

**THE STATE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

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

Ph: 0484 2346488, Mob: 8714356488

[www.keralaeo.org](http://www.keralaeo.org) Email: [ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com](mailto:ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com)

---

**Appeal Petition No. P/061/2024  
(Present A. Chandrakumaran Nair)  
Dated: 18-11-2024**

Appellant : Sri. Mamathukutty,  
AnthuparambilHouse,  
Punnayurkulam,  
Thrissur Dist.

Respondent : The Asst. Executive Engineer, Electrical  
Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd.,  
Punnayoorkulam, Thrissur (DT)

**ORDER**

**Background of the case**

The appellant Shri. Mammathukutty is a Consumer of Licensee (KSEBL) under the Electrical Section, Punnayarkulam, having Consumer No. 1157038020248. The connection is a Domestic Connection with tariff LT 1 A and the power was connected on 04/05/2024. The bills for the consumer were raised on bimonthly basis and the reading for 2/24 was taken on 3/2/24 and that of 4/24 was taken on 4/4/24. The meter reading for the month of 6/24 was taken on 7/6/24 and then the consumption recorded was 641 units and accordingly bill amount works out to Rs. 5598/-. Then based on the complaint from the consumer the bill was revised calculating the consumption for 60 days considering the average daily consumption as 10.015 units. The consumption for 60 days was arrived as 601 units and the bill was revised of Rs.5271/-. The appellant was not satisfied with the method of calculations of the Licensee and approached CGRF by filing the petition. The CGRF had issued order dated 31/07/2024 completing the procedure. This petition was filed to this Authority as the appeal to the CGRF order.

**Arguments of the Appellant**

Mamathukuttyy, residing at Anthuparambil (H), Punnayurkulam, Thrissur - 679561, wish to bring to your kind attention an issue regarding an erroneous electricity bill issued by KSEB, and seek your intervention for justice.

Complaint No. OP 44/2024-25: I had previously raised a complaint with the CGRF, Ernakulam (Central Region), regarding a delay in meter reading which resulted in an inflated electricity bill for June 2024.

2. Delay in Meter Reading: The meter reading was delayed by 64 days due to technical issues on the part of KSEB. This delay led to my consumption being recorded at 603 units, thereby pushing me into a higher billing slab.

3. CGRF Decision: The Hon'ble CGRF acknowledged that there was a delay in taking the bi-monthly reading and directed the respondent to revise the electricity bill based on the downloaded readings for 60 days. However, the revised reading indicated that I had consumed 603 units for 60 days (due to an additional 12-hour delay), whereas the actual 60-day consumption would have been 598.9 units, which is below the threshold for the higher billing slab.

Excessive Billing Due to 12-Hour Delay: The additional 12-hour delay in meter reading unfairly pushed my consumption to 603 units, which led to higher billing under a different slab. Had the reading been taken exactly at the 60-day mark, my consumption would have been approximately 598.9 units, keeping me in the lower slab.

Financial Impact: This error has caused undue financial burden on me, and I believe that I should not be penalized for delays on the part of KSEB.

Bill Adjustment: I request that my bill for June 2024 be revised to reflect my actual 60-day consumption of approximately 598.9 units, which falls within the lower slab.

2. Compensation: I also request compensation for the inconvenience and financial impact caused due to the delay and the subsequent erroneous billing.

## **Arguments of the Respondent**

The Appellant Mr. Mamathukutty, Anthuparambil (H), Punnayurkulam, Thrissur is a consumer of Kerala State Electricity Board Ltd with consumer number 1157038020248 under Electrical section, Punnayurkulam. Date of connection is 04.05.2004. Extracts of Consumer's Profile from the billing software of KSEB, Orumanet is submitted as Exhibit 1. The column Approved date in Exhibit 1 shows the date of taking meter reading and approving bill. From that data, it is clear that the meter reading were taken mostly on 5th or 6th day of the month in Appellant's house. Only in 2/24 and 4/24 readings were taken on 03.02.24 and 04.04.24 respectively.

On 10.06.23 consumer approached Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Punnayurkulam stating that there was a delay in taking meter reading in his house and due to the delayed reading his consumption crossed 600 units slab and requested to reduce the bill amount. The meter reading of Consumer No. 1157038020248 was taken on 07.06.2024 with a

consumption of 641 units and a bill for Rs. 5598/- was issued (Deducting ACD interest of Rs. 190/- and adding surcharge Rs. 20/- balance amount payable was Rs. 5428/-). Last bill issued to the consumer was on 04.04.2024. As per Regulation 130 (4) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014, the issued bill was reviewed. Average per day consumption was found to be 10.015 units. The bill issued to the consumer was revised to 60 day Actual billing method with per day consumption of 10.015 which was 601 units and a revised bill for Rs.5271/- (deducting ACD interest Rs.5101/-) issued.

Not satisfied with the revised bill, Appellant approached CGRF (CR) and the Honorable CGRF has directed the respondent to download the data from the meter installed in the consumer premises to get the actual consumption instead of average consumption. Downloaded energy meter readings is submitted as Exhibit 2. Downloaded data of energy meter readings showed that consumer has consumed 603 units for 60 days instead of 601 units calculated in average method. Considering the downloaded data, Honorable CGRF (CR) issued order dated 31.07.2024 directing the respondent to revise the bill based on the downloaded actual readings for 60 days.

The Appellant has approached Honorable CGRF (CR) with complaint No. 44/ 2024- 25. Forum directed the respondent to download meter reading data from the energy meter installed in the consumer premises to evaluate the actual consumption for the 60 day period. The data so obtained showed that the Appellant has consumed 603 units for 60 days. Even after taking 60 days instead of 61 days, which is the actual number of days between same dates of two consecutive billing months, Appellant's energy consumption has crossed 600 unit slab. The allegation of the Appellant that the meter reading was delayed for 64 days is completely false. Appellant is making such false statement only for misleading the Honorable Ombudsman. In the appeal, he not mentioned in which period such a delay of 64 days in taking meter reading and issuing bill has occurred.

Honorable CGRF (CR) has made a mistake in the order dated 31.07.24 restricting the bi monthly billing period as 60 days. Days between same dates of two consecutive billing months is 61 days and not 60 days. In the billing period consisting of July, August it is 62 days and in period containing February it is 59 days. In the billing period in question, May-June it was 61 days. In order to comply with the order, only 60 days consumption was billed. If it were 61 days, consumption would have been 12 units more( 615 units). Reading on 04.04.2024 was 11338 and readings at midnight of 03.06.2024 and 04.06.2024 were 11941 and 11953 respectively as per the downloaded data.

The real question in this Appeal is whether there is a specific time in between two meter readings of a bimonthly consumer as per Electricity Act 2003 and Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014. Whether the meter reading should be taken at the same date, same hour, same minute, same second.

Regulation 2 (18) of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 defines Billing cycle or Billing period as the period as approved by the commission for which regular electricity bills are prepared by the licensee for different category of consumers. Regulation 110(1) of the code 2014, stipulates that the meter shall regularly be read once in every billing cycle and on special reading occasions. From the above Regulations, it is clear that there is no specific time period in between two meter readings. Argument of the Appellant that there was a delay of 12 hours is not maintainable.

Regulation 128 of Kerala Electricity supply Code 2014, empowers the consumer for self assessment in case of delay or non receipt of electricity bill. At the time of covid-19 lock down, KSEBL had given wide publicity of the option and several consumers used the facility. Appellant has the option to use this facility. But he not used the facility nor intimated about the delay in Electricity Office. It is suspected that the real aim of the Appellant is to get social media publicity by tarnishing the image of KSEBL.

The above being the real facts of the complaint, It is respectfully submitted that there are no merits in any of the grounds raised in the appeal and it is liable to be dismissed as such. There is no deficiency on the part of the respondent and the appellant is not eligible for any of the reliefs sought for. For the foregoing reasons, it is most humbly prayed that this Honorable Ombudsman may be pleased to dismiss the appeal.

Ensure Compliance: I further request that KSEB be directed to ensure strict compliance with the relevant regulations in the future to prevent similar issues for other consumers. I humbly request the Hon'ble Ombudsman to consider my complaint and grant the relief sought.

### **Analysis and findings**

The hearing of this appeal petition was conducted on 08/11/2024 at 11:30 a.m. in the office of Deputy Chief Engineer, Electrical Circle, Kottappuram Rd., Thrissur. The appellant's representative Sri. Shiyas Lal and the respondent Asst. Executive Enginner, Punnayarkkulam Electrical Sub Division attended the hearing.

The appellant is a domestic consumer with LT 1 A tariff. The telescopic tariff structure of the Domestic Consumer are becoming flat tariff for the bimonthly consumption beyond 600 units. Here in the case in hand, the Licensee has taken reading on 2/2024 on 3/2/2024 and that of 4/2024 on 4/2/2024. Then the reading for the month of June/2024 was taken only on 7/6/2024 which is after 64 days from the reading of April/2024. This result to cross the reading beyond 600 and hence the flat rate tariff was applied on arriving the current charge. Then the consumer had complained about this and accordingly the daily average consumption was calculated as 10.015 units and the consumption for 60 days was calculated as 601 units, and then the bill was revised.

As per the direction of the CGRF, the meter data was down loaded. Though the bill for the month of April/2024 was raised on 4/4/2024 the reading was actually taken on 3/4/2024. This has been noticed from the data produced by the respondent.

The reading recorded on 3/4/2024 was = **11338**

From the down loaded data,

The reading recorded on 00:00hrs on 3/6/2024  
which is midnight of 2/6/2024 was = **11929.5**.

Then,

The reading recorded on 00.00hrs on 4/6/2024  
which is midnight of 3/6/2024 was = **11941.3**.

Then,

The consumption for 24hrs from 2/6/2024 midnight to 3/6/2024  
midnight is **11941.3-11929.5 = 11.8 units**.

Then,

The average hourly consumption is **11.8/24 = 0.492 units**.

The consumption up to midnight

2/6/2024 is **11929.5-11338 = 591.5 units**.

If the reading is taken on 12.00hrs on 3/6/2024, the consumption for  
12hrs from midnight 2/6/2024 is **0.492\*12 = 5.9 units**.

Then the consumption from morning 3/4/2024

to 12.00hrs on 3/6/2024 is **591.5 + 5.9 = 597.404 units**.

There are similar complaints from the consumers that the delay in taking the reading by the Licensee is resulting to crossing the consumption beyond 600unit and charging on non telescopic basis. The Licensee has to stick on the regular date of meter reading to avoid such issues. The arguments raised by the appellant is seen to be genuine.

## **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 Licensee may revise the bill taking the bimonthly consumption for 3/4/2024 to 3/6/2024 as 597.404 units.
2. The excess amount charged from the appellant shall be refunded by the Licensee to appellant on adjusting on the Electricity Bills.

3. The above orders are to be implemented with seven days.

4. No order on cost.

## **ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

No. P/061/2024/\_\_\_\_\_ dated: 18/11/2024

### **Delivered to**

1. Sri. Mamathukutty, AnthuparambilHouse, Punnayurkulam, Thrissur Dist. - 679561
2. The Asst. Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd., Thripunithura, Ernakulam 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, 220 kV Substation Compound, HMT Colony P.O., Kalamassery, Pin- 683503.