

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

**Appeal Petition No. P/040/2024
(Present A. Chandrakumaran Nair)
Dated: 12-09-2024**

Appellant : Sri. K.P.Poulose
Kuttattuthottathil House
Kumbalery P.O
Meenagadi, Wayanad Dist.

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division,
Kerala State Electricity Board Ltd.,
Sulthanbathery, Wayanad Dist.

ORDER

Background of the case

The appellant Shri. K.P.Poulose is a domestic consumer of the licensee (KSEBL) under the Electrical section, Meenangadi with tariff LT.1A. The appellant was having a domestic connection for his residence and availed another connection under tariff LT 1A for labour shed near to his home. The consumer number is 1165935040166 and connected on 24/03/2023 and the registered connected load is 1087 watts. APTS along with the officials of the electrical section conducted an inspection on 07/02/2024 and found that two connections in the same tariff in same premises is against the regulation. And also seen that nobody is residing this shed instead the power is utilized for charging the Electric Vehicle (EV) of the inmates of the house (main house). This domestic connection was not used for any residential purpose and no laboures were residing this shed. EV charging by availing another domestic connection is the violation of regulation. Accordingly the licensee has issued a demand notice calculating energy charges adding both the consumptions and reducing the amount already paid. This amount worked out to Rs. 12,293/-. The appellant contented the demand and filed the petition to CGRF. CGRF issued order dated 18/05/2024 stating that the appellant is liable to pay the short assessment bill. Aggrieved by the decisions of CGRF, this appeal petition is field to this Authority.

Arguments of the Appellant

വയനാട് ജില്ലയിലെ അമ്പലവയൽ പഞ്ചായത്തിൽ രണ്ടാം വാർഡിൽ 62 ആം നമ്പർ (Con No.1165938001307) വീട്ടിൽ താമസിക്കുന്ന കെ പൗലോസ് എന്ന എൻറെ മകൻ ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്ന ഇലക്ട്രിക് വാഹനം സുരക്ഷിതമായി ചാർജ് ചെയ്യാൻ എൻറെ വീട്ടിൽ സൗകര്യമില്ലാത്തതിനാൽ എൻറെ കൃഷിയിടത്തിൽ ജോലിചെയ്യുന്ന തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കും ഡ്രൈവർക്കും താമസിക്കുവാൻ നിർമ്മിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന കെട്ടിടത്തിൽ വാഹനം പാർക്ക് ചെയ്യുകയും പ്രസ്തുത കെട്ടിടത്തിൽ LT 1 A താരിഫ് പ്രകാരം (Con No: 1165935040 166) ലഭിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന വൈദ്യുത കണക്ഷൻ ഉപയോഗിച്ച് ചാർജ് ചെയ്തു വരികയും ചെയ്യുന്നു.

07/02/2024 ന് കെ എസ് ഇ ബി മീനങ്ങാടി സെക്ഷൻ അസിസ്റ്റന്റ് എൻജിനീയറുടെ നിർദ്ദേശപ്രകാരം വയനാട് ജില്ലയിലെ എ പി ടി എസ് അധികാരികൾ പരിശോധന നടത്തുകയും, ഒരേ premises ൽ ഒന്നിലധികം കണക്ഷനുകൾ അനുവദനീയമല്ല എന്നും തൊഴിലുകൾക്ക് താമസിക്കാൻ വേണ്ടി നിർമ്മിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന കെട്ടിടത്തിലെ വൈദ്യുത കണക്ഷൻ ഉപയോഗിച്ച് വൈദ്യുത വാഹനം ചാർജ് ചെയ്യാൻ പാടില്ല എന്ന് അറിയിക്കുകയും, വ്യത്യസ്ത മീറ്ററുകൾ ഉപയോഗിച്ച് ഉപഭോഗം read ചെയ്തതിനാൽ K SE B ക്ക് ഉണ്ടായ നഷ്ടം Rs . 12293/- രൂപ നിശ്ചിത തീയതിക്കകം അടക്കുകയും വൈദ്യുതി കണക്ഷൻ വിച്ഛേദിക്കണമെന്ന് ഉത്തരവിടുകയും ചെയ്തു.

എൻറെ വീട്ടിലും, പുതുതായി നിർമ്മിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന കെട്ടിടത്തിലും നൽകിയിരിക്കുന്ന രണ്ടു വൈദ്യുത കണക്ഷനുകളും കെ എസ് ഇ ബി ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥർ പരിശോധിച്ചു രണ്ടും വ്യത്യസ്ത പ്രീമൈസസ് ആണ് എന്ന ബോധ്യപ്പെട്ടതിനാൽ നൽകിയിട്ടുള്ളതിനാലും, വൈദ്യുത ബിൽ കുടിശികയില്ലാതെ കൃത്യസമയത്ത് അടച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതിനാലും, വൈദ്യുത മോഷണം റിപ്പോർട്ട് ചെയ്യാത്തതിനാലും കെഎസ്ഇബി മീനങ്ങാടി സെക്ഷൻ അസിസ്റ്റന്റ് എഞ്ചിനീയർ നൽകിയ ഷോർട്ട് അസസ് മെൻ ബില്ലും ഡിസ്കണക്ഷൻ നോട്ടീസും റദ്ദ് ചെയ്യുകയും, നിയമാനുസൃതമായി അനുവദിച്ചു നൽകിയിട്ടുള്ള കണക്ഷൻ അനുയോജ്യമായ താരിഫ് നിലനിർത്തി നൽകണമെന്ന് ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ട് വൈദ്യുതി പരാതി പരിഹാരം ന്യായസഭ(വടക്കൻ മേഖല) യിൽ പരാതി നൽകുകയുണ്ടായി.

8/5/2024 ന് കൽപ്പറ്റ ഇലക്ട്രിക്കൽ സർക്കിൾ ഓഫീസിൽ വച്ച് നടന്ന വിചാരണയുടെ അടിസ്ഥാനത്തിൽ ലഭിച്ച ഉത്തരവിൽ അവലോകനവും കണ്ടെത്തലും എന്ന തലക്കെട്ടിൻറെ ഭാഗമായി പേജ് നമ്പർ 8 ൽ പരാമർശിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള അഞ്ചാമത്തെ പോയിന്റിൽ പരാമർശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന പ്രകാരം പരാതിക്കാരന് തൊഴിലാളികളെ

താമസിപ്പിക്കാൻ പുതിയ വൈദ്യുതി കണക്ഷൻ LT 1 A താരിഫിൽ നിലനിർത്താവുന്നതാണ് എന്ന് പരാമർശിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്, പ്രസ്തുത പരാമർശപ്രകാരം കെഎസ്ഇബി അസിസ്റ്റന്റ് എൻജിനീയറുടെ നോട്ടീസിൽ വൈദ്യുത കണക്ഷൻ വിചേരദിക്കുന്നതിന് പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്ന കാരണമായ ഒരു പ്രിമൈസസിൽ രണ്ടു വൈദ്യുത കണക്ഷൻ അനുവദനീയമല്ല എന്ന വാദം തെറ്റാണെന്ന് തെളിയിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു. രണ്ട് വൈദ്യുത കണക്ഷനും ലഭിച്ച സമയത്ത് രേഖകളിൽ, വീടും, വീടിനോട് ചേർന്ന് നിർമ്മിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന പുതിയ കെട്ടിടവും രണ്ട് പ്രിമൈസസുകളായാണ് കാണിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത് . ഒരു ഉപഭോക്താവിന്റെ moovable ആയിരിക്കുന്ന വൈദ്യുതോപകരണം, അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ തന്നെ പേരിലുള്ള മറ്റു വൈദ്യുത കണക്ഷനിൽ ഉപയോഗിക്കാൻ പാടില്ല എന്നുള്ളത് വൈദ്യുത വാഹനം ചാർജ് ചെയ്യാൻ പ്രത്യേകം വൈദ്യുത കണക്ഷൻ നൽകണമെന്നും അറിയിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. പ്രസ്തുത ബുള്ളറ്റിൻ ഇതോടൊപ്പം ഉള്ളടക്കം ചെയ്യുന്നു.

31.10.2023 ന് KSEB റെഗുലേറ്ററി കമ്മീഷൻ പുറത്തിറക്കിയ ഉത്തരവിൽ Pg No 133, 134 എന്നിവയിലെ Note No. 5 പ്രകാരം ഗാർഹിക ആവശ്യത്തിന് അല്ലാതെ ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്ന കണകർ ലോഡിന്റെ 20% അല്ലെങ്കിൽ 1000 W കൂടുതൽ ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ രണ്ട് കണക്ഷനും വ്യത്യസ്തമായി കണക്കാക്കി അനുയോജ്യമായ താരിഫ് നിശ്ചയിക്കണമെന്ന് വ്യക്തമാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ട്.

മുകളിൽ പരാമർശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന വാദമുഖങ്ങൾ പരിഗണിച്ച് മീനങ്ങാടി അസിസ്റ്റന്റ് എൻജിനീയർ നൽകിയ നോട്ടീസും, വൈദ്യുതി പരാതി ഹാര ന്യായ സഭ (വടക്കൻ മേഖല) എടുത്ത തീരുമാനവും റദ്ദ് ചെയ്യണമെന്നും തുടർന്നും പുതിയ കെട്ടിടത്തിലേക്ക് ലഭിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന വൈദ്യുത കണക്ഷൻ അനുയോജ്യമായ താരിഫ് നിശ്ചയിച്ച് വൈദ്യുത വാഹനം ചാർജ് ചെയ്യാൻ അനുവദിക്കണമെന്ന് അഭ്യർത്ഥിക്കുന്നു.

Arguments of the Respondent

The appellant is a bimonthly billed single phase domestic customer under, Electrical Section Meenagadi with consumer No: 1165935040166. The connection was effected on 24-03-2023 to a small shed which is very close to the house where the appellant is residing and the present registered connected load of the connection is 1087 Wats.(A photograph of the premises is attached and may be marked as Exbt.R1). The appellant availed the connection stated to be for his laboures residence. The Anti power Theft Squad of the respondent company along with the officials of the Electrical Section Meenagadi conducted a surprise inspection on the premises on 07-02-2024. The inspection revealed the following irregularations. It was found that there 2 connections on the same premises in same tariff which is against the provisions under Regulation 52 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014. it is extracted hereunder us.Supply of electricity to be given only

at one point for same purpose at the same voltage level in a single premises. Supply shall be given only at one point for same purpose at the same voltage level in a single premises.

In the instant case the very same premises is having another domestic connection with consumer No. 1165938001307 (old connection) and hence now the present status is that the premises is having two domestic LT connections viz. 1165938001307 (old connection)& 1165935040166 (New connection). That a part, the impugned connection (New connection) has been found utilized for charging the electric Vehicle (EV) owned and used by the inhabitants of the other house where the old connection is being for all other purpose. Thus the luculent fact is that the inmates of old connection use the electricity from the new connection exclusively to charge their EV. It is also to be noted that there were no inhabitants in the new house as admitted by the appellant .This has created an unpleasant situation to the respondents as a result of the whereby, the respondent is losing its revenue consumption on a single premise being shared from two distinct connections. Had it been used from a single connection, as it ought to be, the petitioner should have to be billed with higher rates and amounts. The above mentioned scenario has resulted in revenue loss to the respondent besides, the violation of existing rules and regulations.. There were also no visible signs of any human inhabitation in the new house on the other hand a heavy consumption is being recorded. After a thoughtful consideration of the facts and circumstances, the respondent decided to invoke provisions under Regulation 134 & 152 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 and enabling provisions under Electricity Act 2003. Accordingly a short assessment bill for Rs. 12293/ was served on the petitioner .There was also a direction to dismantle the impugned connection since it is the violation of existing rules and regulations. It has to be noted that the respondent has not invoked any penal provisions in the Electricity Act 2003, instead resorted to invoke the provisions of Supply Code 2014 for realizing, only the differential amount so as to make good the loss sustained to it, as a result of illegal sharing of the consumption.

The new connection on the inspected premises was found using solely for EV charging. This act from the appellant's side is a willful violation of Regulation concerned. This is more so evidenced by the consumption pattern of the new connection. There was NIL consumption at the time of first meter reading ie. on 11-05-2023. The new connection has been availed for a small shed very close to the house of the appellant where he and family is residing. Plain reading of the appeal and his contentions points to the fact of his intention to use the impugned connection for charging EV. This is what not expected from a consumer who has contracted with the respondent to abide by the laws and regulations as per Supply Code 2014. The tariff structure of the licensee as approved by the Hon'ble State Electricity Regulatory Commission is so formed keeping in mind the social committeemen of a public ltd. Company. The telescopic tariff structure of the

licensee aims to charge less from those who use less electricity .The rate here is far below the average cost of electricity per unit.At the same time the revenue gap in this is made good by charging more from those who consume more. Thus who use more power are bound to pay at higher rates. This method makes a balance in the revenue side of the licensee. Thus the telescopic tariff structure of the licensee is indubitably a scheme aimed at a balancing between social responsibility and financial stability. It is in this context the act of the appellant has to be viewed in.The appellant is deliberately trying to derive some undue benefits by availing a separate connection for EV charging. The impugned connection was obtained with such an ulterior motive and on the pretext of availing a connection for the laboures. During the period of such ill motivated use, the appellant has got a financial gain to the tune of Rs.12293/ and the respondent suffered a corresponding loss.

The bimonthly billing (No.1165935040166) is as follows.

Sl.No	Bill Month	Reading	Consumption in Kwh
1	05/2023	0	0
2	07/2023	470	470
3	09/2023	878	408
4	11/2023	1416	538
5	01/2024	1919	503
6	03/2024	2470	551
7	05/2024	2914	444

The bimonthly billing data of the old connection (No.1165938001307) is as follows.

Sl.No	Bill Month	Consumption in Kwh
1	07/2023	276
2	09/2023	285
3	11/2023	297
4	01/2024	266
5	03/2024	167
6	05/2024	444

It is evident from the afore data, that the electricity for EV charging is being used from the new connection while they are relying on the old connection for all other purposes and thus sharing of consumption takes place between the two connections ultimately resulting in revenue loss to the respondent. Thus is with an ulterior intention and motive to derive the benefits of the telescopic tariff structure of the respondent company. Here, the petitioner is the illegal beneficiary and hence this practice has to be dispensed with and also liable to defray the loss sustained to the respondent. The appellant is continuing the practice even after the order of Hon'ble CGRF(NR) forbids it. As admitted in the appeal that, while the connection was stated to be meant for the labourers of the appellant, nobody was residing there and the petitioner used the very same connection for charging his Electric Vehicle. The recorded maximum demand in the impugned connection also hints at such an act.

Matters being so, an inspection report was prepared and served on the appellant under acknowledgment.(Copy of the Inspection Report is enclosed and may be marked as Ext.R2)It was stated in the inspection report that the act of appellant has caused the respondent, loss and later it was quantified as Rs. 12293.(Detailed calculation statement is enclosed and may be marked as Ext.R3) Had it been used in a way authorized by law, the appellant would have to pay Rs.12293 more by that time. Hence the respondent has decided to invoke the provisions in Reg.134 & 152 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014.The impugned bill is a bill issued as short assessment. This is not a penal bill or excessively charged bill. Aggrieved over the issuance of short assessment bill,the appellant first approached the Hon'ble CGRF(NR) in OP 101/2023-24.However this did not find favour of the Hon'ble Forum. The respondent company had already issued an order permitting the consumers,to use their existing domestic connection for EV charging. Hence it is stated that the petitioner is at liberty to use the old connection for EV charging.(Copy of the Board Order is enclosed and may be marked as Ext.R4) It is evident from the statement of the appellant that he had used the electricity from the connection meant for the labourers. This act is a flagrant violation of existing rules and regulations apart from the dishonest intention behind this.

If the appellant desires so, he can use the existing old service connection for EV charging, subject to the relevant provisions in the Regulations of the Supply Code 2014. The appellant was directed to dismantle the connection as the same was found to be using in the same premises, which is an act against the provisions of Regulation 52 of Supply Code 2014.

The pertinent question to be decided in the instant case is that, whether the appellant be allowed to maintain two separate connections on the same premises under same tariff. This question attains more seriousness,when the continuance of such a scenario benefits the appellant and a

corresponding loss sustains to the respondent. The appellant has not been assessed for unauthorized use of energy as contemplated under Section 126 of the Electricity Act 2003. Had it so, the bill would have to be raised at double the rate. Per contra, respondent has issued a bill only to make good the loss sustained to it. The differential amount only be charged from the appellant. The consumer is bound to pay the so arrived differential amount for the period, wherein the anomaly was in existence. It is reiterated that no coercive action whatsoever has been taken against the petitioner.

The appellant won't be denied the facility for charging his vehicle, as the same can be continued to be done by using the supply from the old connection subject to the relevant provisions of Supply Code 2014. The consumers are at liberty to use their own domestic connection for charging EV. At the same time they are not permitted to circumvent the true spirit of the existing tariff pattern by resorting to split up the consumption in to different connections. The contentions raised by the appellant is due to the misconception of facts and circumstances. There is no cause of action for the appeal as the respondent has acted within the confines of statute and regulations. The entire process of inspection and assessment was done in accordance with the statute and regulations and the contentions put forth by the appellant has no legal or factual basis, enabling him to secure the relief as sought for in the appellant. It is reiterated that the respondent has acted fairly, justly and reasonably. The bill issued is legally valid and liable to be remunerated by the appellant in terms of law.

It is true that the respondent vide order BO.....has allowed the consumers to charge their EV at their office/residence. The respondent was/is ready to extend this benefit to the applicant in its true sense. The appellant should receive this right with clean hands. The statements of the appellant about Captive Charging Station is irrelevant in the subject case.

The respondent is a licensee in the distribution sector in Kerala. The powers and functions of a distribution licensee falls within the limits set by the Act Rules and regulations in this regard. The Hon'ble State Electricity Regulatory Commission controls and supervise the powers and functions of a licensee. As of now Hon'ble SERC has issued guidelines for the installation of public charging Stations. The respondent is ready to adopt and implement the new developments in the EV charging field including the tariff and other modalities once, the Hon'ble SERC issues orders & guidelines on it. The contention of the appellant is that he be allowed to use electricity from another premises is having no legal back up. As the EV charging at present is treated as a domestic activity there is every opportunity to do the same from his own connection. Hence it is most respectfully submitted that the licensee is not under the obligation to issue a separate connection for EV charging, instead the appellant is at liberty to use the connection already provided to him. The appellant has not been denied the opportunity for charging his EV. The averment that there is no facility for charging his

vehicle at his premises is false and incorrect. In fact it is discernible from the consumption pattern that same facility was put in use earlier.

For these reasons, grounds & contentions as set forth in the preceding paragraphs and for those to be urged at the time of hearing this Hon'ble Forum may be pleased to dismiss the appeal with appropriate orders, directing the party to remunerate the bill and adhere to the provisions of Supply Code 2014.

Counter Argument of the Appellant

Premises is a wiring plan drawn by a licensed wiring man after the electrical wiring is complete. An example of this is multiple quarters and flats located in the same building providing multiple connections. The premises of the house is the plan given when I got the electricity connection in the house I live in. In the electrical wiring plan issued to get the electrical connection of the building completed in the month of April 2023, only the said building is included. If the cottages and flats constructed in the same building can be treated as separate premises and provided with electrical connection, the two separate buildings must be treated as separate premises. Considering the above arguments, even if KSEB's contention that there is a connection in one premises is upheld, the house and the building constructed near the house have to be treated as separate premises. To counter the argument that the house I currently live in does not have electric vehicle charging facilities, KSEB has indicated that the vehicle is charged in the old building before using the electric connection in the new building. But after getting the electricity connection and the first bill came, I have bought the electric vehicle only in May and the vehicle has not been charged from home.

Another argument of the KSEB is that the new connection has been taken to gain financial benefit from the additional usage generated while charging the electric vehicle. Before buying an electric vehicle or even charging it once, it is unclear how to calculate the electricity consumption and bill. One of the reasons stated in the first notice issued by the Meenangadi Sub-Engineer to disconnect the electrical connection in the new building and pay the shot. assessment bill is that two electrical connections cannot be provided in one premises, the North Region CGRF Chairperson's order has been corrected as follows "The existing electrical connection may be maintained in the building constructed for the accommodation of the worker,...". As per this order, it is clear that there is no bar to provide multiple connections in one premise or two different buildings are in two different premises. (Copy of order sent with complaint) The reason given by KSEB for disconnecting the newly obtained electricity connection is that there will be financial loss to KSEB while using two different connections, only the financial loss of KSEB is considered here, the loss to the consumer by disconnecting the legally obtained electricity connection should be considered.

Since the owner of the building pays the electricity bill in the building built for the worker's residence, the argument that the electric vehicle should not

be charged from the building constructed for the worker's residence, and that the vehicle should be charged from the building where the worker resides, does not stand. Both electric connections are used in the LT 1 tariff, wherein the bill for the connection used to charge the electric vehicle is flat billing, excluding the telescopic tariff. The Ministry of Power under the Central Government has made it clear through a press release that new electrical connections will be provided for charging electric vehicles. (The document is enclosed with the complaint). If KSEB prohibits use of LT 1 tariff for electric vehicle charging, LT X permitted at electric vehicle charging stations should be allowed. Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission has also clarified that LTX tariff can be sanctioned for CCS charging station. CCS chargers are used to charge current electric vehicles (A copy of the order has been sent along with the complaint)

Analysis and findings

The hearing of the case was conducted on 30/08/2024 at 11.30 a.m. in the office of the KSE Board IB, Kozhikode Dist. The hearing was attended by Sri.Sijo.K.Poulose, S/O, K.P.Poulose, Kuttattuthothil House, Kumbalери, Wyanad Dist., Respondent Sri. Shaju.K.K, Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Sulthan Bathery, Wyanad Dist.,

The appellant is the resident of Kumbaleri at Meenangadi, Wayanad Dist. Under the Jurisdiction of Electrical section Meenangadi of the licensee. He was having a residential connection with consumer No: 1165938001307 under the tariff LT. 1A for his house. He has applied for another new connection for the building constructed to his house at around 7 to 8 meter a part in the same premises under domestic tariff LT.1A. stating that this is building where his laboures are residing. This new service connection was connected on 24/03/2023 with consumer No: 1165935040166 under the tariff LT.1A.

On inspection it is noticed that no persons residing in this out house of the building and the power is utilized for the charging of on EV of the appellant (the car is owned by his Son who is also residing with him). It is seen that the second service connection is availed for the charging of the EV and there was no persons accomodated in this particular building. This is the violation of Supply Code 2014, regulation 52.

52. "Supply of electricity to be given only at one point for same purpose at the same voltage level in a single premises- supply shall be given only at one point for same purpose at the same voltage level in a single premises."

The licensee has violated the regulations and given the connection. Then the connected lad was increased by connecting the charger of EV. The consumer has not informed this to the licensee. The EV would have been charged from the residential connection, then the total consumption of the domestic connection would have been the sum of the consumption of both the connection. It is found out that the EV charging was established with two

months of new service connection. Why this has not been noticed by while taking the meter reading? The Licensee has not properly answered this.

The licensee had issued an order dated 28/04/2021 regarding the power for the EV charging points as per the order of Ministry of power dated 01/10/2019 which is about **“Revised Guide Lines/standard for charging Infrastructure Vehicles”**. This order states that *“private charging points meant for self use at residence shall be permitted and existing supply shall be utilized for electric vehicle charging. No separate electric connection is required in this case. The tariff applicable for domestic consumption shall be applicable for charging of electric vehicle at such private charging points”*. Availing an exclusive connection for charging EV is against this order. Then the short assessment has been prepared for the loss suffered by the licensee.

The regulation 134 of the Supply Code 2014 empowers the licensee to recover the charges in case of under charged

134. Under charged bills and over charged bills

1. *“If the licensee establishes either by review or otherwise, that it has undercharged the consumer, the licensee may recover the amount so undercharged from the consumer by issuing a bill and in such cases at least thirty days shall be given to the consumer for making payment of the bill.”*

Then the short assessment prepared by the licensee is in Order and the appellant is liable to pay the charges as per the demand raised by the licensee.

Decision

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. I hereby agree with the decision of CGRF
2. In addition, if the appellant wishes the licensee shall grant 12 monthly installment for clearing the payment without interest.
3. No other cost ordered.

ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

No. P/040/2024/_____ dated:_____

Delivered to:

1. Sri. K.P. Poullose, Kuttattuthottathil House, Kumblery.P.O, Meenagadi, Wayanad Dist.,
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd, Sulthan Bathery, Wayand Dist.,

Copy to:

1. The Secretary, Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission, KPFC Bhavanam, Vellayambalam, Thiruvananthapuram-10.
2. The Secretary, KSE Board Limited, Vydhyuthibhavanam, Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram-4.
3. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Vydhyuthibhavanam, KSE Board Ltd, Gandhi Road Kozhikode-673011.