



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/180/204 OF 2009-2010 OF
M/S. SANDEEP ENGINEERING, VASAI REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER
GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN ABOUT
EXCESSIVE BILLING.

M/s. Sandeep Engineering Gala No.G-1, Sheetal Indl.Camp.No.1 Waliv Road, Gokhiware Vasai (E), Dist.Thane 421 208	}	(Here-in-after referred as Consumer)
---	---	--

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited through its Dy. Executive Engineer Vasai Road (East) Sub-Division	}	(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 above 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 17/02/2009 for Excessive Energy Bill. The details are as follows: -
Name of the consumer :- M/s. Sandeep Engineering
Address: - As given in the title
Consumer No : - 001590795417
Reason of dispute: Excessive Energy Bill.
- 3). The batch of papers containing above grievance was sent by Forum vide letter No EE/CGRF/Kalyan/136 dated 17/02/2009 to Nodal Officer of licensee. The licensee filed reply vide letter No. DYEE/VSI/(E)/B/2437, dated 17/02/2009 and also filed CPL of the period from May 06 to Dec.06, Feb.07 to Mar 09.
- 4) The consumer has raised these grievances before the Executive Engineer (O&M) Division, MSEDCL., Vasai Division, on 16/12/08. 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 17/02/2009.

5). The Members of the Forum heard both the parties on 26/03/2009 @ 15.00 Hrs. in the meeting hall of the Forum's office. Shri Harshad Sheth, representative of the consumer & Shri M.K. Rathod, Jr.Engineer, Shri R.G. Gharat, UDC, representatives of the licensee attended hearing.

6). Illegal MD based tariff.:

The CR submits that the licensee has charged MD based tariff to the consumer without 100% metering and its such action is illegal. He relies on zerox copy of operative order dtd.20.6.08 of MERC in case No.72 of 2007, MSEDCL circular No.81 dt.7.7.08 in support of his such contention. He further submit that as per order dated 12.9.08 of MERC in case 44 of 2008, the licensee can not impose MD based fixed charges, PF penalty and demand penalty/incentive without MD based tariff being made applicable to the concerned consumer but in the instant case, the licensee has applied the above charges or penalties without MD based tariff being applicable to it and hence such action of licensee is illegal. He further submit that thus the licensee has violated the Act, rules and orders of MERC and hence is liable for action under section 142 and 146 of the Electricity Act 2003. He further submits that therefore the licensee be directed to refund the amounts of such illegally recovered charges together with interest at the rate which it applies to the defaulting consumer.

-As against above contention, the LR submits that the licensee has applied MD based tariff from Aug.08 on completion of 100% TOD metering and as per directives given in Clause 10.5 of Com. Circular

No.81 dt.7.7.08. He therefore submits that whatever charges based on MD based tariff, are recovered by the licensee from the consumer are correct and legal and therefore the question of refunding the same to the consumer does not arise.

- 7). The CR further submits that for billing period from Jul.08 to Sept.08, the licensee has charged MD fix Rs.2200 instead of Rs.1950 and for Oct.08 Rs.2300 instead of 1950. The licensee be directed to refund Rs.1100/- MD fix charge and PF penalty of Rs.31,602.62 along with interest as charge to consumer. As against this , the LR submits that the bills issued in Aug.08 to Nov.08 are correct. Hence the question of refund does not arise.
- 8). The CR further submits that the licensee has shown bill adjustment of Rs.297.32 for the billing period Aug.07, Rs.55.89 for Jun 07 and Rs.1079.08 for Feb.07. The licensee should give details and reasons for levying such charges and if not justified, the amount of Rs.1432.29 may be refunded alongwith interest as charged to defaulting consumer. He further submits that MERC directed the licensee to stop to recover TOSE etc. but the licensee subsequently has recovered the TOSE amount refunded earlier and again started charging TOSE. Such action of Licensee is illegal. As against this, the LR submitted that in Sept.07 Rs.297.32 was charged towards TOSE @ 4\5 4 NP P/U from March 06 to Sept.06, in Jul.07 Rs.55.89 towards tariff adjustment and Mar.07 Rs.1-79.08 towards current bill adjustment. The LR submits that the said charges are levied as per Commercial Circulars. However, the said fact shall be again verified.

- 9). The CR submitted that while taking connection in Mar 06, the consumer paid Rs.31,200/- as SD but bill was showing SD as Nil upto May 08. Thereafter the consumer paid Addl. SD of Rs.18,140/- but bills are showing total SD amount as Rs.37,640/- from Aug.08. The consumer is also entitle for the interest on SD of Rs.31,200/- from Mar 06 to May 08 and interest on Rs.11.700/- from Jun 08 to Nov.08. Such total interest comes to Rs.4563 The said interest be compounded on yearly basis and after adding in principle, respective year interest may be calculated and refunded. In reply, the LR submits that the security deposits paid at the time of connection (28.3.06) and subsequently are not displayed in the bills. The same will be displayed in May 08. The interest from Mar 08 to May 08 will be paid as per rules.
- 10). The CR submits that total deposit comes $19500 + 11700 + 18140 =$ Rs.49,340/- out of which , keeping present SD displayed amount of Rs.37,640/-, balance Rs.11,700/- may be refunded in single stroke as per tariff booklet. As against this, LR submitted that considering the average bills, the balance amount of SD will be refunded for which original receipts are required to be submitted by the consumer.
- 11). The CR submits that the ASC for new consumer i.e. who has become consumer at any time after Jan.05 , should be calculated and charged as per MSEDCL's Com.Cir.No.62 letter No.PR-3/tariff/34883 dt.10.09.07, issued on the basis of clarificatory order dt. 24.08.07 point No.6, Section (iii), as under :

“ For first 18 months, there will be no benchmark / ref. consumption & ASC will be levied at the stipulated proportion. The average consumption during the 13th to 18th month should be taken as benchmark consumption for levying ASC from 19th month onwards. He further submits that as per chart Annexed by the consumer, the benchmark consumption comes to 4231 units per month. (A.9). He further submits that considering 4231 units as benchmark consumption, the ASC charged by the licensee to the consumer for Oct.06, May 07 to Oct.07 has been excessive and therefore the licensee is liable to refund such excess amount of ASC of Rs.3946.02 to the consumer. As against this, L.R. submits that after scrutiny of the case, the bills will be revised and refund will be given, if applicable.

- 12). The CR submits that the incremental ASC charged during the period Oct.06 to Apr.07 is to be refunded as per the MERC order in case of No.45 of 2007 dt.17.9.08. He further submits that the consumer is entitled for total refund of Rs.898.22 towards excess incremental ASC charged during the period from Jan.07 to Apr 07. ... As against this, the LR submits that after confirmation from IT section regarding refund of IASC, suitable reply will be given. However, he did not file such further reply till this date.
- 13). The CR submits that the licensee had to refund difference of MD based charges and HP based charges of the period from Oct.06 to Mar 07 amounting to Rs.11,584.13. The licensee should verify as to how much

amount it had refunded, give its details refund excess amount, if any. In reply to this, the LR submits that the MD based tariff charged from Oct.06 to Mar 07 has been refunded in Jan.07 and May 07. On this CR submits that MERC gave instructions in May 07, how then the licensee could have refunded it in Jan.07.

- 14). The C.R. submitted a rejoinder dt.26.3.09 i.e. on the date of hearing. He submits that for Nov.08 bill, the licensee has charged PF penalty with wrong meter reading. Meter was activated in Dec.07. Since then it was not displaying KVAH reading. Same reading of 99172 was displaying from Dec.07 to Oct.08 and then false reading of 153088 was fed to computer or meter data collecting instrument was faulty. KW divided by KVAH was fed wrongly and PF of 0.15 was shown.
- 15) The CR further submits that for Sept.08 and Oct.08, consumption shown Zero and in Nov.08 combined consumption is shown and then on accumulated charges of 3 months, PF of Rs. .31,602.62 was charged . Penalty starts from 0.9 less 0.15 + 1% = 76 % of charges. Therefore charging of such PF on accumulated consumption of three months is illegal and it is a result of fault of meter reader, IT dept. and billing section. He therefore submit that the consumer is entitle for refund of the said amount of Rs.31,602.62 from licensee.
- 16). The CR further submits the consumer has given complaint regarding above illegalities on 25.11.08 with zero copies of entire period bills. Check reading report taken on 26.11.08 shows PF as 0.43. No cognizance of the above complaint was taken the licensee and officerf

of the licensee threaten disconnection in case the bill is not paid. The consumer claims for (a) refund of PF penalty, (b) interest for the default period of 4 months (c) compensation as per MERC regn.2005 for not taking reading at least once in 2 months. (d) diff. of amount from meter reader as per MSEDCL cir No.50 dt.22.08.06 (e) Compensation of Rs.2000/- for such mental harassment, physical running to give complaint calling and paying the electrician charges, take technical opinion on the matter and paying for it, get check reading report, documentation etc (f) if PF penalty refund with interest is not complied in coming billing cycle, it may be a violation of IE Act 2003, MERC Act, Rules and Regulations.

17). The grievances of the consumer are :

- a) Illegal MD based tariff to LT V above 20 KW con.
- b). Amount collected under – Bill adjustment (no explanation)
- c). SD collected Rs.19,500/- + 11700/- but adjusted in bill Rs.19,500/- only. Balance Rs.11,700/- be refunded alongwith interest (as per statement enclosed)
- d). Supply given in Mar 06. So ASC to charge as per MSEDCL Cir.62 dt.10.9.07 (upto 18 months, ASC on actual cons. And thereafter on 6 month average from 13 to 18th month. But ASC charged irrationally. So difference to refund as per details on very bill submitted.
- e). Incremental ASC collected is not refunded as per order of MERC in case No. 45.

- f). Less refund of MD fixed charge during Oct.06 to Feb.07
 - g). C.P.L. not given.
- 18). The consumer sought the following reliefs from this forum:
- a). Illegal and excess amount collected as per his submission to be refunded.
 - b). Interest should be given by MSEDCL as they charge to the consumer on default amount.
 - c). SD + extra amount paid + unpaid interest to refund
 - d). MERC order is violated. Get assurance that it is not violated repeatedly or E. Act 2003 sections to be invoked.
 - e). Interest on refund for default delayed period be given.
 - f). Compensation of Rs.5000/- for misleading adjustment of SD of only Rs.19,500/- whereas SD of Rs.19,500/- + Rs.11,700/- is issued as one single receipt.
- 19). Forum observations: The consumer attached a copy of letter dated 15.12.08 sent by it to the Executive Engineer by way of grievance, to the grievance in prescribed proforma filed before this forum to show details of his grievances and the licensee also in its reply dtd.25.3.09, replied the said grievances given in the letter dtd.15.12.08, one after another and therefore the grievances of the consumer shall be considered one after another as mentioned in the said letter dtd.15.12.08.
- 20). As to grievance No.(a to g)- Alleged illegal and excess MD charges: -
(View of Mrs. V. V. Kelkar, Member) As per licensee's reply on the subject referring circular No.81, clause No.10.5, they stated that the "the MD based tariff is applied to consumer from Aug.08." Clause No.10.5 is as follows:

“MSEDCL is thus allowed to charge MD based tariff immediately on completion of 100% metering. All Zonal Chief Engineers to immediately inform the IT centre under their jurisdiction about such completion and may also send certificate immediately to that effect to Chief Engineer (Dist).

The clause clearly states that after completion of the 100% metering the Zonal Chief Engineers are required to immediately inform IT centres under their jurisdiction about such completion for the change in charges of MD based tariff.

The licensee did not submit any letter / reply regarding above subject till to-day. Under the above circumstances I come to the conclusion that as the licensee is not able to substantiate this statement of 100% metering completion of their area, I also have a meter replacement report submitted by the licensee in another similar case No.K/E/177/201 M/s. Maharashtra Pencil Factory, which indicates that the Electro Mechanical meter was replaced by static meter (Secure make) on 05/02/09. The date of replacement of meter is much later as compared to the period of grievance, in the present case. This confirms that the licensee has not installed the meter 100% (As per circular dated 5.2.09). Therefore the work is not yet completed and hence they can not charge MD tariff to the consumer from 05.07.08 to 05.08.08. The excess amount charged under this tariff from the consumer should be adjusted in the bills, with interest @ RBI Bank rate at rate prevailing at the date of decision of the forum.

(i) (a) As far as the grievance of consumer to the effect that the Licensee has recovered electric charges as per M. D. based tariff for the month of August 08 illegally is concerned Shri Shivdas, Member Secretary, differed from the above view taken by Sau. V. V. Kelkar, Member and therefore, the view taken and the reasons given by him for such view are separated recorded as under.

(i) (b) Para 47 of the Operative Order dt. 20/06/2008 of MERC in Case No. 72/2007, on the basis of which the licensee/MSEDCL issued Commercial Circular No. 81, dt. 07/07/08, reads as under
“47. In line with Commission’s ruling in the MYT order, since MSEDCL is yet to achieve 100% MD metering for LTV industrial consumers above 20 KW (around 97% completion has indicated by MSEDCL till date), the MD tariffs for LTV industrial consumers will not be made effective. Till the MD meters are installed, MSEDCL will be allowed to charge only the earlier HP based tariffs, though the revenue has been assessed based on MD based tariffs”.

It is clear from the above order that while passing the said order or giving the said directions, MERC relied on the report about completion of 97% given by MSEDCL/licensee, without insisting for proof about it. It is clear from Clause No. 10.5 in commercial circular No. 81, dt. 07/07/2008 issued by the MSEDCL/licensee, reproduced in above para 18 (i) that in view of the above referred order in para 47 of order dt. 20/06/2008 of MERC in case No. 72/2007, the MSEDCL/licensee issued directives to all Zonal Engineers to immediately inform IT centres under

their jurisdiction about such completion and further directed that they may also send a certificate immediately to that effect to Chief Engineer (Dist). The MSEDCL/licensee through Dy. Executive Engineer, MSEDCL Vasai Road (E) S/Dn. vide say cum letter dt. 9/2/2009, claims that on completion of 100% TOD metering and as per the directives given in circular No. 81, clause No. 10.5, the MD based tariff is applied to the consumer from August 2008. Moreover, the licensee in it's circular No. PR-3/Tariff, dt. 05/02/2009 clearly stated that the MSEDCL has completed the 100% work of installation of TOD meters to LTV industries having load more than 20 KW. MSEDCL is a public institute and therefore, the same or it's officers have no personal interest to falsely say that 100% TOD metering was completed and therefore MD based tariff is applied to the concerned consumers i.e. LTV Industries above 20 KW consumers. Under such circumstances, in my opinion, it would not be proper to insist for filing of documents about 100% completion of TOD metering. Therefore I accept the contention of MSEDCL that 100% TOD metering was completed by the end of July 2008.

- (i) (c) It is clear from the provisions of 3.4.1 of Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code & other conditions of Supply) Regulations, 2005 that MSEDCL/licensee can recover charges for the electricity supplied as per the tariffs fixed by the Commissioner (MERC) from time to time. It is clear from the order dated 20/06/2008, passed by MERC in case No. 72 of 2007 that the Commission (MERC) fixed tariffs for LT-V industries above 20 KW

consumers on HP basis as well as on MD TOD basis with a direction that the TOD tariff shall be applicable after installation of MD meters. It is true that as per para 47 in the said order, the Commission (MERC) at that time allowed the licensee to charge as per earlier HP based tariffs but it was because at that time the licensee reported that the work of MD metering was completed to the extent of 97% only. It is further made clear in the said para 47 of the said order that till the MD meters are installed, MSEDCL will be allowed to charge only the earlier HP based tariffs. Moreover, the fact that the Commission (MERC) in the said order also fixed & finalized the MD tariff or TOD tariff clearly show that the licensee was permitted to charge electricity charges as per the MD metering or TOD metering immediately after completion of 100% work of installation of MD meters, as clearly stated in the Commercial circular No. 81, dt. 07/07/2008 by the licensee. In view of this, and since in my opinion the licensee has already completed 100% installation of MD meters as discussed above, in my opinion the licensee has correctly charged the electricity charges to the consumer as per MD tariff and therefore, such charging cannot be said to be illegal as alleged by the consumer. Moreover in my opinion, the consumer should have approached the Commission (MERC) for his such grievance instead of this forum, as the Commission (MERC) is the Competent Authority to decide as to whether the licensee has applied the tariff correctly. For all above reasons, the consumer is not entitled for refund of or adjustment of any amount on such count. Hence I hold accordingly.

21)(i) Clause 8.1 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum) & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations 2006, reads as under :

"On completion of proceedings conducted under Regulation 6, except where the forum consist of a single member, the forum shall take a decision by majority of votes of the members of the forum & in the even of equality of voles, the Chairperson shall have the second & casting vote."

It is clear from the above clause 8.1 of the Regulations 2006 that the Chairperson has been given a second or casting vote, in case of equality of votes, & it clearly means such equality of votes is meant to be equality of the votes of other two members.

(i)(a) In the instant case, there has been difference of opinion or view amongst two members, & therefore, Shri M. N. Patale, as a chairperson will have to give the second or casting vote & the view out of the different views taken by two members, seconded by Shri M. N. Patale Chairperson will become the view of the majority & hence such view will be the decision of the forum.

(i)(b) Shri M.N. Patale, after giving due consideration to the different views expressed by two members as above, approves or supports the view taken by Shri R. V. Shivdas to the effect that considering the tariff order issued by the Commission (MERC) & circular No. 81 issued by the licensee, read with the circular dated 05/02/2009 referred & other facts discussed by him it is clear that the

licensee has completed 100% installations of meters & therefore correctly recovered the electric charges as per MD tariff or TOD tariff from the consumer & therefore the consumer is not entitled for any refund or adjustment of any amount on such ground.

- 22). As to grievance (h): The consumer claims that the licensee has shown the amounts of Rs.297.32, Rs.55.89, Rs.1079.08. As the amounts of bill adjustments in the bills for the months of Aug.07, Jun 07 and Feb.07 respectively. The licensee should give details of the said amount and also the reasons for levying such charges and if not justified, the licensee be directed to refund such total amounts of Rs.1432.29 to the consumer. The licensee claim that the above referred amounts are charged as TOSE @ 4% per unit from Mar 06 to Set.06, tariff adjustments and current bill adjustments respectively. Thus the licensee has given the reason for charging of first amount but not given the detail reasons for charging the other two amounts. Therefore the licensee is directed to give detail reasons for charging the amounts of Rs.5589 and Rs.1079.08 to the consumer in writing within a period 60 days from the date of this decision, failing which to refund the said amounts by giving its credit to the consumer in the ensuing bills thereafter.
- 23). As to grievance (I & j) – The consumer claims that it had paid SD of Rs.31,200/- at the time of taking new connection in Mar 06, but the electric bills upto May 08 do not show any such amounts as SD. He further claims that thereafter it had paid addl. SD of Rs.18,140/-. However, the electric bills from Aug.08 show Rs.37640/- as total SD. He

further claims that it is entitle for interest on the SD amount of 31200/- from Mar 06 to May 08 and on Rs.11700/- from Jun 08 to Nov.08. He further claim that it is entitle for such total interest of Rs.4,563/- and that the same be compounded on yearly basis and after adding the same in the principle, respective year interest may be calculated and the licensee be directed to refund such total amount. He further claims refund of excess SD of Rs.11700/- after keeping the displayed amount of Rs.37,640/- as SD amount. As against this, the licensee claim that the connection has been give 28.3.06. The total SD amount of Rs.31200/- is not displayed in the bills and the same will be displayed in the bill for May 08 and that the interest from Mar 08 to May 08 will be paid as per rules. Therefore the licensee is directed to confirm the exact amounts of SD from its record and the receipts or other record from the consumer and if necessary by taking the affidavit or indemnity bond as per rules from the consumer, calculate interest @ prevailing at the prevalent time and its credit to the consumer, recalculate the proper SD amount at this stage and give the credit of excess SD amount to the consumer, and also display the correct SD amount, in the ensuing bills after a period of 60 days from the date of this decision.

- 24). As to grievance (k) - In view of the say of the licensee to this grievance, the licensee is directed to recalculate the proper ASC to be charged to the consumer in the months of Oct.06, May 07 to Aug.07 and Oct.07 after calculating the benchmark consumption as given in Sub-clause iii of clause-6 in the MSEDCL's Commercial Circular No.62 dt.10.9.07 and

refund the recovered excess amount, if any, by giving its credit to the consumer within a period of 60 days from the date of this decision.

- 25). As to grievance (l) – Refund of excess incremental ASC. The licensee has not filed reply to the contention of consumer in this respect. Though undertake to file the same after confirmation from IT section in its reply dtd.25.3.09. Therefore the licensee is directed to verify the exact incremental ASC recovered from the consumer during the period from Oct.06 to Apr 07, whether any amount on such count has been refunded to the consumer, and then refund excess amount, if any, together with interest @ bank rate of RBI, from the date of recovery till such refund /credit , by giving its credit to the consumer in the ensuing bills after 60 days from the date of decision in this case.
- 26). As to grievance (m) - The contention of licensee that the difference of MD based charges and HP based charges of the period from Oct.06 to Mar 07 has been paid in Jan.07 and May 07 appears to be incorrect since such difference was directed to be paid by MERC in May 07. Therefore, the licensee is directed to verify from its record as to whether any such amount has been refunded to the consumer as such difference, total amount of such difference to which the consumer is entitle as per directions given by MERC, and refund excess amount, if any, together with interest @ bank rate of RBI from the date of recovery till the date of payment/credit, by giving its credit to the consumer in the ensuing bills, after a period of 60 days from the date of decision in this case.

- 27). Grievance regarding PF penalty: - On perusal of copies of the bills (A.5a to d) and other bills of the period from 02.01.08 to 04.11.08, it is clear that the licensee has charged PF penalty to the consumer in the billing period of 6.10.08 to 4.11.08, and that the previous reading and the present of the KVAH in all bills for 2.1.08 to 2.2.08, 2.2.08 to 3.3.08, 3.3.08 to 4.4.08, 5.7.08 to 5.8.08, 5.8.08 to 5.9.08, and 5.9.08 to 5.10.08, are shown as 99172. The bill for the period 6.10.08 to 4.11.08, shows the previous readings in respect of KVAH as 99172 and the present reading about it as 153088. It does appear that the said present reading of 153088 given in the bill for 6.10.08 to 4.11.08 is a cumulative reading of the period from 2.1.08. Therefore the PF calculated on the basis of such reading of KVAH given in the bill for the period 6.10.08 to 4.11.08 is obviously wrong and it resulted in excess charging of PF penalty to the consumer. Therefore the licensee is directed to retrieve MRI reports of the period from Jan.08 to Nov.08, and find out exact KVAH readings for said respective months and decide about the PF if leviable to the consumer from the month of Aug.08 onwards and refund excess amount, if recovered, together with interest @ bank rate of RBI from the date of recovery till the date of refund/credit, by giving its credit to the consumer in the ensuing bills within 60 days from the date of this decision.
- 28). The request of the consumer for compensation: Considering the fact that the consumer is being granted interest on the amounts for the refund of which he is entitled, his request for compensation is rejected.

- 29). There has been No. of holidays and consequently less working days during this month. There has also been sudden increase in registration of grievances by the consumers before this forum since last two months, as result of which this forum is forced to hear arguments in two cases on every day and also to decide such a cases at the same rate. Therefore, there has been 11 days delay in deciding this case.
- 30) In view of the majority view on the point of MD based tariff, and unanimous findings on other points, the forum pass the following order.

O-R-D-E-R

- 1) Prayer of consumer for the refund of the amount of electric charges recovered by licensee as per MD based tariff or TOD based tariff, Demand Charges. is rejected.
- 2) The licensee to comply the directions given in above para Nos.
- 3) Compliance should be reported to the forum within 90 days from the date of decision.
- 4) Consumer can file representation against this decision with the Ombudsman at the following address.

*“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.

- 5) Consumer, as per section 142 of the Electricity Act, 003, 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 : 27/04/2009

(Sau V. V. Kelkar)
Member
CGRF Kalyan

(R.V.Shivdas)
Member Secretary
CGRF Kalyan

(M.N.Patale)
Chairman
CGRF Kalyan