/s. MSEDCL upheld the action of licensee of applying MD based tariff from 1st Aug. 08 to the above 20 KW Industrial consumers and the consumer in the said case filed representation No. 33 of 2009 before the Hon. Electricity Ombudsman against the above referred decision of this Forum. The Hon. Electricity Ombudsman vide order dt. 6th May 09 in the above referred representation though rejected the contention of the consumer to the effect that the Commission has not yet allowed the licensee to start MD based tariff for LT-V Industrial consumers, relying on the circular dt. 05/02/09, issued by the licensee held that as per the said circular, the licensee, in spite of completion of 100% metering work, decided

to levy MD based tariff for LT-V Industrial consumers from April 09 and hence directed the licensee to refund the amount of MD charges collected over and above the fix charges recoverable as per tariff and also to withdraw PF penalty/incentive levied prior to April 09. It is also an admitted fact that the licensee challenged the above referred order of Hon. Electricity Ombudsman before the Hon. High Court vide Writ Petition No. 1273 of 2009 MSEDCL V/s. M/s. Crystal Industries. The licensee has filed copies of the petition filed by it before the Hon. High Court, affidavit in reply of the respondent No. (1), order dt. 17/07/09 passed by the Hon. High Court and the application dt. 31/07/09 filed by it for clarification of the above referred order dt. 17/07/09, in the said Writ Petition. The relevant extracts from the order dt. 17/07/09 passed by the Hon. High Court in the said Writ Petition reads as under :

“ We have heard the learned Counsel appear for the parties. In the order dt. 6th May 09 passed by the Electricity Ombudsman, it has been recorded as under :

“7. It is clear from the above that the respondent MSEDCL is
.....

8. As regards applicability of power factor penalty
.....

2. The Learned Counsel appearing for Respondent No. 1 has not been able to demonstrate before us by reference to any cogent documents on record that the Petitioner has failed to complete 100% installation of meters which was a condition precedent to the circular issued. It is further clear from the record that the petition has agreed to refund the penalty and not to charge penalty and they would be entitle to MD based TOD tariff. In these

circumstances afore-noticed, Rule. The operation of the order dt. 6th May 09 to remain stayed, but the Petitioner will not be entitle to charge any penalty and, in fact, if penalty recovered, shall be refunded or adjusted towards further bills.

- 13) It is thus clear from the above referred order that the Hon. High Court has stayed the effect and operation of the above referred order of Hon. Electricity Ombudsman regarding non applicability of MD based tariff and refund of PF with effect from 1st Aug. 2008 and the said question regarding applicability of MD based tariff and PF penalty with effect from 1st Aug. 08 is now for consideration before the Hon. High Court in the above referred Writ Petition. It is submitted by the representative of consumer (CR) that the licensee has sent a letter dt. 01/08/2008 to MERC informing that it has completed 100% metering work and therefore, is starting applying MD based tariff. Therefore, it should have charged the electric charges as per MD based tariff for the consumption in Aug. 08 in the bill for Sept. 08, but it has charged such electric charges as per MD based tariff in the bill for Aug. 08 naturally for the consumption in July 08 which it could not do and therefore, the licensee be directed to refund such excess fix charges charged in the bill for Aug. 08. He further submits that as per Regulation No. 12.2 of MERC (Electric Supply Code etc.) Regulations 2005, the licensee was suppose to give three months time after applying MD based tariff to the consumer to take effective measures to raise the average power factor or control harmonics of his installation to a value to less than such norms, in accordance with Regulation 12.1, after applying charges as per MD based tariff for the consumption in August 08 in the bill for Sept. 08. Therefore, the licensee could not have charged PF penalty for the months

of Oct. 08, Nov. 08 and Dec. 08 and therefore, PF penalty imposed by the licensee to the consumer in the said months be directed to be refunded to the consumer. He further submits that the above referred grounds for the refund of excess fix charges charged in the month of Aug. 08 and refund of PF penalty imposed during the period from Aug. 08 to Dec. 08 have not been pleaded in the above referred Crystal case and therefore, the said points are not under consideration of the Hon. High Court in the above referred Writ Petition. Therefore, this Forum can direct the refund of excess fix charges and PF penalty imposed by the licensee in the month of Aug. 08, and during the period from August 08 to Dec. 08, respectively. It is clear from the above discussion that the larger question about the legality of the applicability of MD based tariff to such consumers like the present consumer is under consideration before the Hon. High Court in the above referred Writ Petition, and though the consumer in the said Writ Petition did not raise the grounds raised by CR as above, the consumer in the said Writ Petition can very well raise these grounds in the said Writ Petition at the time of final hearing. As far as the question regarding PF penalty is concerned, though the Hon. High Court by the above referred order issued certain directions regarding the penalty recovered, the licensee has filed application for clarification of such directions and the said application is pending before the Hon. High Court. It is true that the present consumer is not party to the above referred Writ Petition before the Hon. High Court. However, the finding of Hon. High Court on the above referred point would be binding on the licensee and the licensee will have to follow such finding and other directions which the Hon. High Court may issue in that regard, to all consumers including the present consumer, and thus such finding and

directions will be applicable to all consumers including the present consumer. Moreover, if the present consumer wishes that it should be heard by the Hon. High Court in the said petition, it can apply for permission to be intervener in the said Petition. Therefore, in our considered view, it would not be proper for this Forum to consider the prayer of consumer for the refund of fix charges charged in Aug. 08 and PF penalty imposed from Aug. 08 to Dec. 08 at this stage and it would be proper to direct the consumer to file fresh grievance application about the same together with refund of fix charges and PF penalty recovered during further period, before this Forum, if necessary, within 60 days from the date of final decision of Hon. High Court in the above referred Writ Petition. Hence the consumer is directed accordingly.

- 14) As far as the prayer of consumer for the refund of demand penalty of Rs. 300 imposed in Sept. 08 is concerned, the same is already considered and decided while deciding grievance No. (1) (b).
- 15) As to grievance No. (2) - Regarding bill adjustment : The consumer claims that the licensee has added the debit bill adjustment charges of various amounts such as Rs. 1816.96, Rs. 1424.72, Rs. 3771.78 and Rs. 536.56 in the bills for Sept.07, Aug.07, March 07 and Jan. 07 respectively. The licensee should justify such adjustments and refund if the same are not justified. The licensee claims that the first amount is of TOSE for Sept. 05 to Feb. 06, second amount is of TOSE of the period from March 06 to Sept.06, third amount is of IASC charges for Jan.07 and the fourth amount is of tariff difference of Oct. 06/Nov. 06. The CR has relied upon the order dated 24th May 2005 passed by MERC in case No. 28 of 2004 in support of his contention that the licensee has earlier refunded the TOSE charged for

the above referred periods as per the above referred order, but has again charged the same as above without any further order of MERC about it. The licensee has not filed any such order of MERC passed after the above order which enabled it recharge the TOSE. In view of the facts as discussed above, the licensee is directed to give in writing an explanation as to how it has recharged TOSE as claimed particularly in reference to the order dated 24/05/2005 passed by MERC in case No. 28 of 2004, to the consumer within a period of 30 days & on failure to do so, or in case of unsatisfactory explanation, refund the excess amount if any, recovered as above first two amounts together with interest at the bank rate of RBI, by giving it's credit to the consumer in the ensuing bill after 30 days.

- 16) As far as the above referred third amount is concerned, the licensee claims that the same is as that of IASC charges for Jan. 07. It is clear from the order dated 17.09.08 passed by MERC in case No.45 that the MERC directed the licensee to refund the incremental ASC for the period Oct.06 to Apr 07 to all the consumers who have contributed towards ASC. It is clear from the CPL for Jan. 07 that the licensee has charged ASC to the consumer. The licensee claims that it has filed normal petition vide case No. 42, dt. 10/12/08 in respect of the concerned MERC's Order dt. 18/09/2008 in case No. 45. It has however, not filed copy of any such petition. Therefore, the licensee is directed to get any such petition filed by it before MERC decided within one month from the decision in this case, and on failure to do so or rejection of such Petition, refund the above referred amounts of IASC together with interest at the Bank rate of RBI to the consumer by giving credit of such amount in the ensuing bill after a period of two months from the date of decision in this case.

- 17) As far as the above referred fourth amount is concerned, the licensee claims that the said amount is of tariff difference of the months Oct. 06/Nov. 06. Thus the licensee has given proper explanation of the said amount and therefore, the consumer is not entitle for the refund of such amount. Therefore, such request of consumer is rejected.
- 18) As to grievance No. (3) - Regarding refund of IASC during the period Feb. 07 to May 07 : The consumer claims that the licensee is to refund IASC charges recovered during Feb. 07 to May 07 as per order dated 15.9.08 passed by MERC in case No.45 of 2005, and such amount is Rs. 1458.86, (Rs. 634.80 - Feb 07, Rs. 421.08 – Mar. 07 , Rs. 153.78 – Apr. 07, and Rs. 249.20 – May 07 i.e. total Rs. 1458.86) and therefore licensee be directed to refund the said amount to the consumer. The licensee claims that it has filed normal petition vide case No. 42, dt. 10/12/08 in respect of the concerned MERC's Order dt. 18/09/2008 in case No. 45. It has however, not filed copy of any such petition. Therefore, the licensee is directed to get any such petition filed by it before MERC decided within one month from the decision in this case, and on failure to do so or rejection of such Petition, refund the above referred amounts of IASC together with interest at the Bank rate of RBI to the consumer by giving credit of such amount in the ensuing bill after a period of two months from the date of decision in this case.
- 19) As to grievance (4) – Regarding refund of Excess SD & interest on SD : The consumer claims that the licensee gave the said connection to it in January 2004. The licensee has collected SD of Rs. 19,500/- + Rs. 11,700/- as additional S.D. = Rs. 31,200/- at the time of giving new connection but the bills till May 2008 were showing SD as NIL. Thereafter

the consumer paid Rs. 31,200 as additional SD. Therefore the licensee be directed to refund Rs. 31,200/- in the next billing cycle. The licensee be also directed to pay the interest of Rs.9,477/- on the total SD as per the calculation sheet annexed by the consumer. As against this, the licensee claims that the connection has been given on 24.01.2004 for 65 HP load. The Security Deposit of Rs. 19,500 and addl. SD of Rs. 11,700 i.e. total Rs. 31,200 paid at the time of connection is not displayed in the bills, the same will be displayed the in the bills and interest will be paid as per rules. Considering the average bill, keeping the deposit balance, excess SD will be refunded to the consumer on submission of the original receipts. In view of the above contentions of the parties, the licensee is directed to verify the correct amounts of SD from time to time from its record and the record with consumer, display the correct amounts of SD, calculate the proper SD at this stage & refund the excess amount of SD & the interest at Bank rate of RBI on such amounts of SD at the prevailing rate, by giving it's credit to the consumer, in the ensuing bill after a period 30 days from the date of decision in this case.

- 20) As to grievance No. (5) read with contention in para 3 of Rejoinder dt. 15/07/09 – Regarding refund of excess ASC in the bills for the months Nov. 06, April 07, May 07, June 07 to Oct. 07 and Nov. 07 : The consumer claims that the licensee has recovered excess ASC of Rs. 180.55, Rs. 267.95, Rs. 409.40, Rs. 5487.60 and Rs. 223.04 during the above referred months respectively by taking 5971 units as Benchmark Consumption (BC) wrongly instead of 6878 units as displayed in the bill for Nov. 07. As against this the licensee claims that the ASC charged during the above referred period is correct and therefore, the question of any refund to the

consumer on this count does not arise. It is clear from the copies of the bills for June 07, July 07, Oct. 07, Nov. 07 filed by the consumer that previous years average i.e. BC is mentioned as 5971 units in the said bills, whereas the copies of the bills for July 08 and June 08 filed by the consumer, the BC is shown as 6878 units for the period from Jan. 05 to Dec. 05. Therefore, the licensee is directed to inform in writing to the consumer as to how there is such difference of BC, mentioned in the bills for the months July 08, June 08 on one hand and in the bills for the above referred months in the year 2007 on the other hand, what was the correct BC for the period from Nov. 06 to Nov. 07 which should be calculated as average monthly consumption of the period from Jan. 05 to Dec. 05 from the bills for Feb. 05 to Jan. 06 within a month from the date of decision in this case, recalculate ASC which could be charged during the period from Nov. 06 to Nov. 07 on the basis of the above referred calculated BC and refund the excess ASC recovered from the said period if any, together with interest at the Bank rate of RBI, by giving credit of such amount to the consumer in the ensuing bill after a period of 30 days from the date of decision in this case.

- 21) As to grievance No. (6) – Regarding refund of difference of MD based charged and HP based charges from Oct.06 to Mar 07 : The consumer claims that the licensee was to refund an amount of Rs.11,584.13 on this count as the charges of the relevant period were reverted back to the HP based tariff from MD based fix charges, due to non completion of installation of MD meters in entire Maharashtra. The licensee however refunded an amount of Rs. 8065.32 only. Therefore the licensee be directed to refund the remaining amount of Rs. 3518.81 with interest. As against this, the licensee claims that it has refunded an amount of Rs.

8065.32 in May 07 and the balance amount in June 2009. The licensee, however, did not produce on record CPL of the said month or any other document to show that it has really paid such remaining amount to the consumer. Therefore the licensee is directed to again verify as to whether it has paid such remaining amount on this count to the consumer and if not, refund such remaining amount together with interest at the bank rate of RBI to the consumer by giving its credit to the consumer in the ensuing bill after period of 30 days from the date of decision in this case.

- 22) As to grievance No. (2) as per Rejoinder dt. 15/07/09 – Regarding refund of Rs. 941.37 charged as DPC & Interest in the bill for the month of Feb. 09 :
The consumer claims that the bill for Jan. 09 was not issued and therefore, the consumer collected hand written bill of the said month personally from the Sub-Division office and paid the amount but the licensee charged Rs. 941.37 as DPC and interest and added the same as arrears. Bill date and due date were not given to the consumer. It was mistake of the licensee. Therefore, the licensee be directed to refund the said amount of Rs. 941.37 to the consumer. The consumer has raised such grievance in it's rejoinder dt. 15/07/09. The say of licensee to the said rejoinder including this grievance could not be obtained as the consumer has raised it in it's rejoinder dt. 15/07/09 filed on 16/07/09, after the hearing on 13/07/09. Moreover, CPL for the month Jan. 09 shows that the bill for the said month was for Rs. 47,108.50 and the date of the said bill was 1st Jan. 09. The CPL for Feb. 09 shows that the consumer has deposited an amount of Rs. 47,108 on 31/01/09 as per the said bill dt. 01/01/09 for Jan. 09. The consumer has not filed copy of bill for Jan. 09 given to him to show that it was hand written one without date of issue and due date. However,

normally the consumers are given about two weeks to pay the bills from the date of bill and considering the said fact, it is clear that the consumer has deposited the amount of the said bill for Jan. 09 after due date and therefore, prima facie, the licensee was justified in charging DPC and interest in the bill for next month i.e. Feb. 09. Therefore, the consumer is not entitled for refund of such amount of Rs. 941.37 charged as DPC and interest as claimed and hence his request for the same is rejected.

- 23) In view of the findings on the grievances of the consumer as above, the forum unanimously passes the following order.

O-R-D-E-R

- 1) The grievance application is partly allowed.
- 2) The licensee to comply the directions given in above para Nos. 07 to 09, 14 to 16 and 18 to 21.
- 3) The grievance No. 1 (c) stands resolved as observed in para 10.
- 4) The grievance Nos. 1 (d) and Grievance No. 1 in Rejoinder dt. 15/07/09 are not considered and the consumer is at liberty to file fresh grievance application in respect of such grievances within 60 days from the date of final decision of Hon. High Court in Writ Petition No. 1273 of 2009 MSEDCL V/s. M/s. Crystal Industries as observed in para 13.
- 5) Prayer of consumer for refund of an amount of Rs. 536.56 claimed in Grievance No. 2 is rejected.
- 6) Grievance No. 2 in Rejoinder dt. 15/07/09 is rejected.
- 7) The Compliance should be reported to the forum within 90 days from the date of decision.

8) The Consumer can file representation against this decision with the Ombudsman at the following address.

“Office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission, 606/608, Keshav Building, Bandra Kurla Complex, Mumbai 51”

Representation can be filed within 60 days from the date of this order.

9). Consumer, as per section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003, can approach Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission at the following address:-

“Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission, 13th floor, World Trade Center, Cuffe Parade, Colaba, Mumbai 05”

for non-compliance, part compliance or delay in compliance of this decision issued under “Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulation 2003”

Date : 24/08/2009

(Sau V. V. Kelkar)
Member
CGRF Kalyan

(R.V.Shivdas)
Member Secretary
CGRF Kalyan

(M.N.Patale)
Chairman
CGRF Kalyan