

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
M.S.E.D.C.L., PUNE ZONE, PUNE**

Case No.20/2016

Date of Grievance : 10.06.2016

Date of Order : 05.08.2016

In the matter of change in load & tariff category & exorbitant billing.

M/s.Indus Towers Limited,
2010, E-Core, 2nd floor,
Marvel Edge, Viman Nagar,
Pune- 411014.

Complainant

(Hereinafter referred to as Consumer)

Versus

The Superintending Engineer,
M.S.E.D.C.L.,
Rastapeth Urban Circle,
Pune.

Respondent

(Hereinafter referred to as Licensee)

Quorum

Chairperson	Mr. S.N.Shelke
Member Secretary	Smt.B.S.Savant
Member	Mr. S.S.Pathak

Appearance

For Consumer	Mr.Sachin Mahangade } (Representatives)
	Mr.D.S.Talware }

For Respondent	Mr.Ekade, Ex.Engineer, Rastapeth Dn.
	(Representative of RPUC)
	Mr.S.R.Patil,EE, (Admin)RPUC,Pune
	Mrs.Anju Fuke, JLO, RPUC,Pune

1. The Consumer has filed present Grievance application under regulation no. 6.4 of the MERC (CGRF & E.O.) Regulations 2006.
2. Being aggrieved and dissatisfied by the order dated 8th June -2016 passed by IGRC Rastapeth Urban Circle, Pune, thereby rejecting the grievance, the

consumer above named prefers this grievance application on the following amongst other grounds.

3. The papers containing the above grievance were sent by the Forum to the Superintending Engineer, M.S.E.D.C.L., RPUC, Pune vide letter no. EE/CGRF/PZ/Notice/20 of 2016/123 dtd.13.06.2016. Accordingly the Distribution Licensee i.e. MSEDCL filed its reply on 4.07.2016.
4. We heard both sides at length and gone through the contentions of the consumer and reply of the licensee and the documents placed on record by the parties. On its basis following factual aspects were disclosed.

i) M/s. Indus Towers Ltd. is a Co. basically an Infra structure provider company for different mobile tower operators with multiple consumer numbers throughout India in general & under Rastapeth Urban Circle, in particular under various sub-divisions including Kasbapeth, Rastapeth, St.Marry, Vishrantwadi, Hadapsar-I, Marketyard, Wadgaonsheri, Peshavepark & Swargate etc. The sub-division wise list of consumers where the grievances raised with provisional/assessment bill amount is enclosed herewith in schedule-A.

ii) As per the tariff orders came into force from time to time, the tariff made levied was industrial or commercial. Details of change of tariff are as under:

iii)

S. No	MERC Case No.	Date of order	Tariff applicable
1	116 of 2008	17.08.2009	Industrial (IT & ITES)
2	111 of 2009	12.09.2010	Industrial
3	19 of 2012	16.08.2012	Commercial
4	APTEL order in Appeal No.211 of 2012 & 215 of 2012	07.11.2012	Industrial
5	121 of 2014	26.06.2015	Industrial

iv) The above mentioned consumers received provisional/assessment bills from the above mentioned Sub-divisions from Nov.2010 to Dec.2015.

v) The Sub-divisionwise assessment /provisional tariff difference bills are as under :

S.No	Sub-division	Total no. of consumers	Total amount of difference Rs.
1.	Kasbapeth	6	16,36,310/-
2	Rastapeth	10	15,20,917/-
3	St.Mary	20	43,71,508/-

4	Vishrantwadi	8	23,29,570/-
5	Wadgaon Sheri	6	28,96,750/-
6	Marketyard	12	52,16,126/-
7	Swargate	2	3,31,674/-
8	Peshavepark	2	4,96,660/-
9	Hadapsar I	3	14,14,034/-
	Total	69	2,02,13,549/-

- vi) The above mentioned bills were issued by the Licensee as per the MERC tariff applicable for Industrial consumers. The MERC classified non residential & Commercial consumers on the basis of their load and the categorization is as under :
- 0 to 20 KW
 - Above 20 KW & upto 50 KW
 - Above 50 KW
- vii) The MERC classified the Industrial consumers on the basis of their load & the categorization is as under :
- 0 to 20 KW (27 HP)
 - Above 20 KW (above 27 HP)
- $$1 \text{ KW} = 0.746 \text{ HP}$$
- $$\text{Hence } 25 \text{ KW} = 33.51 \text{ HP}$$
- viii) Presently, the tariff applicable to above mentioned consumers is Industrial.
- ix) The Licensee while changing the tariff from Commercial to Industrial, the load of the consumer was to be changed from KW to HP. But it was mistakenly not changed. Consequently it remained as 25 KW instead of 33.51 HP. Therefore the Industrial tariff came to be levied to the consumers wrongly having load above 25KW.
- x) Some of the sub-divisions threatened the consumer by issuing notice under 56 (1) of the Act to deposit arrears of said bills or supply will be disconnected within 15 days.
- xi) The consumer deposited approximately amount of 50% of provisional bills under protest.
- xii) The consumer approached to IGRC with complaint (Annexure-X) dated 12.4.2016 that all provisional/assessment bills are time barred and not due to the Licensee in terms of section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003.
- xiii) The IGRC rejected the grievance of the consumer stating that the bills issued to the consumers are proper and correct vide impugned order dated 8th June 2016.

5. The consumer representative Mr. Talware submitted that they (M/s. Indus Towers Ltd.) received provisional/assessment bills from above mentioned subdivisions under Rastapeth Circle, amounting to Rs.2,02,13,549/- for the period Nov.2010 to Dec.2015 i.e. for 63 months wherein it was stated by the Licensee that the consumer was under billed due to wrong load and tariff therefore provisional bills are raised. However the consumer is regular payer of bills having no arrears against any consumers. All these provisional/assessment bills are being time barred, not recoverable and not due to the Licensee. He further submitted that if at all any recovery of arrears is made under section 56 (2) of Electricity Act of 2003 then the limitations of 2 years of recovery of such arrears is binding. The said arrears are being for more than 2 years cannot be recovered & barred by Law.
6. Mr. Talware placed Reliance on the following judgments of the High Courts.:
 - a) W.P.(L) No.221 of 2006, Mr. Awadesh, S.Pandey Vs. Tata Power Co.Limited, AIR 2007 Bom.52.
 - b) W.P.No.8894 of 2007 in the case of MSEDCL Vs. M/s.Greenword Magnum Enterprises, decided on 7.09.2007.
 - c) W.P.No. 6783 of 2009 in the case of MSEDCL Vs. Venco Breeding Farms Pvt. Ltd. and Anr. decided on 5.3.2010.He lastly submitted to set aside all the provisional bills issued by the Licensee being time barred and to refund the 50% amount which was paid by the company under protest towards the impugned bills.
7. On the other hand it is submitted on behalf of Licensee that as per the tariff orders came into force time to time, the tariff category made levied accordingly to the mobile towers. The MERC in case no.19 of 2012 vide order dated 16th Aug.2012 has approved the change of categorization of mobile towers, microwave towers, satellite antenna etc. from Industrial to Commercial. Being aggrieved and dissatisfied by the said tariff order, M/s.Bharati Airtel (Appeal 211 of 2012) & Idea Cellular (Appeal No.215 of 2012) approached to APTEL. The Hon'ble APTEL set aside the tariff order dated 16.8.2012 to the extent of mobile towers etc. as to categorization as Commercial vide order dated 7th Nov.2012. Thereafter the Licensee issued Commercial Circular vide no. PR-3/cos/10472 dated 15.4.2013 issuing directives that the Industrial tariff to be made applicable to all telecom towers w.e.f. 1st Aug.2012. Accordingly the same was implemented. Therefore presently the tariff applicable to Mobile Towers is Industrial.
8. The Licensee further submitted that presently the tariff applicable to mobile tower consumers is Industrial. However, while changing the tariff, the load of consumer was to be changed from KW to HP. But it was mistakenly not changed. Resultantly it remained as 25 KW but which should have been 33.51 HP. Accordingly the Licensee issued the tariff difference bills to the said consumers totaling to Rs. 2,02,13,449/- .

9. The Licensee further submitted that the mistake regarding change of tariff and the load above 25 KW into 25 HP instead of 31.51 HP (KW conversion into HP was not done) & it's a clerical mistake of calculation human error which led to under billing of the consumer. Therefore bar of limitation as contemplated under Section 56 (2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 is not applicable. Therefore recovery of due amount more than 2 years can be made.

The Licensee placed reliance to the case, **M/s. Rototex Polyester Vs. Administrator, Dept. of Dadara & Nagar Haveli (UT) Electricity Department of Silvasa, 2010 (4) BCR 456. Hon'ble High Court Bombay held that-**

A consumer is under billed due to a clerical mistake of calculation-bar of limitation cannot be raised. Hence, challenge of petitioner is not tenable & Section 56(2) of EA is not bar for recovery of due amount by respondents.

10. It is further submitted on behalf of the Licensee that a sum cannot be said to be due from the consumer unless bill of the Electricity charges is served upon the consumer. The Licensee placed reliance to the case - **H.D. Shourie Vs. Municipal Corporation of Delhi, AIR 1997 Delhi 219**, wherein Delhi High Court observed that

The word "due" in this context must mean due and payable after a valid Bill has been sent to the consumer. It does not mean 7 days' notice after consumption of the Electricity & without submission of the bill.

11. The Licensee further contended that bar of limitation is not applicable if the consumer was under billed due to clerical mistake or human error or a such similar mistake. The Licensee placed reliance to the following judgements.
- i. Brihanmumbai Municipal Corporation Vs. Yatish Sharma, 2007 (3) Bom CR 659
 - ii. U.A.Thandani & Anr. Vs.BEST undertaking & an 2000 vol. 102 (2) Bom LR 502
 - iii. Bharat Barrel & Drums Mfg.Co.Pvt.Ltd. Vs. The Municipal Corp. for greater Bombay, AIR 1978 Bom. 369.
 - iv. Devraj Vs. BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.,W.P.No.5360 Delhi High Court.
 - v. Swastik Industries Vs. MSEB,(1997) 9, SCC 465.
 - vi. NDMC Vs.Karamchand Thapar and brothers Pvt. Ltd., LAP No.211/2009 Bombay High Court.
12. The Licensee further contended that the various judgments delivered by the Hon'ble High Court of judicature at Bombay there seems to be the conflicts of the view between two folded ssets of judgments in respect of the interpretation of Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003, particularly the entitlement of the distribution Licensee to recover the amount against arrears more than two years. The judgments referred by the consumer in the case of i) *Awadesh S.Pande*, ii) *Green Word Magnum Enterprises*, iii) *Venco Research & Breeding Farms Pvt. Ltd*, cited Supra are not applicable to the present case.

13. The Licensee further contended that the regulation no. 15.2 of MERC supply code, 2005 provides the bill details & there is a clear indication of the due date for the payment of electricity bill. The Licensee raised the provisional/assessment bills of differentiation amount as per Regulation No.3.4 of MERC supply code, 2005. Therefore the consumer is liable to pay the amount of said bills. Hence grievance be rejected.
14. The provisions of section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003 are necessary to be reproduced for the purpose of deciding the controversy. It reads as under :

56. Disconnection of supply in default of payment:

(1) *Where any person neglects to pay any charge for electricity or any sum other than a charge for electricity due from him to a licensee or the generating company in respect of supply transmission or distribution or wheeling of electricity to him, the licensee or the generating company any, after giving not less than fifteen clear days notice in writing to such person and without prejudice to his rights to recover such charge or other sum by suit, cut off the supply of electricity and for that purpose cut or disconnect any electric supply line or other works being the property of such licensee or the generating company through which electricity may have been supplied, transmitted, distributed or wheeled and may discontinue the supply until such charge or other sum, together with any expenses incurred by him in cutting off and reconnecting the supply, are paid but no longer :*

Provided that, the supply of electricity shall not be cut off if such person deposits, under protest –

(a) an amount equal to the sum claimed from him, or

(b) the electricity charges due from him for each month calculated on the basis of average charge for electricity paid by him during the preceding six months whichever is less, pending disposal of any dispute between him and the licensee.

(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.*

15. Sub-Section-(2) of Section 56 does not allow charges and dues beyond the period of two years. But in case where such dues have been continuously shown as recoverable as arrears of charges for electricity supplied, Section 56 (2) allows such recovery. On the perusal of above mentioned judgments referred by both the parties, it is clear that there is a conflict of opinion on the point of the interpretation of Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. In the present case the tariff applicable to the consumer is "Industrial". In case of Industrial tariff load is to be sanctioned in terms of Horse power (HP). While changing the tariff from

Commercial to Industrial instead of applying correct load in terms of HP as 33.51 HP, wrong load i.e. 25 HP was applied and therefore according to the Licensee wrong bills for a lesser amount have been issued to the consumers. Hence the impugned bills seeking recovery of the difference have been issued to the consumers. Therefore the Licensee sought recovery of difference for the period from Nov.2010 to Dec.2015 for 63 months as has been contended by the consumer.

16. The division bench of Bombay High court in the case of **Awadesh S.Pandey Vs.Tata Power Co. Ltd. reported in AIR 2007, Bombay, observed that –**

Submission of counsel for the petitioner is that the provisions of Section 56 do not empower respondent No.1 to recover any amount if the period of two years has elapsed no can electricity supply be cut off for nonpayment of those dues. In other words what is sought to be contended is that if the demand or part of the demand is time barred the provisions of section 56 would not be attracted. We are afraid, we cannot subscribe to that proposition. Section 56(1) is a special provision, enabling the generating company or the Licensee to cut-off supply of electricity until such charges or sum as demanded under Section 56(1) is paid. Relying on Sub-section (2), it was strenuously urged that Section 56(1) cannot be resorted to after the period of two years from the date when such demand became first due.

In our opinion, Sub-section (2) only provides limitation, that the recourse to recovery by cutting of electricity supply is limited for a period of two years from the date when such sum became due. As long a sum is due, which is within two years of the demand and can be recovered, the licensee or the generating company can exercise its power of coercive process of recovery by cutting of electricity supply. This is a special mechanism provided to enable the licensee or the generating company to recover its dues expeditiously. The Electricity Act has provided that mechanism for improvement of supply of electricity and to enable the licensee or generating company to recover its dues. Apart from the above mechanism, independently it can made recovery by way of a suit. In our opinion, therefore, the impugned order passed by the Electricity Ombudsman does not suffer from any error apparent on the face of the record and consequently there is merit in this petition.

17. Above mentioned ratio in the case of Awadesh S.Pandey was applied by the Bombay High Court in the subsequent judgments in the case of MSEDCL Vs. Green Word Magnum Enterprises, W.P.No.2894 of 2007 decided on

7th Sept.2007 & in the case of MSEDCL Vs. Venco Breeding Farms Pvt. Ltd. W.P.No.6783 of 2009 decided on 5th March 2010.

18. It seems that there is conflict of views between two folded sets of judgments referred to above delivered by the high courts in respect of the interpretation of Section 56 (2) of the Electricity Act,2003. Similarly there is a direct conflict of views between the division benches of Bombay High Court in the case of Awadesh S Pandey & judgment in the case of Rototex (Supra). In W.P.No.10764 of 2011 Hon'ble single bench of Bombay High Court while referring the matter to a larger bench in respect of interpretation of Section 56(2) of the Act vide order dated 17th Jan.2012 observed as under:

If the Distribution Licensee is allowed to wake up after several years and serve bill for a differential amount and thereafter, argues that the amount became due only after service of such bill for a differential amount, in my opinion, then this will not only be contrary to the legislative intent under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 but it will also result in the situation where an innocent consumer may be suddenly faced with a huge demand in respect of the bill even beyond two years of service of bills and will be forced to pay the same without any corresponding mechanism for recovery of charges of difference of the said amount from his customer or consumer to whom said consumer of electricity may have provided goods or service. This will be clearly unjust and arbitrary. In my opinion, interpretation of Section 56(2) done by the Division Bench in the case of Rototex Polyester (Supra) results in a situation where the Distribution Licensee can wake up and issue a supplementary bill after any number of years without there being any limitation on the number of years after which said supplementary bill is issued and can thereafter, claim that the amount becomes dues from the date on which it is sought to have been levied and demanded by presenting a bill by claiming that the amount becomes due only when the supplementary bill is issued. Such interpretation will lead to absurd results.

19. Therefore relying on the cited judgments in the case of Awadesh S. Pandey Vs. Tata Power Co. Ltd., (Supra) & the subsequent judgments in the case of

MSEDCL Vs. Green Word Magnum Enterprises & MSEDCL Vs. Venco Research & Breeding Farms Pvt. Ltd.& the latest judgment in the case of MSEDCL Vs. the Electricity Ombudsman in W.P.No. 10764 of 2011 cited Supra this Forum holds that past arrears for a period more than 2 years in terms of Section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003 are barred by limitation. Hence for the reasons mentioned above in our considered opinion it is necessary to allow the present grievance application partly, directing the Licensee (MSEDCL) not to recover the difference amount of the Electricity charges beyond the period of two years from the demand by way of provisional/assessment bills. However, we hold that MSEDCL is entitled to recover the bills towards the difference of less billed amount only during the limitation period i.e. from Dec.2013 to Dec.2015.

Date : 05.08.2016

I agree,

Sd/-
S.S.Pathak
 Member
 CGRF:PZ:PUNE

Sd/-
S.N.Shelke
 Chairperson
 CGRF:PZ:PUNE

Member Secretary, (B.S.Savant)

I have gone through the above reasoning and my opinion in this matter is differing as below:

In Case of M/s. Rototex Polyester & V/s. Administrator Department of Dadra & Nagar Haveli (UT) Electricity Department of Silvassa 7 ors., 2010 (4) BCR 456, cited supra Hon'ble High Court Bombay held that when consumer is under billed due to clerical mistake, bar of limitations is not applicable.

Hence the propose recovery is correct amounting to Rs.2,02,13,549/- for the period Nov.2010 to Dec.2015 & recoverable from the above mentioned consumers, as this is only clerical mistake. The necessary installments for payment to the consumers shall be given as per MSEDCL Rules & Regulations without interest & DPC."

Sd/-
B.S.Savant
 Member/Secretary
 CGRF:PZ:PUNE

Hence the order by majority

ORDER

1. Grievance application is partly allowed.
2. Provisional / assessment bills issued by the Licensee for the period Nov.2010 to Dec.2015 amounting to Rs.2,02,13,549/- in respect of 69 consumers as mentioned in the enclosed list are hereby set aside.
3. The Licensee to issue the revise bill making it limited only for 24 months for the period Dec.2013 to Dec.2015 excluding DPC & Interest.
4. The Licensee shall not recover time barred amount for the period Nov.2010 to Nov.2013.
5. The Licensee to adjust the amount paid by the consumer under protest in the revised bill and the future bills of the consumer.
6. The Licensee to report compliance within one month from the date of receipt of this order.

Sd/-
S.S.Pathak
Member
CGRF:PZ:PUNE

Sd/-
S.N.Shelke
Chairperson
CGRF:PZ:PUNE

Encl:- Schedule-A

Date :- 05.08.2016

Note :- The consumer if not satisfied may filed representation against this order before the Hon.'ble Ombudsman within 60 days from the date of this order at the following address.

Office of the Ombudsman,
Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission,
606/608, Keshav Bldg.,
Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (E), Mumbai-51.

Sr no	INDUS ID	CONSUMER NO	BU Name	B ^Y AMT	50% Amt	DD No.	Receipt No.	Paid Date	Dr ^Y Ack	Protest Ack	Notice
1	IN-1055144	160240464311	4605-SWARGATE	1,06,615	52,808	300357	2161871	21-Mar-16	Received	Received	15 Days
2	IN-1055002	160240452216	4605-SWARGATE	226059	113,030	300358	2161872	21-Mar-16	Received	Received	15 Days
3	IN-1054149	160250554971	4608-RASTA PETH	58,350	29,175	291218	9823734	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 DAYS
4	IN-1055066	1602505549374	4608-RASTA PETH	99,080	49,540	291219	9823743	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 DAYS
5	IN-1054907	160250552146	4608-RASTA PETH	77,300	38,650	291220	9823742	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 DAYS
6	IN-1054857	160250458565	4608-RASTA PETH	88,230	44,115	291221	9823741	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 DAYS
7	IN-1054173	160250455116	4608-RASTA PETH	169,990	84,995	291222	9823740	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 DAYS
8	IN-1054107	160250451609	4608-RASTA PETH	66,630	33,315	291223	9823739	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 DAYS
9	IN-1054878	160250458514	4608-RASTA PETH	329,997	164,999	291224	9823738	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 DAYS
10	IN-1054959	160250439064	4608-RASTA PETH	73,440	36,720	291225	9823737	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 DAYS
11	IN-1055202	160250557628	4608-RASTA PETH	508,290	254,145	291226	9823735	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 DAYS
12	IN-1073198	160250560564	4608-RASTA PETH	49,610	24,805	291227	9823736	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 DAYS
13	IN-1055118	160250489789	4609-Kashapeth	257,520	128,760	291202	9823744	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 Days
14	IN-1055100	160250482059	4609-Kashapeth	323,290	161,645	291203	9823745	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 Days
15	IN-1054980	160250189262	4609-Kashapeth	361,930	180,965	291204	9823748	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 Days
16	IN-1055011	160250186158	4609-Kashapeth	320,390	160,195	291205	9823747	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 Days
17	IN-1055031	160250490051	4609-Kashapeth	195,770	97,885	291206	9858359	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 Days
18	IN-1054112	160250494359	4609-Kashapeth	177,410	88,705	291207	9823746	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	15 Days
19	IN-1055180	160265114633	4612-Peshave Park	455,260	227,630	301186	9343727	01-Apr-16	Received	Received	3 days
20	IN-1122219	160265230021	4612-Peshave Park	41,400	20,700	301187	9343728	01-Apr-16	Received	Received	3 days
21	IN-1054923	160230487186	4602-VISHRANTWADI	409,280	204,640	291231	361871	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
22	IN-1297972	170014556942	4602-VISHRANTWADI	13,030	6,515	291232	Paid receipt	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
23	IN-1239738	160235185765	4602-VISHRANTWADI	766,340	383,170	291233	361866	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
24	IN-1055152	160235125517	4602-VISHRANTWADI	467,550	233,775	291234	361867	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
25	IN-1280749	170013078257	4602-VISHRANTWADI	100,150	50,075	291235	361908	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
26	IN-1055127	160230829745	4602-VISHRANTWADI	236,930	118,465	291236	361872	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
27	IN-1054966	160231033073	4602-VISHRANTWADI	151,780	75,890	291237	361865	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
28	IN-1055167	160231043699	4602-VISHRANTWADI	184,510	92,255	291238	361903	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
29	IN-1055046	160231445665	4603-HADAPSAR	286,190	143,095	291228	2077347	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
30	IN-1055145	160231449725	4603-HADAPSAR	639,748	319,874	291229	2077348	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
31	IN-1055135	160231557480	4603-HADAPSAR	488,096	244,048	291230	2077349	29-Feb-16	Received	Received	No
32	IN-1055093	160240502175	4606-MARKET YARD	364,248	182,124	301188	8536150	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No
33	IN-1054887	160240130405	4606-MARKET YARD	570,505	285,253	301189	8536149	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No
34	IN-1055017	160240016301	4606-MARKET YARD	599,660	299,830	301190	8536148	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No
35	IN-1073211	160240539770	4606-MARKET YARD	581,239	290,620	301191	8536147	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No
36	IN-1054963	160240135784	4606-MARKET YARD	341,958	170,979	301192	8536151	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No
37	IN-1054872	160240005911	4606-MARKET YARD	256,335	128,168	301193	8536152	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No
38	IN-1054085	160240279794	4606-MARKET YARD	268,951	134,476	301194	8536153	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No

39	IN-1055067	160240105478	4606 MARKET YARD	6' 98	315,999	301195	8536154	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No
40	IN-1054905	160240271777	4606 MARKET YARD	38'-459	192,730	301196	8536155	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No
41	IN-1054991	160240539800	4606 MARKET YARD	217,179	108,590	301197	8536156	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No
42	IN-1054123	160240461976	4606 MARKET YARD	154,584	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	Received	No
43	IN-1055139	16024045216	4606 MARKET YARD	844,010	422,005	301199	8536157	29-Mar-16	Received	Received	No
44	IN-1054174	160250395547	4610 Scmarry	110332	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
45	IN-1054892	160250670017	4610 Scmarry	127083	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
46	IN-1054911	160250153152	4610 Scmarry	268731	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
47	IN-1055005	160250118705	4610 Scmarry	187582	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
48	IN-1054846	160250709118	4610 Scmarry	288800	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
49	IN-1054188	160250406956	4610 Scmarry	148798	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
50	IN-1054941	160250711121	4610 Scmarry	98121	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
51	IN-1093556	160250718532	4610 Scmarry	228875	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
52	IN-1054987	160250135961	4610 Scmarry	302533	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
53	IN-1054929	160250671145	4610 Scmarry	154210	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
54	IN-1054906	160250403850	4610 Scmarry	225912	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
55	IN-1054068	160250403868	4610 Scmarry	188610	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
56	IN-1054155	160250137840	4610 Scmarry	303425	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
57	IN-1091721	160250727043	4610 Scmarry	304256	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
58	IN-1055171	160250133950	4610 Scmarry	211762	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
59	IN-1054087	160250288945	4610 Scmarry	295026	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
60	IN-1024697	160250387056	4610 Scmarry	331706	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
61	IN-1055072	160250316434	4610 Scmarry	134309	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
62	IN-1055172	160250308237	4610 Scmarry	259876	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
63	IN-1124782	160250261648	4610 Scmarry	201561	Not Paid	NA	NA	NA	Received	NA	No
64	IN-1054879	160230542012	4746 WADGAON SHERI	620,640	310,320	301181	552257	12-Apr-16	Received	Received	No
65	IN-1055115	160231427837	4746 WADGAON SHERI	520,650	260,325	301202	552260	12-Apr-16	Received	Received	No
66	IN-1054888	160231382272	4746 WADGAON SHERI	395,110	197,555	301182	552273	12-Apr-16	Received	Received	No
67	IN-1055213	160231368393	4746 WADGAON SHERI	453,570	226,785	301183	552272	12-Apr-16	Received	Received	No
68	IN-1055223	160231263150	4746 WADGAON SHERI	383,390	191,695	301184	552254	12-Apr-16	Received	Received	No
69	IN-1054975	160231398896	4746 WADGAON SHERI	523,390	261,695	301185	552263	12-Apr-16	Received	Received	No