

**THE STATE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

D.H. Road & Foreshore Road Junction, Near Gandhi Square,  
Ernakulam, Kerala-682 016

Ph: 0484 2346488, Mob: 8714356488

Email: [ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com](mailto:ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com)

---

**Appeal Petition No. P/071/2024  
(Present A. Chandrakumaran Nair)  
Dated: 06-01-2025**

Appellant : Shri. Khundombam Rojit Singh,  
Junior Telecom Officer (CSC)  
Ranni, Pathanamthitta (DT)- 679672

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical  
Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd, Ernakulam,  
Ranni (South), Pathanamthitta (Dist.)

**ORDER**

**Background of the case**

The telephone exchange of BSNL at Ranni situated in a rented building owned by Shri. George Varghese. The building given on lease to BSNL for the past 29 years. The service connection was in the name of Shri. George Varghese. The purpose of use of power is for the functioning of the Telephone Exchange of the BSNL and is represented by the Junior Telecom Officer who is the incharge of this exchange. The original Consumer has authorised the employees of BSNL and the Licensee was also corresponding with the Telecom Officer of BSNL. Here in this case the appellant is the Junior Telecom Officer of BSNL and the Consumer number is 114061006929. The registered connected load is 8 KW and the tariff applied was LT 6F. On 25/08/2011 the RAO of Pathanamthitta had inspected the premises of their exchange and detected an unauthorised load of 5 KW and accordingly the provisional assessment of Rs.1,39,025/- was prepared and send as demand to the appellant. The additional SMPS connected as standby only considered as the unauthorised additional load. The provisional assessment has been revised to Rs. 70,137/- for a period from 15/12/2011 to 25/08/2011. The appellant has remitted Rs. 35,069/- and filed appeal to Dy. CE, Pathanomthitta. The Dy. CE had taken a decision

that the final decision of considering SMPS as connected load will be subject to the decision of High Power Committee. Then another bill for unauthorised additional load for 10/2011, 12/2011, 02/12, 04/12 has been issued for Rs.86,404/-. Then the total balance payable by M/s BSNL is Rs. 1,21,473/-. The Licensee has intimated about the OTS Scheme and have not been availed by the appellant. The appellant filed petition to CGRF and CGRF issued order dated 14/02/2024. This petition has been filed as the Appeal petition to the order of CGRF.

## **Arguments of the Appellant**

I am writing on behalf of BSNL Telephone Exchange Vayalathala, an LT Consumer of KSEB (Consumer No. 1146061006929, Tariff LT VI.F, Three-phase, connected load 8KW). The Assistant Engineer, KSEB Electrical Section Ranni South, has issued a demand for an arrear bill of Rs. 121,572/- based on assessment bills dated 05.11.2011 and 10.04.2012 (Letter No. DB/ES/Ranni South/Insp Bill/01 dated 08.02.2023). This amount has been categorized as a penalty against our consumer account.

We have contested this assessment and appealed to waive the penalty by remitting Rs. 35,069/-, representing 50% of the penalty imposed on 05.11.2011, as there was no unauthorized usage of electricity. Furthermore, the assessment of the exchange's connected load was inaccurate, lacking relevant documents or a site mahazar for the physical inspection. No action was taken by KSEB on this request. Despite an oral assurance that our appeal was granted, a second penalty of Rs. 86,504/- was imposed without proper documentation. We have approached AE KSEB Ranni South and subsequently EE KSEB Pathanamthitta for correction on 9/2/2023 and 5/3/2023 respectively. The arrear amount was not appearing in subsequent invoices issued by KSEB to us. This made us believe that the issue is resolved as promised by KSEB **However the KSEB has not acted on this issue for a very long period, leading us to escalate the matter to the CGRF, Kottarakkara, resulting in OP No. 57/2023. On 27.12.2023, we received a favorable ruling quashing the amount of Rs. 121,572/-.**

However, this judgment was unilaterally revised on 14.02.2024, demanding payment of the principal amount again. Unfortunately we were not informed about the hearing either by post or phone call. We received the revised judgment as an enclosure on 19.09.2024 only when the local KSEB office served a demand note of even date (Copies attached). It was on receipt of this demand note dated 19-09-2024 that we came to know about the honorable CGRF order dated 14-02-2024. Consequently, we are deprived of our legitimate right for appeal within the time limit of 30 days. Based on these grievances, we respectfully request the following:

1. Waiving the long-pending arrear bill of Rs. 121,572/- and refunding the excess amount of Rs. 35,069/- with market rate interest.

2. Acknowledgment that the energy meter has functioned correctly throughout the period in question.
3. Clarification that penalties were imposed without a proper technical inspection or detailed mahazar report.

## **Arguments of the Respondent**

The Appellant is a consumer belong to the category of Central Government Departments bearing Consumer No. 1146061006929 with the respective tariff LT 6F with registered connected load of 8000 watts registered in the name and address as George Varughese, Kulathunmkal, Telephone Exchange Vayalathala under the jurisdiction of Electrical Section Ranni South. The consumer is billed under the bimonthly spot billing system.

On 25.08.2011, the Regional Audit Officer Pathanamthitta had inspected the premises of said consumer, BSNL Exchange Vayalathala and detected an unauthorised additional load of 5kW. Accordingly a provisional assessment of Rs 139025/- was prepared by the then Assistant Engineer and Assessing officer as per the section 126 of the Electricity Act 2003 and issued to the consumer on 1.9.2011. The objections were filed before the then Assistant Engineer and Assessing officer and hearing was conducted on 12.1.2012. Sri. Babu Raj SDE PTCC Thiruvalla, Sri. Venu A V, SDE Groups Phones Ranny and Sri. Rajesh S JTO Groups Ranny attended the hearing. They argued that SMPS type power plant modules are working on Hot stand by/load sharing mode and there is no change over switch permitting the operation of only one SMPS module at a time in the premises and they infomed that additional module of SMPS power plant was installed and put into operation on 15.2.2011 and Submitted the making over memo of SDE installation (Ref No. SDEint/MO/10-11/12) and accordingly based on the objections filed, the provisional assessment bill was revised to Rs 70137/- for the assessment period from 15.2.2011 to 25.8.2011 and final assessment order dtd 12.01.12 was issued to the consumer. The consumer remitted 50% of the final assessment amounting to Rs 35069/- on 14.2.2012 and filed appeal before the Deputy Chief Engineer Electrical Circle Pathanamthitta. The Deputy Chief Engineer observed that there exists more than one SMPS units at the time of inspection and ordered that decision as to whether the SMPS units is liable to be taken into account while computing total connected load will be decided by the expert committee or high power committee also until a decision comes, the realization of amount claimed shall be kept in abeyance and it shall be considered as and when the decision of High Power Committee comes and disposed off the appeal petition.

On 10.4.12 since the Unauthorized additional load remains unregularized, based on the audit of the Regional Audit Officer Pathanamthitta for the

balance bills for the months 10/2011, 12/2011, 02/2012 and 4/2012 an inspection bill for Rs 86404/- was issued to the consumer on 10.4.12. On 08.02.2023 it has been intimated to the consumer that total outstanding amount corresponding to two inspection bills comes to Rs 1,21,572/-. But the consumer has not remitted. As per office order (DF)No.1030/2023(TRAC/GL/OTS-2023/22-23) dated Thiruvananthapuram 20.07.2023 the one time settlement scheme 2023 towards settlement of long pending arrears has been implemented and accordingly statement of additional Monetary Benefit towards surcharge portion with interest rate at 5% thereby reducing the original surcharge arrear of Rs 248078/- to Rs 68911/- (under OTS 2023) thereby total outstanding arrear amount reduced from Rs 369650/- to Rs 190483/-, has been intimated to the consumer on 10.08.23 and received by the consumer. The consumer has not responded to the OTS scheme.

The consumer approached the Hon'ble Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum. Kottarakkara vide letter dtd 21.8.23 and hearing was conducted on 14.11.2023 and 30.11.2023 and AEE Electrical Sub Division Ranny attended the hearing. Only respondent was present in hearing dtd 14.11.2023 and petitioner and respondent were present in hearing dtd 30.11.2023. The contention raised by the petitioner that they were not informed about hearing by post or phone call is false and is not sustainable.

Accordingly, the Hon'ble Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum issued final order dtd 14.2.2024 and duly signed order received at the office of the Assistant Executive Engineer. As per the said order, the petitioner is liable to remit the principal amount only and the surcharge demanded by the licensee is not sustainable. The said order was submitted to the Senior Law Officer, O/o the Legal Advisor & Disciplinary Enquiry Officer, Vydhyuthi Bhavanam, Thiruvananthapuram for further directions. The Senior Law Officer has requested the Deputy Chief Engineer to report the matter whether said matter was reported to High Power Committee and requested to forward the detailed report. The said report was submitted from the office of the Deputy Chief Engineer and Senior Law officer has requested the Deputy Chief Engineer to inform the details of Final demand as per the HPC decision. The Board after examining the matter has issued compliance of the order of Hon'ble CGRF. Accordingly demand note dated 19.9.2024 for principal amount of Rs 121572/-was issued from Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section Ranny South.

The long pending arrear bills were issued based on the site inspection carried out by Regional Audit Officer Pathanamthitta and site mahazar were served during inspection as mentioned in letter of Sub Divisional Engineer, Ranni -Groups, BSNL Ranni -689672. Also details of remittance of 50% payment RAO Audit on 25.8.2011 has been forwarded to the then Assistant Engineer from the Office of the Sub Divisional Engineer (G) Ranny Therefore the contentions raised by the petitioner is false and hence not sustainable.

No anomaly has been pointed out by the Regional Audit Officer Pathanamthitta on the working condition of Energy meter during inspection. It is humbly requested that Hon'ble CGRF may be made as a party in the Appeal petition as two orders dated 27.12 2023 and 14.2.2024 are mentioned in appeal petition. It is humbly submitted that long pending arrears are shown in the Bill issued as per system records.

The Honourable Apex Court on 20/10/2011 in Civil Appeal No.8859 of 2011(Executive Engineer & Anr Vs M/s Seetharam Mill) had precisely concluded that

(1) Where the consumer commits the breach of the terms of agreement, regulations and the provisions of the Act by consuming electricity in excess of the sanctioned and connected load, such consumer would be in blame and under liability within the ambit and scope of Section 126 of 2003 Act.

(2) "The expression Unauthorised use of Electricity means as appearing in Section 126 of the 2003 Act is an expression of wider connotation and has to be construed purposively in contrast to contextual interpretation while keeping in mind the object and purpose of the Act. The cases of excess load consumption than the connected load inter alia would fall under the Explanation (b) (iv) to the Section 126 of the 2003 Act, besides it being in violation of Regulation 82 and 106 of the Regulations and Terms of Agreement."

The Honourable Apex Court in its order made it clear that the existence of unauthorised additional load shall be reckoned as unauthorised use of electricity and shall be assessed under Section 126 of Electricity Act 2003. The Honourable Apex Court on 16/12/2022 in Civil Appeal Nos.9252-9253 of 2022(Kerala State Electricity Board & Ors Vs Thomas Joseph Alias Thomas M J & Ors) had precisely concluded that

1. Section 45(3)(a) of the Act 2003 would indicate that the charges for electricity certified by a distribution licensee include the fixed charges, in addition to the charges for the actual electricity supplied and consumed. In such circumstances, it can be said that the tariff includes both, fixed charges and energy charges and once the assessing officer arrives at the conclusion that unauthorised use of electricity has taken place, he is obliged to make the assessment charge equal to twice the tariff applicable, which includes the dues payable towards the energy charges also. Also the Hon'ble Apex Court held that overdrawal of electricity is prejudicial to the public at large as it may throw out of gear the entire supply system, undermining its efficiency, efficacy and even-increasing voltage fluctuations.

Hence the arguments raised by the petitioner that exorbitant bill corresponding to assessment for unauthorized use of electricity was issued arbitrarily, is false and unsustainable. Based on the facts explained, it is

evident that the opposite party has acted by the law and there was no deficiency on the part of respondent in discharging duties. The complainant raises vague allegations. Please note the consumer had been given opportunity to settle the long pending arrears under OTS 2023 scheme. Therefore, it is humbly prayed that this Hon'ble forum may be pleased to dismiss the complaint with the cost of the opposite party.

### **Counter Arguments of the Appellant**

There were two inspection by The Regional Audit Officer, KSEB, Pathanamthitta on 25-08-2011 and 12-01-2012 respectively at Telephone Exchange Vayalathala, under the jurisdiction of the appellant. In both inspections, the The Regional Audit Officer, KSEB, Pathanamthitta has wrongly assessed SMPS power conversion units as loads. The details of actual connected load is as follows:

#### **ACTUAL CONNECTED LOAD AT TE VAYALATHALA**

Sl No.	Type of Load	No	W/Each	Wattage
1	1*40 W Fitting	15	40	600
2	1*40 W Lamp	2	40	80
3	5 A Plug	4	60	240
4	Exhaust Fan	1	80	80
5	Ceiling Fan	3	60	180
6	1.5 TR split type AC	1	1600	1600
7	Power plant	1	2842	2842
		Total		5622
			KW	5.6

#### **DC SHARED LOAD OF SMPS UNITS**

POWER PLANT LOAD CALCULATION			
Sl No.	Particulars	Quantity	Unit
1	DC Output voltage	54	V
2	DC Output Current	50	A
3	Total DC Output Power	2700	W
4	Efficiency of SMPS	95	%
5	Input of SMPS	28 42.10526	W

NOTE: In this method power plant load is calculated by actually measuring the DC output with clamp on meter. Alternatively, the rating punched by the manufacturer of telecom switch can be taken as the load. Therefore, it is humbly prayed that:

1. SMPS is a power conversion device, not a load.
2. When more than one number of modules put in SMPS unit the output load remains unchanged.
3. Only single SMPS module is sufficient for the working of telephone exchange. The next module is solely for the purpose of redundancy.

Here, no such considerations/procedures are observed to be adopted by the Regional Audit Officer, KSEB, Pathanamthitta at the premises TE Vayalathala. The lapses from the inspection conducted are as follows:

1. No detailed site mahazar report on 25/8/2011 showing details of equipment and the rating of each device, cumulative total load etc.
2. During the entire period the energy meter has been in the working condition and its healthiness had ensured by the meter reader bimonthly spot billing system. Hence imposing the uncounted use of energy consumption in penal bill is not sustained.
3. During the first inspection on 25/8 /2011 to second inspection on 10/4/2012, they unilaterally ascertained that this load had existed permanently.
4. Not submitted or conducted detailed mahazar report on 10/4/2012. Details of equipment's and rating of each device, cumulative total load etc to establish that this additional load exist permanently.

Based on these assessments, KSEB has issued two demand notices of Rs-70137/- and Rs 86404/- respectively. The first demand notice was appealed by BSNL by making 50% of the bill amount (Rs-35069/-) before Deputy Chief Engineer, KSEB Pathanamthitta. During the hearing of appeal the Deputy Chief Engineer KSEB Pathanamthitta has expressed serious doubts regarding whether SMPS power conversion units are actually loads or not. Based on this, Deputy Chief Engineer, KSEB Pathanamthitta has ordered for the decision of an expert committee / high power committee and kept the demand notes in abeyance. Until this date, no such expert committee / high power committee is formed nor any decision conveyed to BSNL. On 08.02.2023, KSEB intimated BSNL that the pending dues is Rs 121572, after deducting the interim payment made by BSNL.

One Time Settlement offer was received from KSEB but BSNL has to decline this offer due to the following reasons:

1. The decision of the expert committee / high power committee ordered by the Deputy Chief Engineer, KSEB, Pathanamthitta is still pending.

2. The assessment of SMPS power conversion equipment's as loads is against justice.

The appellants approached the Hon'ble CGRF Kottarakkara on 21.08.2023. The statement that the appellants failed to attend the first hearing on 14.11.2023 is only partially true. The notice for this hearing was only pasted by KSEB on the remote, unmanned telephone exchange of Vayalathala and no postal / telephonic/ e-mail notice was served to BSNL. Upon our prayer, The Hon'ble CGRF Kottarakkara was kind enough to hear this case again on 30.11.2023, for which, BSNL duly attended. Hence the contention once raised by BSNL in this regard is true and as per fact.

Prior to the final order of the Hon'ble CGRF, Kottarakkara, dated 23.12.2023 was posted unsigned judgment copy of quashing the amount of Rs. 121,572/ in its website under the tab of "Latest Orders" and this was misleading the appellants to the false conclusion that the issue is settled permanently. However, this judgment was unilaterally revised on 28.02.2024, demanding payment of the principal amount again. We received the revised judgment on 19.09.2024 only through KSEB Ranni section office. The order dated 23.12.2024 appeared in the official web site was misleading and deprived the appellants of their right for timely appeal. The contentions raised by BSNL are true as there was no detailed site mahazar enlisting the load found at Vayalathala exchange based on which the The Regional Audit Officer, KSEB, Pathanamthitta arrived at their conclusion. Due to the inclusion of two SMPS units in load share mode, BSNL has not committed any financial loss to KSEB. Hence the demand note issued as per the the findings of the The Regional Audit Officer, KSEB, Pathanamthitta is unjust and against fact. Hence the contentions raised by us are true and sustainable.

On 20/9/2024, we again submitted an RTI application seeking the detailed mahazar report (copy attached) and the reply of this RTI application is attached. Also send Email on 19/10/2024 seeking the detailed calculation sheet of the penalty imposed, but till date it is not submitted. Thus there were no detailed site mahazars during the inspections took place on 25.08.2011 and 10.04.2012 and the contentions raised by us are true and sustainable.

Therefore it is humbly prayed that this Hon'ble forum may kindly allow the following petitions:

1. Waiving the long-pending arrear bill of Rs. 121,572/- and refunding the excess amount of Rs. 35,069/- with market rate interest.
2. Acknowledgment that the energy meter has functioned correctly throughout the period in question.



3. Clarification that penalties were imposed without a proper technical inspection or detailed site mahazar report.

## **Analysis and findings**

The hearing of the case was conducted on 21/12/2024 at 03:00 p.m. in the KSEBL, IB, Paruthippara, Thiruvananthapuram(Dist.). The hearing was attended by the appellant's representative Sri. Jijo. C. Abraham (Divisional Engineer, BSNL, Ranni) , Shri. Rajeev. K, (SDE) and the respondent Smt.Ranimol Sreedharan, Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSEBL, Ranni (South) , Pathanomthitta (Dist.).

The Ranni Telephone Exchange of BSNL functioning in a leased premises. The building was on lease for a period of 29 years. The connection is in the name of Shri. George Varghese who is the owner of the building,. The connected load of the exchange was 8 KW and the tariff applicable was LT 6F. The appellant of this petition is the Junior Telecom Officer who is the incharge of this telephone exchange. The Telephone Exchange is working on DC power and SMPS (Switched Mode Power Supply Unit) is used for this purpose. SMPS is a device which converts power of AC source to DC and connected to the DC loads. The SMPS is not an active power device and it is only a passive power device which is acting as a rectifier. This mainly used to get a stable DC Output and an ideal SMPS wastes no energy. This Ranni exchange uses following SMPS.

One number 25 Ampere, 48 Volt  
One number 50 Ampere, 48 Volt  
One number 100 Ampere, 48 Volt  
One number 40 Ampere, 48 Volt

These SMPS were connected to the exchange which is sharing the load of the exchange and also when one fails the load will be fed from the other SMPS. The total connected load is very much less than the registered connected load which is 8 KW.

The RAO of the Licensee had conducted an inspection on 25/08/2011 and a provisional short assessment prepared for Rs. 1,39,025/- has been revised to Rs. 70,137/-. The 50% of this amount worked out to Rs. 35,069/- has been remitted by the appellant with protest. The appellant has represented to the Dy. CE and Dy. CE has issued letter stating that the decision will be subject to decision of High Power Committee.

The respondent has produced an unsigned minutes of meeting which states that the High Power Committee held on 27/03/2024 and had taken a decision that the SMPS is to be considered as connected load subject to the Regulation of KSEERC (Fifth Amendment) Regulation 2009. This regulation is the Fifth Amendment of Supply Code 2005 which states that the Rated capacity of rectifiers shall be considered as connected load.

Then the **Regulation 153 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 describes about the Estimation and Regularization of unauthorised additional load.**

**153. Estimation and regularisation of unauthorised additional load.-**

*(1) If it is detected, on inspection, that additional load in excess of the sanctioned load has been connected to the system without due sanction from the licensee, further action shall be taken in accordance with the following sub regulations.*

*(2) The difference between the total connected load in the premises of the consumer at the time of inspection and the sanctioned load of the consumer shall be reckoned as unauthorised additional load.*

*(3) Connected load shall be determined as per the following clauses:-*

*(a) the rated capacities of all energy consuming devices and apparatus which can be simultaneously used, excluding stand-by load if any, in the premises of the consumer and found connected to the system shall be considered for estimating the total load of the consumer;*

*(b) while estimating the total load of a consumer, the loads of the following equipment and apparatus shall not be taken into account:-*

*(i) standby equipment of consumers, when they are operated through a change over switch;*

*(ii) firefighting equipment;*

*(iii) un-interrupted power supply equipment (UPS), switch mode power supply system (SMPS), transformer, voltage stabilizer, inverter, rectifier and measuring devices: Provided that the rated capacities of the equipment and apparatus connected to the UPS or SMPS or voltage stabilizer or inverter or rectifier shall be considered for computation of the connected load.*

This regulation is very clearly tells that the rated capacity of SMPS should be considered as the connected load.

The case was happened during 2011 & 2012 and then the Supply Code applicable was the Supply Code 2005. The rated capacity of rectifiers shall be considered as connected load. Here the SMPS connected were acting as stand by units and hence none of the SMPS is working as full load at the rated capacity. The load of Telephone Exchange is always varies. When the lines are switched in then only a minor load of that switching module is connected to the power system. The rated load of an exchange will always be very much lower than the registered connected load. As such the rating of stand by SMPS could not be considered as the connected load. The Supply Code 2005, Amendment also silent about the standby rectifiers or SMPS.

Further there is no mahazar has been prepared during inspection and the

copy has not been served to the Consumer. The appellant states, that no mahazar has been prepared and issued for the inspection carried out on 25/08/2011 as well as on 10/04/2012. The respondent had failed to produce the copy of the mahazar. **The Regulation 173 (5), 173(6), 173(7), 173(8), 173(9) tells about the procedure of inspection.**

**173. General provisions relating to inspection.-**

*(5) Every inspection shall be complete in all respects and the officer authorised to conduct inspection shall inspect thoroughly, all relevant aspects of the installation including the load connected, purpose for which electricity is being used, condition of the metering installation etc., without limiting the scope of inspection to one or two aspects.*

*(6) The officer who prepares the mahazar or the inspection report shall obtain the signature of inspecting officers, officers of the licensee at site and of independent witnesses.*

*(7) The consumer or his employee or his representative or the occupier or his representative present at the premises shall be allowed to read the mahazar and to affix his signature in it.*

*(8) In case the consumer or the occupier or his representative refuses to affix his signature in the mahazar, the fact shall also be recorded in the mahazar.*

*(9) As far as possible, the officer authorised to inspect the premises of the consumer shall take two independent witnesses for the inspection of the premises and shall make such independent witnesses fully aware of the facts recorded in the mahazar and shall obtain their signature in the mahazar.*

Here the Licensee has not conducted the inspection as per regulation. The payment was made by the appellant on 14/02/2012 and after that there was no communication from the Licensee. Then the Licensee has intimated the appellant about the outstanding payment only on 19/09/2024 which is after 12 1/2 years. **The Regulation 136 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 describes about the recovery of arrears and its limitation.**

**136. Recovery of arrears and its limitation.-**

*1) The licensee shall be entitled to recover arrears of charges or any other amount due from the consumer along with interest at the rates applicable for belated payments from the date on which such payments became due.*

*2) The licensee may prefer a claim for such arrears by issuance of a demand notice and the consumer shall remit the arrear amount within the due date indicated in the demand notice.*

*(4) No such sum due from any consumer, on account of default in payment shall be recoverable after a period of two years from the date when such sum became first due unless such sum has been shown continuously as recoverable arrear of charges for electricity supplied.*

Here the mistake was detected 12 years back and then the amount was due

on the date of detection of fault/mistake. Then the payment shall be recoverable only within 2 years.

The demands which is raised after a period two years is not recoverable from the consumer. As such the Licensee cannot recover this amount from the consumer.

## **Decision**

On verifying the documents submitted and hearing both the petitioner and respondent and also from the analysis as mentioned above, the following decision are hereby taken.

1. The Short assessment bills raised by the Licensee is set aside here with.
2. The Short assessment amount already remitted by the appellant is to be refunded.
3. The above decisions are to be executed within a period of one month and the respondent have to submit the compliance report.
4. No other costs sanctioned.

## **ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

No. P/071/2024/\_\_\_\_\_ dated: 06/01/2025.

### Delivered to:

1. Sri. Kundombam Rojith Singh, Junior Telecom Officer (CSC), Ranni, Pathanamthitta (DT) - 679672.
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd, Ranni (South), Pathanamthitta (Dist.)

### Copy to:

1. The Secretary, Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission, KPFC Bhavanam, Vellayambalam, Thiruvananthapuram-10.
2. The Secretary, KSE Board Limited, Vydhyuthi bhavanam, Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram-4.
3. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Vydhyuthi Bhavanam, KSE Board, Kottarakkara - 691506