

**MINUTES OF 25th MEETING
TO
REVIEW THE PERFORMANCE OF CGRFs AND OMBUDSMAN**

Date : 19.08.2023 Time : 11:30 AM
Venue : Grand Mercure, GIFT City, Gandhinagar

The meeting started with greetings to the members of all the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forums (CGRFs) and the Electricity Ombudsman by Hon'ble Chairman, GERC. It was observed that few new members of CGRFs were attending the meeting for the first time and on the request of Hon'ble Chairman, GERC, meeting started with introduction of the members. Thereafter discussion took place on agenda items.

Item No. 1: Confirmation of the Minutes of the 24th Meeting

Minutes of 24th Meeting for review of performance of Consumer Grievances Redressal Forums and Ombudsman held on 18.09.2019 circulated to the members of CGRFs and Ombudsman vide letter dated 01.10.2019 were confirmed as no comments were received from any of the members.

Item No. 2: Action Taken Report on Minutes of 24th Meeting

During the 24th Meeting, the Commission informed the members that it is in process of finalizing the GERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019. Subsequently, the Regulations were published in Gazette on 30.09.2019 as Notification No. 2 of 2019.

In reference to above, necessary directions were given to the concerned Discoms / CGRFs on the issues raised during the 24th Meeting.

- In accordance with the Clause 2.3 of the GERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019, the Commission, in order to enhance the ease of consumers to reach the Forum, directed all Discoms to establish one number of Forum in addition to the existing number of Forum/s functioning in the Licensee. Subsequently, additional CGRFs were constituted in all the Discoms.
- Moreover, in pursuance to Clause 2.11 of the Regulations, the Commission determined the remuneration and facilities to be provided to the Chairperson and Independent Member of the CGRF, applicable from 01.01.2020.

Item No. 3: Attendance of Members of the Forum

It was observed that the Technical Members of PGVCL Forums have attended less number of hearings. The representatives of the PGVCL Forums informed the Commission that as the Technical Member handle various other portfolios, sometimes they are not able to attend the hearings. It was stated that the Technical Member is an important person of the CGRF coram to provide views on the technical aspects of the matter. The Hon'ble Chairman advised the Technical Members to be more regular in the CGRF hearing.

Item No. 4: Review of performance

The performance report of all the CGRFs and the Electricity Ombudsman for the FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23 was presented.

The Commission has noted the performance of CGRFs and Ombudsman during FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23. The summary of Annual Reports received from the CGRFs & Ombudsman for FY 2021-22 and FY 2022-23 are kept for information at **Annexure 1 and Annexure 2**, respectively.

The Commission advised that the CGRFs shall mention the reason for delay in issuing the final order after time limit of 30 days, in the order itself. Further, the reasons for delay in issuing the order beyond time limit of 30 days shall also be mentioned in the quarterly reports submitted by the CGRFs to the Commission.

Item No. 5: Status of implementation of orders of the Ombudsman by distribution licensees

The Electricity Ombudsman submits yearly report to the Commission with status of implementation of orders of the Ombudsman by distribution licensees.

Moreover, the Commission advised that the orders of the CGRFs and Ombudsman be implemented by the Discoms within time limit and as far as possible there shall be less litigations by the Discoms.

Item No. 6: Suggestions received for amendment in the GERC (CGRF & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019

The suggestions given by the CGRFs for the Draft GERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) (First Amendment) Regulations, 2022 were noted.

Item No. 7: Presentation by Forums

Presentations were made for a specific case by the CGRFs of DGVCL - Surat, PGVCL - Junagadh, UGVCL - Mehsana and the Electricity Ombudsman - Rajkot and it was discussed by the participants for the necessary know how.

Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, suggested that in case of demise of a consumer, Discoms should not insist on submission of multiple documents for name change and they should expedite the process of name change applications received by it by giving proper guidance to the consumers.

Further, Electricity Ombudsman, Rajkot, suggested that the orders of the Ombudsman and CGRFs should be informed to all the filed level officers of the Discoms so that same type of complaints are not received by the CGRFs repeatedly.

Hon'ble Chairman thanked the members of the Forums for their participation in the meeting.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

Sd/-
(Roopwant Singh, IAS)
Secretary
Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission
Gandhinagar

List of Participants

The Commission and the staff:

1. Shri Anil Mukim, Chairman, GERC, Gandhinagar
2. Shri Mehul M. Gandhi, Member, GERC, Gandhinagar.
3. Shri S.R. Pandey, Member, GERC, Gandhinagar.
4. Shri D.R. Parmar, Director
5. Shri M.R. Jhala, Joint Director
6. Shri B.J. Shah, Staff Officer
7. Shri Jignesh Makwana, IT Manager
8. Shri Abhishek Makwana, Asst. Director
9. Shri Ketan Thanki, Asst. Director
10. Shri Pratap Mistry, PA to Hon'ble Chairman

Chairpersons / Members / Representatives of CGRFs and Ombudsman:

1. Shri P.A. Vaghela, Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad
2. Shri S.H. Upadhyay, Electricity Ombudsman, Rajkot
3. Shri B.C. Majmudar, Chairperson, DGVCL Valsad Forum and I/c Chairperson, DGVCL Surat Forum
4. Shri S.P. Trivedi, Chairperson, MGVCL Vadodara Forum
5. Shri A.G. Shah, Chairperson, MGVCL Godhra Forum
6. Shri N.C. Makwana, Chairperson, PGVCL Rajkot Forum and I/c Chairperson, PGVCL Bhavnagar, Bhuj & Junagadh Forums
7. Shri K.N. Parikh, Chairperson, UGVCL Ahmedabad Forum and I/c Chairperson, UGVCL Mehsana Forum
8. Shri N.M. Vyas, Chairperson, TPL Surat & Dahej Forums and I/c Chairperson, TPL Ahmedabad Forum
9. Shri N.B. Mistri, Independent Member, DGVCL Surat Forum
10. Smt. Shobhanaben Chhapia, Independent Member, DGVCL Valsad Forum
11. Shri R.C. Raval, Independent Member, MGVCL Godhra Forum
12. Smt. Nitinaben H. Joshi, Independent Member, PGVCL Rajkot Forum
13. Smt. Jignasa M. Mehta, Independent Member, PGVCL Bhavnagar Forum
14. Shri R.G. Kumpawat, Independent Member, PGVCL Bhuj Forum
15. Shri N.S. Pandya, Independent Member, PGVCL Junagadh Forum
16. Shri A.S. Mehta, Independent Member, UGVCL Ahmedabad Forum and I/c Independent Member, UGVCL Mehsana Forum
17. Smt. Shobhanaben D. Trivedi, Independent Member, TPL Ahmedabad Forum
18. Shri J.C. Raychura, Staff Officer, Electricity Ombudsman Office, Ahmedabad
19. Shri Y.S. Ghedia, Staff Officer, Electricity Ombudsman Office, Rajkot
20. Shri G.B. Patel, Technical Member, DGVCL Surat and Valsad Forums
21. Shri R.C. Patel, Technical Member, PGVCL Rajkot Forum
22. Shri J.A. Gosai, Technical Member, PGVCL Bhavnagar Forum
23. Shri B.D. Parmar, Technical Member, PGVCL Junagadh Forum

24. Shri D.B. Patel, Technical Member, UGVCL Mehsana and Ahmedabad Forums
25. Shri U.S. Kanani, Technical Member, TPL Surat Forum
26. Shri R.M. Parmar, Convener, DGVCL Surat Forum
27. Shri D.S. Patel, Convener, DGVCL Valsad Forum
28. Shri N.A. Shah, Convener, MGVCL Vadodara Forum
29. Shri G.B. Pateliya, Convener, MGVCL Godhra Forum
30. Shri R.K. Vegda, Convener, PGVCL Bhavnagar Forum
31. S.A. Memon, Convener, PGVCL Bhuj Forum
32. Shri D.S. Rajpal, Convener, PGVCL Junagadh Forum
33. Shri K.B. Chaudhari, Convener, UGVCL Mehsana Forum
34. Smt. U.A. Parmar, Convener, UGVCL Ahmedabad Forum
35. Shri D.R. Panirwala, Convener, TPL Ahmedabad Forum
36. Ms. Seema S. Parikh, Convener, TPL Surat Forum
37. Shri M.U. Dave, Junior Assistant, Electricity Ombudsman Office, Ahmedabad
38. Shri P.H. Ashiyani, Junior Assistant, Electricity Ombudsman Office, Rajkot
39. Shri S.S. Doshi, Jr. Assistant, PGVCL Rajkot
40. Shri U.M. Solanki, Jr. Assistant, PGVCL Bhavnagar
41. Shri J.K. Chavda, Jr. Assistant, PGVCL Junagadh

Annexure 1

Grievances redressed by CGRFs during FY 2021-22

CGRF	Grievances pending at the end of previous Year	Grievances received during the Year	Total Grievances	Grievances redressed during the Year	Balance Grievances to be attended	Grievances successfully redressed during the Year			Number of cases redressed in favour of the Licensee	Number of cases redressed in favour of the Consumers	Others	No. of sittings
	1	2	3=1+2	4	5=3-4	Within 30 days	After 30 days	Total				
DGVCL Surat	16	156	172	162	10	41	121	162	64	60	38	48
DGVCL Valsad	0	33	33	30	3	23	7	30	19	1	10	12
MGVCL Vadodara	3	13	16	16	0	16	0	16	10	6	0	7
MGVCL Godhra	0	10	10	10	0	9	1	10	5	5	0	4
PGVCL Rajkot	7	105	112	101	11	19	82	101	44	52	5	23
PGVCL Bhavnagar	19	95	114	102	12	19	83	102	27	36	39	34
PGVCL Bhuj	3	6	9	5	4	3	2	5	3	0	2	4
PGVCL Junagadh	27	55	82	71	11	0	71	71	42	13	16	14
UGVCL Mehsana	1	23	24	24	0	17	7	24	8	16	0	15
UGVCL Ahmedabad	5	67	72	72	0	66	6	72	32	30	10	39
TPL-D Ahmedabad	7	47	54	54	0	34	20	54	50	1	3	50
TPL-D Surat	0	15	15	15	0	10	5	15	9	1	5	51
TPL-D Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Total	88	625	713	662	51	257	405	662	313	221	128	313

Grievances redressed by CGRFs during FY 2022-23

CGRF	Grievances pending at the end of previous Year	Grievances received during the Year	Total Grievances	Grievances redressed during the Year	Balance Grievances to be attended	Grievances successfully redressed during the Year			Number of cases redressed in favour of the Licensee	Number of cases redressed in favour of the Consumers	Others	No. of sittings
	1	2	3=1+2	4	5=3-4	Within 30 days	After 30 days	Total				
DGVCL Surat	10	172	182	176	6	73	103	176	47	79	50	54
DGVCL Valsad	3	25	28	27	1	20	7	27	18	7	2	18
MGVCL Vadodara	0	24	24	24	0	24	0	24	12	11	1	6
MGVCL Godhra	0	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	1	1	0	1
PGVCL Rajkot	11	102	113	99	14	44	55	99	44	49	6	26
PGVCL Bhavnagar	12	109	121	100	21	36	64	100	28	33	39	31
PGVCL Bhuj	2	11	13	10	3	4	6	10	7	3	0	4
PGVCL Junagadh	11	66	77	65	12	20	45	65	38	18	9	15
UGVCL Mehsana	0	29	29	28	1	21	7	28	9	16	3	12
UGVCL Ahmedabad	0	47	47	45	2	41	4	45	19	19	7	31
TPL-D Ahmedabad	0	18	18	17	1	9	8	17	16	0	1	36
TPL-D Surat	0	28	28	27	1	17	10	27	11	2	14	53
TPL-D Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Total	49	633	682	620	62	311	309	620	250	238	132	299

* PGVCL Bhuj: 2 cases pending from previous FY were withdrawn by the consumer

Number of sittings of CGRF during FY 2021-22

CGRF	No. of sittings in the quarter	No. of sittings attended by Chairperson	No. of sittings attended by Technical Member	No. of sittings attended by Independent Member
DGVCL Surat	48	46	48	48
DGVCL Valsad	12	12	12	12
MGVCL Vadodara	7	8	8	7
MGVCL Godhra	4	2	2	2
PGVCL Rajkot	23	23	6	23
PGVCL Bhavnagar	34	34	15	32
PGVCL Bhuj	4	4	0	4
PGVCL Junagadh	14	14	1	14
UGVCL Mehsana	15	14	12	15
UGVCL Ahmedabad	39	39	34	37
TPL-D Ahmedabad	50	45	43	50
TPL-D Surat	51	51	51	51
TPL-D Dahej	12	12	12	12
Total	313	304	244	307

Types of grievances redressed by the CGRF during FY 2021-22

CGRF	Delay in restoring supply	Quality of supply	Meter Problems	Billing Problems	Quality of Service	Others	Total
DGVCL Surat	5	10	0	63	0	84	162
DGVCL Valsad	0	1	0	8	1	20	30
MGVCL Vadodara	0	0	1	6	0	9	16
MGVCL Godhra	0	0	2	1	0	7	10
PGVCL Rajkot	0	8	11	41	41	0	101
PGVCL Bhavnagar	0	2	5	41	26	28	102
PGVCL Bhuj	0	0	0	2	0	3	5
PGVCL Junagadh	1	2	3	32	30	3	71
UGVCL Mehsana	2	0	4	11	1	6	24
UGVCL Ahmedabad	0	0	0	51	0	21	72
TPL-D Ahmedabad	0	0	1	8	0	45	54
TPL-D Surat	0	0	1	2	0	12	15
TPL-D Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8	23	28	266	99	238	662

Number of sittings of CGRF during FY 2022-23

CGRF	No. of sittings in the quarter	No. of sittings attended by Chairperson	No. of sittings attended by Technical Member	No. of sittings attended by Independent Member
DGVCL Surat	54	33	49	54
DGVCL Valsad	18	16	18	18
MGVCL Vadodara	6	5	5	5
MGVCL Godhra	1	1	0	1
PGVCL Rajkot	26	26	19	26
PGVCL Bhavnagar	31	31	15	31
PGVCL Bhuj	4	4	3	4
PGVCL Junagadh	15	15	2	15
UGVCL Mehsana	12	12	12	7
UGVCL Ahmedabad	31	31	29	21
TPL-D Ahmedabad	36	36	35	32
TPL-D Surat	53	52	52	40
TPL-D Dahej	12	12	12	9
Total	299	274	251	263

Types of grievances redressed by the CGRF during FY 2022-23

CGRF	Delay in restoring supply	Quality of supply	Meter Problems	Billing Problems	Quality of Service	Others	Total
DGVCL Surat	0	5	3	72	1	95	176
DGVCL Valsad	0	1	4	5	0	17	27
MGVCL Vadodara	0	0	0	17	0	7	24
MGVCL Godhra	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
PGVCL Rajkot	0	6	12	37	42	2	99
PGVCL Bhavnagar	1	0	2	50	23	24	100
PGVCL Bhuj	0	1	1	2	0	6	10
PGVCL Junagadh	0	2	0	35	27	1	65
UGVCL Mehsana	4	1	0	10	2	11	28
UGVCL Ahmedabad	0	2	2	33	0	8	45
TPL-D Ahmedabad	0	0	0	6	0	11	17
TPL-D Surat	0	2	2	3	0	20	27
TPL-D Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5	20	26	272	95	202	620

Annexure 2

Appeals redressed by the Electricity Ombudsman during FY 2021-22

CGRF	Representation			Representations disposed of				Pending at the end of the Year	Appeals disposed of within 45 days	Appeals disposed of after 45 days	No. of sittings
	Pending at the start of the Year	Received during the Year	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
DGVCL Surat	16	14	30	5	4	12	21	9	0	21	38
DGVCL Valsad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MGVCL Vadodara	5	11	16	7	1	2	10	6	0	10	18
MGVCL Godhra	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
PGVCL Rajkot	11	11	22	9	1	4	14	8	0	14	24
PGVCL Bhavnagar	8	14	22	6	3	3	12	10	0	12	20
PGVCL Bhuj	0	4	4	2	0	1	3	1	0	3	3
PGVCL Junagadh	9	18	27	8	6	1	15	12	0	15	30
UGVCL Mehsana	4	5	9	4	2	1	7	2	0	7	10
UGVCL Ahmedabad	6	13	19	4	4	6	14	5	0	14	26
TPL-D Ahmedabad	10	12	22	5	8	5	18	4	1	17	23
TPL-D Surat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TPL-D Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	69	104	173	50	29	35	114	59	1	113	193

Appeals redressed by the Electricity Ombudsman - Ahmedabad during FY 2022-23

CGRF	Representation			Representations disposed of				Pending at the end of the Year	Representations disposed of within 45 days	Representations disposed of after 45 days	No. of sittings in a Year
	Pending at the start of the Year	Received during the Year	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
DGVCL Surat	9	9	18	8	4	2	14	4	0	14	26
DGVCL Valsad	0	5	5	1	1	1	3	2	0	3	5
MGVCL Vadodara	6	8	14	8	3	0	11	3	0	11	13
MGVCL Godhra	2	3	5	2	1	0	3	2	0	3	5
PGVCL Rajkot	8	0	8	5	2	1	8	0	0	8	0
PGVCL Bhavnagar	10	0	10	6	4	0	10	0	0	10	0
PGVCL Bhuj	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
PGVCL Junagadh	12	0	12	5	5	2	12	0	0	12	0
UGVCL Mehsana	2	2	4	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	5
UGVCL Ahmedabad	5	8	13	2	7	0	9	4	0	9	9
TPL-D Ahmedabad	4	4	8	3	3	0	6	2	0	6	9
TPL-D Surat	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3
TPL-D Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	59	41	100	43	31	6	80	20	0	80	75

Appeals redressed by the Electricity Ombudsman - Rajkot during FY 2022-23

CGRF	Representation			Representations disposed of				Pending at the end of the Year	Representations disposed of within 45 days	Representations disposed of after 45 days	No. of sittings in a Year
	Pending at the start of the Year	Received during the Year	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
PGVCL Rajkot	0	15	15	2	6	0	8	7	0	8	23
PGVCL Bhavnagar	0	14	14	6	7	0	13	1	0	13	31
PGVCL Bhuj	0	3	3	1	1	0	2	1	0	2	5
PGVCL Junagadh	0	14	14	4	6	0	10	4	1	9	25
Total	0	46	46	13	20	0	33	13	1	32	84

DAKSHIN GUJARAT VIJ COMPANY LTD., SURAT

**Consumer Grievances Redressal
Forum – DGVCL, Surat**

Performance Review Meeting of Consumer Grievances
Redressal Forums and Ombudsman, Gujarat State

Arranged by
Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission

Date: 19.08.2023

Place : Gandhinagar

DAKSHIN GUJARAT VIJ COMPANY LTD., SURAT

**Consumer Grievances Redressal
Forum – DGVCL, Surat**

Welcomes

Dignitaries of Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity
Regulatory Commission,

Ombudsman, Chairperson & Members of
Forums of the state

DAKSHIN GUJARAT VIJ COMPANY LTD., SURAT

**Consumer Grievances Redressal
Forum – DGVCL, Surat**

Registered & Corporate Office,
Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Ltd.,
“Urja Sadan”, Nana Varachha Road, Kapodra
Char Rasta, Surat.

E-mail: eegerc.dgvcl@gebmail.com

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat

- 1. Mr. B.C. Majmudar,**
I/c. Chairperson, Retd., SE, MGVCL
- 2. Mr. G.B. Patel,**
Member (Tech.) & S.E. (Vigi.), DGVCL,
Corporate Office, Surat
- 3. Mr. N.B. Mistri,**
Member Independent (Advocate)
- 4. Mr. R.M. Parmar,**
Convener & E.E. (C&R), DGVCL, Corporate
Office, Surat

Jurisdiction of CGRF, DGVCL, Surat

Total Circles : 03

Total Districts : 04

Total Consumers : 28.43 Lacs (As on March-23)

Name of Circle & District :

Sr. No	Circle	District
1.	Surat City	Surat
2.	Surat Rural	Surat & Tapi
3.	Bharuch	Bharuch & Narmada

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat

Case Study

- ❖ **CGRF Complaint No.18/Q-01/22-23**
- ❖ **Nature of Grievance:** Release of new connection
- ❖ **Applicant :** Smt. Laxmiben Odhabhai Senta, Plot No.35, Dangivev Soc., Part-2, Punagam, Surat.
- V/S**
- ❖ **Respondent :** Deputy Engineer, DGVCL, Puna Sub Division, Surat (R) Division.
- ❖ **Case registered :** Dtd.09.06.2023
- ❖ **Case heard :** Dtd.22.06.2023
- ❖ **Forum order :** Dtd.30.06.2023
- ❖ **In favor of :** Consumer

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat

Complainant's representation

- ❖ Smt. Laxmiben Odhabhai Senta is the owner of residential property at Plot No.35 Dangivev Soc., Part-2, Punagam, Surat.
- ❖ Complainant had asked for new residential lighting connection on 30.04.2022 at Puna S/Dn. For 1st floor of plot No.35 Dangivev Soc., Part-2, Punagam, Surat.
- ❖ Complainant raised the grievances at from Respondent no action for giving new connection has been taken, on the contrary respondent inform them in writing that since on the premises in question hold by them is having and old outstanding theft arrears of Rs.28,444.02+Rs.72,780.54 (Interest) towards the theft committed by Shri Rajkumar Uttamsingh Rajput in the year 2006. So, respondent informed them only after payment of those 17 years old arrears the process for giving new connection shall be done.

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat

Complainant's representation

- ❖ Complainant in his representation further submitted that Discom & Respondent had informed that the old outstanding theft arrears is of year 2006 (23.02.2006) and after 2006 there were many changes occurred in the ownership in the premises in question.
- ❖ Further, informed that they are not aware of any such incident and not knowing the culprit so they should not be held responsible for such outstanding dues.
- ❖ Under surprise on the same plot new connection is released in 2014 without insisting any outstanding dues so complainant has failed to understand that why such recovery of those old dues are demanded from them.

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat

Complainant's representation

- ❖ Respondent on the entire issue has not taken any actions for recovery of theft bill.
- ❖ Complainant has raised a doubt about connivance of respondent with the culprit.
- ❖ There is no reason seen that after about 17 years of period why such recovery is demanded for them when respondent has already released new connection in 2014 and approved the change of name without insistence of any recovery.

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat

Complainant's representation

- ❖ Complainant has quoted that in line with the directives passed by **Hon'ble GERC in supply code 4/2015 as per Clause-6.84** “No sum due from any consumer on account of default in payment shall be recoverable after the period of two years from the date when such sum become first due unless such sum has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrears of charges for electricity supplier as per **Section 56 of E.A. 2003.**” So, she has complained that without insisting long back arrears from her, she should be given new connection.

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat

Complainant's representation

- ❖ Complainant therefore prayed that in accordance with Clause 6.84 , they should not be insisted for 17 years old theft bill recovery from them and requested to cancel the recovery letter dtd. 10.05.2022 issued by Respondent and process for releasing new connection and they have claimed for Rs. 5,000/- towards undue inconvenience suffered by them.

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat

Respondent's representation

- ❖ On the premises in question, on 31.01.2006 during installation checking it was found unauthorized use of electricity by Shri Satyendrasinh(Tenant) for which the theft bill amounting to Rs. 39,912.97 under Section -135 of Electricity Act-2003 was issued by them vide office letter dtd. 29.05.2006.
- ❖ Similarly, on the same spot, second time the theft of electricity was detected on 23.02.2006 in respect of Mr. Rajkumar Uttamsinh Rajput for which from the office of Respondent dtd. 29.05.2006 the bill amounting Rs. 32440.72 under Section-135 (E.A.-2003) was served to the culprit.
- ❖ On the same premises on ground floor the new connection in respect of Shri Shantilal Jogani was released on 27.01.2014 . Since then the same connection is existing in the name of Shri Odhabhai G. Santa.

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat

Respondent's representation

- ❖ As per Hon'ble GERC Supply Code notification no. 4/2015 Clause 4.30 whenever new connection is demanded on the premises and if there are outstanding arrears existing on the same then further process can be done only after recovery of dues.
- ❖ Respondent further submitted that on the premises in question there is an outstanding arrears of Rs.72,353.69 (without interest) which is conveyed to the complainant (applicant) on 06.05.2022 and informed that on the premises since there is a pending recovery of theft bill so only after payment of dues further process can be taken.
- ❖ Respondent has confirmed that procedure to lodge FIR is not carried out. But as per Clause 4.30 since, there is an outstanding arrears on the premises, no further process for giving connection could be done.

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat Forum's Findings

- ❖ After studying the representation from complainant and Respondent, it is felt that there is an outstanding arrears towards non-consumer theft bill of year 2006 for which no actions, efforts, procedure are carried out by Respondent till the date of hearing in Forum.
- ❖ Secondly, in the year 2014 (27.01.2014) while releasing new connection in respect of Shri Shantilal Jogani Respondent had not raised an issue of recovery of old arrears.
- ❖ Subsequently, while giving effect of change of name in respect of Shri Odhabhai G. Santa issue of arrears was not raised.

Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum – DGVCL, Surat Final Order

- ❖ **After pursuing the records ,documents and representations of Complainant and Respondent, Forum is arrived to the decision that in accordance to Hon’ble GERC Supply Code notification 4/2015 Clause no. 6.84 the Respondent can not demand old recovery which is 17 years old. So, Respondent is therefore directed to process the new connection application in respect of Smt. Laxmiben Odhabhai Santa.**

Consumer's Grievance Redressal Forum- Junagadh

Welcome

To

Dignitaries of

Hon'ble

Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission,

Ombudsman, Chairman and Members of Forums¹ of the state.

Consumer's Grievance Redressal Forum - Junagadh

**Performance Review Meeting of
Consumer Grievances Redressal Forums of**

Gujarat State Arranged by

Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission

Date: 19.08.2023

Place: Gandhinagar

Consumer's Grievances Redressal Forum- Junagadh

PASCHIM GUJARAT VIJ CO. LTD.

Circle Office,

“Vij Seva Sadan”

Azad Chowk – M G Road

Junagadh-362001

Phone - 9925209460

e-mail: forumjunagadh.pgvcl@gebmail.com₃

CGRF – JUNAGADH

- Mr. N.C.Makwana - Chairperson
(Rtd. Chief Engr. UGVCL)
- Mr. B.D.Parmar - Member (Technical)
Superintending Engineer
PGVCL Circle Office, Junagadh
- Mr. N.S. Pandya - Member Independent (Advocate)
- Mr. D. S. Rajpal - Convener

બ્રીફ હિસ્ટ્રી, જુનાગઢ ફોરમ

- ધીરજલાલ સી કક્કડ , ગામ – પોરબંદર
- પેટા વિભાગીય કચેરી – ઉદ્યોગનગર, વિભાગીય કચેરી - પોરબંદર શહેર
- પોરબંદર જી.આઈ.ડી.સી વસાહત માં પ્લોટ નં ૩૨૩ આવેલ છે. આ પ્લોટ પર નવું કનેક્સન લેવા અમો દ્વારા ૧૨ માસ અગાઉ પી.જી.વી.સી એલ કચેરી માં જરૂરી ફોર્મ ભરી જરૂરી ડોક્યુમેન્ટ જમા કરાવી પી.જી.વી.સી.એલ માં અરજી કરેલ છે. પી.જી.વી.સી.એલ પક્ષકાર ને અરજદાર તરફ થી કોઈ બેંક ગેરંટી આપવામાં આવેલ નથી જેથી પીજીવીસીએલ અરજદાર શ્રી નું કનેક્સન અટકાવેલ છે તે અન્વયે અરજદારે આ બેંક ગેરંટી જુના ગ્રાહક દ્વારા આપવાની થતી હતી હાલ આ જગ્યા ના માલિક અરજદાર હોઈ તે અંગે ના પુરાવા રજૂ કરવામાં આવેલ હતા.
- સદર અરજદાર શ્રી નું લોક અદાલત માં સમાધાન થયેલ છે. અને પીજીવીસીએલ દ્વારા કોઈ બેન્ક ગેરંટી લેવામાં આવેલ નથી.

પીજીવીસીએલ ની રજૂઆત

- ઉદ્યોગનગર સબ ડિવિઝન હેઠળ નવા કનેક્શન માટેના અરજદાર શ્રી ધીરજલાલ ચંદુલાલ કક્કડ, જીઆઇડીસી પ્લોટ નં.૩૨૩ માં હાલના કબજેદાર દ્વારા નવા વિજ કનેક્શન ની માગણી કરવામાં આવેલ, પરંતુ અગાઉ સદર પ્લોટ ના કબજેદાર ૧૦૦% ડીપીસી ની રકમ માફ કરવા માટે જરૂરી બેંક ગેરેંટી આપેલ નથી અને સ્થળ પર નવું કનેક્શન પણ માંગેલ નથી. ટૂંક માં લોક અદાલતની શરતોનું પાલન કરેલ નથી. તેથી અરજદાર જે નવું કનેક્શન માંગેલ તે ના મળતા તેઓ દ્વારા નામદાર સીજીઆરએફ માં અરજી કરેલ. તા. ૨૨.૦૭.૨૨ ના રોજ થી જજમેન્ટ આવેલ છે. જેમાં દર્શાવ્યા મુજબ અરજદારશ્રી ની રજૂઆત ગ્રાહ્ય રાખીને તેમને નવું કનેક્શન આપવા અંગેનો જરૂરી હુકમ કરેલ છે. તેથી સદર કેસ રીવ્યુ કરવા માટે પીજીવીસીએલ એ જણાવેલ છે.

- અરજદાર દ્વારા સુનાવણી દરમિયાન જે પરિપત્ર ધ્યાને લીધેલ તે પરિપત્ર ગુજરાત સરકારશ્રી ના ઉદ્યોગ અને ખાણ વિભાગના પત્ર ક્રમાંક જીએસએફસી/(જીઆઈસી) ૧૦-૨૦૦૩-૧૭૧૧ થી તા.૦૭-૦૨-૨૦૦૪, જે નકલ રજુ થયેલ છે તે ફક્ત હરાજી થી જે એકમનું વેચાણ થાય તે કીસ્સામાં જ લાગુ પડે છે. આ કિસ્સામાં લાગુ પાડી શકાય નહિ. તેવું અમારું સ્પષ્ટ માનવાનું થાય છે. વધુમાં સદર જગ્યા પર ૨૫% ડીપીસી ની રકમ રૂ. ૮,૧૩,૬૧૨=૦૦ બાકી રકમ છે એટલે સપ્લાય કોડ ના પેરા ક્લોઝ નંબર ૪.૩૦ મુજબ જે જગ્યા પર બાકી લેણા હોય તે જગ્યા એ નવું કનેક્શન આપી શકાય નહિ. તે બાબત નો સ્પષ્ટ ઉલ્લેખ થયેલો છે.
- આપ નામદાર સીજીઆરએફ દ્વારા જે પરિપત્ર ધ્યાને લીધેલ તે આ કેસમાં લાગુ પાડી શકાય નહિ. જે અરજદારો દ્વારા GSFC માંથી હરાજી દ્વારા વેચાણ લેવામાં આવેલ તેવા કિસ્સામાં સદર પરિપત્ર નો અમલ કરવામાં આવેલ છે અને તેમને નવા વીજ કનેક્શન પણ ફાળવવામાં આવેલ છે. આમ ઉપરોક્ત દર્શાવેલ મુદ્દાઓ ધ્યાને લઈને સંદર્ભ પત્ર થી આપવામાં આવેલ જજમેન્ટ રીવ્યુ કરવા આપ નામદાર સાહેબશ્રી ને નમ્ર અરજ છે.

➤ વધુ માં કાર્યપાલક ઈજનેર શ્રી શહેર વિભાગીય કચેરી પોરબંદર દ્વારા તારીખ- ૨૯.૦૮.૨૦૨૨ ના રોજ ઈ-મેઈલ મારફત જણાવેલ છે કે, શ્રી પારસમણી આઈસ ફેક્ટરી નું તા.૧૦-૦૨-૨૦૧૮ના રોજ લોક અદાલતમાં સમાધાન કરવામાં આવેલ હતું. લોક-અદાલતની શરત અનુસાર ૧૦૦% ડીપીસી બાદ કરવા માટે જે બેંક ગેરેંટી પાર્ટી દ્વારા રજુ કરવાની હતી તે પાર્ટી દ્વારા રજુ કરેલ નથી.આ અંગે કોઈ કાનુની કાર્યવાહી PGVCL દ્વારા કરવામાં આવેલ નથી. સીજીઆરએફના નિર્ણયમાં જે પરિપત્ર અનુસાર કનેક્શન આપવા માટે જણાવેલ છે તે અનુસાર કનેક્શન આપી શકાય નહિ કારણ કે હાલના અરજદાર દ્વારા સદર પ્લોટ GSFC ની હરાજીમાંથી ખરીદેલ નથી. તેથી CGRF ના નિર્ણય અનુસાર કનેક્શન આપી શકાય નહિ આ બાબત ધ્યાને લઈ અમારી રીવ્યુ અરજી ગ્રાહ્ય રાખવા અરજ કરેલ છે.

ફોરમ કક્ષાએ થી થયેલ મૂલ્યાંકન

- સદર રજુઆત બાબતે અરજદાર શ્રી દ્વારા તા. ૨૪.૦૮.૨૦૨૨ ના રોજ લેખિત રજુઆત કરેલ છે. તે અનુસંધાને પીજીવીસીએલ પક્ષકાર દ્વારા જે તે વખતે ત્રાહિત વ્યક્તિ દ્વારા લોક અદાલત માં સમાધાન કરવામાં આવેલ તે અંગે નો પ્રત્યુત્તર પાઠવવામાં આવેલ નથી.
- તેમજ નામદાર હાઈકોર્ટ દ્વારા સ્પેશિયલ સિવિલ એપ્લી. નં. ૬૨૮૧/૨૦૨૧ જે યોગેશ લક્ષ્મણભાઈ ચોવટીયા ગામ-રાતીધાર, તા.તાલાળા વિરુદ્ધ નાયબ ઈજનેર શ્રી આંકોલવાડી પેટા વિભાગીય કચેરી (વિભાગીય કચેરી વેરાવળ) ના કામે તા. ૦૨/૦૮/૨૦૨૨ ના રોજ જે હુકમ કરવામાં આવેલ છે જે નીચે મુજબ છે.

- Learned advocate Mr.Raval appearing for the petitioners has placed reliance on the order dated 27.01.2010 passed in Letters Patent Appeal No.91 of 2010 and also relied upon provision of Section 43 of the Electricity Act, 2003 (for short "the Act") C/SCA/6281/2021 ORDER DATED: 02/08/2022 and has submitted that the provision refers for supply of electricity to any owner or occupier of any premises. It is submitted that the petitioners can be said to be "occupier" of the land in question and the respondents cannot deny the electricity connection to them.
- At this stage, it would be apposite to refer to Section 43 of the Act.

- "Section 43. (Duty to supply on request): -(1) [Save as otherwise provided in this Act, every distribution] licensee, shall, on an application by the owner or occupier of any premises, give supply of electricity to such premises, within one month after receipt of the application requiring such supply:
- Provided that where such supply requires extension of distribution mains, or commissioning of new sub-stations, the distribution licensee shall supply the electricity to such premises immediately after such extension or commissioning or within such period as may be specified by the Appropriate Commission:

- Provided further that in case of a village or hamlet or area wherein no provision for supply of electricity exists, the Appropriate Commission may extend the said period as it may consider necessary for electrification of such village or hamlet or area.
- C/SCA/6281/2021 ORDER DATED: 02/08/2022
(2) It shall be the duty of every distribution licensee to provide, if required, electric plant or electric line for giving electric supply to the premises specified in sub-section (1):

- Provided that no person shall be entitled to demand, or to continue to receive, from a licensee a supply of electricity for any premises having a separate supply unless he has agreed with the licensee to pay to him such price as determined by the Appropriate Commission.
- (3) If a distribution licensee fails to supply the electricity within the period specified in subsection (1), he shall be liable to a penalty which may extend to one thousand rupees for each day of default."

- The Division Bench of this Court, in the order dated 27.01.2010 passed in Letters Patent Appeal No.91 of 2010, has observed thus:
- "In the present case, Counsel for the appellant has failed to show that any provision laid down under law or guidelines allowing a company to recover its dues by seizure of property or by auction sale of such property for which condition is imposed on consumer to show right or title in giving electrical connection. Such power being not vested under the law with the company and as the company cannot decide the disputed question of right and title, we are of the view that ownership or right of occupancy has no nexus with grant of electrical connection to a consumer."

- Thus, the petitioners, who are the occupiers of the land, cannot be denied the electricity connection only because dispute with regard to C/SCA/6281/2021 ORDER DATED: 02/08/2022 decision of the land in question is pending. The Division Bench has observed that the company cannot decide the disputed question of right and title and the ownership or right of occupancy has no nexus with grant of electrical connection to a consumer.
- Under the circumstances, the respondent- Company is directed to supply electricity connection to the petitioners in the premises or in the property, where they are presently staying and occupying the same.

ફોરમ કક્ષાએ થી થયેલ હુકમ

- સદર બાબતો ધ્યાને લેતા અને નામદાર કોર્ટ નો હુકમ માં જણાવ્યા મુજબ વીજ કનેક્શન માંગનાર અરજદાર શ્રી ધીરજલાલ સી. કક્કડ ને વીજ કનેક્શન આપવા ઇન્કાર કરી શકાય નહીં.
- સીજીઆરએફ જુનાગઢ દ્વારા તે મુજબ નો હુકમ કરવામાં આવેલ છે.

Consumer's Grievance Redressal Forum- Junagadh

THANK YOU

25th Meeting to Review Performance of CGRFs and Ombudsman

dtd. 19.08.2023

**Agenda Item No.7 – Presentation by Forums (Typical cases
highlighting the legal aspects and general observations**

Presented by : CGRF, UGVCL, Mehsana

CGRF Mehsana – Forum Members



Name	Position	Designation
Shri K N Parikh	I/C Chairperson	Retd. Chief Engineer-MGVCL
Shri A S Mehta	I/C Independent Member	Retd. SE (R&B), Electrical
Shri D B Patel	Technical Member	I/C Addl. Chief Engineer R&C Office, Mehsana
Shri K B Chaudhari	Convener	Deputy Engineer, UGVCL

Typical Case Details



- Case No.1 : UGM-03-006-2022-23, dtd. 14.10.2022
- Matter : Reduction of Load from 30 HP to 10 HP.
- Hearing date: 04.11.2022.

➤ Complainant details

Desai Ratubhai Ramjibhai
Ahmedabad

Respondent details

Deputy Engineer,
Kadi Rural S/dn

- Order date: 04.11.2022.

Brief of Case



➤ **Applicant request**

- Applicant has connection of bore well in name of his late father Desai Ramjibhai Chelabhai having 30HP load at Indrad, Ta: Kadi. Applicant has applied for load reduction from 30HP to 10HP on dated 08.12.2021. Also, paid Rs. 16000/- as electricity bill dues (arrears) for the month of April-21 to Oct-21.
- Applicant has requested to refund it back as during April-21 to Oct-21 borewell not used & requested for reduction of load from 30HP from 10HP as electricity bill since long paid by applicant.

➤ **Respondent objections**

- Connection was made PDC due to arrears of bills, against that applicant approach CGRF (case no. UGM-02-005-2021-22). CGRF vide order dated 21.10.2021, ordered to Reconnect the Ag connection, as consumer had paid electricity bill in due time limit of notice subject to payment of bill up to reconnection of date, So amount of Rs.16000/- can not be refunded as it is against payment of bills as per CGRF order dated 21.10.2021.
- For change of name case, applicant has not ownership in premise's as per latest 7x12 Utara. so, application for change of name can not be proceed further.

Brief of Case



➤ **Forum view**

- Applicant has connection of bore well having 30HP load in name of his late father.
- As per CGRF order in case no. UGM-02-005-2021-22, dated 21.10.2021, connection (PDC) was reconnected due to part payment of bills by consumer
- However, applicant has again approach CGRF & raise grievances for approval of load reduction from 30HP to 10HP. However, due to incomplete documents, application returned by respondents stating that applicant has no ownership i.e no name in 7x12 Utara.
- According to change of name prevailing rules, without ownership name cannot be change.

➤ **Final Judgement**

- Applicant have to apply first change of name as per prevailing rules & than after he may apply for reduction of load.

Prevailing regulations



As per Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC), Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters Regulations Notification No.4 of 2015 Section-4, Load Reduction, Clauses

- 4.88 The applicant shall apply for load reduction to the licensee in the format prescribed in Annexure-I or II (as applicable) to this Code, along with the following documents:
- (1) Details of alteration/modification/removal of electrical installation with work completion certificate and test report from a Licensed Electrical Contractor where alteration of installation is involved.
 - (2) Any other reason(s) for reduction of contract demand.
- 4.89 The licensee shall process the application form in accordance with clauses 4.64 – 4.66 of this Code. For site inspection, both the licensee and applicant shall follow the procedure and timelines as laid down in clauses 4.26 – 4.37 of this code.

- For such type of cases, where applicant is having no any ownership, only arguing that he has paid the bill amount since long than as per CGRF & Ombudsman Regulations, 2019 Clause no. 2.31 The forum can not register the application at CGRF.

Past Case Details



- Case No.2 : UGM-02-005-2021-22, dtd. 30.09.2021
- Reconnection of Agriculture connection
- Hearing Date: 12.10.2021.

➤ Applicant details

Desai Ratubhai Ramjibhai
Ahmedabad

Respondent details

Deputy Engineer,
Kadi Rural S/dn

- Order date: 20.10.2021.

Brief of Case:



➤ **Applicant request**

- Applicant has paid due bill as follows:
- 17.02.2021 - Rs. 10000/-
- 24.03.2021 - Rs. 5000/-
- 26.04.2021 - Rs. 18400/-
- No notice received from S/dn regarding PDC. Therefore requested to reconnect the connection.

➤ **Respondent objections**

- Last payment done by Applicant is of Rs. 6000/- on dtd. 06.02.2020 after that no bill payment done by applicant during last 1 year i.e upto 13.02.2021. At that time total due amount was Rs. 28369.44/- and consumer paid Rs. 10000/- on dated 13.02.2021 and cheque dated 22.04.2021 was returned amounting Rs. 5000/-. During that time, final notice dated 07.01.2021 and seven days last notice served to consumer on dated 03.02.2021. Hence, connection made PDC on dated 27.03.2021 as per prevailing rules.

Brief of Case:



➤ **Forum view**

- Applicant has Ag connection on the name of his late father. Connection was not in used since long due to failed bore well. Connection made temporary disconnected on dated 09.09.2020 due to arrears of Rs.18394/- as per prevailing rules. After that consumer has served final notice on dated 07.10.2020 to clear dues. But, unfortunately no payment was received from consumer. After 6 months, again final notice served on dated 07.01.2021 to paid up dues of Rs.25044/- + DPC. Consumer made partly payment of Rs.10000/- on dated 13.02.2021 after that no notice served from UGVCL side and Connection was made PDC on dated 27.03.2021

➤ **Final Judgement**

- CGRF Ordered respondent to reconnect connection after taking reconnection charges, DPC and ordered applicant to pay electricity bill dues.

Prevailing regulations



As per Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC), Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters Regulations Notification No.4 of 2015 Section-8, DISCONNECTION AND RECONNECTION, Clauses

- **Permanent Disconnection 8.6**

The supply shall be disconnected permanently in following cases:

- (1) On the termination of the Agreement.
- (2) If the cause for which the supply was temporarily disconnected is not removed within the notice period.

Provided that if the service of the consumer remains continuously disconnected for 180 days, not being a temporary disconnection upon request of the consumer, the Agreement shall be deemed to be terminated on the expiry of 15 days or after expiry of the initial period of agreement whichever is later on issuance of written notice, without prejudice to the rights of the licensee or of the consumer under the Act for recovery of any amount due under the Agreement.

- Earlier Forum has considered and registered the complaint for reconnection of Ag connection as per complainant request, However Complainant is not consumer and represent his matter just based on his argument for payment of light bills since long.
- In such cases, without consumer, Forum heard the case and again complainant approach the forum for Change of name on his name though no any ownership proved by him

Case no.: OMB/RJT/21/2023

Appellant-M/s. Hans Ship Breaking
Company Pvt. Ltd.

V/s.

Respondent-The Executive Engineer,
PGVCL, City-2 Division Office, Jamnagar

Representation of the Appellant

- The Appellant is a HT consumer of the Respondent company, bearing consumer no.27309 with contracted demand of 275 KVA under HTP-1 tariff.
- The Appellant has received a supplementary bill from the Respondent amounting Rs.4,50,102.15.
- The supplementary bill was issued in response to installation checking, at that time it was found that 12.44% less energy was recorded. During checking, MRI data were collected and the said supplementary bill was issued based on 'voltage related events'.
- The Respondent has considered the low voltage events for the period starting from 08.11.2020 to 10.08.2022, whereas as per the regulation 6.33 it can be issued for a maximum period of 6 months.
- The Respondent has issued bill for total 100% energy including 87.56% for which bill is already paid, the Appellant has also drawn attention of the Respondent about the mistakes, however the Respondent didn't take any action on it. Therefore, the Respondent has filed grievance before the CGRF-Junagadh.
- During the course of the hearing of the said case before CGRF, the Respondent issued a revised bill of Rs.56,837.94 by eliminating the calculation mistakes, but for the the same period of 22 months.
- Both the supplementary bills issued so far were based on voltage failure events noted in the MRI, but the Respondent has misinterpreted the order of CGRF and issued a revised supplementary bill for the total units consumed during the last 6 months for Rs.6,93,141.47.

Representation of the Respondent

- The Respondent has submitted that, the Appellant is having HT connection bearing consumer no.27309.
- As per the installation checking carried out by the IC-Squad of the Respondent Company, it was detected that, the consumer meter of the Appellant connection was recording 12.44% less energy.
- Therefore, as per the data of the Meter collected through MRI, supplementary bill was issued to the Appellant.
- The Appellant has filed the grievance before the CGRF-Junagadh.
- As per the order of the CGRF, the Respondent has revised the supplementary bill for the period of 6 months following the provisions of regulation 6.33 of the Supply Code-2015.

Major points of pronounced Order no. 21/2023

- The said connection of the Appellant was checked on 26.07.2022 by the team of the Respondent Company in presence of the representative of the Appellant and test was carried out using Accucheck Meter. It was detected that, meter was recording less energy @ 12.44%. Accordingly, the Respondent has issued supplementary bill to the Appellant and revised it subsequently, the details of supplementary bill are as under.

Sr. No.	Bill Date	Bill Amount (Rs.)	Remarks
1.	14.09.2022	Rs.4,50,102.15	Bill amount calculated for total energy including billed energy for the duration recorded in voltage related events for total period of almost two years.
2.	20.12.2022	Rs.56,837.94	Bill amount calculated considering the energy recorded less during the voltage related events for total period of almost two years.
3.	10.03.2023	Rs.6,93,141.47	Bill amount calculated for the period of six months on total consumption recorded during that period considering slowness @12.44%

Major points of the pronounced Order no. 21/2023

- The data extracted through MRI also confirmed that, total 17 events were recorded during last six months as 'Voltage Related Events' and during 'Occurrence' and 'Restoration' of that particular event, energy consumed/generated during that particular interval was also recorded.
- It is also noted that, the Respondent has earlier issued supplementary bill only for the duration, which are recorded as 'Voltage Related Events'.
- Later, after Order of the CGRF-Junagadh, the Respondent has revised supplementary bill considering total energy consumed during the six months period.
- The Appellant didn't dispute the slowness @12.44% detected during installation checking on 26.07.2022. Therefore, in such cases, the Respondent should take actions as per the Hon'ble GERC-Electricity Supply Code and Related Matter-Notification no. 04 of 2015, regulation 6.33.

Observations of the CGRF-Junagadh

- સદર અરજદારશ્રીને GERC SUPPLY CODE-2015નાં Clause No. 6.33 મુજબ ૦૬ મહિનાનું બિલ આપવું. આવા તમામ કિસ્સાઓમાં નિગમીત કચેરીની કાર્યાલય નોંધ નં.પીજીવીસીએલ/જીઈઆરસી/લોકપાલ/૧૯૮ તા.૦૬.૦૫.૨૦૨૨નાં દિશા નિર્દેશ મુજબ અરજદારશ્રીને આપવામાં આવેલ પુરવણી બિલ રીવાઈઝ કરવાનું થાય છે.
- અરજદારશ્રીને આપવામાં આવેલ પુરવણી બિલ રીવાઈઝ કરી છ માસના ગાળાનાં કુલ વપરાશનું ૧૨.૪૪% લેખે ગણી રીવાઈઝ બિલ કરી આપવું.

Our Observations

- **Prayer of the Appellant:**

The Appellant has prayed to grant interest on 1/3rd amount paid towards revised supplementary bill and to revise bill as per the provisions.

- **Observations:**

1. In response to that, the Respondent has represented that, the revised supplementary bill was issued as per the order of the CGRF.

2. It is noted that, as the Respondent has issued revised supplementary bill following the Order of CGRF, the Appellant is not eligible for any interest on 1/3rd amount paid towards supplementary bill.

3. CGRF has in its order directed to revise the supplementary bill on the basis of total consumption of last six months, instead of energy recorded during particular events of slowness as per MRI. Due to such ambiguity, the Respondent had issued revised supplementary bill for total consumption during six months, otherwise earlier supplementary bill was issued for the energy recorded during temper events.

Decision of the case

- The Respondent was directed to cancel the revised supplementary bill issued to the Appellant and further directed to issue revised considering slowness @ 12.44% for energy consumed/generated during the period of last six months from dated 10.08.2022 for duration recorded as 'Voltage Related Events' only.