

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/06/2026
(Present A. Chandrakumaran Nair)
Dated: 24-04-2026**

Appellant : Sri.Prakasan P.R
Panangattu Parambil House
Kolazhy P.O, Sivigiri Nagar
Kolazhy, Thrissur (dt) - 680010

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd,
Viyyur, Thrissur(dt)

ORDER

Background of the case

The appellant Shri.Prakasan P.R is a domestic consumer of the Licensee KSEBL bearing consumer no.1156802019717 under the Electrical Section, Viyyur. The single phase connection availed by the consumer has been converted to three phase on 03/07/2025. While taking the meter reading on 25/04/2025, the meter shows an abnormal reading and accordingly bill issued for Rs. 13,572/- with due date as 05/05/2025. The appellant submitted the complaint to the Section office about the erroneous reading of the energy meter and requested for testing. On 20/05/2025, the meter was tested with a parallel meter and found that the appellants meter was over reading by 18 units for a period of seven days. Then the bill was revised for Rs. 8457/- and the same has been paid by the appellant. Then the meter was dismantled without the knowledge of the consumer and send for testing to TMR. The meter was tested without the presence of the consumer and meter test results shows that meter is functioning well. The consumer is asked to pay the balance amount as per original bill. This has been disputed by the appellant and filed the petition to CGRF which was numbered as OP/54/25-26. The CGRF issued order on 18/11/2025 completing the procedure formalities. Then the respondent filed the review petition to CGRF and CGRF issued revised order on review petition RP/02/2025-26 on 07/01/2026, which states that the petitioner is at liberty to retest the meter complying all

the formalities. Aggrieved with the decision of CGRF, this appeal petition is filed to this Authority.

Arguments of the Appellant

This appeal is submitted against the Review Order no. No.CGRF-CR/Review Petition No.02/2025-26 Dated 07/01/2026 of the CGRF (Central Regional).

The Hon'ble Forum ordered as

- 1) The Review Petition No. 02/2025-26 is dismissed.
- 2) The order dated 18.11.2025 passed in OP No. 54/2025-26 is hereby upheld.
- 3) The review petitioner is at liberty to test the meter again, complying all the procedural formality enumerated in the regulations.

Since the Original Order of the Forum has been upheld, the decision in item no. 3 to give liberty to the Respondent to test the meter afresh is against the settled legal position. The facts of the case is detailed below. I am a Consumer Kerala State Electricity Board Limited coming under Electrical Section Viyyur and own a Single phase domestic electricity connection having allotted consumer no. 1156802019717. As of now the connection is converted into three phase. That the electricity bi-monthly bill for the period February 2025 to April 2025 shows an electricity charge of Rs. 13572/- (Rupees Thirteen Thousand Five Hundred and Seventy Two Only). Upon receipt of such an exorbitant electricity bill, I lodged a complaint before the Assistant Engineer Electrical Section Viyyur. That the Authority of the Opposite party raised a demand of Rs. 345/- towards the fees for testing the meter and, I remitted the same. On 13.5.2025, the employees of opposite party installed a meter as they called check meter in my premises. The initial reading in the Main Meter and the check meter are 10879 and 973 respectively. On 20.05.2025, the employees of opposite party came to my premises and took the check meter and the reading in the Main meter and Check Meter at this time was 11004 and 1080 respectively. As per data in the two meters, the comparative reading are:-

Details	Main meter	Check meter
Initial Reading	10879	973
Final Reading	11004	1080
Consumption	125	107

The reading shows difference of 18 units for 7 days, and if this is taken for granted for two months there ought to have difference of 255 units which is more than 20% of the actual consumption. The Officials of opposite parties

changed the meter on 24.5.2025 due to the obvious variation in reading shown in Main Meter and Check Meter.

On 21.05.2025, I received electricity bill for Rs. 8457/- and remitted the amount. Since the meter in dispute is not showing correct consumption, and opposite party changed the meter due to its faulty status. But, in surprise, it is learned that the bill of Rs. 13572/- is not cancelled, rather opposite party stated that it is still a disputed one. Hence, I, submitted another letter to the opposite party to cancel the bill amount of Rs. 13572/- as the main meter was seen as faulty.

On, 18.7.2025, I received a letter from the opposite party to remit Rs. 320/- for testing the meter at their testing office which they stated as TMR. On 16.8.2025, another letter was also received from the opposite party to remit the same amount. As I have already remitted the requested amount, it is the duty of the opposite party to take necessary action. Rather, Opposite party insisted to remit the testing fees which is irregular. As per schedule 1 of the miscellaneous charges published by the KSERC and the KSEB, the testing fees for single phase meter is only Rs. 100/-. This unauthorised collection is deficiency in service

On 7/08/2025, I went to the opposite party,s office for remitting my current charge for the period April to August 2025 and they collected Rs. 220/-. But, I realised later that this was not the current charge, rather misc. Division cash charges. Without any information and consent from my part, the opposite party demanded and collected Rs. 220/- instead of current charge which is an obvious deficiency in service. The Opposite party has violated the provisions of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 with respect to the cause of action. The Opposite party violated the provisions 104 (6) and 104 (7) of the Code 2014.

Had the Opposite Party been not convinced of the faultiness of the meter, they should not have changed the meter. Changing of the main meter itself is a proof that the main meter was faulty. The Opposite Party violated the provisions 113, 114 and 115 of the Code 2014 for not the fault of the complainant. The two current bills received for the period Feb 2025 to April 2025, are not self explanatory and the details are not understandable to a common man.

The licensee admitted that meter is faulty, and subsequently, if the licensee feels that the meter is to be tested in an accredited laboratory, the petitioner is not liable for remitting any amount as neither petitioner nor opposite party has any dispute. If later Opposite party take a decision to test the meter which is already replaced, the petitioner is not liable to remit the any amount. As there is no dispute, and in the absence of any dispute collecting Rs. 555/- is illegal and the excess amount collected shall be refundable to the petitioner.

The Hon'ble Forum has allowed the Original Complaint of the Appellant. After declaring the meter as faulty and changed the faulty meter with new one, testing the meter without following the formality as prescribed in the Code 2014 and file review petition on the premise of the so called test report itself is bad in law and hence, the review order itself is liable to be set aside and reinstate the original order

The Hon'ble Forum's Original Order is speaking one and there is no question of facts or law to review the original order of the Forum. Hence, review order is liable to be set aside. The Forum has given liberty to test the meter in the review petition which is bad in law as the entire procedure of the respondent in the present cause of action is total illegal and give another liberty to the respondent is bad in law and hence the review order is to be set aside in full. The respondent in their capacity tested the meter without following any of the formalities provided in the Code 2014, the respondent has no right to file a review petition against the illegal procedure to make good in an illegal manner. The Forum, in Original petition has not considered the pleas of the appellant for compensation and to make good loss financial loss to the Appellant in relief which is bad in law. As per Code 2014, "In the case of testing on the request of the consumer, he shall have to pay the testing fee as per the Schedule of Miscellaneous Charges given in schedule 1 of the Code" and the schedule contain only Rs. 100/- for testing the meter, demand in excess of what is legally permissible is ultra-vires. More than 20% consumption for a period of 60 days itself is an obvious fact that the meter is faulty. The Opposite Party violated the provisions of the Supply Code 104 (6) (7), 113, 114 and 115 which in turn cause unnecessary hardship to the complainant. Additional demand of Rs. 220/- is against the law and collecting the same without any information is illegal. Changing of meter by the Opposite Party itself shows the faulty character of the meter, demanding the current charge of Rs. 13872/- based on the consumption during the period of faultiness is illegal.

It is, therefore most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Forum may be pleased

1. To set aside the review order of the CGRF (Central Region) dated 7/01/2026 and restore the original order
2. To direct the Opposite party to refund Rs. 220/- collected being the unauthorized collection of testing fees, in violation of the KSERC's rate fixed and without any consent or information of the complaint.
3. Direct the opposite party to compensate for unnecessary hard ship caused to the complainant and also award compensation as per the prevailing Standard of performance Regulations.

Arguments of the Respondent

Petitioner is a consumer under Electrical Section, Viyyur bearing Consumer No: 1156802019717 under domestic category in LT 3Phase with a sanctioned load of 7516 Watts. On service request from the consumer this single phase connection was changed to 3 phase category with effect from 03/07/2025. On receipt of request from the petitioner for testing the meter, a demand of Rupees 345/- was generated, and petitioner remitted the same. The existing meter of the petitioner was checked with a parallel meter that was maintained at section office for this purpose and it is observed that the petitioner's meter reads incorrectly, and it was replaced with a new one. The suspicious defective meter was sent to laboratory of licensee situated in Angamaly vide letter No.DB/AE/VYR/2025-26/47A/10.06.2025, as per the regulation 115(1) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014. Executive Engineer, TMR Angamaly telephonically informed that testing fee remitted by the petitioner was insufficient, and ordered to collect the balance amount from the petitioner for testing. Executive engineer, TMR, Angamaly had also sent a letter to Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Thrissur, West in this regard.

On 20/05/2025, the petitioner's meter was tested at site with a check meter of the section office, and it was found that petitioner's meter recorded '18 units' higher than parallel meter over a span of 7 days. Hence a revised bill of Rupees 8457/- was issued to the petitioner as per the regulation 130(4) and the original bill amounting to Rupees 13572/- was marked as disputed. Sub regulation (1) of regulation 115 of Kerala State Electricity Supply Code 2014 reads as below

115. *Procedure for testing of meter.- (1) The meter shall normally be tested in the laboratory of the licensee, approved by the Commission.*

Subsequently the consumer requested this office to revise the bill issued, considering the meter to be faulty. In response to this, the section authorities intimated the consumer that the bill could be revised only once the meter has been challenged on dispute mode. Further to this, the consumer remitted the balance testing fee and the section office authorities took the meter for testing to the meter testing lab at TMR-Angamaly after replacing the disputed meter with correct meter. This act was done in accordance with the regulation 116(2) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014.

As per the schedule 1 of Kerala Electricity supply code 2014, the meter testing fee has to be borne by the petitioner who challenged the meter.

Schedule 6(c)(i) of Miscellaneous charges in Schedule 1 reads as follows

Testing fee for single phase meter Rupees 100/- with following notes.

Note1. Consumer can entrust the meter testing either in the Electrical section office can directly submit to the appropriate laboratories for testing Consumer who entrust the meters (to be tested) in electrical section office, is to remit transportation cost and packing charge of Rupees 100/- per meter in addition to testing mentioned above. But the board vide its order No: B.O.(FTD)No 888/2021(KSEB/TRAC/TMR/R3/2021) dated 26.11.2021 has revised the rate for testing fee to Rupees 555/-.

Meter testing charge amounting to Rupees 345/- was the charge for testing the meter in non dispute mode at testing lab. Actual cost for testing a disputed meter is Rupees 565/- which was demanded by the Assistant Engineer vide his letter No. DB/AE/VYR/2025-26/71/18-07-2025. Since the consumer had already remitted Rupees 345/- (Three Hundred and Forty Five Only), vide Rt no. 56800250509101026 dtd 09.05.2025, the section authorities requested the consumer to remit the balance amount of 220/- (Two hundred and twenty rupees) which was remitted by the petitioner on 07.08.2025. This act of the Assistant Engineer by which he demanded the additional amount of 220/- was in accordance with the regulations of Kerala Electricity Supply code 2014. Consequently the meter was tested at Meter testing unit at TMK Angamaly and this office received the test result on 12.11.2025 by email as per which the percentage errors of the meter are within the limits.

Meanwhile the consumer had approached hon'ble CGRF in this regard and after conducting the hearing on 24.10.2025, the commission passed its orders on 18.11.2025 which reads as follows.

1. Disputed bill amounting to Rupees 13572/- issued by the licensee in cancelled.
2. The licensee shall issue a fresh bill in compliance with kerala electricity supply code 2014.
3. No order as to cost him.

In the findings of the honourable commission, it has been clearly stated that, "The licensee is bound to revise the billing in accordance with the test results received from TMR Angamaly and issue a fresh bill, based on the average consumption as per the relevant provisions of the supply code"..

Since this office received the meter testing results from the testing lab only on 12.11.2025, this result could not be presented in the hearing. This result was emailed to the office of CGRF on the very same day that this office received it.

As there was ambiguity in the order, this office filed a review petition at the forum, seeking a more clear order. Based on this a hearing was held by the

hon'ble CGRF on 19.12.2025, in which the petitioner submitted that the procedural formalities that has to be observed by the licensee while testing a disputed meter were not observed by the meter testing lab at TMR Angamaly. Further to this, on 07/01/2026 the forum passed orders dismissing the review petition and in this order the earlier order passed by the forum was upheld. By this order the forum has reminded the licensee of its liberty to test the meter again complying all the procedural formalities enumerated in the regulations.

Now the meter with details of testing conducted by meter testing lab at TMR Angamaly, is available with the section authorities and as per the testing conducted the meter is found healthy. Hence the dispute on the energy bill of 13572/- stands revoked and the consumer is Doblged to remit the same. This office has sought for the concurrence from the legal wing of KSEBL to comply with the orders of CGRF. It is most respectfully submitted that the there is no merits in any of the grounds raised in the petition and is liable to be dismissed as such.

Counter Argument of the Appellant

The appellant filed a complaint before the CGRF (Central Region) and numbered as OP 54/2025-26 and the Opposite party filed the version. In the 2nd and 4th para of the counter in the original petition of the appellant before the CGRF (CR), the Opposite party stated in the 2nd and 4th para that the meter is reads incorrectly and it is an admission of fact that the meter is incorrect and faulty. Since admitted facts need not be proved is the settled legal position, prayers in the complaint of the Appellant shall be passed in favour of the Appellant. As per section 55 of the Ele. Act 2003, no licensee shall supply electricity, after the expiry of two years from the appointed date, except through installation of a correct meter in accordance with the regulations to be made in this behalf. The primary function of an electric meter is to measure consumption accurately. If the readings are significantly higher or lower than the actual usage, it is failing its basic function. Since the Opposite party stated unequivocally that meter is incorrect, then there is no dispute in the fact about the status of the meter. Rest is with the Opposite party.

The licensee/1st respondent admitted that meter is faulty, and subsequently, if the licensee feels that the meter is to be tested in an accredited laboratory, the Appellant is not liable for remitting any amount as neither Appellant nor opposite party has any dispute. If later Opposite party take a decision to test the meter which is already replaced, the Appellant is not liable to remit the any amount. As there is no dispute, and in the absence of any dispute collecting Rs. 555/- is illegal and the excess amount collected shall be refundable to the Appellant. The original complaint was allowed by the CGRF (Central Region), but in a clandestine manner, the 1st respondent has filed a review petition before the CGRF (CR) which was given a liberty to the 1" respondent to test the meter again following the necessary formalities. This

order of the CGRF (CR) is against the settled law.

The test meter installed by the 1st respondent in the premises of the appellant based on the complaint of the appellant, had shown obviously shown as fault. The faultiness of the meter was admitted by the respondent in the version of the respondent before the CGRF (CR). When the consumer meter showed incorrect consumption, the 1st respondent, without informing the appellant taken the meter and replaced with another one without following the legal formalities. The 1st respondent ought to have prepared a site mahazar to this effect and should got convinced the appellant with the dated signature of the appellant in the site mahazar itself. respondent has not prepared any site mahazar while taking the consumer meter of the appellant and this is an obvious violation of the Supply Code 2014 and other existing rules, orders etc..

The 1st respondent ought to have follow the chapter 6 of the Supply Code 2014 (hereinafter Code 2014) in the matter of METERING. But none of the regulations with respect to Code 2014 in metering and billing, inspection etc has been followed by the 1st respondent. The 1st respondent without any communication to the appellant has taken both the consumer meter and test meter without following the regulations of Code 2014. The 1st respondent is treating the appellant as an enemy and harassing by making unnecessary remarks. After long period of taking the consumer meter from the premises of the appellant, the 1st respondent issued a letter to the appellant to remit some amount for testing of the meter. This is grave violation of the regulations in Code 2014. The 1st respondent took an erroneous presumption all along the impugned period and till this date.

After the original order of the CGRF, the respondent tested the meter without informing the appellant. After the testing of the meter without following the regulations in Code 2014, the 1st respondent filed a review petition stating that the test report revealed that the meter is correct. After taking the meter from the consumer's premises without informing the appellant and sans following the necessary formalities, the impugned meter was in the custody of the 1st respondent's office. The 1st respondent , has every opportunity to make unnecessary adjustments in meter as the impugned meter was in the custody of the KSEB Ltd. When meter is installed, the consumer or his representative shall witness the sealing or removing of seals and the sign on the sealing certificate. (Reg 104(7) of Code 2014. When the new meter was installed in the premises of the appellant, the 1st respondent had not followed this provision and without any notice to the appellant, the 1st respondent has replaced the faulty meter with new one. After holding the faulty meter for long time in the custody of the 1st respondent, they tested the meter without the consent/knowledge of the appellant. By not following any regulations /formalities specified in the Code 2014 and other rules, orders circulars etc. , the 1st respondent tested the meter. This illegal holding of meter for long time, definitely give ample opportunity to the 1st respondent to make some illegal action with the meter by the 1st respondent to get the desired result. This is an obvious violation of the settled law. This pivotal fact has not been considered by the CGRF(Central Region) and issued an order to

test the meter again in the Review Petition Order. The CGRF (CR) ought to have consider this pivotal fact while making the review order. Hence, the review petition order of the CGRF (CR) is bad any law.

Hence, I humbly pray that this appeal be considered favorably and set aside the review order of the CGRF (CR) and restore the original order and the prayer in the appeal shall be favourably be considered for fulfilling the justice to the appellant as justice should not only be done but manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done.

Analysis and findings

The hearing of the appeal petition was conducted on 24/03/2026 at 11:00 am in the office of the State Electricity Ombudsman, DH Road & Foreshore Road Junction, near Gandhi Square, Ernakulam south. The hearing was attended by the appellant Shri. Prakasan P.R and the respondents Smt. Mini C.V, Asst. Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd., Viyyur, Sri. Sankar. R, Nodal Officer(litigation), Thrissur and Sri. Sijo Jose, Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Viyyur, Thrissur (DT).

The appellant is a domestic consumer under the Electrical Section Viyyur with connected load 7.576 KW and his average bimonthly electricity bill was around Rs. 8500/-. The Licensee has served a bill for Rs. 13,572/- for two months of February & March on 25/04/2025 mentioning the due date as 05/05/2025. The appellant suspected the correctness of the energy meter and requested for testing the meter. The meter was tested with a parallel meter for 7 days in the month 05/2025 (from 13/05/2025 to 20/05/2025) and found that the consumer meter reading 18 unit higher than the test meter. Then the bill was revised to Rs. 8457/- and issued on 21/05/2025. The regulation 125 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 describes about the billing procedure in case of defect in the meter.

125. Procedure for billing in the case of defective or damaged meter. -

(1) In the case of defective or damaged meter, the consumer shall be billed on the basis of average consumption of the past three billing cycles immediately preceding the date of the meter being found or reported defective:

Provided that, the average shall be computed from the three billing cycles after the meter is replaced if required details pertaining to previous billing cycles are not available:

Provided further that any evidence given by consumer about conditions of working and occupancy of the concerned premises during the said period, which might have had a bearing on energy consumption, shall also be considered by the licensee for computing the average.

(2) Charges based on the average consumption as computed above shall be levied only for a maximum period of two billing cycles during which time the licensee shall replace the defective or damaged meter with a correct meter.

Here it is very clearly mentioned that the consumer is to be billed on the basis of average consumption for the past three billing cycles. This has been complied by the Licensee.

Subsequently the meter was dismantled by the Licensee without the knowledge of the consumer and send for testing at TMR Angamally and demanded additional testing fee of Rs. 320/- in addition to the testing already paid Rs.345/-. The meter testing fee was Rs.345/- and Rs.565/- is the charges for testing the erroneous meter or disputed meter. The consumer had accepted the testing by parallel meter and accordingly the payment as per the revised bill has been made. The consumer has not made any dispute and not requested for testing again. Then how the dispute arises about the accuracy of the meter? The Licensee was not having any proper answer for this. But explained that they were suspected the accuracy of the test meter. Then the test meter was not tested. The testing of the meter is to be done by taking the consumer into confidence. The meter has been dismantled without any intimation to the consumer and violating the provisions of the Supply Code. The regulation 109 of Supply Code 2014 states about the replacement of meter.

(10) Initial installation as well as replacement of the meter shall be done by a qualified employee of the licensee duly authorised for this purpose, in the presence of the consumer or his representative.

(11) The licensee shall adopt a format of meter particulars sheet for recording the particulars of the meter at the time of initial installation or replacement.

(12) The licensee shall retain one copy of the meter particulars sheet and its second copy, duly signed by the authorised representative of the licensee, shall be given to the consumer under proper acknowledgment.

(13)The consumer or his authorised representative shall also sign the meter particulars sheet.

(14) Subsequently, details of any faults in the meter, repairs, replacements etc. shall be entered in the meter particulars sheet by the licensee or his authorised representative.

(15)Whenever a new meter is installed, either for a new connection or for replacement, it shall be sealed in the presence of the consumer.

(16) The seal, name plates and distinguishing numbers or marks affixed on the said equipment or apparatus shall not in any way be broken, erased or altered by the consumer or his employee or any person acting on his behalf

Neither site mahazar nor the inspection report/meter particular format is prepared during the dismantling of old meter or replacement. The testing of the meter at TMR is decided by the Licensee unilaterally. Then the consumer

is not liable to pay the additional amount demanded by the Licensee which is Rs. 320/-.

Then the compliance of procedure of testing the meter is to be examined. The regulation 115 of the Supply Code describes about the testing procedure.

115. Procedure for testing of meter. -

(1) The meter shall normally be tested in the laboratory of the licensee, approved by the Commission

(4) In the case of testing on the request of the consumer, he shall have to pay the testing fee as per the Schedule of Miscellaneous Charges given in schedule 1 of the Code:

Provided that if the meter is found to be recording incorrectly or defective or damaged due to technical reasons such as voltage fluctuation or transients, attributable to the licensee, the testing fee shall be refunded to the consumer by the licensee by adjustment in the subsequent bill.

(5) Before testing a meter of the consumer, the licensee shall give an advance notice of three days, intimating the date, time and place of testing so that the consumer or his authorised representative can, at his option, be present at the testing.

(6) The testing shall be done within a maximum period of thirty days from the receipt of the application.

(7) The consumer or his authorised representative and the representative of the licensee present during testing shall affix their signature on the test report issued by the authorised officer of the laboratory as a token of having witnessed the testing:

Provided that the licensee and the consumer shall be eligible to get a copy of the test report which shall be despatched to them within two working days of the date of testing, if not delivered in person at the time of affixing their signature.

Here it is pertinent to note that the Licensee was tested the meter without the presence of consumer or his authorised representatives. The consumer has been requested for the testing in May 2025 and the meter was tested in the month of Oct 2025, which is after a period of 5 months. The regulation states that the meter is to be tested within 30 days from the date of application. It is mandatory that the Licensee is bound to comply the procedures issued by the Hon'ble Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission. In this the officials of the Licensee seems to be acted as per their will and wish violating the rules and regulations. Then the appellant is not liable to pay the bill as demanded by the Licensee.

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 bill amounting to Rs.13,572/- issued by the Licensee is quashed herewith.
2. The appellant is liable to pay the amount for the electricity consumed for the month of 02/2025 and 03/2025 as per regulation 125(1) of the Supply Code 2014 which is bill amount on the basis of average of consumption for the past three billing cycles immediately before the meter found defective.
3. The Licensee shall refund Rs. 320/-collected from the appellant as additional testing fee.
4. No other costs ordered.

ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

No. P/06/2026/_____ dated: 24/04/2026.

Delivered to:

1. Sri.Prakasan P.R,Panangattu Parambil House,Kolazhy P.O, Sivigiri Nagar Kolazhy, Thrissur (dt) - 680010
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd, Viyyur, Thrissur (dt)

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.