

**Before Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.'s
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum
Nagpur Urban Zone, Nagpur**

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/093/2006

Applicant : Late Shri Dayaram Otanmal Dewani,
D/H Shri Pratap Dayaram Dewani,
At 99, Jaripatka,
Nagpur.

Non-Applicant : The Nodal Officer-
Executive Engineer,
Civil Lines, Division,
Nagpur representing the MSEDCL.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri S.D. Jahagirdar,
Chairman,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum,
Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

2) Smt. Gouri Chandrayan,
Member,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum,
Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

3) Shri M.S. Shrisat
Exe. Engr. & Member Secretary,
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
NUZ, MSEDCL, Nagpur.

ORDER (Passed on 20.02.2006)

The present grievance application has been filed on 16-01-2006 under Regulation 6.3 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2003 here-in-after referred-to-as the said Regulations.

The grievance of the applicant is in respect of allegedly improper disconnection of his power supply and also in respect of allegedly improper and illegal theft assessment pertaining to his CT meter bearing no. 8000051428 worked out way back in June, 2003.

In this case, the applicant had filed appeal, being appeal no. A-599/05 before the Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Maharashtra State, Mumbai here-in-after referred to as the State Commission against the Order dated 17.02.2005 passed by the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Nagpur hereinafter referred-to-as the District Forum under the provisions of Consumer Protection Act, 1986. This appeal before the State Commission was withdrawn by the present applicant with permission to approach this Forum. The State Commission, upon hearing the matter, allowed withdrawal of appeal before it and directed both the parties to appear before this Forum. It is in view of this position that the present grievance application came to be filed by the present applicant in terms of the said Regulations.

The matter was heard by us on 10.02.2006 & 13.02.2006.

The applicant has contended that he is the owner of the premises known as "Fun n Food" in which a small restaurant and a Cyber café was being run. The restaurant of the consumer was opened way back in May, 2001. Earlier, a regular electricity meter was installed in the said premises

which was replaced by a CT meter bearing no. 8000051428 on 24.12.2002.

He added that this CT meter was working in an erratic manner right from its installation. Some times this meter was showing excessive readings and some other time, it showed abnormally less reading. The first bill of the said CT meter for the period from 24.12.2002 to 31.03.2003 showed consumption of zero units. Thereafter, second bill for the period from 31.03.2003 to 30.04.2003 suddenly showed consumption of 6545 units and a bill amounting to Rs. 37,592/- came to be issued which was abnormally excessive. Citing these two examples, the contention of the applicant is that the said CT meter was showing incorrect readings.

Being aggrieved by the excessive billing, the applicant made a complaint on 22.05.2003 to the concerned Assistant Engineer of the non-applicant Company. The applicant, thereafter, personally met the Assistant Engineer on 31.05.2003 who asked him to make payment of amount of Rs. 25,000/- against the disputed bill of Rs.37,592/- which the applicant paid under protest on 03.06.2003. A complaint was also lodged by him with the Head Office of the non-applicant on 03.06.2003.

He further submitted that the said CT meter showed abnormally low consumption of only 185 units during the period from 30.03.2003 to 31.05.2003 which was a peak summer month. According to him, the said meter CT meter

was faulty became clear from the aforesaid abnormally low energy bill only for 185 units. The applicant brought this fact to the notice of the non-applicant's Officer by filing his complaint dated 09.06.2003 which was duly received by him on 10.06.2003. He also brought to the notice of the MSEB official that since his restaurant was not doing good business, his consumption of electricity was very less and that there was no necessity of CT meter which, according to him, was apparently not working properly. He also requested for installation of a parallel meter to testify correctness of his complaint. It is his strong contention that this conduct shows his honesty and bonafides.

He added that no steps were taken on his complaint and his grievance continued. He had also given a copy of his complaint dated 09.06.2003 to the Electrical Inspector which was duly received by his office on 16.06.2003.

He vehemently argued that in the backdrop of the aforesaid events, his CT meter came to be inspected, all of sudden on 17.06.2003 by the Flying Squad of the non-applicant Company, erstwhile MESB. The Flying Squad prepared inspection report on 17.06.2003 without any justification and without bringing any panchas and without following any provision of law, much less provisions of Electricity Act, 2003.

The applicant has denied all the observations of the Flying Squad. The allegations in the Flying Squad's inspection report dated 17.06.2003 that the applicant's CT

meter was tampered with and that secondary wire S-1 and B-phase CT meter were found broken and there was no current in Y and B phase etc are all denied by the applicant. Since the inspection report was not proper and correct, the applicant signed the inspection report with a specific remark that its contents were not correct and that he was signing the report under protest. It is his say that there was nothing abnormal detected in the functioning of the said CT meter.

According to him, the Inspecting Officer was not sure about the allegations made and, therefore, he did not prefer to seize the meter then and there only and he also did not comply with various formalities as required in law. Subsequently, by twisting the facts, a Police complaint was lodged about alleged theft of electricity and the applicant was wrongly charged in the complaint for offence punishable under sections 39 and 44 of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910.

The applicant has termed this action of the non-applicant as highhanded.

He is also disputing the quantum of theft assessment done by the non-applicant. In that, he submits that a false allegation was made against him that he had committed theft of electricity since last 36 months till 17.06.2003 causing a loss Rs. 8,06,152/- to the non-applicant. No details of any kind, whatsoever, as to how the figure of theft assessment was arrived at were given to him despite requests. His power supply was disconnected on

18.06.2003 without following due procedure of law and without giving any prior notice to him.

According to him, provisions of law do not permit the MSEB official to make the allegation without affording opportunity of hearing to him and that the conclusion that there was theft of electricity causing loss of Rs. 8,06,152/- was unjust and illegal.

Pursuant to the non-applicant's complaint, an offence came to be registered against him. The applicant's CT meter was seized by the non-applicant on 18.06.2003.

The applicant also complained to Electrical Inspector, Nagpur by filing his complaint dated 19.06.2003 denying therein allegation of theft. He also complained about the improper disconnection of his power supply.

The applicant, thereafter, wrote a letter to the Chief Engineer, MSEB, NUZ, Nagpur on 21.06.2003 calling upon him to inform the applicant the basis on which such an exorbitant sum towards theft assessment was being claimed from him. A copy of this letter was also sent to Electrical Inspector, Nagpur by him. He addressed another letter on the same subject to the non-applicant on 24.06.2003 with a copy to Electrical Inspector. Subsequently, a letter was given by the applicant to the Executive Engineer, MSEB, Civil Lines Division, Nagpur on 25.06.2003 bringing to his notice that as per section 126 (5) of the Electricity Act, 2003, it was not permissible for the MSEB to claim the charges for a period of more than six months. A similar letter was sent by him again on 02.07.2003.

It is his strong contention that the Electricity Act, 1910 has since been repealed and that the Electricity Act, 2003 has now come into force w.e.f. 10th June, 2003. He added that no notification was also issued by the Govt. of Maharashtra in terms of Section 172 (d) notifying that the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 would not apply for such period not exceeding six months from the appointed date. Hence, according to him, the provisions of the new Electricity Act, 2003 are applicable to the instant case and not the provisions of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 and that the theft assessment charges were wrongly worked out by MSEB and that the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, particularly section 126 (5) thereof, were not duly followed.

According to him, even as per the MSEB's Conditions of Supply, clause 31 (e), the theft assessment was not worked out as per the guidelines given in this clause.

The applicant received a letter dated 26.06.2003 from the Electrical Inspector informing that the complaint filed by him cannot be entertained since the consumer ought to have given a notice of 7 days under section 26 (6) of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910. The applicant has stated that this course of action adopted by the Electrical Inspector was also not proper.

The applicant was issued a letter on 04.07.2003 by the non-applicant mentioning therein that an assessment of Rs.8,09,000/- was made on account of theft of energy and he was called upon to pay at least 20% of the amount assessed and balance amount in minimum four equal installments for

restoration of supply. The applicant submitted that this letter was issued by relying on clause 31 (e) of Conditions of Supply by ignoring the other provisions relating to the manner in which calculations ought to have been made.

Since the applicant's grievance was not redressed, he issued a notice calling upon the non-applicant to withdraw the bill of theft assessment amounting to Rs. 8,09,000/- and to restore the electricity supply to the applicant's premises failing which he would be constrained to take appropriate legal action against the non-applicant.

Ultimately, the applicant filed his complaint under section 12 of the Consumer Protection Act, 1985 before the District Forum. His complaint was numbered as U.T.P. 186/2004. Initially, this complaint was dismissed as not tenable and the State Commission remanded the matter to the District Forum. An interim order dated 09.08.2004 was issued by the District Forum directing the applicant to pay a sum of Rs. 1,61,230=40 towards 20% of the assessment bill issued by the non-applicant and it also directed the MSEB to restore his power supply. This order was complied with by both the parties. The complaint of the applicant was finally rejected by the District Forum by passing an order on 17.02.2005 on the ground that the District Forum does not have jurisdiction to entertain and try the complaint case. The power supply of the applicant was disconnected again immediately after the applicant's complaint was dismissed by the District Forum.

Being aggrieved by the District Forum's judgment dated 17.02.2005, the applicant preferred an appeal before the

State Commission. The applicant also filed an application for restoration of his electricity connection. After hearing, the State Commission directed the applicant to pay a sum of Rs. 1,00,000/-. It also directed the non-applicant to re-connect the applicant's electricity supply after receipt of this amount. Accordingly, the applicant paid this amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- and, thereupon, his electricity supply was restored on 13.12.2005. The State Commission permitted the applicant on 13.12.2005 to withdraw his appeal and to approach this Forum for redressal of his grievance.

It is in pursuance the above order of the State Commission that the applicant has filed the present grievance application before this Forum.

He lastly stated that the entire action of the non-applicant was unjust, improper & illegal. He prayed that the non-applicant be directed to withdraw the theft assessment bill of Rs. 8,09,000/-.

The non-applicant had stated in his parawise report dated 31.01.2006 that the Flying Squad inspected the premises of the applicant on 17.06.2003 and it found that theft of electricity was committed in the applicant's CT meter, being meter no. 51428 and that this meter was running slow by 93.75%. Thereupon, a theft assessment for 36 months for 1,26,360 units for Rs. 8,06,152/- was worked out and a bill was accordingly issued to the applicant. His power supply was also disconnected. Since the theft assessment was not acceptable to the applicant, he filed a complaint before the District Forum followed by an appeal before the State Commission, being

appeal case no. 1860/2003. The State Commission did not admit this case and directed the applicant to file a complaint before the District Forum. Accordingly, a complaint, being complaint no. 186/2004, was filed by the applicant before the District Forum. In an interim Order passed by the District Forum on 09.08.2004 in complaint case 186/2004, the District Forum directed the applicant to pay 20% amount of theft assessment amounting to Rs. 1,61,800/- which the applicant paid on 24.08.2004. Thereupon, his power supply was restored. The District Forum rejected the complaint case of the applicant on 17.02.2005. Thereupon, the applicant's power supply was again disconnected. Being aggrieved by the District Forum's order dated 17.02.2005, the applicant filed an appeal before the State Commission. The appeal case before the State Commission was numbered as 599/2005. During the pendency of appeal before the State Commission, an interim order was passed by the State Commission on 21.04.2005 directing the applicant to deposit an amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- within four weeks with the District Forum. It also directed the non-applicant to restore the applicant's power supply immediately after this payment. The applicant deposited the amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- with the District Forum on 28.07.2005 and thereafter, the applicant's power supply was restored on 22.09.2005. The appeal before the State Commission being appeal no. 599/2005, came to be disposed of on 13.12.2005. In that, the State Commission permitted the applicant to withdraw his appeal and directed both the parties to approach this Forum.

The non-applicant further contended that a balance amount of Rs. 5,44,352/- is still outstanding against the applicant out of the total amount of theft assessment.

During the course of arguments, the non-applicant strongly contended that since the present case pertains to theft of electricity as well as tampering of electricity meter by the applicant, this Forum does not have the jurisdiction to entertain the applicant's grievance in terms of Regulation 6.4 of the said Regulations.

He added that the entire action of the non-applicant in this case was proper and legal and that there is no substance in the applicant's grievance.

He lastly prayed that the present grievance application may be rejected.

The applicant argued in reply that there is no reply from the non-applicant to the applicant's submission to the effect that the demand raised by the non-applicant is violative of Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003. According to him, there is also no submission from the non-applicant's side on the applicant's arguments pertaining to the quantum of assessment and period for which such an assessment was permissible. He added that the non-applicant has no legal authority to assess charges for a period of three years.

The applicant further submitted that the present case is not a case of theft of electricity but it is a case of a faulty meter.

He vehemently argued that no specific reason is given by the non-applicant for opposing grant of relief claimed by him.

According to him, the non-applicant did not also make any submission before the State Commission to the effect that this Forum does not have jurisdiction to try and hear grievance cases pertaining to theft of electricity and theft assessment. Hence, he submits that there is absolutely no legal impediment in allowing the present grievance application.

We have carefully gone through the record of the case, documents produced on record by both the parties as well as all submissions, written & oral, made before us by both the parties.

The first and foremost point that needs to be decided by us is whether this Forum has the jurisdiction to entertain the present case.

According to Regulation 6.4 of the said Regulations, grievances falling within the purview of any of the following provisions of the Act are excluded from the jurisdiction of the Forum :

- 1) Unauthorised use of electricity as provided under section 126 of the Act.
- 2) Offences and penalties as provided under Sections 135 to 139 of the Act.

The applicant on his part has made several submissions pointing out that the presence case, according to him, is not a theft case while the non-applicant has pleaded

that the present case very much pertains to theft of electricity and tampering of meter and theft assessment worked out consequent upon detection of theft of electricity.

It is pertinent to note that the Flying Squad inspected the CT meter on 17.06.2003 in the presence of the applicant and observed the following irregularities:

- 1) S-1 of terminals of Y & B phase CT's connecting the meter terminals found to have been broken inside the insulations itself. Thus, there is no flow of current in the secondary side of both the CTs. Thus, it is established that the meter wiring is tampered resulting into abnormally slow recording of the meter.
- 2) Meter found abnormally slow.
- 3) Meter stopped on Y & B phase.
- 4) Meter Box seals found spurious and tampered.

Although the applicant had signed the inspection report under protest, the irregularities found by the Flying Squad can not be ignored. Hence, whatever may be the contentions of the applicant, the fact remains that the present case is a case of theft of electricity and tampering of the meter.

The joint inspection report dated 17.06.2003 drawn by the Dy. Exe. Engineer, Flying Squad, Nagpur Urban, a copy of which is produced on record, demonstrates that the entire inspection was carried out in the present of Shri Pratap Dewani i.e. the applicant and that he was apprised of all the irregularities noticed during the course of inspection. This

joint inspection report is also signed by the applicant, may be under protest, and also by two other independent persons.

Consequent upon the inspection, the Dy. E.E., Flying Squad, Nagpur Urban had also filed a Police complaint on 17.03.2006 in respect of theft of electricity. Accordingly, F.I.R. was registered at the Jaripatka Police Station, Nagpur.

The contention of the applicant that this is not a theft case and that it is a case of faulty meter can not be accepted by us considering the nature of irregularities observed by the Flying Squad during inspection.

The applicant himself has stated that he had approached the Electrical Inspector under section 26 (6) of the Electricity Act, 1910 but the Electrical Inspector declined to entertain his complaint on the technical ground of not giving 7 days' notice in advance. It is his say that the Electrical Inspector did not look in to the merits of his case, which according to him, was not legal and correct.

Section 26 (6) of the Electricity Act, 1910 relates to a dispute as to whether any meter is correct or not, whether it is inherently defective or faulty. The Electrical Inspector was given the power to decide such a dispute upon the consumer's complaint. Since the Electrical Inspector did not entertain the applicant's complaint, a remedy was open to the applicant to have filed an appeal before the appropriate Government in terms of section 36 (2) of the Electricity Act, 1910. However, it seems that the applicant did not take resort to section 36 (2) of the Electricity Act, 1910. The contention of the applicant that his meter was defective, therefore, holds no legal support.

Looking to the specific serious irregularities noted by the Flying Squad in the inspection report dated 17.06.2003, it becomes further clear that the meter was not defective and that the same was not only tampered with but a theft of electricity was also committed.

A complaint was made by the applicant before the District Forum under section 12 of the Consumer Protection Act 1986, in which the applicant had raised the present grievance. The District Forum has passed a detailed order on 17.02.2005 and it rejected the applicant's complaint.

There were two issues framed by the District Forum. The first issue was whether the applicant is covered by the definition of word "Consumer" made in the Consumer Protection Act 1986 and the second issue was whether the District Forum has the jurisdiction to entertain and try the case of theft of electricity. Both the issues are answered in the negative by the District Forum.

We, at this Forum, are concerned about the second issue which was deliberated upon by the District Forum in its order. Observations made by the District Forum in its judgment in respect this issue go to show that the District Forum also accepted the fact that the non-applicant has made out a prima-facie case of theft of electricity against the applicant.

It is also pertinent to note that the State Commission did not quash the order of the District Forum. What the State Commission did was that it permitted the applicant to withdraw his appeal at the later's behest and

permitted him to approach this Forum. Hence, the observations made by the District Forum which hold good so far as theft element is concerned can not be brushed aside. The District Forum ultimately held that it has no jurisdiction to entertain and try a case of theft of electricity.

The said Regulations were very much in force on 13.12.2005 when the State Commission passed its order permitting the applicant to withdraw his appeal. The applicant, at that time, should have known that as per Regulation 6.4 of the said Regulations, grievances falling within the purview of un-authorized use of electricity as provided under section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and offences and penalties as provided in Sections 135 to 139 of the Act are excluded from the jurisdiction of this Forum. Had he known this, perhaps he would not have sought permission of the State Commission to approach this Forum.

In this respect, a point is raised by the applicant that the non-applicant made no submissions, whatsoever, when the applicant was seeking permission of the State Commission to withdraw the appeal and to approach this Forum.

We are of the view that the non-applicant can not be held responsible for not making any submission as contended by the applicant and that it was for the applicant to have possessed full knowledge of the said Regulations. Ignorance of the applicant in respect of Regulation 6.4 of the said Regulations at the relevant time can not be treated as an excuse.

A point also has been made by the applicant that the non-applicant did not follow the procedure laid down in Section 126 (5) of the Electricity Act, 2003.

It is a matter of record that the applicant did not file any appeal under section 127 (1) before the appellate authority specified by MERC against the theft assessment of Rs.8,09,000/-. If the contention of the applicant is that the assessment was not done as per section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003, a remedy of appeal was open to him under section 127 of the Act which, it seems, the applicant did not avail of.

The applicant, during the course of arguments, has also referred to clause 31 (e) of MSEB's Conditions of Supply of electrical energy and tried to argue that the quantity of electricity consumed was not assessed as per guidelines laid down in this clause and that the theft assessment worked out was abnormally excessive and that it was not in tune with the guidelines given in clause 31 (e). Here again, if the applicant felt that his theft assessment in terms of clause 31 (e) was not properly worked out, a remedy was open to him to approach the appellate authority prescribed under clause 31 (e) for H.T. consumers challenging the quantum of assessment which, it seems, he has not done. In short, the applicant did not file any appeal before the appropriate appellate authority either under section 127 of the Electricity Act, 2003 or under clause 31 (e) of the Conditions of the Supply though this remedy was available to him at the relevant time.

A point is also made by the applicant regarding his honesty and about his innocence. The applicant may prove his

innocence in relation to the theft case in the appropriate Court of Law.

It is also seen that the applicant's power supply was restored from time-to-time as per orders of the District Forum / State Commission.

During the course of arguments, the applicant has replied upon the following citations / rulings :

- 1) The judgment given in writ Petition No. 3418 / 2004 on 03.09.2004.
- &
- 2) the judgment in writ petition No. 3510 on 30.01.2004 given by High Court at Bombay bench at Nagpur.

It has been held in these Orders that procedure of Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003 was not followed by the respondent MSEB under Section 126 of the Act. Cases u/s 126 are excluded from the purview of this Forum as per Regulation 6.4 of the said Regulations. No purpose is, therefore, served by citing these rulings.

- 3) Judgment dated 20.09.1999 given by the High Court at Patna in case Nos. 8802 & 9061 reproduced in AIR,2000, Patna at page No. 67
- &
- 4) Judgment given by High Court Patna in case No. 8938 of 1999 on 27.09.1999 reproduced in AIR 2000 Patna at page 95.

These judgments relate to the subject of theft of electricity and /or un-authorized use of electricity and consequential actions upon detection of theft. This Forum does not have the jurisdiction to entertain & hear any cases

of theft of electricity. Hence, no purpose is going to be served by the applicant by citing the judgments.

5) Judgment given on 12.06.1992 by the Haryana State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Chandigarh in first appeal No. 159 of 1992. (Sub-Divisional Officer, H.S.B.C.-Vs. Sita Ram) reproduced in II (1992) 819 CPJ at page 819.

It has been held in this case in this case that it is mandatory to serve inspection reports in respect of theft of electricity upon consumer before any adverse action. In the instant case before this Forum, there is no such point involved. Moreover, as stated in the preceding paragraphs, this Forum has no jurisdiction to entertain any case of theft of electricity. Secondly, in the citation relied upon by the applicant, the Haryana State Commission has held that a person using electricity for running industry is a consumer under the provisions of Consumer Protection Act, 1986. This citation is not at all relevant to the present case since the applicant is already treated as a consumer of electricity by this Forum.

6) Ruling given on 01.11.1996 in Civil Appeal No. 14787 of 1996 in the case of Cheema Engineering Services – Vs. – Rajan Singh reproduced in (1997) I Supreme Court cases at page 131.

Here also, ruling is given in respect of definition of word “consumer” made under the Consumer Protection Act, 1986. This ruling is also not relevant to the instant case since this Forum has already treated the present applicant as a

consumer of electricity in the context of his grievance application under the said Regulations.

- 7) Judgment dated 05.11.1993 given by the National Commission, New Delhi in Civil Appeal No. 6237 of 1990 in the case of Lucknow Development Authority –Vs. M.K. Gupta reproduced in AIR 1994, Supreme Court at page 787.

The judgment relied upon by the applicant pertains to interpretation of certain provisions of Consumer Protection Act, 1986 and the same is not relevant to the instant case.

- 8) Judgment dated 23.04.1992 given in Civil Appeal No. 2495 of 1980 reproduced in AIR 1994 SSC at page 800 (Shadi Singh – Vs. Rakha)

The applicant has not produced the full text of the judgment. Moreover, the matter seems to be pertaining to eviction of tenants under East Panjab Urban Rent Restriction Act.

It is not understood as to in what way this citation is relevant to the instant case. The same is in no way having any relevance to the subject-matter of the present case.

- 9) Judgment dated 14.03.1996 given by the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi in First Appeal Nos. 473 & 487 of 1993 in the case of Haryana State Electricity Board – Vs. – Naresh Kumar reproduced in 1999 NCJ (NC) at page 45.

The facts and circumstances in these appeal cases are quite different from the present case. Hence, no purpose is going to be served by the applicant in producing the citation.

10) Judgment dated 28.02.1990 given in Civil Appeal No. 3693 of 1989 in the case of Municipal Corporation of Delhi Vs.- Ajanta Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. reproduced in (1990) 2 Supreme Court cases at page 659.

In the above cited case, a plea was made by the respondent Company that some officers of the Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking made an inspection of the meters and alleged theft of electricity after tampering with the seals affixed on the meters.

The facts in the above cited case do not, therefore, appear to be identical with the facts of the present case. Moreover the matter pertains to theft of electricity.

Since offences and penalties as provided under Sections 135 to 139 of the Electricity Act, 2003 as also the subject-matter of un-authorised use of electricity as provided in Section 126 and actions consequent upon detection of theft / unauthorized use of electricity are specifically excluded from the purview of jurisdiction of this Forum, this Forum can not entertain the present grievance application.

In the result, it stands disposed off accordingly as not tenable prima-facie.

Sd/- **Sd/-** **Sd/-**
(M.S. Shrisat) **(Smt. Gouri Chandrayan)** **(S.D. Jahagirdar)**
Member-Secretary **Member** **CHAIRMAN**
CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CO LTD's
NAGPUR URBAN ZONE, NAGPUR.