

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION COMPANY LTD.
NASHIK ZONE**

(Established under the section 42 (5) of the Electricity Act, 2003)

Phone: 6526484
Fax: 0253-2591031
E.Mail: cgrfnsk@rediffmail.com

**Office of the
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum
Kharbanda Park, 1st Floor,
Room N. 115-118
Dwarka, NASHIK 422011**

No. / CGRF /Nashik/Nagar Circle /Sangamner Dn./590/66-2016-17/

Date: 17/03/2017

(BY R.P.A.D.)

CORRIGENDUM ORDER

In the matter of

Refund of excess collected AEC-3 and AEC-4.

Date of Submission of the case :30/01/2017

Date of Decision : 17/03/2017

To.

1 M/s.Paris Ispat Pvt. Ltd.,
S.R.No. 151, Plot No. 1 to 8 ,
At post Velhale Tq. Sangamner ,
Dist. Ahmednagar 422605
(Con.No. 155709005810)

Complainant

2 Nodal Officer ,
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Com. Ltd.,
Circle office, Ahmednagar,

Distribution Company

3 Executive Engineer,
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Com. Ltd.
Sangamner Divn. Office
Dist. Ahmednagar.

M/s.Paris Ispat Pvt. Ltd., (hereafter referred as the Complainant). Sangamner is the industrial consumer of the Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. (hereafter referred as the Distribution Company). The Complainant has submitted grievance against MSEDCL for refund excess collected due to premature billing AEC-3 and AEC-4. Complainant filed a complaint regarding this with the Internal Grievance Redressal Committee of the Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. . But not satisfied with the decision of the Distribution Company , the complainant has submitted a representation to the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum in Schedule "A". The representation is registered at Serial No.23 of 2017 on 30 /01/2017.

The Forum in its meeting on 31/01/2017, decided to admit this case for hearing on 21/02/2017 (later shifted to 22/02/2017 because of holiday due to Municipal Elections) at 12.30 Pm in the office of the forum . A notice dated 31/01/2017 to that effect was sent to the appellant and the concerned officers of the Distribution Company. A copy of the grievance was also forwarded with this notice to the Nodal Officer, MSEDCL, Circle Office Ahmednagar for submitting para-wise comments to the Forum on the grievance within 15 days under intimation to the consumer.

Shri. J.S.Chavan , Nodal Officer represented the Distribution Company during the hearing. Shri B.R. Mantri appeared on behalf of the consumer.

Consumers Representation in brief :

1. The Grievance is for billing dispute, wrong interpretation and implementation of the directions of the Commission issued in its order in case no.95 of 2013 dated 05/09/2013; 44 of 2013 dated

Case No.66-16/17 M/s Paris Ispat Pvt. Ltd.

Page No.1 of 7

- 04/09/2013; 28 of 2013 dated 03/09/2013 and finally order in case no.95 of 2013 and M.A. 187 of 2014 dated 26/06/2015 in the matter of wrongful premature billing.
2. The Grievance is limited to wrongful premature billing and as per Commission's order dated 26/06/2015 and not for recovery calculation or its recovery mechanism approved by Commission.
 3. MSEDCL has not said anything about the final/ fresh order of MERC dated 26/06/2015 which clearly given order to refund the amount which has collected on wrongful premature billing. MSEDCL submission of earlier orders which was based on main order dated 05/09/2013, has already set aside by ATE and remanded back to Commission for to decide the matter in transparent manner and for passing the final order. **Once the main order of MERC has set aside by ATE (higher authority), then all subsequent orders with reference to main orders, automatically set aside.**
 4. The Commission has approved the levy of AEC 1 +AEC 2 from the month of Sept.2013, AEC 3 + AEC 4 from the month of Oct.2013 and Addl. FAC from Sept.2013 by order issued in the month of Sept.2013. But MSEDCL has interpreted the order and started to levy from the month of Aug.2013.
 5. Commission has instructed vide order dated 26/06/2015 to refund amount erroneously charged to remaining consumers during August, 2013, as MSEDCL has submitted to Commission that "it had rectified the error in levy of AEC, and refunded the amount Rs.2461.22 Lakh in the billing month of Feb.2014 erroneously charged to 1198 consumers during August, 2013. Also in this order Commission has clarified that "(18) under-recovery of the cost by MSEDCL will be dealt with in its MYT Petition in Case No.121 of 2014."
 6. **Regarding AEC -1 and AEC-2 charges:(Case No.95 of 2013 dated 05/09/2013)**
 - The Commission issued suo-moto Order in Case No. 95 of 2013 on 5 September, 2013 and allowed MSEDCL to recover accumulated under recovery of Rs. 2037.78 crore occurred till the month of August, 2013 for the period of 6 months with effect from September, 2013 till the month of February, 2014 as Additional Energy Charge (AEC-1).
 - The Commission further allowed MSEDCL to recover monthly fix expenses of Rs. 235.39 crore from its Consumers starting from the month of September, 2013 till the further Tariff determination for MSEDCL as Additional Energy Charge (AEC-2). (Above Commission Ruling on Page No.5 of 6 Para 22 (a)& (b))
 7. **Regarding AEC-3 and AEC-4 charges:(Case No.28 of 2013 dated 03/09/2013)**
 - The Commission issued the Order in Case No. 28 of 2013 on 3 September, 2013 and allowed MSPGCL to recover the amount of Rs. 628.9 crore. (Including carrying cost) from the MSEDCL in six equal monthly installments starting from October, 2013. The Commission further allowed the Respondent MSEDCL to recover the variation in fixed cost component of the Consumers. The Commission further said that the variation in the cost of generation is to be passed through FAC mechanism as additional energy charge (AEC-3).
 - The Commission in its Order dated 4 September, 2013 allowed fix charges of Rs. 596.12 crore, to be paid by Respondent MSEDCL to MSPGCL for FY 2012-13 in six equal monthly installments from October, 2013 onwards as additional energy charge (AEC-4). (Above Commission Ruling on Page No. 48-49 of 50 Summery of Findings (v) & (x))
 8. **Regarding Addl. FAC charges:(Case no.44 of 2013 dated 04/09/2013)**
 - The Commission vide its order in case no.44 of 2013 dated 04/09/2013, observed that MSPPGCL has capitalised the amount of fuel cost less revenue, on account of infirm generation of power. However, as fuel cost is a revenue expense, whether incurred during infirm generation or firm generation, the same needs to be recovered directly for the power supplied during the period instead of capitalising it as a part of Capital Cost. Accordingly, MERC has allowed MSPGCL to recover the under recovered fuel cost, i.e. Rs. 28.05 Crore for infirm power supplied to MSEDCL in three monthly instalments after issue of this order and MSEDCL can recover this cost through FAC mechanism. (Above Commission Ruling on page No.110 of 114 Summery of Findings (iv))
 9. **MERC order dated 26/06/2015 in Case No.95 of 2013 and M.A. no.187 of 2014:**

Shri Sanjay Gupta, Ashok Hotel, Nagpur submitted objection that MSEDCL had levied AEC-1, AEC-2, AEC-3, AEC-4 between August to November, 2013. These charges were to be collected from September, 2013 onwards in six monthly installments, but MSEDCL collected them in August as well, which is illegal. The Commission should direct MSEDCL to refund the excess amount to

consumers along with interest. As regards for above objection, Commission has given the guidelines in para 13.25 as below:

"In these Petitions, it was submitted that, on the basis of the Order in Case No. 95 of 2013, MSEDCL should have started levying AEC only from the month of September, 2013. However, MSEDCL started recovery from August, 2013 itself, thereby violating the Commission's directives under that Order. During the proceedings of those Cases, MSEDCL submitted that it had rectified the error in levy of AEC, and refunded the amount erroneously charged to consumers during August, 2013 in the billing month of February, 2014. That has been reflected in the Commission's Orders dated 27 March, 2014 on those Petitions. However, during the present proceedings, Shri Sanjay Gupta, Ashok Hotel, Nagpur has raised the matter of refund of the excess amount recovered by MSEDCL due to early billing. Therefore, the Commission directs MSEDCL to review the refunds made by it so far on account of wrongful premature billing, and to make any remaining refunds due to consumers in the next billing cycle."

MERC has directed vide this order to refund the excess collected due to premature billing and under recovery of the cost by MSEDCL will be dealt with in its MYT petition in Case No.121 of 2014. (Above Commission Ruling on page No. 12 &13 of 21 Para (13.25) and Summary of findings (17).

10. **Definition of Premature:**

Meaning of Premature: means occurring or done before the usual or proper time; too early. Premature means: Untimely, early, too soon, before time.

Premature means "not yet ready". Something that is premature arrives early, like premature baby birth before her due date, or the soggy cake you took out of the oven prematurely.

11. **Tariff Philosophy of Commission:**

Hon'ble Commission has never approved any levy on retrospective basis.

Hon'ble Commission in its tariff order dated 16/02/2012 defined the applicability of order in section 8.1 reads as below: (and same principle noted in all tariff related orders)

"Revised tariff shall be applicable from 01/08/2012. In case, where there is a billing cycle difference for a consumer with respect to the date of applicability of the revised tariffs, then the revised tariff should be made applicable on pro-rata basis for the consumption. The bills for the respective periods as per existing tariff and revised tariffs shall be calculated based on pro-rata consumption (units consumed during respective period arrived at on the basis of average unit consumption per day multiplied by number of days in the respective period falling under the billing cycle)."

In this order, tariff will be applicable date is mentioned. In this case MSEDCL shall raise bills as per revised tariff from the date of tariff applicability date in respect to consumption date. MERC has not allowed recovering the bills issued with revised tariff rates for earlier date consumption after issue of tariff order applicability date.

12. **Provision of MERC in regards of tariff determination & its implementation:**

AEC is the part of Tariff and Tariff is being determined by the MERC. The methodology of AEC calculation and recovery thereof has to be approved from the Commission in the order. Without change in Order or without approval /sanction of MERC, the AEC methodology could not be changed or altered. MSEDCL has changed levy of AEC recovery methodology for charging for earlier period consumption i.e. from the month of Aug.2013 instead of Sept.2013 thereby violating the principles of Commission's directions. This has clarified by the Commission vide order dated 26/06/2014 and instructed to make any remaining refunds on **account of wrongful premature billing** in next billing cycle.

MSEDCL has submitted the letter ref. no. PR-3/Tariff/No.026517 dated 23/09/2013 regarding recovery of AEC & Addl. FAC – Implementation of MERC orders, for information and approval. In this letter MSEDCL informed to Commission that "to avoid complications in billing mechanism, instead of levying all individual AEC's separately, MSEDCL has merged all the AEC charges under one head as well as also merged the Additional FAC 1 & FAC 2 under one head and started the levy of above said charges **from the month of Sept.2013** In the aforesaid orders under reference, the Hon'ble Commission has allowed MSPGCL to recover the amount from MSEDCL in six months

starting from October 2013; hence MSEDCL has started charging the same from September 2013."

Commission has not approved the MSEDCL request in the same matter or not revised its original orders, as per letter No.PR-3 date 23/09/2013 submitted to commission.

13. As per provisions of the MERC 1999 Act, Electricity Act, 2003 and various Supreme Court orders, in one of M/s. LML Ltd. (supra), Court proceeded on the basis that it was the Commission alone who had the exclusive jurisdiction to determine the tariff. In view of the provisions of the 1999 Act as also the regulations framed thereunder, as the law stands now, there cannot be any doubt or dispute that the Commission alone has the exclusive jurisdiction and even for the purpose of modification and / or alteration of tariff, the Commission must be approached. (Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.7433 of 2008 dated 19/12/2008)

Nobody has power to change the Commission's orders for methodology of AEC calculation and recovery schedule approved. If not agreed, consumer and Licensee can apply for review or apply against the order to APTEAL.

MSEDCL has not file review petition or not challenged the same order of Commission to appropriate authority. MSEDCL has duty to comply the Commission's direction in right sprit.

Electricity Ombudsman, Nagpur has given orders for refund in more than 50 orders on the account of premature recovery of AEC 3 + AEC 4. The same principle has to be followed for AEC 1 + AEC 2 and Addl. FAC also.

14. Recently in Case No.78 of 2016 in the matter of M/s. Paul Strips and Tubes Pvt. Ltd, who has applied to Commission for violating order dated 5/09/2013 and non-compliance of Commission's order dated 26/06/2015 regarding same matter as our, MSEDCL has confirmed that the AEC billed to the Petitioner for August 2013 has not been refunded or adjusted in subsequent billing.
15. The Commission asked MSEDCL to clarify the status of compliance of its direction in Order dated 26 June, 2015, i.e. to take a review of the refunds made on account of premature billing and to make refund to any remaining consumers in the next billing cycle. MSEDCL requested additional time for submission of these details.
16. The Commission directed MSEDCL to submit its Reply, along with details of the AEC levied to the Petitioner in the month of August, 2013 and up to 12 September, 2013, and the refund/adjustment, if any, made on account of premature billing, with dates.

Relief Sought :

1. MSEDCL has wrongly collected following AEC before the usual or proper time: too early and not as per order of Commission and recovery also not as per MSEDCL letter dated 23/09/2013 submitted to Commission.
2. AEC3 + AEC4 Wrongly collected for the billing month of August & September, 2013
3. So collection of amount due to premature should be refunded with interest as per EA, 2003.

Arguments from the Distribution Company.

The Distribution Company submitted a letter dated 21/02/2016 from the Nodal Officer Ahmednagar Circle. MSEDCL, and other relevant correspondence in this case. The Distribution Company has stated that:

1. Present Grievance filed by the consumer is in respect of the subject matter which is already decided by Hon'ble CGRF vide its order dt. 02/11/2016 in the matter of excess collected AEC & Additional FAC before proper time.
2. Original intimation of the grievance to the office was given on 24/05/2016 & complaint in from 'X' was submitted to IGRC on 15/06/2016, wherein consumer was seeking to claim Refund AEC-1, AEC-2 ,AEC-3 & AEC-4. IGRC passed order in the matter & aggrieved by the order of IGRC consumer approached Hon'ble CGRF & filed grievance in Form Schedule 'A' with elaborate details on 06/09/2016 .
3. Hon'ble CGRF after hearing both the sides decided the issue of AEC & even granted relief to the consumer. In this backdrop, it appears that, consumer has again filed the grievance on 27/01/2016 to the Hon'ble CGRF. Details of grievance at clause No. 5 Schedule 'A' submitted by consumer on 27/01/2017 to Hon'ble CGRF shows that, consumer is seeking refund of AEC-3 & AEC-4 alleging that charges are prematurely recovered by MSEDCL. In this context kind attention is invited to detailed grievance submitted on 06/09/2016 wherein consumer has claimed refund of AEC-3 &

AEC-4. Needless to state that, consumer is not claiming any new relief: Hon'ble CGRF has decided issue of AEC & no more relief ' if any ' could be granted in the present matter. It is settled law that, relief if claimed & not expressly granted is deemed to have been refused.

4. It would not be out of place to bring to the kind notice of Hon'ble Forum that, under pretext of the litigations, consumer is not even making payments of current bills in full & arrears of electricity have mounted up to Rs. 9,18,35,000/-. Copy of the electricity bill dated 06/02/2017 & order dt. 17/02/2017 of Hon'ble High Court in WP 6252 of 2016 is enclosed herewith to demonstrate the state of affairs.
5. In view of the express bar created by Regulation 6.7(c) of CGRF & EO Regulations 2006 grievance of the consumer is not maintainable & deserves to be dismissed with heavy costs. Submission of the grievance & admission thereof has necessarily raised questions to the effect & operation of the earlier order dt. 02/11/2016 of the Hon'ble CGRF in the matter of AEC collected from the consumer. In the event Hon'ble Forum decided to entertain the grievance further, it is kindly requested to accord opportunity to respondent Office to make detail submission in the matter.

It is kindly requested to take reply of MSEDCL on record & oblige.

Action by IGRC :

1. Internal Grievance Redressal Cell Ahmednagar Circle conducted hearing on 03/08/2016 for the complaint submitted on 15/06/2016
2. After hearing both the parties IGRC gave decision as per letter dated 05/08/16 as under:
"I njhy xtgdkP; k vt k rhy fok; koj ek- mPp U; k; ky; ; Fks fjV ; kfpdk da 6252@2016 vll; s nk[ky dsysy vks o I njhy idj.kkrhy frllgh ckch U; k; ifo'B vkgR- r0gk I nj ckc vrxt xtgd xk&gk.ks epkP; k d{kr ; r ul Y; kefs ; k epkl fu.kj nrk ; r ukgh- **

Observations by the Forum:

1. The issue is regarding Additional Energy Charges (AEC) AEC-3 and AEC-4 wrongly collected for the billing month of August & September, 2013 by the Distribution Company.
2. AEC includes AEC-1 , AEC-2 ,AEC-3 and AEC-4 .
3. The complainant had filed a representation for this to the IGRC on 15/06/2016 .But IGRC did not give any decision , hence the complainant approached the Forum on 06/09/2016 which was decided by order dated 02/11/2016 [Case no. 28/2016] .
4. In this order the Forum has already directed the Distribution Company to refund prematurely collected AEC amounts in view of the paras as under.
5. After the issuance of tariff order for MSEDCL on 16th August 2012, the MERC has passed orders in relation to the matters of tariff of MSPGCL and intra-state transmission system. The MERC directed vide Order Dt. 05/09/2013 in case No. 95 of 2013, MSEDCL to recover Additional Charges -a) AEC-I Rs. 2037.78 Crs. in 6 equal instalments & b) AEC -2 Rs. 235.39 Crs. On monthly basis till issue of MYT Tariff Order from the consumers, in the form of Additional Energy Charges .
6. MERC had approved the Capital Cost and determined the tariff for Paras Unit# 4 and Parli Unit# 7 for FY 2010-11 .MERC vide order dated 03/09/2013 in Case No. 28 of 2013, has also allowed MSPGCL to recover the total amount of Rs. 628.90 Crs (including carrying cost) on account of impact of Hon'ble ATE Judgment in Appeal No. 47 of 2012 from MSEDCL in 6 equal monthly instalments. The Fixed Charges is to be recovered through AEC 3. MERC has determined the Capital Cost and Tariff of Khaperkheda Unit # 5 for FY 2012-13 vide its order dated 4th September 2013 in Case no. 44 of 2013. The Fixed Charges are to be recovered through AEC 4.
7. All the above Additional Energy Charges (AEC 1 to 4) were included and combined under the single head i.e. AEC which is indicated on the energy bill.
8. MERC in the order dated 04/09/2013 in Case No 44 of 2013 has also allowed MSEDCL to recover the Additional Fuel Adjustment Cost (FAC) . The relevant paras are as under:
4.4.34 The Commission observes that MSPGCL has capitalised the amount of fuel costs less revenue, on account of infirm generation of power. However, as fuel cost is a revenue expense, whether incurred during infirm generation or firm generation, the Commission is of the view that the same needs to be recovered directly for the power supplied during the period instead of capitalising it as a part of Capital Cost. As these expenses have been incurred prior to the COD, the Commission has

considered the same as a part of capital cost for the purpose of computation of IDC. However, the Commission has not considered fuel expenses as part of Capital Cost for computing the tariff and the Commission hereby allows MSPGCL to recover the under-recovered fuel cost, i.e., Rs. 28.05 Crore for infirm power supplied to MSEDCL in three monthly instalments after the issue of this Order and MSEDCL can recover this amount through Fuel Adjustment Cost (FAC) mechanism.

.....
Summary of Findings:

.....
xix) As the variation in cost of generation is ultimately to be passed on to consumers, the Commission hereby allows MSEDCL to recover the variation in energy charge component of the amount billed by MSPGCL to MSEDCL as approved by the Commission from the consumers through the FAC mechanism. Similarly, the Commission allows MSEDCL to recover the variation in fixed charge component of the amount billed by MSPGCL to MSEDCL as approved by the Commission from the consumers in proportion to Average Billing Rate of respective consumer categories, under intimation to the Commission.

9. Accordingly the Distribution Company issued Commercial Circular No. 209 dated 07/9/2013 and raised demand for the **AEC** and **Additional FAC** from the Electricity Bill of month of August, 2013.
10. However, the MERC order dated 05/09/2013 in case No. 95 of 2013 was challenged with the Appellate Tribunal of Electricity (ATE). The ATE by order dated 22.8.2014 directed as under:
"We, therefore, set aside the Impugned Order and remand the matter to the State Commission to give opportunity to the parties concerned as per the provisions of Section 64 of the Electricity Act and hear the matter in a transparent manner and pass the final order uninfluenced by its earlier findings, as expeditiously as possible. We want to make it clear that we are not giving any opinion on the merits."
11. The matter was remanded to MERC for decision once again. Accordingly the MERC has followed the procedure as laid down in Section 64 of the Electricity Act and recorded following observations as per order dated 26th June 2015 :
".....the issue of over-recovery in terms of difference in time period of recovery considered by MSEDCL and that approved by the Commission had come up before the Commission in 19 identical Petitions filed by various consumers. In these Petitions, it was submitted that, on the basis of the Order in Case No. 95 of 2013, MSEDCL should have started levying AEC only from the month of September, 2013. However, MSEDCL started recovery from August, 2013 itself, thereby violating the Commission's directives under that Order. During the proceedings of those Cases, MSEDCL submitted that it had rectified the error in levy of AEC, and refunded the amount erroneously charged to consumers during August, 2013 in the billing month of February, 2014. That has been reflected in the Commission's Orders dated 27 March, 2014 on those Petitions. However, during the present proceedings, Shri Sanjay Gupta, Ashok Hotel, Nagpur has raised the matter of refund of the excess amount recovered by MSEDCL due to early billing. Therefore, the Commission directs MSEDCL to review the refunds made by it so far on account of wrongful premature billing, and to make any remaining refunds due to consumers in the next billing cycle."
The Hon'ble Commission has finally directed the Distribution Company as under:
17. However, MSEDCL shall review the refunds made by it so far on account of wrongful premature billing, and make any remaining refunds due to consumers in the next billing cycle.
12. The Commission has allowed AEC recovery from the month of September, 2013 but as represented by the complainant the recovery was made from the month of August, 2013. Similarly Commission has allowed recovery of Additional FAC from the month of September, 2013 for the period of three months. But MSEDCL has billed Additional FAC to the complainant for five months from August, 2013 up to December, 2013 instead of three months from September, 2013 up to November, 2013.
13. M/s Paul Strips and Tubes Pvt. Ltd has filed a petition for non-compliance of Commission's Order dated 26 June, 2015 regarding levy of Additional Energy Charge (AEC). In the Daily order dated 15/11/2016, the Hon'ble Commission has directed MSEDCL to take a review of the refunds made by it on account of premature billing of AEC and to make any remaining refund to consumers in the next billing cycle. In the said order, the Commission directed MSEDCL to submit details as follows:

- i. Total number of consumers from whom AEC is recovered for August, 2013 and the relevant period in September, 2013.
 - ii. Out of (i) above how many of them have been refunded the amount that was prematurely recovered.
 - iii. Reasons for not refunding to balance consumers, if any.
14. The MERC orders are clear and the complainant is entitled to the refund of the amount of AEC recovered on account of premature billing . The term AEC is supposed to include all the AEC subcategories like AEC-1 ,AEC-2 ,AEC-3 and AEC-4 .
 15. AEC-1 and AEC-2 were prematurely recovered from August 2013 instead of September 2013 and AEC-3 and AEC-4 were prematurely recovered from August 2013 instead of October 2013. Hence AEC-1 and AEC-2 recovered for August 2013 and AEC-3 and AEC-4 recovered for August 2013 and September 2013 needs to be refunded.
 16. It is to be noted that the High Court Writ Petition No. 6252 of 2016 is not on the subject of AEC.
 17. In the Forum order dated 02/11/2016 mention of "AEC recovered for the month of August 2013" has been made.. The Distribution Company may infer that the refund of only AEC-1 , AEC-2 and AEC-3 recovered for August 2013 is allowed by the Forum and refund of AEC-3 and AEC-4 for September 2013 is denied.

After considering the representation submitted by the consumer, comments and arguments by the Distribution Licensee, and keeping in view the nature and intent of the original order dated 02/11/2016 in Case No. 28 of 2016-17, the following corrections are made by in this order:

CORRIGENDUM ORDER

The para 1 of the Order read as follows:

"The Distribution Company should refund to the Complainant , the amount of AEC recovered in the month of August 2013 and Additional FAC should be billed for September ,2013 up to November, 2013 and excess recovered by billing it for August ,2013 up to December, 2013 should be refunded . Both amounts should be refunded along with the interest till the date of refund as per the provisions of Section 62 (6) of the Electricity Act, 2003."

This should be read as :

"The Distribution Company should refund to the Complainant , the amount of AEC-1 , AEC-2 recovered in the month of August 2013 and AEC-3,AEC-4 recovered for August 2013 and September 2013 and Additional FAC should be billed for September ,2013 up to November, 2013 and excess recovered by billing it for August ,2013 up to December, 2013 should be refunded . Both amounts should be refunded along with the interest till the date of refund as per the provisions of Section 62 (6) of the Electricity Act, 2003."

(Rajan S. Kulkarni)
Member

(Sandeep D. Darwade)
Member-Secretary
& Executive Engineer

(Suresh P.Wagh)
Chairman

Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum Nashik Zone

Copy for information and necessary action to:

- 1 Chief Engineer , Nashik Zone, Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. , Vidyut Bhavan, Nashik Road 422101 (For Ex.Engr.(Admn)
- 2 Chief Engineer , Nashik Zone, Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. , Vidyut Bhavan, Nashik Road 422101 (For P.R.O)
- 3 Superintending Engineer, Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. , Circle office, Ahmednagar .