

GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

Ahmedabad-380015. Phone: +91-79-26302689

Barrack No.3, Polytechnic compound, Ambawadi

ગુજરાત વિદ્યુત નિયંત્રક આયોગ વિદ્યુત લોકપાલની કચેરી, બેરેક નં. ૩. પોલિટેક્નીક કંપાઉન્ડ, આંબાવાડી, અમદાવાદ-૩૮૦૦૧૫. ફોન: +૯૧-૭૯-૨૬૩૦૨૬૮૯

e-mail: eleombahm@gercin.org / so.ombudsman@gercin.org

No. Ombudsman/56 Date: 11.06.2024

The Secretary Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission GIFT CITY, GIFT ONE, 6th floor, Road 5C, Zone 5, GIFT One GANDHINAGAR-382355.

Sub: Annual report on all representations filed before the Electricity Ombudsman and general review of activities for the year 2023-2024.

With reference to above mentioned subject, please find enclosed herewith Annual Report for the F.Y. 2023-2024 consist of report for 1st Half Year and 2nd Half Year of 2023-2024 separately, on all representations filed before the Electricity Ombudsman, along with general review of activities, as provided in Chapter 3.54 of GERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019, Notification No. 02 of 2019, for further necessary action.

Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad

Encl: As above.

Tech. 2



## REPORT FOR THE FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 2023-24 [April, 2023 TO September, 2023]

### Activities of the office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad under Section (1) 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003.

The Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission has established office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad which is an appellate authority to file appeal/representation against the order passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum of Distribution Licensees.

The reports of general review of the activities of office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad for the First Half of Year 2023-2024 (April, 2023 to September, 2023) as

provided in Regulation 3.51 of GERC Notification No.02 of 2019 is as under:

The awareness amongst the Electricity Consumers regarding their right is gradually increasing. A large number of grievances are presented before the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forums (CGRF). The Consumer Grievances Redressal Forums are disposing of grievances generally in schedule time. However, with increase in awareness, some of the consumers, who are not satisfied by the order of CGRF, are filing their representation before the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad under Section 42(6) of The Electricity Act, 2003. However, aggrieved by the order of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad dissatisfied parties are filing writ petition before Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat in certain cases.

Forum-wise status report of representations filed before the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad against CGRF Decisions during the FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 2023-24, (2)is enclosed as Annexure -I.

Status of Review of Application: (3)

The details of review applications were filed by the party as per Clause No. 3.47 of GERC (Regulation-2019) Notification No. 02 of 2019 are stated in table below:

Sr. No.	Case No.	Decision.
1	49/2022	Original order stands.
2.		Review pending.
3.	8/2023	Review pending.

# Opinion of the Ombudsman regarding non-compliance of standard of performance by Licensee.

Order-wise comments of Ombudsman and response of Licensee in redressal of grievances are stated in the table provided in Annexure-I.

Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission had published Notification No.2 of 2019 (CGRF & Ombudsman) Regulations 2019 superseding earlier Notification No.2 of 2011. These Regulations provides effective mechanism to dispose of grievances timely and effectively and implementation of order within specified time limit.

#### Other Activities (4)

Orders of Ombudsman are being uploaded on website of GERC. 1)

Hearing schedule is also displayed on website of GERC. 2)

Monitoring of implementation of Ombudsman/CGRF orders and related activities. 3)

Providing general guidelines to applicants who approach before Ombudsman. 41

Monitoring of cases challenged before Hon'ble High Court by parties.

At every Quarter, details of implementation of order of Ombudsman are asked from the Licensees to analyze the implementation of CGRF/ Electricity Ombudsman order.



- Reply provided to RTI applications received by the office of the ombudsman from time to time
- The process for the hiring of the new office premises at BHARAT SANCHAR NIGAM LIMITED, Ground Floor & First Floor, CMTS Building, Vastrapur Telephone Exchange, Bimanagar, Jeevandhaam Road, Ahmedabad-380015 was done, the rent agreement executed on 06.09.2023.
- The preparation of the scope of civil work has been done in consultation with UGVCL and as per the directive of the Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission, the tender process initiated and finalized the civil renovation work for
- The civil renovation work is under process.
- The process of hiring of Architect/ Interior designer was initiated as per the directive of the Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission in consultation with

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, AHMEDABAD FOR THE FIRST HALF OF YEAR 2023-2024 (APRIL, 2023 TO SEPTEMBER, 2023) AS PER CLAUSE 3.51 OF GERC NOTIFICATION NO. 2 OF 2019:

## : Annexure-I:

Sr. No.	Case No.	Name of Applicant	Forum	Subject	10-	
.10.	140.		Concern	Jabject	Comments of Ombudsman	Respons
1	36/2	0 M/s. Laxmiba Texti			-	Licensee
	22	C/o. Shri Ishwarbha		Estimate	The Appellant has filed the	Licensee
		Modbyhla i M	ai Surat	Related	representation lias filed the	
	1	Madhubhai Narola			representation seeking relief	
	1		1		against the recovery of the	
	1			1 2	amount snown in the estimate.	0
					by the Respondent for	
	l)	*:		-	providing a new HT connection.	
1		1	:		As per the representation the	
	l)	1	l l	i	appendit has disputed the	
9			1	18	recovery of amounts like Dro	
- 1					rata charges of Rs.3,90,500/-	
- 1			1		1 8000 1000 -1	
- 1		J.		3	Rs.8,73,352/- and argued that	
		(1)			the Respondent beautiful	
		T.	4:		the Respondent has wrongly	
		1			recovered the aforesaid amount in the estimate.	
- 1		1	2.3		Consumer O.	•
- 1					Consumer Grievance Redressal	
- 1					Forum, Surat has decided the	
1		1		1	aforesaid subject issue for	
- 1		1 -	1		recovery of per KVA cost for	
- 1			W =		laying of the underground cable	
1					in the case of the	
- 1		¥: ×			Appellant and observed the	
- 1			1		recovery made by the	
- 1			1		Respondent is as per the	
	10	1		1	relevant provisions framed by	
- 1		1		1	the Gujarat Electricity	
1		l.			Regulatory Commission as well	
- 1			Ji		as the guideline from 1	
- 1			1	1	as the guideline framed by the	
- 1				1	Respondent. No error is found in the order passed by	
- 1					In the order passed by	
- 1	1				Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Surat The	
			i k		Forum, Surat. The	
- 1		3.2	1	W	representation file by the	
		2		1	Appellant and prayer sought be-	
1	0.100				are Appellant is dismissed	
	0/20	Shri Pravinbhai	UGVCL,	Tariff	accordingly.	
2:	2	Parsottambhai Joshi	Mahesana	1	The Appellant has prayed	
				Related	Deloie the Ombudemen	
	1			1 1	instruct the Respondent to	
				1	propare the electricity bill for	
				*	then agriculture connection	
					no.	



					TID tomiff	
					73917/00119/5 with HP tariff	*1
				h.1	rather than meter tariff. The	
1		13			agriculture connection of the	- 3
- 1					agriculture connection of the	
- 1	8 1	A			Appellant is released under the	
- 1	1	(4)		>	Meter tariff by the Respondent,	
- 4		. 1			Mcter taring of the extension	
- 4			F.		the subsequent load extension	
		i i			process was done considering	
3		1			the meter tariff. As per the	
	l. 1	1			the meter tarm. As per the	
y.	M 20	1			GERC Petition No. 19/1999	-
					tariff order dated 10.10.2000,	
					tarin order dated rolling of	
		* 36	N5 6		the agriculture connection of	
		3.0			the Appellant is eligible to be	SF III
	1	te:			the appendix to ong Upper	
					billed as per meter tariff. Hence,	
			N 5		no error was found in the order	
		9	11		issued by the CGRF, UGVCL,	
12		.00			issued by the cold, car as	(4)
					Mahesana. The prayer of the	
			08		Appellant is not accepted.	
					Appendit to Hot door	
	15.100	Shri Niteshkumar	MGVCL,	Estimate	The Appellant is a consumer of	
3	45/20	Shri Niteshkulliai		Related	the Respondent having a	
	22	Chinubhai Thakkar	Vadodara	Keiaica	contracted load of 100KW	
	1	C/o. Nilkanth Rice		1	Contracted toad of Tooley	
			596		under LTMD Tariff with	
	1 2	Mill	1	1	Consumer No.50801/02219/3.	
	4	8 21			Companied 110.00001/02227/51	
		8		6	The Appellant has challenged	
	1	- X			the Suo-Moto estimate issued	
	1	1		1	by the Respondent to regularize	
			2	12	by the Respondent to regularize	8
	1	** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** **			the electricity load before	
		, * "		T.	Consumer Grievance Redressal	
	0	1 . " * .		(1)	THE TRANSPORT To de dono and	
				I. V	Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and	
					against the order of CGRF,	
					MGVCL, Vadodara, the	
	1	1			WGVCL, vadodara,	
			1		Appellant filed a representation	
	1	All Control of the Co		1	before Electricity Ombudsman,	
	1			1	Al and proved that he	
	1		, K	1	Ahmedabad and prayed that he	
	1		4	1	wants to continue consumption	
		~	1	1	of electricity as per the	
	1	1 2 A		1	OI - ciccurately as por all	
	1	34 (3)	1	1	contracted demand of 100KW	
	1			1	under the LT connection and he	2
	A				does not require HT tariff	
	4		V	1	does not require in tarm	
15				1	connection as per the contract	
	100	1		N/	demand of 120KVA as proposed	
	1			1	demand of 120KVA as proposed	2
	l l	1			by the Respondent.	
					This case has having different	
		20			Tills case new ments it opposes	
			85 0 <sup>26</sup>		and distinct merits, it appears	
		*			that, the Appellant didn't follow	
			1	1		
		1	2.0	1	the Undertaking/Statement	
					submitted before the CGRF i.e.	
				1	26.08.2022 in true spirit, as	
	1	A.		1	ZU.UU.ZUZZ III Glab opiits, as	
					submitted by the Respondent,	
	1				the actual demand recorded for	
	1 -	*		1	the month of December-2022	
	1		1		the month of becomes 2022	į.
	1		1		and February-2023 exceeded	1
	-				the contracted demand by more	1
	1	L		10	than 5%, the Appellant didn't	ĺ
	- 3	1		1	than 576, the appendic didire	1
	1	T		1	oppose about such submission	1
	4.	l .	2.4		of the Respondent. It is also	1
	10	1			of the the Annallant has	l.
	1	1		V	noted that the Appellant has	10
		1			opted seasonal tariff,	1
	1	1			accordingly the actual demand	1
	1	4			accordingly the actual domaid	1
		4			during the 'ON Season' period	1-
			1		exceeded the contracted	1
						l
		. 1			demand whereas during 'Off	
			1	1	Season' period actual demand	I
				1	was within contracted demand	T.
	1	2				
		TI 5	2		wherein other cases, the	1
1	1	M: *			Appellant had consumed	1
	1	1				1
-	1	1		4	exceeding contracted demand	1
1					in particular Financial Year,	1
1	1	V ==	1	1		4
I .	1	1 5		1		
1	- 35.		1	4	financial years, they have	
		1	T.	- 3	restricted their actual demand	
	- 1					
		24			within contracted demand.	

	_25			m. a	
1 1		: N	1 .	Therefore the decision of othe	r
1 1			1	cases can't be applicable to thi	s
- 1	8			case.	T.
				The procedure adopted by the	e –
- M - 1	1			respondent for regularization	- 1
	=	1	14	of the excess demand is as not	
A 16	-		1	the provision under clause	2 /
	1	8		1 T. 30 01 the Hon'ble GERC's	. 1
1 1	1			Biccurcity Supply Code and	
1 1	1		/*-	Matters Pemilation	. I/
1 1		1		2010 alla is lound in order The	
1 1	() (a)		1	1 10 spondent is directed to tol-	
			0 5	further actions as per the	8
l.,	-			provisions of clause no. 4.95 of	
	30			the Hon'ble GERC's Electricity	
1 - 1		1		Supply Code and Related	
3.				Matters Regulations 2015	
4 51/	20 M/s. Adison Granito	HOTTO		Matters Regulations-2015, Notification no.4 of 2015.	1 -
22	Pvt. Ltd.	UGVCL,	Estimate	The subject matter:	-
1	- · · · · · · ·	Sabarmati,	Related	The subject matter is related to	
	1	Ahmedabad	Lancara established	the regularisation of contract	Respon-
		n		denially of the Appellant The	dent has
1	, a		-1	inpoctant is an Hi congression	filed the
1 1	1		4	lidving Contracted demand of	Petition
1 1				2000KVA. The Annellant bad	before the
		W.	A 1 1987	dulized Contract demand man-	Hon'ble
- 1	1			Citali 570 OI IIS Contract demand	High
: J	1		1	toth times in the FY 2021-22.	Court of
	1				Gujarat,
1	_ 1	1	J	Respondent had issued notice	Ahmedab
1-	1	1	1	the Appellant to control the	ad vide
-	4 1			contract demand or otherwise	SCA/203
1	T I			regularised the contract	00/2023.
(S. J.)	10 . 1			demand. The Appellant had not	7 4020.
* 0			1	regularized his contacti	
1		1	1	demand till the issuance of the	
1		1	100	contract demand of	
		1	1.3	2092AVA Under Suo moto	
	I I			process. The Annellant had	
. 1	1	1	1.16%	regulation 4.95 of	
1		1	3113	CERCS (Electricity Supply)	
1	A) 1		. 13	Code and Related Mottorel	
	T I		0.3	regulations, 2015 Even act	
	*		1.3	eccipi of monthly notice from	
30	1	_ 1	1.5	ic Respondent the Appellant	
110	1 -		1 4	add fiot controlled its contained it	
	2		1.0	temand within permissible	
	1		1 4	111111.	
		1	1	n the aforesaid observation,	-
1	1			ne Respondent is directed to	
1	4	=	13	ssue 2 years minimum charge	
1	1		0	tatement to the Appellant and	
	1	18	1 4	Collect the undertaking c	
I		1	1 11	TO Appellant to utilize cont	
1			1 25	William mermicaible	
1	1		111	mils. Further, the Respondent	
1			10	directed that in the event of	
	1		aı	ly subsequent violation the	
	I T	1	CC	miliact demand of the	
	1	1	Aj	ppellant shall be regularized	
	1		111	inediately as per the	
	1		re	corded contract demand The	4
	, 1	J.	01	der passed by the CODE in	
		1	110	Collect and treated on	1
52/20	Shri Vasimkhan TPI	S17mat	Ca	nceled.	
22	Salimkhan Pathan		me Th	e Appellant has applied for	
	C/o. Shri	Ch		IIIC ITANSIEI Of the residential	
	Maheshkumar		ele	ectric connection to the TPL,	
	Surajram Salwala		Su	rat. The Respondent has	
	- THE SAME WOLLYVININ	1	TIV. 7	respondent has	740
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	lini	ormed to pay the ald -	0.00
			1111	Ulined to pay the old arroom	1
	, and the second		bef	ormed to pay the old arrears ore the process of the name nsfer application of the	



					1 1 11
					Appellant. Aggrieved by the
		3	9	l l	action of the Respondent, the
1					Appellant registered a
1	1				complaint before CGRF, TPL,
1	1				Surat, and aggrieved by the
- 1	4				order of CGRF, TPL, Surat, the
- 1	1			17	order of CGRF, TFL, Surat, are
	1	1			Appellant filed an appeal before
	1 1				the Ombudsman.
1	1 1		v:		Considering the documents on
	1 1	* =			record it is noted that the old
3	140				arrears do not belong to the
	1				premises/connection for which
	1/		1 (		premises/conflection for which
					the Appellant has applied for
	1 1	** a	v >=	1	name transfer. Hence, the
10	F 3		-	6. 2	prayer of the Appellant is
	1	52			accepted.
			1.		The Appellant has registered Vide letter
6	1/202	Shri Jamanbhai	DGVCL,	New :	the appeal before the Electricity dated
О		Ramtabhai Bhusara	Valsad	Connection	The anical ocioic the brock.
	3	Kamtannai Difusara	,		I mininginali aggileved by dis [
	1				order of the CGRF for not giving   3, the
	1		-		them an electric connection for Responde
					their agricultural land. The nt has
	1	F1 F1	, E	H: 25	Their agricultural land.
	1				Allenant mas submittee
	1	2			the Respondent has released ted the
	1	140	12	1	another connection on the directive
	1				same land with the name of of order
	4		0.00		Shri Nareshbhai Dhakalbhai passed by
		1		1	Bhusara without the consent of the
	V			V	T Rhiisara Williout the comodite of
			20	1.	The Appendix The ripponder
		1	2	1	has prayed for giving them a   man.
		1			new electric connection or
	1	1			disconnect another connection
	1	10.00			given on the same land by the
	1	1		1	given oil the same land by the
	1	TV.	E 0 1		Respondent. Considering the
	4	1		13	merit of the case and
			1		documents on record, the
	A	£5	1		Respondent was directed to
	1		1	(4)	
	Ale:		1	1	disconnicoe
					no.43608/16677/7.
- 61	0.100=	M/n In Chamical	DGVCL,	Load	THE Appenaire is a second
7	2/202	M/s. Jay Chemical	Surat	Reduction	bearing connection No. 63855 dated
	3	Industries Ltd.	Sulai	1 TOUR GOLDS	with contracted demand 12.10.20
				4	2750KVA at 11KV Voltage 3, the
	V	1			system, the unit located at plot Respond
		1			
	1	× ×		0.	[ NO. Dr 45 to 52, G12 5, 555
	1	Ar.			
	1	N			The Appellant has applied for   ted the
	1			10	an Additional Load of 1250KVA   directive
					to raise their contract demand of order
	1	4			I W Large filett contract domination
	1	V			
	1		1		
	360	[	1		system voltage for their existing   Ombuds
		l .		1	unit on 14.02.2022. The man.
			V.	M)	estimate was issued and paid
1	W	1		1	accordingly and executed the
	ľ.	1			accordingly and exceeded the
	1	1			power supply agreement with
	10				the Respondent on 17.05.2022.
		1			The Appellant had demanded
			1.		the Additional load on
		:-	1		THE RESERVE THE PROPERTY OF TH
		-			14.00.2022 and paid the
		;-			14.02.2022 and paid the
		;-			estimate on 11.05.2022 with an
					estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works
					estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works himself. The Appellant has to
		9			estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works himself. The Appellant has to
		8			estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works himself. The Appellant has to complete the proposed works
		÷			estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works himself. The Appellant has to complete the proposed works within the time frame as
					estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works himself. The Appellant has to complete the proposed works within the time frame as specified in the SoP regulation,
					estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works himself. The Appellant has to complete the proposed works within the time frame as specified in the SoP regulation, 2015. The time period for
					estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works himself. The Appellant has to complete the proposed works within the time frame as specified in the SoP regulation, 2015. The time period for execution of work by the
		33			estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works himself. The Appellant has to complete the proposed works within the time frame as specified in the SoP regulation, 2015. The time period for execution of work by the Appellant for their load
		- E			estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works himself. The Appellant has to complete the proposed works within the time frame as specified in the SoP regulation, 2015. The time period for execution of work by the Appellant for their load
				25 7	estimate on 11.05.2022 with an option to carried out works himself. The Appellant has to complete the proposed works within the time frame as specified in the SoP regulation, 2015. The time period for execution of work by the Appellant for their load



		-	13.11.2022. The Appellant has
1 4			dominica me load reduction
			request on a temporary basis without payment of the
			registration
		A	observed that there is
			procedural lacuna on the part
	T		of the Kespondent while
			processing the load reduction
		22	application. The Respondent
	l	1	1205 HOL HOHOWED the relevent
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Provisions in regard with the
1	MED _		load reduction/additional load service event and thereby the
1 1	1 (4		present dispute is aroused. The
			application for load roduction
			Submitted by the Appellant
	1 -		belote the Respondent :-
			without payment of remetration
1	1	581	charges and therefore the said
	41	2	application cannot be
-			considered as valid and eligible
			reduction purpose As the
		1	application for load reduction in
1 1		1	not valid one therefore the
		1	order passed by the CCPP is
1 1			deated as erroneous and not
			accepted. The prayers sought
8 3/202	2 M/s. Khodiyar Ice	Dorin	and rejected
3	Factory	DGVCL, Valsad	Meter The Appellant in L
		vaisad	Connection with
	1		Supplemen   consumer No. 05428/00700/7
	2		1 released on 27.05.2011 The
	1		meter of the said connection A
	- G		was replaced on [1012021 by
	1	1	providing a Bi-directional meter by the Respondent. The passed by
	- 1	1	installation checking of the
	1		promises of the Appellant
			carried out by the Respondent
		1	on 01.09.2022 and checking
1 1			sheet no. 312 was prepared.
			The meter was inspected in the meter testing laboratory on
1 1	1 - 1	-	00.03.2022 in the presence of
		1	ic representative of the
			Appellant and checking shoot
1 1		1	110. VLD/400 Was prepared A-
	T	1	per the remarks of the
		1	laboratory, the MRI data of the meter could not be retrieved
			and nence, the meter is
	"	Į.	required to be sent to the motor
		1	manufacturing company The
		1.	supplementary bill for the
	1		slowiless of the meter
		-	amounting to Rs. 4,80,767.76
	a ii	1	was issued on 20.10.2022 as per clause no. 6.33 of the
	=	1	GERC, Electricity Supply Code
	· ·		and Kelated Motton
			Regulations, 2015 Aggricused
1 1 1		1	order of the CODE
	- 5	1	DGVCL, Valsad, the Appellant
			has represented before the
	1		Ahmedabad with a proven
		1	decide the meter slowness and
			Diffing related issue. The meter
The state of the s			THE MICHAEL
Half yearly report (First	half yearl for the	Wallet Committee Committee of the Commit	
Half yearly report (First	half year) for the year 2023-2024	(April, 2023 to Se	ptember, 2023). Page 6

	12				slowness is because of the non-	
			19	S	availability of B-phase voltage	
1 3		- 1	541	8	lue to corrosion on B-phase	
	625				ink observed in installation	1
	1	- P				1
1 1	- 1		1.3	1.7	wiring. The erroneous recording by the meter in the	1
			Mr.	ı	recording by the fileter in the	1
	()		¥	1	present case is due to wiring of	
	1 1	1		1	the installation which leads to	1
	1 1	1	8		slow recording by the meter.	
					The same is confirmed from the	1.
	1		D 1/25	1	record of the increment in	340
					consumption observed after the	4
	1 1	ľ.			replacement of the meter and	1
		N. Au	1	8 , 10	correction in wiring by the	V
1		V IV	1	= 20	Respondent. The provision of	
1 6		l. II		*	the supply code clause no. 6.33	1
				***	is applicable in the present	
	1	1	8		case. Clause No. 6.33 of the	1
1			Y	1	Gujarat Electricity Regulatory	
	17	1		1	Commission (Electricity Supply	1
1			1	353	Commission (Electricity Supply	
					Code and Related Matters)	9
	21	1	13.7			4
	-	1	100	1	supplementary bill issued by	Y
					the Respondent for the period	1
					of 6 months for slowness of	
		T.		2.7	meter @-29.65% is as per	
	1	1		9.71	provision 6.33 of the Gujarat	
	1	1			Electricity Regulatory	
	4	1		all a	Commission (Electricity Supply	
:3	1	1	1	^	Code and Related Matters)	
					Regulations, 2015. Therefore,	
1				1	the supplementary bill issued	1
		1			by the Respondent is as per the	1
			1	. 8	norms and payable by the	
1		1			Appellant. The order passed by	3
1				-	the CGRF is confirmed.	1
1	- 1				the CGRF is confirmed.	N.
	- 1	A	l l		The review application filed by	
	1				the Appellant does not show	
	1	W .			any mistake or error apparent	
	1			Y	on fact of record or any other	T.
		1			sufficient reason and hence,	1
1	1	1	1		the review appeal filed by the	l l
	1				Appellant does not survive and	
	1	The state of the s			dismissed.	
		The stine	MGVCL,	Meter	The Abbendare	The
9	4/202		Godhara	Slowness &	Consumer having contracted	Appellant
1	3	Industries	Gouliara	Supplemen	load of 100KW with Consumer	has filed
1	4			tary Bill	No.17101/50154/0, at GIDC,	the
				Issue	Halol, which was checked by	Petition
				Issuc	the Respondent on 04.02.2022	before the
	10				and declared 39.47% slow. The	Hon'ble
		1			old meter was replaced and	High
					tested in the meter testing	Court of
- 1					laboratory of the Respondent,	Gujarat,
		1			and it is found that R-Phase	Ahmedab
	1	(1)			and it is found that it indo	ad vide
	1	A			voltage is "O" volt. The meter is	SCA/161
			1		repacked and sent to the meter	95/2023.
			MG /	1	manufacturing company for	90/2020.
				1	further investigation. The	
					supplementary bill was issued	
1				7,1		
					of meter by 39.47% to the	
					Appellant. The supplementary	
11	1	· ·			bill was revised by the	
					Respondent as per the order of	
			1		CGRF. The supplementary bill	l
		2			issued by the Respondent for	
		*			issued by the Respondent for	
			*		issued by the Respondent for slowness of meter @-39.47% is	
			*		issued by the Respondent for slowness of meter @-39.47% is to be revised for 6 months	
				-	issued by the Respondent for slowness of meter @-39.47% is to be revised for 6 months period as per the provision 6.33	
				1	issued by the Respondent for slowness of meter @-39.47% is to be revised for 6 months	

10	5/200				Code and Related Matters Regulations-2015. The cumulative temper report of meter MRI data confirms the breaking of R & B phase voltage during the said period. The assessment units for the period of 6 months are required to be calculated considering the effect of make/break events reflected in cumulative temper report of the MRI data. The order passed by the CGRF is not in line with the provision of GERC's Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters Regulations-2015 hence	
	5/202	year) for the year 2023-2024	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	the stucture of the stucture o	The Appellant has submitted the grievance before the ombudsman with billing issues of their 2 nos. of LT connections with the name of M/s. Indus Tower Ltd. has consumer numbers 72037/10221/6 and 72038/05544/0 each having a contract demand of 25 KW each. Both connections are for the use of electricity for the mobile tower, which is in remote areas, the bill issued by the Respondent for the Consumer No.72037/10221/6, considering the period from the date of meter replacement to the date of MRI data taken is for accumulated units and subsequently revised as per CGRF order, considering the monthly average units for this period with prevailing tariff and accordingly, the fuel charges and DPC charges. In the case of connection to 72038/05544/0, the meter reas billed with "0" units from the month of July-21 to Nov21 and the MRI data was not made vailable due to technical sues. The meter testing was one on 18.10.2022 and the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in order. The lissued to the Appellant is accumulated units for the couracy test is in ord	Vide letter dated 02.09.202 3, the Responde nt has implemented the directive of order passed by the Ombuds man.



d date of the most work the Respondent of Segondent with the work of Respondent all the segondent and the segondent all							
the Respondent in this case, accordingly on 23.05.2024, the Respondent submitted by email the revised calculation from Jan. 2020 considering the prevailing tariff, PPPPA & DPE charges of the Appellant is decordingly.  All Salamad Cattle Peeds  MGVCL, Bistimate The Respondent having a contracted load is 98/W under LTMD Tariff with Consumer No. 01201/50160/1. The Appellant has challenged the Suo-Moto estimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand by the Respondent to regularize the Consumer of Consumer (Circle).  All Consumer of Consumer Great the Consumer of Consumer of Circle and Consumer of Circle and Consumer of Consumer of Circle and C		- 1		(a)		of date of meter	
accordingly on 23.05.2023, the Respondent submitted by email the revised calculation from Jan. 2020 considering the prevailing tariff, FPPPA & DPC charges of the respective period. The Appellant is directed to pay the revised bill according the prevailing tariff, FPPPA & DPC charges of the respective period. The Appellant is directed to pay the revised bill according the property of the property						replacement/testing date with	
Respondent submitted by email the revised calculation from Jan-2020 considering the prevailing tariff, PPPAR & DPC charges of the respective period. The Appellant is directed to pay the revised bill accordingly.  Batimate Related Related Carbon Power of the Appellant is a customer of Vide letter dated for the prevailing tariff, Program of the Power of the Appellant is a customer of the Consumer No. 1020 (50166) 1. The Appellant is challenged the Stun-Moto estimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and significant of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and significant is a customer of consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabed and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per process of the contracted demand of 15 MyA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand with the Appellant and contents the contract demand by the contract demand by the contract demand by the contract demand by the		l i				the Respondent in this case,	
the revised calculation from Jan2020 considering the prevailing tariff, FPPPA & DPC charges of the respective period. The Appellant is directed to pay the revised bill is directed to pay the revised bill accordingly.  Bestimate Released Prevailing tariff, FPPPA & DPC charges of the Repellant is a customer of the Repellant is a customer of the Respondent having a customer of the Respondent having a customer of the Respondent is a customer of the Respondent in regularize the contracted demand before Consumer Co				N N		accordingly on 23.05.2023, the	
Jan. 2020 considering the prevailing tarift, PFPA & DPC charges of the respective period. The Appellant is directed to pay the revised bill adverted to pay the revised by the contracted demand before consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that be wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 15 MCVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract de		1	*			Respondent submitted by email	19 Ot
Jan. 2020 considering the prevailing tarift, PFPA & DPC charges of the respective period. The Appellant is directed to pay the revised bill adverted to pay the revised by the contracted demand before consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that be wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 15 MCVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract de			*:			the revised calculation from	
prevailing tariff, FPPPA & DPC charges of the respective period. The Appellant is directed to pay the revised bill scordingly.  11 6/202 M/s. Anand Cattle Vadodara Related Peeds on the Appellant is a customer of the Respondent having a contracted load is 99KW under LTMD Tariff with Consumer No. 01201/50160/1. The Appellant is a customer of the Respondent having a contracted load is 99KW under LTMD Tariff with Consumer No. 01201/50160/1. The Appellant is a customer of the Respondent to regularize the contracted deam and before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MCVCL, Vadodara, the Respondent for the Appellant is a customer of the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MCVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ornbudsman, Ahmodabed and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require ITT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent in such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimums charges against the differential the contracted demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the morbudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shell collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and concends and the Appellant in case of drawl of the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in case of the Appellant in case of drawl of the Appellant in case of the Appellant in case of drawl of the Appellant in case of the				21			39
Changes of the respective period. The Appellant is directed to pay the revised bill sidenced to pay the revised bill secondingly.   Vide letter than the period of the pay the revised bill secondingly.   Vide letter than the period of the pay the revised bill secondingly.   Vide letter than the period of the pay than the period of the pay						prevailing tariff, FPPPA & DPC	9
meriod. The Appellant is directed to pay the revised bill sacordingly.  The Appellant is a customer of the Repondent having a contracted leads if 99KW under the Respondent having a contracted lead if 99KW under the Respondent having a contracted lead if 99KW under the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand charges of Consumer Original Polymore, and sequence of Con		1 :	10			charges of the respective	
isirected to pay the revised bill accordingly.  M/s. Anand Cattle Feeds  MGVCL, Vadodara  Related  The Appellant is a customer of Related to Respondent having a contracted load is 99kW under the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand before Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order of Consumer Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grievance Redressel Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the Order Grieva	1		Tax				
Needs		V				directed to pay the revised bill	h
The Appellant is a customer of Related   Nadodara   Related   Related   Respondent having a contracted losal is 99kW under the Respondent to regularize the school of 1201/50160/1. The Appellant has challenged the Suo-Monto estimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the hontracted demand before Consumer Crievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and hamedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99kW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 181KW as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand the force of the development of the proposed by the ments in case No. 46/2021, order dated.16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature a	-						
New Comment			2 -			accordingly.	Vide letter
Related  In State 1 is 99,8W under LTMD 1 ariff with Consumer to 1 in the Committee of the Committee of the Committee of the Consumer of the Respondent to regulate the Consumer Officers of Consumer	11	6/202	M/s. Anand Cattle			The Appellant is a customer of	
ITMD Tariff with Consumer No. 01201/50160/1. The Appellant has challenged the Suc-Moto estimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115KWA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand with the contract demand with the contract of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsmar had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 0.1/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is hawing similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply, here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant in case of the continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant in case of the continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant in it all iberty to take action as per	1			Vadodara	Related	the Respondent Having a	
olizo1/50160/1. The Appellant has challenged the Suc-Moto estimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MCVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MCVCL Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contract demand with the contract demand wwirked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the multiple to the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the multiple that the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the multiple that the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the multiple that the contract demand the order passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesald direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant in it at liberty to take action as per		2 1	-			contracted load is 99kw under	
has challenged the Suo-Moto estimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contracted demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand of the contracted demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated, 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated, 13.16.06.2002 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant in case of trawl of the Appellant in a continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant in case of trawl of the Appellant in case of				5		LTMD Tariff with Consumer No.	
restimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contracted demand with the contracted demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the combudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated, 13.12.2021 and in case Ro. 01/2022, order dated, 13.12.2021 and in case Ro. 01/2022, order dated, 13.02.2021 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesald direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in at illustry to task action as per		73				01201/50160/1. The Appellant	
Respondent to regularize the contracted demand before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Refressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contracted demand with the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. The Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant and exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during for a least four time during for the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per							
contrageted demand before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressals Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection as per the contracted demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand with the contracted demand with the contracted demand with the contracted demand with the order passed by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases, I noted that previously, the ombudsman's had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice, the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in a current of the presence of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant in the Conference of t		1	- 1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			estimate issued by the	
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Refressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted dernand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tauffi connection as per the contract demand of 15KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand with the contract demand with the contract demand with the contract demand with the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13. 12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 13. 12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 13. 12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 13. 12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 13. 12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 13. 12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 15. 06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant In case of drawl of the Appellant and exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per						Respondent to regularize the	
Forum, MOVCL, Vandodara, and against the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, MOVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 95KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand with the contracted demand with the contracted demand and the contracted demand with the contracted demand with the contracted demand and the contracted demand with the contracted demand with the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman'had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice, the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in acase of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by SW or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per		1		27		contracted demand before	
Forum, MGWCL, Vadodara, and had against the order of Consumer Grirevance Redressal Forum, MGWCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedshad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 95KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 10/2022, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 10/2022, and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant and exceeds its contract demand by SW or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			- × ×			Consumer Grievance Redressal	
against the order of Consumer Grievance Refresals Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT taniff connection as per the contract demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand with the contract demand with the contract demand worked out under Sto moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 40/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 10/2022, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 10/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant in case of drawl of the Appellant in case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to task cation as per						Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, and	
Grievance Redressal Forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman. Ahmedabad and payed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT taiff connection as per the contract demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 61/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 13.12.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per	1			V		against the order of Consumer	
MGVCL, Vadodara, the Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT taniff connection as per the contract demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman's had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 10/2022, order dated. 16.05.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant in case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per						Grievance Redressal Forum,	Ombuds
Appellant filed a representation before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99kW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115kVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand with the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar of case of the contract demand with the contract demand with the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per	1		0.0000				man.
before Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99kW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115kVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contract demand with the contract demand with the contract demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman' had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice, the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant. In case of order of the Appellant in exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per	1	-	B-340		1		
Ahmedabad and prayed that he wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99kW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115kVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand writed out under Stu moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated.13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			25		A .	before Electricity Ombudsman,	
wants to continue consumption of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 15KW as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contracted demand with the contracted demand with the contracted demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated.16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per						Ahmedahad and prayed that he	1
of electricity as per the contracted demand of 99KW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115KVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsmar had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant case of the aforesaid of the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per		1				wants to continue consumption	
contracted demand of 99kW under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115kW as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply, here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per		100				of electricity as ner the	
under the LT connection and he doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115kVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant naces out the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at illowed.	1	1				contracted demand of 99KW	
doesn't require HT tariff connection as per the contract demand of 115kVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated, 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated.16.05.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice, the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at illevire to take action as per						and or the LT connection and he	
connection as per the contract demand of 115kVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. The Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			l	1			
demand of 115kVA as proposed by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman' had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant and exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per		1					1
by the Respondent. In such type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			,			connection as per the contract	
type of cases, when the Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman' had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply, here for the delivery of natural justice, the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			1			demand of 115KVA as proposed	51
Appellant had consented for payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per		1.2	A			by the Respondent. In such	1
payment of two-year minimum charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per		1				type of cases, when the	
charges against the differences of the contracted demand with the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in case is contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per						Appellant had consented for	
of the contracted demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman in an observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per				1	1	payment of two-year minimum	
the contract demand worked out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman' had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated.16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per		1		1		charges against the differences	
out under Suo moto proceeding by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman' had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant in case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per						of the contracted demand with	
by the Respondent, it is to look into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per	1	1				the contract demand worked	
into the order passed by the ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			-		1	out under Suo moto proceeding	
ombudsman in a similar type of cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated.16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per						by the Respondent, it is to look	15
cases. I noted that previously, the ombudsman' had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated.16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per		-	18			into the order passed by the	. 1
the ombudsman had observed the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated.16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per				T.		ombudsman in a similar type of	1
the merits in case No. 46/2021, order dated. 13. 12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated. 16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			8			cases. I noted that previously,	1
order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated.16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases.  This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per	1				1	the ombudsman had observed	1
order dated. 13.12.2021 and in case No. 01/2022, order dated.16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases.  This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per						the merits in case No. 46/2021,	
dated.16.06.2022 and passed order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			1 12			order dated. 13.12.2021 and in	
order in the respective cases. This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per					1		2011
This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			1			dated.16.06.2022 and passed	< 1 × 1
This case is having similar nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per		2	1	1		order in the respective cases.	s][]
nature and the aforesaid direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			1			This case is having similar	•
direction is need to apply here for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per				1		nature and the aforesaid	l
for the delivery of natural justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per				1		direction is need to apply here	: [
justice. the Respondent shall collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per				4		for the delivery of natura	1
collect the minimum charges of two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			- 1	1		justice, the Respondent shall	1
two years in connection with the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per						collect the minimum charges of	f
the Appellant and continue to supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			T.	1		two years in connection with	ı
supply power under the LT Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			245	1		the Appellant and continue to	
Connection to the Appellant. In case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per						supply power under the Li	Γ
case of drawl of the Appellant exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			3		1	Connection to the Appellant. In	ı
exceeds its contract demand by 5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per						case of drawl of the Appellan	t
5% or more for at least four time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per			4			exceeds its contract demand by	y
time during forthcoming financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per					1	5% or more for at least four	r l
financial year, the Respondent is at liberty to take action as per					1		
is at liberty to take action as per							
regulation 4.95 of the GERC's		1		9	:=	in at liberty to take action as ne	r
regulation 4.95 of the GERC's	1		[	1		regulation 4 05 of the CEPC	S
			AN			regulation 4.55 of the diske	~

		\$ .		-	Electricity Supply code and related matters Regulation-2015 to regularize the contract	1
12	7/202	M/s. Ventana	140000		i demand.	1
A453.57	3	Speciality Pvt Ltd.	MGVCL,	Representat	The Appellant, M/s, Ventage	-
		-positinty I vt Ltd.	Vadodara	ion	Specialty Pvt. Ltd. has applied	1
				Admission	For a new EHT connection with	li .
				stage	a contracted load of 8000KVA	li .
		(6)		Hearing	(HIP-IV tariff) at 66 voltage	0
		14			level for their proposed unit	
					located at block/survey No	
		- N (A)		>	257/1, 257/2, and 268 of	ľ
			1		Village: Ghantiyal Ta. Savli to	
		¥			the Respondent on 24.06.2021. The Appellant has paid the	
5 10	*					a (A)
- 1					02.11.2021 and executed the	
- 1			1 1	1	agreement with the Respondent	
- 1			1	27	on 23.11.2021. The Appellant	ľ
- 1			4 . 4		requested the Respondent on	
			1		05.05.2022 to provide 66 KV	
	- 1		1 . 1		power supply from the	
	1				Khakariya substation instead of the Chandran	
	14		1 . 1	- 1	of the Chandranura	
	- 0				Substation. The Respondent has forwarded the request of	€
		§	1	1	the Appellant to the GETCO.	
- 1			1		The Respondent had issued 60	
				1.0	days notice to the Appellant	
- 1				100	vide letter No. 496 dated	
				(3	23.05.2022 for commencement	
- 1				103	of billing for the new 8000KVA	
					(HTP-IV tariff) EHT power,	
	1	a:		13	supply) as the work under	
- 1		E1 11#0			option-III was not completed in 180 days as per clause No. 4.33	
				10	(2) of the GERC, Electricity	9
- 1	1		W.	Š	Supply Code and Related	
				1 1	Matters, Regulations 2015 The	
				1.0	JETCO has issued a revised	
	4			6	sumate to the Respondent and	
- 1				h	accordingly, The Respondent	
- 1			1	ti	has issued a revised estimate to he Appellant vide letter No.	
- 1	1	R = 3		6	32 dated 23.06.2022 with the	
- 1		*		1 10	emark "the revised estimate is	1.2
	1	2		IS	ssued with keeping agreement	
		*		C.	Accuted on 23.11.2021 and 1	
			1	0	uler terms and condition as it	
			V	18	as per prior approval on	
	1			re	1.08.2021. The liability for edressing any issues in	•
		-		re	elation to the erection of a line	
				101	way leave permission parted	
			-	l w.	ill the Appellant under	
		4		O <sub>I</sub>	ption-III. The issue of time	
	2.00		Į.	1 1111	nit extension for completion	
				01	electric line work and time	
				1111	nit extension request for	4.5
				mi	inimum billing after receiving	
				rel	inimum billing under deemed lease of EHT connection. The	
			-	sai	id action of the Appellant is	
				ais	so called a subsequent course	
			1	[ 01	action as seen that the	
		1	[	ere	ection of line work was not	
	1			11111	tiated by the Appellant at the	
	1		ľ	1 1 616	evant point of time after	
				111181	king payment of estimate on	
- 1	1	1		1 02.	II ZUZI ond organization	



13 8/202 M/s. Objects Ambuja 3 M/s. Objects Limited  Baimate Ahmedabad  Baimate Ahmedabad  Baimate Related Related Related Related Ahmedabad  Baimate Related Rel			11 2/12			The state of the state of	
18.05.2023 after laps of move than 10 months from the revised date of the estimate, the work is not completed by the Appellant is seems that the delay in work execution by the Appellant is because of the Appellant is a because of the Appellant is because of the Appellant is a because of the Appellant is a because of the Appellant is a most of the time limit for the execution of work, postponement of the effect of 60 days notice, and cancellation of bills served as dimmed released connection, are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted. The Appellant is a having appeal from the Appellant is a post of the Himstinager of the Himstinager of the Appellant is a having appeal of the ap				4		Further, it is noted that as of	
than 10 months from the revised date of the estimate, the work is not completed by the Appellant is seems that the delay in work execution by the Appellant is been that the delay in work execution of the Appellant is been proved of the Appellant is been proved of the Appellant is been proved on the time limit for the execution of work, postponement of the effect of 60 days notice, and cancellation of bills served as dimmed released connection are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted.  Estimate Related Appellant is having Review Appellant in the Respondent During PY 2021-22, the actual demand of the Appellant was exceeded the Contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent During PY 2021-22, the actual demand of the Appellant was exceeded the Contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent During PY 2021-22, the actual demand of the Appellant was exceeded the Contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent being the order of 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to contral due to the auditional didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent wide No. 2762 dated 67.04,2022 and hence; the Respondent wide No. 2762 dated 67.04,2022 and hence; the Respondent wide No. 2762 dated 67.04,2022 and hence; the Respondent wide No. 2762 dated 67.04,2022 and hence; the Respondent wide No. 2762 dated 67.04,2022 and hence; the Respondent wide No. 2762 dated 67.04,2022 and hence; the Respondent wide No. 49.55, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievenness before the Consumer control of the Consumer control of the Respondent has been carried out of the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out of the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out of the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out of the Appellant and the Respondent has additional lead demand from			Ē.			the date of hearing i.e., on	Į.
revised date of the estimate, the work is not completed by the Appellant is seems that the delay in work execution by the Appellant is seems that the delay in work revecution by the Appellant is seems that the delay in work revecution by the Appellant for an extension the postponement of the first of 50 days notice, and cancellation of bills served as dimmed released connection are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted.  Estimate  Exports Limited  Babarmati, Ahmedabad  Estimate  Related  Ahmedabad  Estimate  Related  Ahmedabad  Estimate  Related  Ahmedabad  Estimate  Related  Ahmedabad  Estimate  The Appellant is and appeal and the postpondern. During appeal and the postpondern. During appeal and the postpondern and not postpondern. During appeal and the postpondern and postpondern. During appeal and the postpondern and postpondern. During appeal and the postpondern and po			e 8			18.05.2023 after laps of more	1
revised date of the estimate, the work is not completed by the Appellant is seems that the delay in work execution by the Appellant is seems that the delay in work revecution by the Appellant is seems that the delay in work revecution by the Appellant for an extension the postponement of the first of 50 days notice, and cancellation of bills served as dimmed released connection are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted.  Estimate  Exports Limited  Babarmati, Ahmedabad  Estimate  Related  Ahmedabad  Estimate  Related  Ahmedabad  Estimate  Related  Ahmedabad  Estimate  Related  Ahmedabad  Estimate  The Appellant is and appeal and the postpondern. During appeal and the postpondern. During appeal and the postpondern and not postpondern. During appeal and the postpondern and postpondern. During appeal and the postpondern and postpondern. During appeal and the postpondern and po	l. 1			- 1		than 10 months from the	1
work is not completed by the Appellant is seems that the delay in work execution by the Appellant is because of their own reasons, the prayer of the Appellant for an extension of the time limit for the execution of the effect of the time limit for the execution of the effect of the effec		1		Э.	71	revised date of the estimate, the	
Appellant is seems that the delay in work execution by the Appellant is because of their own reasons. the prayer of the Appellant for an extension of the time limit for the execution of work, postponement of the effect of 60 days motion, and not pushed and different of bills seems and sequent of the effect of 60 days motion, and not pushed and different of bills seems and sequent of the effect of 60 days motion and not pushed and different of the effect of 60 days motion and not pushed and different of bills seems and the effect of 60 days motion of the field by Respondent. During PY 2021-22, the actual demand of the Appellant was exceeded the contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent has insued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 49.55 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the control due to the suddeh failure of the generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator and at that time demand didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent to load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent to a 320 MWA vide No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent to a single service of the contract of the suddeh issued an estimate to a contract of the contract of the suddeh issued and the summation of the suddeh issued to the suddeh iss		1				work is not completed by the	1
delay in work execution by the Appellant is because of their own reasons, the prayer of the Appellant for an extension of the time limit for the execution of work, postponement of the effect of 60 days notice, and cancellation of bills served as dimmed released connection are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not pustified and the appellant and the pustified and the pusti		1	5.9			A llest is seems that the	
Appellant is because of their own reasons. The prayer of the Appellant for an extension of the Appellant for the execution of work, postponement of the effect of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send on the order of the effect of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send on the order of the effect of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send on the order of the effect of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send on the order of the effect of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send of the effect of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send of the effect of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of bills send of 60 days' notice, and cancellation of 60		1	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )			Appellant is seems that the	
own reasons, the prayer of the Appellant for an extension of the time limit for the execution of work, postponement of the effect of 50 days notice, and cancellation of oillus served as dimmed released connection; are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted.  Exports Limited  Bayorts Limi	l I	1	1			delay in work execution by the	1
Appellant for an extension of the time limit for the execution of work, postponement of the effect of 50 days notice, and cancellation of bills served as dimmed released connection, are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted.  By 202 M/e. Gujarat Ambuja Exports Limited  By 203 Extended Related  Abmedabad  By 204 Exports Limited  By 205 Extended Related  Abmedabad  By 205 Extended Related  Abmedabad  By 205 Extended Related  Abmedabad  By 206 Extended Related  Abmedabad  By 206 Extended Related  Abmedabad  By 207 Extended Related  Abmedabad  By 208 Extended Related  By 208 Extended Related  Abmedabad  By 208 Extended Related  By 208 Extended Related						Appellant is because of their	N.
Appellant for an extension of the time limit for the execution of work, postponement of the effect of 50 days' notice, and cancellation of hills served as dimmed released connection, are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted.  By 202  M/e. Gujarat: Ambuja Exports Limited  Myre. Gujarat: Ambuja Exports Limited  Belated Ahmedabad			F 1			own reasons, the prayer of the	1
the time limit for the execution of work, postponement of the effect of 60 days notice, and cancellation to bills served as dimmed released connection are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted.  Mys. Gujarat Ambuja Exports Limited  Belated Ahmedabad  Belated Ahmedabad  Belated Contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent has issued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 4,95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, was exceeded the notice to regularize the demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the sadded failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an' application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent wide No. 2762 dared 07.04.2022 and hence the Respondent than the summation of the Respondent than the summation process and issued an estimate to raise contract demand to raise the Respondent than the summation process and issued an estimate to raise contract of the Summation process and issued an estimate to raise contract of the Summation process and issued an estimate to raise contract of the Summation process and issued an estimate to raise contract of the Summation process and issued an estimate to raise contract of the Summation process and issued an estimate to raise contract of the Consumer Grevance Redressal Forum. UGVCI, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey. The Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from						Appellant for an extension of	. 1
13 8/202 M/s. Gujarat Ambuja Babarati, Ahmedabad Babarati, Ahmedab	4					the time limit for the execution	
## state of 60 days motice, and cancellation of bills served as dimmed released connection, are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted.  ### Sabarmati, Ahmedabad  ### Related Ahmedabad  ### Related Canada Cana						of work postponement of the	
a separate and the sepa		1				of work, postponement of and	* _ *
dimmed released connection, are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted.  13 8/202 M/s. Gujarat Ambuja Sabarmati, Ahmedabad Related Related Sabarmati, Ahmedabad Related Respondent. During PY 2021-20; the actual demand on the Respondent nas issued the notice to regularize the demand on the Respondent was exceeded the demand as per clause No. 4.95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the exceeded the down and the Respondent of the Appellant, the exceeded the down and the Respondent of the Appellant, the exceeded the down and the Respondent of the Appellant, the exceeded the down and the Respondent of the Appellant will be redered as the control due to the suddential the control due to the suddential the control due to the suddential the first of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent wide No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent wide No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract deshand from 2634KVA to 32.0KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,0791-8 per clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmatia against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4,95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1			l/	effect of 60 days notice, and	-
are not genuine and not justified and therefore it is not accepted.  13 8/202 M/s. Gujarat Ambuja Exports Limited  28 Barmati, Ahmedabad  29 Exports Limited  20 Exports Limited  21 Exports Limited  22 Exports Limited  23 Exports Limited  24 Exports Limited  25 Exports Limited  26 Exports Limited  26 Exports Limited  27 Exports Limited  27 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  29 Exports Limited  20 Exports Limited  27 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  29 Exports Limited  29 Exports Limited  29 Exports Limited  20 Exports Limited  21 Exports Limited  22 Exports Limited  23 Exports Limited  24 Exports Limited  25 Exports Limited  26 Exports Limited  27 Exports Limited  27 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  28 Exports Limited  29 Exports Limited  29 Exports Limited  20 Exports Limited  20 Exports Limited  20 Exports Limited  21 Exports Limited  22 Exports Limited  23 Exports Limited  24 Exports Limited  25 Expor		1				cancellation of bills served as	i.,.
13 8/202 M/s. Gujarat Ambuja 3 M/s. Gujarat Ambuja Ahmedabad  Bestimate Sabarmati, Abpellant is having Sabarmati, Sabarmati, Appellant was executed the Appellant is baving uppeal the official was executed the Appellant	1	1	8 8	1		dimmed released connection	n
13 8/202 M/s. Gujarat Ambuja 3 M/s. Gujarat Ambuja Ahmedabad  Bestimate Sabarmati, Abpellant is having Sabarmati, Sabarmati, Appellant was executed the Appellant is baving uppeal the official was executed the Appellant						are not genuine and not	1
13 8/202  M/s. Gujarat Ambuja Exports Limited  Mbmedabad  The Appellant is having 26/34K/A HT connection under the suppeal filled by the Respondent. During FY 2021-12, the actual demand for the Appellant was exceeded the Respondent has issued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 4-95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the sudder failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract demand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Res. 1.28F,9079/9- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint sire survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from					1	instified and therefore it is not	
By 202   Sabarmati, Ahmedabad   Basimate   Sabarmati   Sabarmati, Ahmedabad   Basamati, Ahmedabadada   Basamati, Ahmedabadada   Basamati, Ahmedabadada   Basamati, Ahmedabadada   Basamati, Ahmedabadadada   Basamati, Ahm			-				
Sy202   Exports Limited   Exports Limited   Easternate   Easternate   Easternate   Ahmedabad   Exports Limited   Expor		1				accepted.	Review
Related Ahmedabad Related Ahmedabad Related Ahmedabad Related Respondent. During Fy 2021- the Respondent was exceeded the Appellant was exceeded the Appellant was exceeded the Contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent has issued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 495 of the GREC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't sible to control due to the sudden failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent wide No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract definand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1.28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Orievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has additional load demand from 2dditional load demand from 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	12	8/202	M/s Gujarat Ambuja	UGVCL,		THE ADDCHAIL 10	
Ahmedabad  Himatnagar division of the Respondent. During FY 2021-22, the actual demand of the Appellant was exceeded the contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent has issued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 4,95 of the notice to regularize the demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the Cappellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the control due to the suddeh failure of the generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an' application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,288,790,79/-8 per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Ocde and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The injoint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	13		Exports Limited		Related	2634KVA HT connection under	
Respondent. During FY 2021 the Appellant act actual demand of the Appellant was exceeded the contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent has issued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 4.95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1.28.79.079?- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Re-lated Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		3	Exports Emilion			Himatnagar division of the	
22, the actual demand of the Appellant was exceeded the contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent has issued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 4.95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent the No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 made on the No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 made of the No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has imitiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 mounting to Rs. 1.28.79.079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The ioint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from				Immodubad	1	Respondent. During FY 2021-	
Appellant was exceeded the contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent has issued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 4.95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract dethand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,287,9079'- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC. Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The injent survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from				-	1	22. the actual demand of the	
contracted demand more than 5% for 4 times and the Respondent has issued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 4.95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the sudden failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an' application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent wide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence; the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract demand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28.79.079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95, GERC notifications, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load emand from list survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load emand from			W			Appellant was exceeded the	
5% for 4 times and the Respondent has issued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 4.95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent wide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28.79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4,95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			12			contracted demand more than	
Respondent has issued the notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 4.95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice stsued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.202 and hence; the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 GERC, Electricity Supply Code, and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1	2:	-		rov for 4 times and the	
notice to regularize the demand as per clause No. 4,95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the sudden failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an' application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence; the Respondent is initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2002 amounting Rs. 1,28,79,079/-4 ap for Clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4,95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from						5% IOF 4 tilles and the	
as per clause No. 4-95 of the GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the sudden failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence; the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract denhand from 2634kVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			V		A	Respondent has issued the	
GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an' application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent sinitiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract deshand from 2634KWA to 222KWA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1				notice to regularize the demand	
GERC, Electricity Supply Code, 2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an' application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent sinitiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract deshand from 2634KWA to 222KWA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1				as per clause No. 4.95 of the	man.
2015. According to the Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the sudden failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762' dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717' dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28.79.079'- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1			1	GERC, Electricity Supply Code,	
Appellant, the excess demand during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time damand didn't able to control due to the sudden failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an' application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2643-KVA to 3220-KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			i			2015 According to the	
during the year 2021-22 was due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28.79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from				×	1	Appellant the excess demand	2 .08
due to the commissioning work of a 4.2 Mw generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the sudden failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28.79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarnati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The piont survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1	_			Appendit, the cheese deline was	
of a 4.2 MW generator and at that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence,' the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1				during the year 2021-22 was	13
that time demand didn't able to control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence,' the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634kWA to 3220kWA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting Rs. 1,28,79,079 - as per clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4,95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			1 2			due to the commissioning work	
control due to the suddeh failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 70.04.2022 and hence; the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79.079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	1		27	1		of a 4.2 MW generator and at	-
failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an' application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4,95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The point survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			-			that time demand didn't able to	
failure of the generator during commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an' application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4,95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The point survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	1					control due to the sudden	
commissioning. The Appellant didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/-as per clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Refressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4,95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	1		A.			failure of the generator during	
didn't register an application for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence; the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634kVA to 3220kVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1		10.		commissioning The Appellant	14
for enhancement of load in reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	- 1					didn't register on application	
reply to the notice issued by the Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4,95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			*:			didit register an approach	
Respondent vide 'No. 2762 dated 07.04.2022 and hence,' the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1	1			for ennancement of load in	141
dated 07.04.2022 and hence, the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1	12			reply to the notice issued by the	
the Respondent has initiated the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract demand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1.28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1	1	1		Respondent vide No. 2762	
the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1	-	V.		dated 07.04.2022 and hence,	1
the Suo-moto process and issued an estimate to raise contract derhand from 2634kVA to 3220kVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			59 (5			the Respondent has initiated	
issued an estimate to raise contract demand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			(* 35	0		the Suo-moto process and	
contract derhand from 2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	1					issued an estimate to raise	1
2634KVA to 3220KVA vide No. 1717 dated 13.07.2022 amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	l l	1				4 1 1 6	1
amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4,95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		10				())][[act actionic	ja A
amounting to Rs. 1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4,95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1		1		- 4 40 07 0000	1
1,28,79,079/- as per clause No. 4,95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			1			1,1,	1
4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of 2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	A					announting	140
2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from						1,28,79,079/- as per clause No.	
2015. The Appellant has raised grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	1		1			4.95, GERC notification No. 4 of	
grievances before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from	1					2015. The Appellant has raised	
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			8	1	1	grievances before the	
Forum, UGVCL, Sabarmati against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			1		1		
against notice for load extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		1	A .	1	1		
extension issued under clause No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			1			1014411	· 10
No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			I.		1	against modes	
Supply Code and Related Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			A.	1	1	extension issued under clause	
Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			. []			No. 4.95 of GERC, Electricity	
Matters, Regulations, 2015. The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			ω.	I		Supply Code and Related	
The joint survey by the Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			11) 14			Matters, Regulations, 2015.	
Appellant and the Respondent has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from						The joint survey by the	: 1
has been carried out on 17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from		-		T .	A.	Annellant and the Resnandent	:
17.10.2022. During the joint site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from			li .		1	Appendit and the Respondent	
site survey, the Appellant requested to release their additional load demand from					1	has been carried out on	4
requested to release their additional load demand from						17.10.2022. During the joint	: 14
requested to release their additional load demand from	}				10	site survey, the Appellant	Ī.
additional load demand from		53	1		1	requested to release their	r
the 66 KV Amodra substation			1			additional load demand from	1
12.0 00 12.1			s.			the 66 KV Amodra substation	1

after the completion of the stop gap arrangement allowed by the Respondent to the M/s. Deep alloy, HT to EHT conversion under progress. The Respondent has suggested an alternative possibility of the underground plus overhead network from the 66 KV Gadhoda substation with the erection of a 1.4 KM O/H line and 1.7 KM U/G line during the joint survey which is not accepted by the Appellant. The action initiated by the Respondent for regularization of the contract demand as per recorded maximum demand of the Appellant which is in accordance with clause 4.95 of GERC (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations, 2015 seems to be in line. Further, it is to note that the Appellant is habituated for utilization of excess demand than permissible contract demand. Looking to the load utilization history, it seems that the Appellant is utilizing the load as per his wish and commercial benefits only and does not want: to cooperate with Respondent for regularization of the load and distribution system. In such case, the commitment for utilizing the power from their own generator or wind power in the future cannot be accepted. In view of this, the estimate issued for regularization of the contract demand of Appellant under the Suo-moto procedure is considered valid and thereby contract demand workout by the Respondent was considered as 3220KVA i.e., 586KVA additional. The estimate issued by Respondent for regularizing the additional load demand with the Suo moto procedure by proposing the erection of a new 11KV feeder with hybrid line configuration is the best possible and technically justified option, which is duly worked out after joint site The inspection. alternative solution by releasing the additional demand from the existing feeder as a stop gap arrangement is not accepted by the Appellant. The Respondent is at liberty to complete the remaining procedure regularize the enhanced demand of the said connection as per the provisions of GERC

					(Electricity Supply Code and	
					Related Matters) Regulations, 2015.	
	2 10 00	M/s. Rajratan Plastic	MGVCL,	Billing	The Appellant is LT category Vide	e letter
	9/202 3	M/s. Rajiatan Flastic Industries	Godhara	Related		11.202
					connected load of 100kw 3, t	
	111				located at plot No. 417/B, GIDC Res	sponde has
						nas olemen
		E			to Rs.47.511/- was issued as ted	the
				1	per the internal audit report for   dir	ective order
	8 *	790				ssed by
	13		1		as per HT tariff.	3
Si.	-	,			It is seen that timely actions   On	nbuds
					have not been initiated by the Respondent for excess	Z11.
	1		V		maximum demand recorded in	
					the financial years 2021-22 for	
	1				conversion of the appropriate category of supply as well as	
32		- 5			appropriate tariff for billing to	
-	2	** ** ** **			the Appellant. Hence, the	
					Respondent is directed to adhere to the provisions	
	S	2			stimulated as per Clause No.	
					4 95 of Supply Code, 2015, and	
					take necessary action in time for such types of cases	12
$\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{(i)}$					accordingly.	
	10/20	M/s. Gujarat Metro	TPL,	Billing	The present representation	
15	23	Rail Corporation Ltd.	Ahmedabad	Related	filed by the Appellant before the Ombudsman whereby the	
	1	800			Appellant has requested for	
			5	-	quashing the CGRF order dated	
	1			1	requesting to quash and set	
		7.			aside the power factor penalty	
		3.0			imposed by the Respondent considering the modified power	
					factor calculation formula and	
					further requested to refund the	
		1			penalty amount paid along with 18% interest from the month of	
		54	1		June-2022 onwards. The	
				W.	proposed modified formula	
	V	2		_	adopted for the calculation of the average power factor by the	
					Respondent without approving	
					the same before the Hon'ble Commission is not having any	
					legal support as far as the	
					changes in the existing formula	
					for the calculation of average power factor is concerned.	
	100				Hence, the leading PF penalty	
					with the proposed modified	
			1		formula levied in the energy bills and served to the	
		•:			Appellant does not survive and	
		2			the amount recovered against	
		2			the power factor penalty by the Respondent is required to be	
			2		refunded to the Appellant.	TT: 4 - 1
10	5 11/	20 Ms. Tuli Banerjee	TPL,	Billing	The LT service No.3138452 is	Vide le dated
16	23	Mr. Amjad Khan	Ahmedab	ad Related	NRGP category connection with the name of Chhaya Amit	22.08.
		Pathan C/o. Chhay	ra	8	Khajuriwala, "Amitchhaya",	3, the
		Amit Khajuriwala	1		Opp. Devnandan Avenue, 100	Respor
1	1				Road, B/H Seema Hall,	I IIC IICO

Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13:08:2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs. 3:155.38 for 155 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the display of the last three billing cycles to the display of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the hash of the last three billing cycles to the last		Ginning Company	Mahesana	Related	consumer of the Respondent company utilizing HT power supply for his ginning factory with consumer No. HT-19935.	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF during the meter reading at the Drambins of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as a per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Combudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that a takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her business partner. the, Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant point the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the green of the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading out to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the green of the month of Der Control of the Respondent. The Meter reading count of the respondent in the Meter reading to the Respondent of the Respondent of Der Control of Rs. 315.38 is found in line with the provision of DERC Supply Code-2015, clause up.6.58. The said estimated bill. Hence, the revision of the Supply Code-2015 clause up.6.58. The said estimated bill. Hence the revision of the CERC Supply Code-2015 and hence, the critical bill. Hence, the critical bill amounting to Rs. 30.003.42 debited by the Respondent.		M/s. Shree	UGVCL,	Billing	declared as cancelled.	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Re.3.185.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GRC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration that takes into consideration that takes into consideration that takes on her and her business partner. the Respondent land issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the representative of the Respondent. The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent amounting to Rs.315.38 is found in line with the provision of GERC Supply Code-2015, clause no.6.58. The said estimated bill usual reading the said estimated bill subsequent consumptions by the Respondent does not supply the Appellant and there is no representation found/submitted by the Appellant and there is no representation found/submitted by the Respondent does not supply the Respondent of the Respondent of the Respondent of the Respondent of GERC Supply Code-2015, clause no.6.58. The said estimated bill usual ready paid by the Appellant against the estimated bill. Hence, the revision of the estimated bill considering the subsequent consumptions by the Respondent does not support the provision of the RESC Supply Code-2015 and hence, the revised bill amounting to Res 20.00 as a		* 2	-		needs to be cancelled. Hence,	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3.155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GRC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her business partner. the Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the representative of the Respondent The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent for meter testing in the laboratory of the Respondent Company. The estimated bill to the Appellant of Respondent GERC Supply Code-2015, clause to.6.58. The said estimated bill was already paid by the Appellant and there is no representation for one of GERC Supply Code-2015, clause to.6.58. The said estimated bill was already paid by the Appellant against the estimated bill. Hence, the revision of the estimated bill. Considering the subsequent consumptions by the Respondent does not support the provision of the Respondent of the Respo		. 21			amounting to Rs 20 003 42	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3.155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as the differential amount of Rs.1.123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of Sec. 11.23.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of Sec. 11.23.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of Sec. 11.23.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of Sec. 11.23.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of Sec. 11.23.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of Sec. 11.23.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of Sec. 11.23.91 was posted by the Respondent and provide her with a fair and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her business partner. the Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug. 2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading out to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the representation for the Respondent. The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent during the meter testing in the laboratory of the Respondent company. The estimated bill issued by the Respondent amounting to Rs.3155.38 is found in line with the provision of GBRC Supply Code-2015, clause no.6.58. The said estimated bill was already paid by the Appellant against the estimated bill. Hence, the revision of the Rs. Supply Code-2015, clause no.6.58. The Appellant against the estimated bill. Hence, the revision of the Rs. Supply Code-2015, clause no.6.58. The Appellant against the estimated bill. Hence, the revision of					GERC Supply Code-2015 and	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.123.39 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ornbudsman to re-caulate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her, business partner. Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the representative of the Respondent company. The estimated bill was laud to the Respondent company. The estimated bill was already paid by the Respondent amounting to Rs.3155.38 colony in the Populant and there is no representation found/submitted by the Appellant against the estimated bill. Hence, the revision of the estimated bill.					the Respondent does not	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08, 2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs. 3155.38 for 165 unit based on the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.38 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs. 1123.39 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005. notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Combudsman to re-educate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toil this has taken on her and her business partner. the, Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent. The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent than the laboratory of the Respondent amounting to Respo				1	esumated bill considering the	
Respondent company has found the meter reader of the Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reader of the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 or 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant aper clause no.6.38 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of Security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her business partner. the, Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the audit and the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the representative of the Respondent. The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent and issued an estimated bill issued by the Respondent company. The estimated bill was already paid by the Appellant and there is no representation found/submitted by the Respondent company. The said estimated bill was already paid by the Appellant and there is no representation found/submitted by the Respondent company.					Appellant against the estimated bill. Hence, the revision of the	
Respondent company has found the meter reader of the Respondent company has found the meter display "OFP" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her business partner. the, Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFP" at the time of meter reading by the representative of the Respondent. The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent during the meter testing in the laboratory of the Respondent company. The estimated bill issued by the Respondent company. The estimated bill issued by the Respondent amounting to Rs.3155.38 is found in line with the provision of GERC Supply Code-2015, clause to 6.58. The said estimated bill was already paid by the Appellant and there					found/submitted by the	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause mo.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of sex. 1123.91 was posted by the Respondent has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her. business partner: the, Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of the					paid by the Appellant and there	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of section of the Respondent as the differential amount of Section of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of section of the Respondent as the differential amount of section of the Respondent as submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional off this has taken on her and her business partner. the Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the representative of the Respondent during the meter testing in the laboratory of the Respondent company. The estimated bill issued by the Respondent amounting to Rs.3155.38 is found in line with				1	Code-2015, clause no 6 58 The	10
classes. The meter reader of the Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her. Business partner. the Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the representative of the Respondent. The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent company. The estimated bill issued by the sespondent company. The				-	Rs.3155.38 is found in line with	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her. business partner. the Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the representative of the Respondent. The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent during the meter testing in the laboratory of the			30	-	estimated bill issued by the	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13,08,2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before to Combudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her business partner. the Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the representation of the Respondent. The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent. The Meter reading could not be retrieved by the Respondent during the meter.		*	,	P	testing in the laboratory of the	
Respondent company has found the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent and sent and the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent and sent and the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her business partner. the Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the time of meter reading by the representative of the Respondent, The Meter reading			i ž		Respondent during the motor	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.38 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombusman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her business partner. the, Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reading due to the display "OFF" at the			: 5		Respondent. The Meter reading	
classes. In emetr reader of the Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her. business partner. the, Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant for the month of Aug-2022 for not getting the actual reaction.		5.6	0		time of meter reading by the	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Combudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her business partner, the Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant.			₽.	G.	not getting the actual reading	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this has taken on her and her.					Respondent had issued an estimated bill to the Appellant	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that takes into consideration the mental and emotional toll this.					business partner the	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate her complaint and provide her with a fair and just resolution that			2	. 1	mental and emotional toll this	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the representation before the Ombudsman to re-evaluate here					a fair and just resolution that	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation-2005, notification no. 8 of 2005. The Appellant has submitted the		2.5	-		Ombudsman to re-evaluate har	
of or passes. The meter reader of the Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential amount of security deposit as per the GERC Regulation. 2005					Appellant has submitted the	
during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of Rs.1123.91 was posted by the Respondent as the differential				* =	per the GERC Regulation-2005	
Classes. The meter reader of the Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code-2015. In the bill of Aug-2022, an additional amount of					Respondent as the differential	
Classes. The meter reader of the Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to the Appellant as per clause no.6.58 of GERC Supply Code.					all additional amount of	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based on the average consumption of the last three billing cycles to			8		110.0.30 Of GERC Supply Code	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of Rs.3155.38 for 165 units based		2 % V	Sa 3	P .	the last three billing cycles to	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on 13.08.2022. The Respondent has sent an estimated bill of			ē <sup>∓</sup>		on the average consumption of	
Respondent company has found the meter display "OFF" during the meter reading at the premises of the Appellant on the premises of t		58° <sup>6</sup> .60			has sent an estimated bill of	mail.
Respondent company has passe found the meter display "OFF"				-	premises of the Appellant on	Omb
classes. The meter reader of the of or.	-			* *	found the meter display "OFF"	pass
is utilized by the Appellant for ted t					classes. The meter reader of the	direc

_					17	The Appellant has opted for a	
				5		seasonal tariff for the year	
811			59			2022. The Respondent has issued the bill for an annual	
	21		.9			minimum guarantee as per	
1	١				1	tariff schedule clause no.	3.
1				-		13.11.1 to 13.11.7. Aggrieved	1
	1		* *			by the amount of AMG, the	
			F1		1	Appellant has registered a complaint before the CGRF,	
	1		5			UGVCL, Mahesana, and	A.
1			i i	1	l (v	aggrieved by the order passed	1
		*	,			by the CGRF, UGVCL,	Ce I
1	72	, I				Mahesana, the Appellant filed	1
-		8	2 5	-		an appeal before the Ombudsman. The bill issued by	
- 1			×			the Respondent for the	~
		8.5				seasonal tariff is as per GERC,	
				}		tariff order 2021-22, and found	
			21	1		correct.	
	18	13/20	M/s. Sidwin Fabric	UGVCL,	Billing	The Appellant M/s. Sidwin Fabric Pvt. Ltd. located at	1
	10	23	Pvt. Ltd.	Sabarmati,	Related	village: Dhundhar Ta.	*
			2	Ahmedabad		Himatnagar having H.T.	V
	-		100	5.		Connection of 1650KVA,	,
				*		bearing consumer No.33380	1
	1		5±5			has registered the grievances at the Consumer Grievance	- 1
			- 20 m			the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Uttar	
						Gujarat Vij Company Limited,	1
		3				Sabarmati, Ahmedabad vide	
	ł	1	,			case number. UGA-04-003-	
						2022-23 in regard with the subject of considering their	
		*1				solar project under Gujarat	
						solar power policy 2015 as per	A
	1		148			registration at GEDA and	4
	T.					waving the banking charges Rs.1.10 per consumed unit. As	
						per the provision under clause	
		1				no 11.2(a) of GERC (Net-	
						Metering Rooftop Solar PV Grid	
						Interactive Systems)	
	1		- C	A		Regulations, 5/2016 and GERC (Net-Metering Rooftop	1
			15		- 2	Solar PV Grid Interactive	
	1				A.	Systems) (Third Amendment)	
						Regulations 2022, Notification	
	1					no. 2 of 2022 – dispute in billing	
						pertaining to energy injection and billing amount are to be	
						settled by the Consumer	1
						Grievance Redressal Forum	
						and Electricity Ombudsman.	
						the said dispute of the Appellant does not pertain to	
				1		billing and hence, it is not in	
						the scope of the Electricity	
				1		Ombudsman to settle the	
						dispute, hence, the appeal filed	*
						by the Appellant is disposed of without entering into the merits	
						of the case.	
	10	14/0	0 M/a SD2	DGVCL,	Non	The SCA No.7389 of	Aggrieved
	19	14/2 23	0 M/s. SP3 Technologies LLP	Surat	Implementa	2023[Filling (Stamp) Number:	by the order
		23	1001110108100		tion of	SCA/10568/2023] filed by the Respondent is pending in the	passed by
		À			CGRF orde	Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat	the
	1			1		wherein the order of Consumer	Consumer
		*1				Grievances Redressal Forum,	Grieva- nces
						DGVCL, Surat has been	1,000
	-						

Challenged. Oral order 01.05.2023 is passed by Hon'ble High Court of Guahmedabad. Thus, the matter is pending, precedence is the statem law found in the decision superior court. Such decare binding to that court the inferior court has to and generally, the in courts or any tribunals bound to obey the precessablished by the High Cor Supreme Court. Looking the said aspect,	by the ujarat, Dakshin Gujarat A Vij Company of the sisions at and follow Responde
established by the High (or Supreme Court. Looking)	
representation filed by Appellant is barred deciding at this level. He the Representation of	cedent Petition Court before the mg at Hon'ble the the Court of Gujarat, Ahmedab
20 15/20 M/s. Inara Polyfab DGVCL, Surat Surat Related The Appellant is dismissed with any order.  The Appellant is dismissed with any order.  The Appellant has demanded the new HT connection 495KVA on 08 08 2022	scA/738 9/2023.
Bitck no.35, Near Nati Industrial-4, Moti Ca Pipodara, Ta. Mangrol, To Surat. The Respondence released the connection 13.12.2022 with consumer HT-12909. The Appellant raised the grievances regard recovery of various chartaken in the estimate a execution of work for giving connection by the Respond and registered the grievance before the CGRF, DGW Surat vide case no.156/202 23. Aggrieved by the CG order dated 23.03.2023; Appellant has submitted representation before to Ombudsman. The Appella has failed to submit documen or evidence regarding the missellaneous in material purchased and supplied them to the Respondent for the estimate charges. The arrangement of the estimate charges. The arrangement of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The arrangement of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The arrangement of the estimate charges of their HT connection is found as an arrangement of the estimate charges. The arrangement of the estimate charges of their HT connection is found as an arrangement of the estimate charges. The arrangement of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The prevention of the estimate charges are the estimate charges are the estimate charges are the estimate charges. The estimate charges are the estimate	ional anal, Dist. dent on no. has dings rges and HT lent nce CL, 22-iRF the his the his the ial by for hid he
Murtipujak Sangh  Mahesana  Supply & P.F. Penalty Related  Sup	r , g , g , g , g , g , g , g , g , g ,

					penalty recovered by the	
				2		
- 1					Respondent for low power	
		Ψ.			factor and compensate against	
	1	\$	1	1	damage to electrical appliances	37
- 1	1				damage to electrical appropriate	
- 1		-	₹	74	due to frequent interruption of	
Y	-			4	supply. The Prayer of the	
- 1					Appellant cannot be considered	
- 1		27			Appellant carriot be considered	
1		1			as per Clause No. 3.4 to 3.8 and	
- 1		1		25	9.6 and 9.7 of GERC, Supply	
- 1	1 1	1514	2		9.6 and 9.7 of object, suppose	
- 1		N I			Code, 2015. There is no error	
- 1		V		1	found in the order issued by	
		× = ×		8	CODE LICUCI Meheana	
-					CGRF, UGVCL, Mehsana.	
- 1			DOMOI	Power	The Appellant, M/s. Bhagwan	
2	17/20	M/s. Bhagwan Shree	DGVCL,		Shree Polyfab Pvt. Ltd. is HT	
~	23	Polyfab Pvt. Ltd.	Surat	Supply	Silico Tolylab Iva Banandent	
	23	1 Oly lab 1 7 st = 1	161	Related	consumer of the Respondent	
		4		1 3	company i.e., DGVCL bearing	
		9.7			consumer No. 64018, CD-	
	0					
					425KVA, located at Block	
		1			no.162/163, Opp. Gangadhara	
		I	1		Police Chowki, Village: Soyani,	
	I.	1	.8		Police Chowki, village, boyam,	
	I .	1	14		Surat Bardoli Road, Ta.	
	1	V -		8: 2:	Palsana, Dist. Surat. The	
		1				
	1	- A	*		Appellant has registered the	
	1				grievance before the CGRF,	
	1			18	DGVCL, Surat regarding	
	N.	ES	18		La moutiene in nower cumply	
	1	2 47 10 10		1	Interruptions in power supply	
	1	5 - 2	1		on 30.01.2023 with case	
	1	2 -	D		no.158/2022-23. The CGRF,	
	10				DOVOL Count has issued the	
			k i	1	DGVCL, Surat has issued the	
	Wil	1	177	1	order on 10.03.2023 and	
					directed the Respondent to	
	0	1			directed the respect through	
		1 5			carry out necessary through	
			(i)		maintenance within 30 days,	
		K 6.7			aggrieved by the decision of the	
	1	A	8 6	1	aggileved by the decision the	
			1		CGRF, DGVCL, Surat, the	
	1				Appellant has registered the	
	1			1	case before the Electricity	
				1	Case Delote tite Encounters	
	1			1	Ombudsman. The Appellant.	
33	1	T.			has repeatedly represented	
- 6		l l	1		their concern about the quality	
		36		1	LICH COHOCITI about the quanty	
					power supply and minimizing	
	1				the interruptions of their	
	1				feeder. The Appellant has	
	1		10	4	leeder. The Appendix	
	U		× 1.		demanded the MRI data of their	
	- Mr	l.	12		energy meter from the	
	1					
					Respondent. It is also noted	
	1				that the Respondent has made	
					various efforts like carrying out	
		L			various choice and star feeder	
	l.	1.	19		the maintenance of the feeder,	
		A ·			bifurcation of feeders,	
	1	1 -	1	1	conversion of overhead to	
	1	(4)	1		CONVERSION of the	
	1	4		1	underground conversion of the	Y
		L			line where trees are more.	
	1	-			It was directed to take some	
	1	9	1	1		
					concrete solution to the	
	100			N.	problem of interruption is	
	4		1	9	required to be worked out by	
		l	8		required to be worked out by	
	W	l .		1	the Respondent. The specific	
		ľ	li .	1	responsibility of the monitoring	
		l l	V.	21	-Cabe 11/0/ Seveni ICV feeder	
		4	1		of the 11KV Soyani JGY feeder	
	0	1	1	V.	is required to be assigned to the	
	1	4	1		field officer and causes for the	
	10	/ D	1		licit diffect and educate to be	
	li.	S-2	1		interruptions required to be	
	1	12	1		identified and remedial actions	
			2/1		should be initiated from time to	
1	1	1			should be initiated from time to	
11	1				time. The power failure data	
ľ	14	1		1	extracted from the meter by	
	1				CALIACICAL HOILI CHICAGO	
		8 [1]			taking an MRI is to be handed	
	1	1				
					over to the Appellant and the	
		ē.			over to the Appellant and the	
		ė (	-	э	over to the Appellant and the reply to the complaint for interruptions or other matters	

00			1 AC	K	should be given to the Appellant by the Respondent.	4 1
23	18/20 23	M/s. Vaibhav Raj Stone Quarry C/o. Shri Harendrasinh	DGVCL, Surat	Represe ion Admissi	ntat The Appellant, M/s. Vaibhav	* *
		Rupsinh Matieda		stage Hearing	consumer no.18703/00008/7	
	3	27 0		2	Umarpada, Dist. Surat. The subject matter relates to	
			-	2   2	disputed supplementary bill, which is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat	
		ao nai		· ·	Sub-judicial. The Honghia Hist	
					said matter and kept it aside for final hearing vide oral	
		141	* *	18 18	A precedent is a statement of law found in a decision of	
	-				are binding to that court and the inferior court has to fell	
				9	courts or any tribunals are	
			*		or Supreme Court.	
		a .			Appellant is barred from deciding at this level I	
		sen u Sa	٠		Appellant is dismissed. The Appellant has	
		_*			submitted that the power supply quality of their installation is not up to the	
		4	a v <sup>e</sup>		corrective action from the	
					power supply to their consumer and hence, the Respondent	
		(E W)	* ×		required maintenance of the	
21, 23	/20 Shr Kho	i Mansukhbhai orasiya	TPL, Surat	Representat	ensure quality power supply.  The Appellant has supply.	ā
			-1	Admission stage Hearing	CGRF TPL, Surat which was	
			* 1		issue raised by the applicant does not fall under	
	_		;s-		definition of complaint and hence, the application is prematured and dismissed.	
		6			Aggrieved by the action of the CGRF, TPL, Surat, the Appellant approached the Ombudsman.	
					The matter is remanded back to	
				is	lirection to decide the present ssue of the Appellant as per the rovisions of GERC's	



1	4	1	25		Regulations on the t
1		- 1		1	Regulations on the base of the merits of the case.
				1	merits of the case.
25	22/2	O Shri Anilkumar	MGVCL,	Danne	1 -
	23	Natavarlal Devada	Godhara	Representa	
i.			Godffafa	Admission	the application before the
		1			CGRF, MGVCL, Godhra which
	1			stage	was not registered by the
		* =		Hearing	CGRF, MGVCL, Godhara
		101	1	**	stating that the matter is
		/4			pending before the Hon'ble
		1		100	Court and hence, as per 2 33(1)
	1				of the GERC (CGRF and
		1	* 1		Ombudsman) 2 of 2019 the
		1	12	E E	matter cannot be entertained
		1	60	×1 .	by the CGRF, MGVCL,
			***	6	Godhara.
		1		1	Aggrieved by the action of the
					CGRF, MGVCL, Godhara, the
					Appellant approached before
	1		**		the Ombudsman.
	1	< 5		*8	The matter is remanded to
					The matter is remanded back to
		I	C.		CGRF, MGVCL, Godhara, with
		4	- 14	1	the direction to decide the
			7	55	present issue of the Appellant
		N. Control of the con		1	as per the provisions of GERC's
26	05.400		383		regulations on the base of the merits of the case.
20	25/20	Shri Palakkumar	UGVCL,	Disconnecti	Aggriculd by the Case.
	23	Sureshbhai Patel	Sabarmati,	on of Power	Aggrieved by the Order of the CGRF, UGVCL, Ahmedabad,
		1	Ahmedabad	Supply	the Appellant has remind a late
	1	1		11.3	the Appellant has registered the
		1	1		appeal before the Ombudsman
	1		, s		for disconnection of the power
					supply of M/s. Pushpanath
					Mamra Pauva factory stating
	1		11 0	200	that the connection is continue
				1	without consent of the owner.
					The connection of the disputed
5					factory premises is not liable to
		1			disconnect as per clause no.
					8.3 of the GERC, Supply Code
W			1 -		2013, and hence, the prayer of
			1	[	the Appellant for permanent
					disconnection of the power
					supply of M/s. Pushpanath
	~	ř.		1	Mamra Pauva factory cannot be
	27/20	Shri Mehmudmiya A.	UGVCL,	Representat	accepted.
- 1	23	Kureshi	Sabarmati,	ion	The Appellant has withdrawn
- 1			Ahmedabad	Admission	the representation stating that
- 1					a mutual settlement was made
				Stage	with the Respondent and
		Ti Ti	1	Hearing	Respondent has submitted the
	1				same. Withdrawal of the
		- W		la l	representation is allowed no
	33/20	M/s. Sanidhya	TPL, Surat	W	order issued.
	23	Corporation One	TFL, Surat	New	The Appellant has withdrawn
		Partnership Firm C/o.		Connection	the representation stating that
	J)	Shri Ashok		1/1	a mutual settlement was made
		Mohanbhai Bhanderi	l		with the Respondent, Mutually
		DIMINE!			settled, no order issued.

Electricity Ombudeman, Ahmedabad



OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, AHMEDABAD
Status of representations disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad during the
First half-year (i.e. Apr.2023 to Sept.2023) of the year 2023-24

						7.7	9	28	13	2	26	41
-1	Total	20	21	41	8	11			0	0	0	0
-		0	0.	0	0	0	0	0			2	3
	TPL- Dahej		4	5	1	0	2	3	2	<u>U</u>	2	2
	TPL- Surat	1		4	2	0	0	2	2	0		3
	TPL- Ahmedabad	2	$\frac{1}{2}$		0	3	0	3	0	0	3	
5	UGVCL- Mahesana	2	1	3		2	2	6	1	1	5	8
	UGVCL- Sabarmati	4	3	7	2	0	1	2	0	0	2	6
	DGVCL- Valsad	2	0	2	0	1	$-\frac{3}{1}$		3	0	6	8
_		4	5	9	1	2	3	6	0	U	3	4
	DGVCL- Surat	2	1	3	1	1	1	3	0	0	3	7
2	MGVCL- Godhara		5	8	1	2	0	3	5	0		
1	MGVCL- Vadodara	3	Sept.'23						30.09.2023		l i	E.
		01.04.'23	Apr.'23 to		Appellant	Licensee			pending at the end of	45 days.	45 days.	
٧o.	CGKF	as on	during			favour of	Others	Total	ntations	of within	of after	seati
3r. 🕫	CGRF	Pending	Received	Total	In favour	In			Represe-	Disposed	Disposed	No.
		1			Repres	Representations disposed of Represed Disposed Di						

Electricity Ombudaman, Ahmedabad

### REPORT FOR THE SECOND HALF OF THE YEAR 2023-24

(October, 2023 TO March, 2024)

# (1) Activities of the office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003.

The Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission has established office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad which is an appellate authority to file appeal/representation against the order passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum of Distribution Licensees.

The reports of general review of the activities of office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad for the Second Half of Year 2023-2024 (October, 2023 to March, 2024) as provided in Regulation 3.51 of GERC Notification No.02 of 2019 is as under:

The awareness amongst the Electricity Consumers regarding their right is gradually increasing. A large number of grievances are presented before the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forums (CGRF). The Consumer Grievances Redressal Forums are disposing of grievances generally in schedule time. However, with increase in awareness, some of the consumers, who are not satisfied by the order of CGRF, are filing their representation before the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad under Section 42(6) of The Electricity Act, 2003. However, aggrieved by the order of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad dissatisfied parties are filing writ petition before Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat in certain cases.

(2) Forum-wise status report of representations filed before the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad against CGRF Decisions during the SECOND HALF OF THE YEAR 2023-24, is enclosed as Annexure-I.

### (3) Status of Review of Application:

The details of review applications were filed by the party as per Clause No. 3.47 of GERC (Regulation-2019) Notification No. 02 of 2019 are stated in table below:

Sr. No.	Case No.	Decision.
1.	52/2022	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
2.	3/2023	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
3.	8/2023	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
4.	10/2023	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
_	15/2023	Deview Dejected Original order stands
5.	(6/2024)	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
6.	40/2023	Review Rejected-Original order stands.

# Opinion of the Ombudsman regarding non-compliance of standard of performance by Licensee:

- Order-wise comments of Ombudsman and response of Licensee in redressal of grievances are stated in the table provided in Annexure-I.
- Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission had published Notification No.2 of 2019 (CGRF & Ombudsman) Regulations 2019 superseding earlier Notification No.2 of 2011. These Regulations provides effective mechanism to dispose of grievances timely and effectively and implementation of order within specified time limit.

#### (4) Other Activities:

- 1) Orders of Ombudsman are being uploaded on website of GERC.
- 2) Hearing schedule is also displayed on website of GERC.
- 3) Monitoring of implementation of Ombudsman/CGRF orders and related activities.

- 4) Providing general guidelines to applicants who approach before Ombudsman.
- 5) Monitoring of cases challenged before Hon'ble High Court by parties.
- 6) At every Quarter, details of implementation of order of Ombudsman are asked from the Licensees to analyze the implementation of CGRF/ Electricity Ombudsman order.
- 7) Reply provided to RTI applications received by the office of the ombudsman from time to time
- 8) The process for the hiring of the new office premises at BHARAT SANCHAR NIGAM LIMITED, Ground Floor & First Floor, CMTS Building, Vastrapur Telephone Exchange, Bimanagar, Jeevandhaam Road, Ahmedabad-380015 was done, the rent agreement executed on 06.09.2023.
- 9) The preparation of the scope of civil work has been done in consultation with UGVCL and as per the directive of the Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission, the tender process initiated and finalized the civil renovation work for rented premises.
- 10) The civil renovation work is under process.
- 11) The process of hiring of Architect/ Interior designer was initiated as per the directive of the Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission in consultation with UGVCL.
- 12) Monitoring of site work at BHARAT SANCHAR NIGAM LIMITED, Ground Floor & First Floor, CMTS Building, Vastrapur Telephone Exchange, Bimanagar, Jeevandhaam Road, Ahmedabad-380015.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, AHMEDABAD FOR THE SECOND HALF OF YEAR 2023-2024 (OCTOBER, 2023 TO MARCH, 2024) AS PER CLAUSE 3.51 OF GERC NOTIFICATION NO.2 OF 2019:

### :: Annexure-I ::

Sr.	Case	Name of Applicant	Forum	Subject	Comments of Ombudsman	Response
No.	No.		Concern			of Licensee
1	19/2023	Shri Chetendrasinh Narpatsinh Puvar	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Billing Related	The Appellant, Shri Chetendrasinh Narpatsinh Puvar who runs a restaurant in partnership with other partners in the name of Shree Khodiyar Kathiyavadi Dhaba, received a very high electricity bill of Rs. 2,94,218.77 for the month of January. The Appellant challenged the charges due to initially low consumption and a discrepancy between meter readings in the bill stating that the meter reading was inaccurate. The Electricity ombudsman observed that the factual details revealed that there was a discrepancy between the meter reading taken by meter reader of the Respondent and the actual meter reading recorded in the meter. The discrepancy was due to human error on the part of the meter reader of the Respondent. These misreadings resulted in accumulated, unbilled charges that were reflected in the disputed bill. The meter manufacturing company's report confirmed that the meter itself was functioning correctly.	

Description   Proceeded by the consumption recorded by the consumption recorded by the meter installed at the premises of the Appellant seems accurate, the bill served by the Respondent to the Appellant on 27.01.2023 for 30999 units was accumulated consumption which was not billed previously due to human error in taking meter reading by the meter seading by the meter than the consumption which was not billed previously due to human error in taking meter reading by the careful of the consumption of the property of the consumption of the c				1	ZÎ.	The Electricity ombudsman	
consumption recorded by the meter installed at the premises of the Appellant seems accurate, the bill served by the Respondent to the Appellant on 27.01.2023 for 30.999 units was accumulated consumption within was not been of the standard of the Respondent to the Appellant on 27.01.2023 for 30.999 units was accumulated consumption within was not been of the standard of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the CGRF is found consumption of Work Under Child the Company of the CGRF is found to the consumption of Work Under Children of Childre	1	1	*				
meter installed at the premises of the Appellant on the Appellant on 27.01.2023 for 30999 units was accumate, the bill served by the Respondent to the Appellant on 27.01.2023 for 30999 units was accumulated consumption which was not billed previously due to human error the dater reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the CRF is found correct.  2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk Mills Private Limited  Surat Limited  DGVCL, Surat Limit for Execution of Work Under Option—Hill Time Limit for Execution of Work Under Option—Hill Control of the Control		1	1	1	J.		
of the Appellant seems accurate, the bill served by the Respondent to the Appellant on 27.01.2023 for 30.999 units was accumulated consumption which was not billed previously due to human error in taking meter reading by the meter reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appendix by the reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appendix by the said bill amount. The order issued by the CGRF is found correct.  2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk Mills Private Limited  Burnet Limited  DGPUCL, Extension of Work Under Option-III the Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III the green and the Respondent and paid the fees on 10.6.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement with the Respondent and paid the fees on 10.6.2022. As per Option-III, the green stripulated completion of the project within 180 days. Option of Completion of the project within 180 days. Option of Completion of the project within 180 days. Option of Completion of the project within 180 days. Option of Complete the deadline. Consequently, the deadline. The Appellant appealed the increased power capacity from 23.90.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 M/A. The Appellant appealed with the decision and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudaman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant appealed the Appellant appealed to the Appellant appealed to the Consequently, the Electricity ombudaman found that the Respondent aced accompleted by the CGRP and rejected the Appellants request for an exemption of atleast four mounts from the minimum billing for the minimum billing the decision of CGRP and rejected the Appellants request for an exemption of		1	H			consumption recorded by the	
accurate, the bill served by the Respondent to the Appellant on 27.01.2023 for 30999 units was accumulated consumption which was not billed previously due to human error in taking meter reading by the meter reading by the meter reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount: The order issued by the CGRF is found being the CGRF is found being the CGRF is found being the CGRF is found of Work Under Option-III  Differ Dimit for Execution of Work Under Option-III  Whys. Garden Silk Pri. Ltd. Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III  Whys. Garden Silk Pri. Ltd. Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III  Whys. Garden Silk Pri. Ltd. Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III  Whys. Garden Silk Pri. Ltd. Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III  Whys. Garden Silk Pri. Ltd. Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III  Whys. Garden Silk Pri. Ltd. Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III  Whys. Garden Silk Pri. Ltd. Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III  Whys. Garden Silk Pri. Ltd. Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III the Garden Silk Pri. Ltd. Limit for Execution of Work Under Option III of the Execution of the project washing the Appellant and paid the fees on 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement stipulated completed by the deadline. Consequently, the deadline. Consequently, the deadline. Consequently, the Execution of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional IS MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant sequence of th				I.		-	10.24
Respondent to the Appellant on 27.01.2023 for 30999 units was accumulated consumption which was not billed previously due to human error in taking meter reading by the meter reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent sum dependent is suited by the CGRF is found correct.  2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk Mills Private Limited  Burst Limited  DQVCL, Surat Limited Surat Under Option-III Time Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III Time Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III the agreement set prower supply expactly from 13 MVA to 28 MVA. They signed an agreement with the Respondent and paid the fees on 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement set publicated completion of the project within 180 days:  Observed the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under MTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional IS MVA. The Appellant appealed which the control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and caircular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent active for an exemption of active the macket of the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellants request for an exemption of active the macket of the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellants request for an exemption of active the macket of the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellants request for an exemption of active the macket of the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellants request for an exemption of active the macket of the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellants request for an exemption of active the macket of the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellants request for an exemption of active the country of th		1		1	1		1.401
2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk Milis Private Limited  DGVCL Surat Limited  D	1	1		1	1		
was accumulated consumption which was not billed previously due to human error in taking meter reading by the meter reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the CGRF is found correct.  Burst Limited    DGVCL, Mills Private Limited   DGVCL, Mills Private Limited   Extension of Work Under Option-III   DGVCR							
which was not billed previously due to human error in taking meter reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the CGRF is found correct.  2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk Mills Private Limited  Surat In Time Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III https://doi.org/10.06.2022. Appellant, bill spired to increase their power supply expactly from 13 MVA to 28 MVA. They signed an agreement with the Respondent and paid the fees on 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement stipulated completed by the detailine. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 13 MVA. The Appellant appealed his decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were coustide their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CORF and rejected the Appellants request for an exemption of alteast four months from the minimum.	1		1			27.01.2023 for 30999 units	
due to human error in taking meter reading by the meter reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the CGRF is found correct.  2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk Mills Private Limited  Surat Limited  DGVCL, Silk Mills Private Limited  Extension of Work Under Option-III In Time Appellant Respondent supply capacity from 13 MVA to a greenment with the Respondent and paled the fees may be a supply capacity from 15 MVA to a greenment with the Respondent and paled the fees may be a supply capacity from 15 MVA to a greenment with the Respondent and paled the fees may be a supply capacity from 18 MVA to obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider determed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity mobulasman determined that these delays resulted from approvals on under the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellants request for an exemption of alteast four months front the minimum.						was accumulated consumption	
meter reading by the meter reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the CGRR is found correct.  Mills Private Limited  DGVCL, Mills Private Limited  Extension of Work Under Option-III  Option-III  Option-III  Option-III  DGVCL, Seventher of the region of the			1			which was not billed previously	
reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the CGRF is found correct.  2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk DGVCL, Mills Private Limited  DGVCL, Surat Limited  Extension In Time Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III. The Completed of More Surply capacity from 13 MVA to 28 MVA. They signed an agreement with the Respondent and paid the fees on 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement spitulated completion of the project within 180 days. However, due to delays in obtaining approvais from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvais by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gight. Communication of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of adleast fo	1		1			due to human error in taking	
reader of the Respondent and hence, the bill served by the Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the CGRF is found correct.  2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk DGVCL, Mills Private Limited  DGVCL, Surat Limited  Extension In Time Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III. The Completed of More Surply capacity from 13 MVA to 28 MVA. They signed an agreement with the Respondent and paid the fees on 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement spitulated completion of the project within 180 days. However, due to delays in obtaining approvais from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvais by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gight. Communication of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of adleast fo			1			meter reading by the meter	
Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the GGRF is found correct.  2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk DOVCL, Surat Limited  DOVCL, Surat Limited  Extension In Time Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III Office Secution of Work Under Option-III Office Secution of Work Under Option-III Office Secution of the project within 180 days. However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GFTCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GFTCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the GigrCl. Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the GigrCl. Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
Respondent found appropriate. The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the GGRF is found correct.  2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk DOVCL, Surat Limited  DOVCL, Surat Limited  Extension In Time Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III Office Secution of Work Under Option-III Office Secution of Work Under Option-III Office Secution of the project within 180 days. However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GFTCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GFTCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the GigrCl. Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the GigrCl. Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum					1	hence, the bill served by the	
The Appellant is liable to pay the said bill amount. The order issued by the GGRF is found correct.  Mills Private Limited  DGVCI, Surat  Extension in Time Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III  Differ Option-III  Differ Option-III  Differ Option-III  Differ Option-III  Differ Option-III  Differ Option-III  DGTCO, the project within 180 days. However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum in the province of all the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum					1		
the said bill amount. The order issued by the CGRF is found correct.  2 20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk Mills Private Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III the agreement stipulated completion of the East of the Silk Pvt. Ltd. applied to increase their power supply capacity from 13 MVA to 28 MVA. They signed an agreement with the Respondent and paid the fees on 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement stipulated completion of the project within 180 days.  However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant appeal that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellants requests for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						The Appellant is liable to pay	
Supply Content of the Research of the Resear						the said bill amount. The order	
2   20/2023 M/s. Garden Silk Mills Private Limited   DGVCL, Mills Private Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III   M/s. Garden Silk Fvt. Ltd. applied to increase their power supply capacity from 13 MVA to of Work Under Option-III   M/s. Garden Silk Fvt. Ltd. applied to increase their power supply capacity from 13 MVA to of Work Under Option-III   M/s. Garden Silk Fvt. Ltd. applied to increase their power supply capacity from 13 MVA to of Work Under Option-III   M/s. Garden Silk Fvt. Ltd. applied to increase their power supply capacity from 13 MVA. They applied to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant spequency of CERCO, Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGER and rejected the Appellant's requests for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum		1				issued by the CGRF is found	
Mills Private Limited    M/s. Garden Silk Pvt. Ltd.   Ltd.   Ltd.   Limit for Execution of Work   Under Option-III		1				correct.	
Mills Private Limited    M/s. Garden Silk Pvt. Ltd.   Ltd.   Ltd.   Limit for Execution of Work   Under Option-III	2	20/2023	M/s. Garden Silk	DGVCL.	Extension	On 09.02.2022, The Appellant,	
Limited  Limit for Execution of Work Under Option-III of Work Under Option-III option-III option-III option-III the agreement stipulated completion of the project within 180 days.  However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity ombudsman (GERC). Consequently, the GERC). Consequently, the GERC). Consequently, the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						M/s. Garden Silk Pvt. Ltd.	
Execution of Work 2 Supply capacity from 13 MVA to 2 MVA. They signed an agreement with the Respondent and paid the fees on 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement stipulated completion of the project within 180 days.  However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the deedline. Consequently, the deciricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum		1				applied to increase their power	
of Work Under Option-III  28 MVA. They signed an agreement with the Respondent and paid the fees on 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement stipulated completion of the project within 180 days.  However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum		1				supply capacity from 13 MVA to	
agreement with the Respondent and paid the fees on 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement stipulated completion of the project within 180 days.  However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider demmed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Commission (CERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum	1					28 MVA. They signed an	ì
and paid the fees on 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, 10.06.2022. As per Option-III, 180 days.  However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside that delays in the approval process, which were outside that delays in the approval process, which were outside that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity. Regulatory Commission (EERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum	1			E1			
10.06.2022. As per Option-III, the agreement stipulated completion of the project within 180 days.  However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gigarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC).  Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
the agreement stipulated completion of the project within 180 days. However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity (Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of GERG and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum	1						
However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of GCRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of at least four months from the minimum				-		the agreement stipulated	
However, due to delays in obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of GGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of at least four months from the minimum	1			()	2	completion of the project within	
obtaining approvals from GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity. Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of GGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						180 days.	
GETCO, the project wasn't completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						However, due to delays in	
completed by the deadline. Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum		1				obtaining approvals from	1
Consequently, the electricity provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						GETCO, the project wasn't	
provider deemed released the increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-1 tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum	1 (					completed by the deadline.	- 1
increased power capacity from 23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							- 1
23.02.2023 under HTP-I tariff under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						provider deemed released the	1
under Clause No. 4.33 of Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						increased power capacity from	
Supply Code and started charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
charging the minimum billing for the additional 15 MVA.  The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum	1	1					
for the additional 15 MVA. The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						Supply Code and started	
The Appellant appealed this decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum			1			charging the minimum billing	
decision, argued that delays in the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						for the additional 15 MVA.	
the approval process, which were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum			1			The Appellant appealed this	
were outside their control, should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum			1				
should be considered. However, the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum			1	1		the approval process, which	
the Electricity ombudsman determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum				1			
determined that these delays resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum				1			
resulted from approvals by GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
GETCO, an entity not under their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum		1					
their jurisdiction. Additionally, the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum		1	1				
the Appellant submitted documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case.  Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum			1	1			
documents, such as petitions and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case.  Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC).  Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum			1			1 2	
and a circular, were consider irrelevant to the case.  Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC).  Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						L Transcription	
irrelevant to the case. Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							1
Ultimately, the Electricity ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
ombudsman found that the Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
Respondent acted according to regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum						J	
regulations set by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum		5		1			
Commission (GERC). Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							1
Consequently, the Electricity ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
ombudsman upheld the decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
decision of CGRF and rejected the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
the Appellant's request for an exemption of atleast four months from the minimum		1		1			
exemption of atleast four months from the minimum							
exemption of atleast four months from the minimum		[	13	1	1	the Appellant's request for an	
	1		l.			exemption of atleast four	
billing charges.		1					
						billing charges.	

3	23/2023	M/s. Kanam Paper	MGVCL,	Billing	The Appellant, M/s. Kanam	
13	25/2025	LLP	Vadodara	Related	Paper LLP is HT consumer of	75
		DD1	Vadodara	Related	the Respondent with a	
	,				.contracted load of 1500KVA,	
1					bearing consumer no. 60416	
					which was was released on	_
			1		29.11.2022 by the Respondent.	
			1		This case involves a billing	8
					dispute between the Appellant,	
					M/s. Kanam Paper LLP and the	
				DX	Respondent regarding an electricity bill for the period	
		40			when the CTPT unit	)
					malfunctioned at premises of	
		n 763 W			the Appellant, necessitating a	
					bypass of the CTPT Unit. The	
					Appellant challenges the high	
					bill amount, which is based on	
	1				estimated consumption during	
	1 1		1		the bypass period, and argues	
1				C	for a swifter replacement of the CTPT unit. The Respondent, on	B 9
			1		the other hand, cites the GERC	
					Supply Code regulations	
					governing billing procedures for	-
					meter malfunctions and	
					justifies bypassing the CTPT	
					unit with the Appellant's	1
					consent to avert production stoppages. The Respondent	
					explain delays in replacing the	
					CTPT due to stock limitations	
					and staffing issues. In the	
					absence of data from the	
					preceding period to estimate	
					consumption during the bypass	
	1		i		period, the Respondent take consumption data from the	
					succeeding period for estimate	
1					billing.	
		1			The Electricity ombudsman	
	2				identified several shortcomings	
					in the case. First, bypassing the	- 1
					CTPT unit violated GERC	- 1
					Supply Code regulations, which presumably exist to ensure	1
					accurate billing and prevent	- 1
					tampering. Second, the	
					Respondent's reasons for the	
	I				delayed CTPT replacement,	
					such as stock limitations and	
					staffing issues, were considered	
	1				insufficient justification for the extended downtime. Ideally, the	
					Respondent should have	
					prioritised resolving this issue	
	l		s		to minimise disruption to the	1
					Appellant's operations and	
					ensure proper billing data	
					collection. Third, while the	
					Appellant challenged the high bill amount, their evidence to	4.3
					support their actual	- 1
					consumption during the bypass	- 1
					period was inadequate. This	1
					lack of data from the Appellant	
	-				further complicated	
					determining the accurate	
					consumption for billing	
					purposes.	

The Electricity ombudsman observed that the the average consumption of the immediately preceding the date of the consumption of the process of the consumption of the process of the consumption of the period during which CTT bypassed. The evidence submitted by the Appellant is not sufficient/ appropriate to consider for deciding the consumption of the said periodicy and hence the bit is a consumption of the said periodicy and hence the bit is a consumption of the said periodicy and hence the bit is a consumer to the consumer for the period from O2.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is found logical and appropriate.  Wadodara  M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd.  MGVCL, Vadodara  Billing Related  The Appellant, M/s. VS  The Appellant, M/s. VS  The Appellant appears an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant Ays.  VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant appears that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance of the Respondent of the Appellant appears the distribution of the process of the contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant will be actual administration of the Appellant argued that according to GRRC regulations, the Respondent and the actual demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GRRC regulations, the Respondent and the actual demand to the actual dema		0						
consumption of the immediately preceding the date of the meter bypassed is not sufficient to decide the consumption of 1500 RVA HT connection for the period during which CIPT bypassed consumption of the said periodic and interest of the period during which CIPT bypassed considering the reduces sufficient/ appropriate to consider for deciding the consumption of the said periodic and periodic form of deciding the considering the succeeding period from O2.01.2023 to 160.1.2023 is found logical and appropriate. For the periodic during which CIPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from O2.01.2023 to 160.1.2023 is found logical and appropriate. For the periodic during which CIPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from O2.01.2023 to 160.1.2023 is found logical and appropriate. For the decidence of the Respondent of the Consumer No. 15.269 with a contract demand of 290 KVA under the Nadiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand to the Appellant, Mys. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand compliance issues raised by OFCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant appropriate in the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GRCC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to intilate the process of regularising the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GRCC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to intilate the process of regularising the contracted demand to an otice issued by the Respondent accords their contracted demand in the Appellant and the contracted demand is a satisfactor of the Respondent accords their contracted demand in the Appellant and the contracted demand to a notice issued by the Respondent accords their contracted demand in the Appellant accords their contracted demand in the Appellant accords their contracted to additional the Appellant accords the contracted to ad				. 8			The Electricity ombudsman	
immediately preceding the date of the meter bypassed is not sufficient to decide the consumption of 1500 KVA HT connection for the period during which CTPT bypassed. The evidence submitted by the Appellant is not sufficiently appropriate to considering the succeeding period from the period during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 02.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is found legical and appropriate.  Will lissued by the Respondent for the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 02.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is found legical and appropriate.  Wild letter the probability of the probability of the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 02.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is found legical and appropriate.  Wild letter the probability of the Respondent of the probability of the probability of the Respondent of the probability of the probability of the Respondent of the probability			1	1				1
of the meter's bypassed is not sufficient to decide the consumption of 1500 kVA HT connection for the period during which CITT bypassed. The evidence submitted by the Appellant is not sufficiently appropriate to consider for deciding the consumption of the said period by the Appellant is not sufficiently appropriate to consider for deciding the consumption of the succeeding period form of 10,10,203 to 16,10,10,203 to 16,10,10,10,10,10,10,10,10,10,10,10,10,10,			1				1	1
sufficient to decide the consumption of 1500 KVA HT connection for the period during which CTPT bypassed. The evidence submitted by the Appellant is not sufficient/y appropriate to consider for deciding fine closed during which CTPT bypassed. The evidence submitted by the Respondent for the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 502.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is from 150.00 for the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 502.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is from 150.00 for the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 502.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is from 150.00 for the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 502.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is from 150.00 for the periods during the succeeding period from 502.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is from 150.00 for the periods during the date of the periods of the		1	1					
consumption of 1500 KVA HT connection for the period during which CTPT bypassed. The evidence submitted by the Appellant is not sufficiently appropriate to consider for deciding the consumption of the said period(s) and hence the bill issued by the Respondent for the periods during which control of the said period(s) and hence the bill issued by the Respondent for the periods during which control of the period during which control during the period		1			1			1
connection for the period during which CTPI bypassed. The evidence submitted by the Appellant is not sufficiently appropriate to consider for deciding the consumption of the said period(s) and hence the bill issued by the Respondent for the periods during which CTPI bypassed considering the succeeding period from 20.1.2022 and p		1			1	1		
The evidence submitted by the Appellant is not sufficient/sappropriate to consider for deciding the consumption of the said period(s) and hence the bill issued by the Respondent for the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 20.1.0.203 to 16.01.2033 is found logical and appropriate.  4 24/2023 M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. Billing Pvt. Ltd. bearing HT dot contract demand of 290 KVA duated winder the Nadiad Ctty Division 10.06.202 office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and carmot afford the additional charges. The propliant will be remarked demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant valued the contracted demand to a higher capacity. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to influidate the contracted demand to a higher capacity. The Respondent is authorised to influidate the process of regularising the contracted demand to a higher capacity. The Respondent is authorised to influidate the process of regularising the contracted demand to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. The Respondent specifically and the decident of the Appellant valued of the Appellant receded demand to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellants request to adjust the contracted demand it.e. 335 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellants request to adjust the contracted demand to a dijker capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellants request to adjust the contracted demand to a dijker capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the			8			1		
Appellant is not sufficient/ appropriate to consider for deciding the consumption of the said period(s) and hence the bill issued by the Respondent for the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 02.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is under the Nadioad appropriate.  Wadodara  MGVCL, Pvt. Ltd.  Billing Related  Related  The Appellant, M/s. VS  Texmills Pvt. Ltd. bearing Hid dated Consumer No. 15269 with a con							during which CTPT bypassed.	
appropriate to consider for deciding the consumption of the said period(s) and hence the bill issued by the Respondent for the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 20.201.2023 to 16.01.2023 is found logical and appropriate.  The Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd.  Billing Vadodara  MGVCL, Ptt. Ltd.  Billing Vadodara  MGVCL, Pot. Ltd.  Billing Vadodara  MGVCL, Pot. Ltd.  Billing Vadodara  MGVCL, Pot. Ltd.  Billing Vadodara  The Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. Searing HT Consumer No. 15269 with a contract demand of 290 KVA under the Natifial City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand to the Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant and charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand to the actual demand to the actual demand in the actual demand in the actual demand is a suddorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand in the actual demand is a suddorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand is a suddorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand is a suddorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand is a suddorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand is a suddorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand is a suddorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand is a suddorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand is a suddorised by the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand is the contracted demand is the cont		1				1		
deciding the consumption of the said period(s) and hence the bill issued by the Respondent for the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 22.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is found logical and appropriate.  Wadodara  MGVCL, Vadodara  Billing Related  The Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd.  The Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd.  The Appellant for Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd.  WS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated changes levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher expacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand on the actual demand in the actua		ľ	M)				Appellant is not sufficient/	
the said period(s) and hence the bill issued by the Respondent for the periods during which CYPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 20.01.2023 is found legical and appropriate.  The Appellant, M/s. VS Vide letter account of the Respondent of the Respondent of the Respondent of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand of 290 KVA under the Nadiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand to the Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to require their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent is acuthorised to initiate the process of regulations, the Respondent is acuthorised to initiate the process of regulationing the contracted demand to a notice issued by the Respondent is acuthorised to initiate the process of regulations about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed if the Appellant about addressing the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand is. 335 KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand in the requirement of the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand in the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand in the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand in the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand in the Respondent is the Respondent in the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand in the Respondent's proc								0
bill issued by the Respondent for the periods during which CIPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 22.01.2023 to 16.01.2023 is found logical and appropriate.  4 24/2023 M/s. VS Texmills Pv. Ltd. Billing Related The Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pv. Ltd. Ltd. Earling HT Consumer No. 15269 with a contract demand of 290 KVA under the Nadiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for a higher capacity. However, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand for the actual demand to the actual demand to the actual demand to the actual demand to the actual demand in the								
for the periods during which CTPT bypassed considering the succeeding period from 02.01.203 to 16.01.0203 is found logical and appropriate.  4 24/2023 M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. Billing Pvt. Ltd. Bearing HT Consumer No. 15269 with a contract demand of 290 KVA under the Nadiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant requested the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the contracted demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations the Respondent and the process of regularising the contracted demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 358 KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand i.e. 358 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fullills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they		1						
4 24/2023 M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. MGVCI, Vadodara  MGVCI, Pvt. Ltd. Billing Related  The Appellant, M/s. VS Vide letter Consumer No. 15269 with a contract demand of 290 KVa under the Nadiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent should demand ite. 335 KVA to a higher capacity; considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand ite. 335 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand ite. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted doment is a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted doment between the capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted doment the process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand the process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand the process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand the process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand the process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand the p		1				/		
succeeding period from 02.01.023 to 16.01.023 is found logical and appropriate.  ### Pvt. Ltd.  ### Billing Vadodara  ### Pvt. Ltd.  ### Billing Pvt. Ltd. bearing HT Consumer No. 15269 with a contract demand of 290 KVA under the Radiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, M/S. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand of a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant requested demand of a representation of the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed that actual demand it. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand. The Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand it. 335 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load and higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they		1						
4 24/2023 M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd.  MGVCL, Vadodara  MGVCL, Pvt. Ltd.  Billing Related  The Appellant, M/s. VS Vide letter Texmills Pvt. Ltd. Dearing HT Consumer No. 15269 with a contract demand of 290 KVd, under the Nediad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd.  Responde the Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fullills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they								
4 24/2023 M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd.  MGVCL, Vadodara  Billing Related  The Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. bearing HT day anontract demand of 290 KW day under the Nadiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, AVS VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383 KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 383 KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand i.e. 385 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to a dijust the contracted to daw then they							Date of the last o	E.
A 24/2023 M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd.  Wadodara  Billing Related  The Appellant, M/s. VS VS dated a contract demand of 290 KVA under the Nadiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant volume to regularise their contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to intitate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent actual demand i.e. 353 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 353 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted demand then they								
Pvt. Ltd.  Vadodara  Related  Texmills Pvt. Ltd. bearing HT Consumer No. 1529 with a contract demand of 290 KW under the Nadiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, No. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 383KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 350 KWA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate to a higher capacity is considered appropriate the contracted of the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted to when they		4	24/2023	M/s. VS Texmills	MGVCL,	Billing		Vide letter
contract demand of 290 KVA under the Nadiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant Mys. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compilance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant volated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand i.e. according to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellants request to adjust the contracted demand i.e. adjust								
under the Nadiad City Division office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for appellant with the contracted demand for a proper and the contracted demand for a proper argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of results actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand is a proper and its process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand is a proper and is a proper acceptancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand is process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted demand is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted demand is contracted demand is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted dawn then they			1					
office of the Respondent. The dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Fvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand to the actual demand to the actual demand to baserved if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand it. Sassival of the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand it. Sassival of the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand it. Sassival of the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand it. Sassival of the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted admand it. Sassival to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted demand it.								
dispute involves an electricity bill for exceeding contracted at has implement to the process of the process of the process of the process of regularising the contracted demand by the Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand i.e. 383KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they								
bill for exceeding contracted demand by the Appellant, M/s. VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA to a higher capacity; is considered demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted demand to regularise the contracted demand i.e. and the contracted appropriate to adjust the contracted								
demand by the Appellant, M/s. WS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand be actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand i.e. ossigned the demand i.e. and the actual demand i.e. and			>2					
VS Texmills Pvt. Ltd. The Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand to be respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they						:43		
Appellant argues that their factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellants request to adjust the contracted load when they								
factory is closed due to environmental compliance issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand for the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted demand i.e. 383KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted days the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they								order.
issues raised by GPCB and cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contract demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	u		-					
cannot afford the additional charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	- 1							
charges. The Appellant requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	- 1						issues raised by GPCB and	
requested to waive the estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they								
estimated charges levied to regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	И							
regularise their contracted demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	1	- 1	- 1				10440000	
demand to a higher capacity. However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	1		1					
However, the Respondent claims the Appellant violated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	1							
claims the Appellant violated the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	1	1	1					
the contract by exceeding the contracted demand for several months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	- 1	- 1	1					
months. The Respondent argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	1	1	ľ				the contract by exceeding the	
argued that according to GERC regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	-	- 1						
regulations, the Respondent is authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	1	- 1					months. The Respondent	
authorised to initiate the process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	1	- 1						1
process of regularising the contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they			4					
contracted demand to the actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they								
actual demand observed if the Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they							contracted demand to the	
Appellant fails to respond to a notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy.  The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they			1					
notice issued by the Respondent about addressing the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they		l,	1					
Respondent about addressing the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they								
the discrepancy. The Electricity ombudsman observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they		1						
observed that actual demand i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they							the discrepancy.	
i.e. 383KVA of the Appellant exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they		1						
exceeds their contracted load. Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they		- 1						1
Therefore, the Respondent's process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	1				1			
process of issuing estimate to regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they	1				1			
regularise the contracted demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they								
demand i.e. 355 KVA to a higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they			[					
higher capacity is considered appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they			- [					1
appropriate under GERC regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they				1				- 1
regulations. This fulfills the Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they							appropriate under GERC	1
Appellant's request to adjust the contracted load when they			1				regulations. This fulfills the	
the contracted load when they							Appellant's request to adjust	
resume operations.								

	*	261	9	16	Regarding the billing during the	
		1	× ,,	1	factory closure, The Electricity	
	1			l .	ombudsman observes that The	
					dispute raised and subsequent	
					proceeding by the CGRF and	
				(	Ombudsman was done during	
	l.				the period when the plant of the	
					Appellant was under GPCB	
				194	compliance, and the connection	
	3	39			was disconnected. The	
				l,	Appellant was billed during this	
1	1	1			period with an 85% contract	
	1	i .			demand i.e. 247 KVA. The	
					Appellant is liable to pay and	
	1				the Respondent is eligible to	
					recover these charges as per	
	1				the norms. The disconnection	
					of connection of the Appellant	l 1
		l i			was not because of a violation	
1					of the power agreement with	
1					the Respondent, the billing	
					during the disconnection	
					period was done by the	
					Respondent as per the norms.	4
					The Estimate amount was	1
1					debited with Suo motto action	1
					by the Respondent in the	
				0 18	month of February-2023 and	
1		-				
					the grievance is pending at the	
					competent authority, the delay	
1					payment charges for the	
					estimate amount for the period	
					from February-2023 to order	
					date is waived as per the prayer	
1	n n					
-	06 10000	344 0 1 1	1101101		of the Appellant.	
5	26/2023	M/s. Satyendra	MGVCL,	Agreement	The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra	
5	26/2023	M/s. Satyendra Packaging Limited	MGVCL, Vadodara	Agreement Related	The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA.	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023.	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023.	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023.	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023. Both CGRF and Electricity	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023. Both CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman rejected their request due to GERC	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023. Both CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman rejected their request due to GERC regulations. Following GERC	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023. Both CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman rejected their request due to GERC	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023. Both CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman rejected their request due to GERC regulations, following GERC regulations, the Respondent issued a two-month notice in	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023. Both CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman rejected their request due to GERC regulations, following GERC regulations, the Respondent issued a two-month notice in May 2023 before the Appellant	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023. Both CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman rejected their request due to GERC regulations, the Respondent issued a two-month notice in May 2023 before the Appellant could utilize the increased	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023. Both CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman rejected their request due to GERC regulations, the Respondent issued a two-month notice in May 2023 before the Appellant could utilize the increased power. The regulations	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023. Both CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman rejected their request due to GERC regulations. Following GERC regulations, the Respondent issued a two-month notice in May 2023 before the Appellant could utilize the increased power. The regulations stipulate that the Respondent	
5	26/2023				The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra Packaging Ltd., is EHT consumer of the Respondent bearing consumer No.15640 having contract demand of 2500 KVA catering at 66 KV voltage level with U/G cable line. The Appellant applied to increase their contract demand from 2500 KVA to 3300 KVA. The Appellant paid the charges and executed the agreement in February-2023. The Respondent replaced metering CT to increase the Appellant's power capacity. The Appellant completed the work and received a completion certificate in April 2023. However, due to a global economic slowdown, the Appellant requested to cancel the agreement in June-2023. Both CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman rejected their request due to GERC regulations, the Respondent issued a two-month notice in May 2023 before the Appellant could utilize the increased power. The regulations	

					7	_
×					applicable if the Appellant fails	
- 1	1				to utilise the increased power	.
1		1		74	supply within 60 days after	3
		1			work completion as per Clause	
		1		(6)	4.42.	1
		1	1		The Appellant, M/s. Satyendra	
	ł	1			Desired It die alternative	
1					Packaging Ltd.'s alternative	
			4		proposal to transfer the	The state of the s
	1			1	increased load to another of	
	1.10				their other manufacturing	
1				1	plant i.e. M/s. Satyendra	
	1			1	Packaging Ltd., Consumer No:	
11	1				TIT 60620 and is willing to pow	
		-			HT 60630 and is willing to pay	
1					any additional charges and sign	
	N .				a new agreement which was	
	1	I.			also denied as per Clause 4.102	1
	1	la l			of GERC regulations which	
			1		prohibit contract termination	
		1			within two years of agreement	
1		1				
1		II.			execution. The Appellant can	
	1	4		1	reduce their contracted load by	1
1	1				10% after one year but will still	1
	L			1	be liable for minimum charges	1
	1				if they terminate the agreement	
			(4)		before two years.	
					Therefore, the Ombudsman	
					upheld the decision of CGRF	
		*			and the actions of the	
		1				
			1		Respondent was as per the	
					GERC regulations.	
6	28/2023	Shri Maheshbhai	TPL, Surat	New	The Appellant has withdrawn	
		Vallabhbhai		Connection	the representation stating that	1 1
		Savsaviya			a mutual settlement was made	1 1
	1	Davsaviya	1		with the Respondent and	1
						1 1
				1		1 1
					Respondent has submitted the	
					Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the	
					Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no	
					Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.	
7	29/2023	M/s. Dhanlakshmi	DGVCL,	New	Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s.	The
7	29/2023	M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries	DGVCL, Surat	New Connection	Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.	The Responde
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries	
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC	Responde nt has
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007.	Responde nt has implemen
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner,	Responde nt has implemen ted the
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec-
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs.	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec-
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt.	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt.	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner,	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.,	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in 2001. Additionally, the	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in 2001. Additionally, the	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in 2001. Additionally, the Respondent failed to take any action to recover the dues from	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in 2001. Additionally, the Respondent failed to take any action to recover the dues from the previous owner, Shri	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in 2001. Additionally, the Respondent failed to take any action to recover the dues from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd. despite	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in 2001. Additionally, the Respondent failed to take any action to recover the dues from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd. despite the court order.	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in 2001. Additionally, the Respondent failed to take any action to recover the dues from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd. despite the court order. Further, strengthening their	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in 2001. Additionally, the Respondent failed to take any action to recover the dues from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd. despite the court order. Further, strengthening their case, the Appellant, M/s.	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in 2001. Additionally, the Respondent failed to take any action to recover the dues from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd. despite the court order. Further, strengthening their case, the Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202
7	29/2023				Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.  The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries bought a plot No.504 at GIDC Panoli from GSFC in 2007. Despite being the new owner, the Appellant were denied an electricity connection due to unpaid bills i.e. outstanding since 1999 amounting Rs. 13,36,063.69 from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.  The issue lies in who is responsible for this old debt. M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries argued that they should not be liable since they purchased the plot after the disconnection and were not involved in the lawsuit against the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd., which the Respondent won in 2001. Additionally, the Respondent failed to take any action to recover the dues from the previous owner, Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd. despite the court order. Further, strengthening their case, the Appellant, M/s.	Responde nt has implemen ted the order and released connec- tion on 05.02.202

					T=	
					Respondent's claim against them is time-barred. The Respondent didn't pursue recovery within the appropriate timeframe, leading to the dismissal of their application in 2019. Moreover, government regulations protect new owners from inheriting such liabilities. The situation worsened when the pandemic forced the Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries to shut down, leading to unpaid bills and PDC in 2020. Although their security deposit exceeded the outstanding amount, it wasn't refunded by the Respondent in the account of the Appellant. the Respondent has not reconnected their electricity and still demands payment of the time-barred previous owner's debt. The Appellant, M/s. Dhanlakshmi Industries seeks reconnection and argues they shouldn't be held responsible for the previous owner's debt. The Appellant, M/s. Dhanalakshmi Industries faced a dispute with the Respondent who refused a new connection due to an unpaid bill from the previous owner i.e. Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd. The Electricity Ombudsman noted that a prior decision by the Government of Gujarat protecting new owners from such liabilities. Therefore, the Electricity Ombudsman noted that a prior decision by the Government of Gujarat protecting new owners from such liabilities. Therefore, the Electricity Ombudsman overruled Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum's order and directed the Respondent to provide the new connection to the Appellant, M/s. Dhanalakshmi Industries, with the right to recover the old debt from the previous owner i.e., Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd.	
7 in		¥7			reconnection and argues they shouldn't be held responsible for the previous owner's debt. The Appellant, M/s. Dhanalakshmi Industries faced a dispute with the Respondent who refused a new connection due to an unpaid bill from the previous owner i.e. Shri Poonam Silica Pvt. Ltd. The Electricity Ombudsman noted that a prior decision by the Government of Gujarat protecting new owners from such liabilities. Therefore, the Electricity Ombudsman overruled Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum's order and directed the Respondent to provide the new connection to the Appellant, M/s. Dhanalakshmi Industries, with the right to recover the old debt	
8	30/2023	Shri Kushal	MGVCL,	Estimate	separately. The Appellant, Shri Kushal	Status of
		Vinodkumar Bhatt	Vadodara	Related	Vinodkumar Bhatt, owner of property at Survey No.667/3 in Anand village, filed a dispute with the Respondent i.e. Madhya Gujarat Power Company Limited regarding a dome erected for electricity bill collection and the cost of shifting the existing power lines. The dispute arose because the Respondent demanded Rs.12,48,034/- for shifting the lines.  While The Appellant paid the estimate and the lines were shifted, he believes the cost was excessive. The Appellant argues	order of Ombuds man is asked from the Responde nt.

-						
		1		12	that underground cables used	
		III			in the process were	
	1	1	.		unnecessary and could have	
1	1	1			been replaced with overhead	
		1	ren.		lines for a lower cost.	1
		1			The Electricity Ombudsman	1
					reviewed the case. They	
				A	acknowledged that the	1
					electricity collection dome was	
0	1			1		
					removed at the Respondent's	
	1	Į.		1	expense, but disagreed with	
1			1		The Appellant's claim that the	
	1	1		1	existing power lines shifting	
		1			cost should be borne by the	
	1				Respondent.	
					The Electricity Ombudsman	
1					concluded that the Appellant is	
	1				responsible for the shifting cost	
		1			under Notification of the	
		I.				
	1		1		Gujarat Electricity Regulatory	
					Commission and the Electricity	
	1		1		Act.	
					The Electricity Ombudsman	1
	1	1	1		directed the Respondent to	1 1
					provide an item wise cost detail	]
					and cost of "spare cable" not to	
	I	1			be recovered from the	
		I.		1	Appellant. The amount charged	
		1			for the "spare cable" to be	
		I		-	refunded to the Appellant after	
					final billing of the amount paid	
					by the Appellant for the line	
				1		
	01/0000		NOTION	- NY	shifting.	Status of
9	31/2023	Shri Maheshbhai J.	MGVCL,	New	The Appellant, Shri	1
		Thakkar	Vadodara	Connection	Maheshbhai Thakkar applied	order
				1	with application number	implemen
	1				152987 for a new electricity	ted asked
	1	l.			connection of 10HP for his	by the
	1				factors at D.C. No. 200 Village:	Electricity
1					Tactory at K.S. No.326, Village.	Electricity
	an u				factory at R.S. No.328, Village: Vadadla, Vadodara, He paid the	Ombuds
1					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the	
1					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began	Ombuds man. Not
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines.	Ombuds man. Not reported
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected,	Ombuds man. Not reported
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim. The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made efforts to obtain way leave and	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made efforts to obtain way leave and Shri Bharatbhai Patel's	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made efforts to obtain way leave and Shri Bharatbhai Patel's	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made efforts to obtain way leave and	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made efforts to obtain way leave and Shri Bharatbhai Patel's cooperation was needed in this situation.	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made efforts to obtain way leave and Shri Bharatbhai Patel's cooperation was needed in this situation.  The Electricity Ombudsman	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made efforts to obtain way leave and Shri Bharatbhai Patel's cooperation was needed in this situation.  The Electricity Ombudsman found no fault with consumer	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made efforts to obtain way leave and Shri Bharatbhai Patel's cooperation was needed in this situation.  The Electricity Ombudsman found no fault with consumer Grievances Redressal Forum's	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made efforts to obtain way leave and Shri Bharatbhai Patel's cooperation was needed in this situation.  The Electricity Ombudsman found no fault with consumer Grievances Redressal Forum's order which asked the	Ombuds man. Not reported by
					Vadadla, Vadodara. He paid the fees and the Respondent began installing the electric lines. However, a villager, Shri Bharatbhai Patel, objected, claiming the poles were on his land. Despite requests, Shri Bharatbhai Patel refused to provide any documents to support his claim.  The Respondent tried to resolve the situation. The Respondent requested documents from Shri Bharatbhai Patel and even sought police protection to complete the installation work of the electric lines. The Appellant argued that the delay violated electricity supply regulations. The Respondent countered that they made efforts to obtain way leave and Shri Bharatbhai Patel's cooperation was needed in this situation.  The Electricity Ombudsman found no fault with consumer Grievances Redressal Forum's	Ombuds man. Not reported by

S5-X					protection if necessary. The Electricity Ombudsman also agreed with Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum's	-
				۰	decision to deny compensation to the Appellant since the delay was due to circumstances	
					beyond anyone's control.  In conclusion, both parties made efforts to resolve the	
			× .		issue but hold-up is due to the land ownership dispute, and the Electricity Ombudsman	
		Na.			directed the Respondent to obtain police protection and complete the installation of the	ľ
					electric lines as soon as possible.	
10	32/2023	Shri Babubhai Devjibhai Dhanani	TPL, Ahmedabad	Conversion of 132KV Line from	The Appellants requested the Respondent to make the overhead 132KV power line	10
		Shri   Ghanshyambhai   Haribhai Shyani		Overhead to Under-	running through their undeveloped plot to	9)
		Ms. Gaytriben Ramnikbhai Patel		ground	underground. The land is on prime location and planned commercial development which	
		•	8		were hindered by the overhead line.	d
					CGRF, TPL, Ahmedabad rejected their complaint, stating the Appellants weren't	
			X1		classified as "consumers" under regulations and hadn't	
					applied for electricity connection yet.  The Electricity Ombudsman	
		-c D1			disagreed. While acknowledging the technical challenges of shifting or	
	2				burying the line due to its age and importance, they argued	
					that the Appellants' concerns deserved a hearing.  The Electricity Ombudsman	
					upheld CGRF's decision regarding the immediate	
		959			undergrounding of the power line due to technical limitations. However, they	
					recommended the Respondent to explore alternative solutions in the future, such as rerouting	
					or burying the line underground, and consider the	
					Appellants' request if they reapply when such options become technically feasible.	
11	34/2023	Shri Divyakant	TPL,	Meter	The Appellant, Shri Divyakant Ajubhai Parmar C/o. Smt.	
		Ajubhai Parmar C/o. Smt. Manjulaben	Ahmedabad	Reading & Billing Issue	Manjulaben Divyakant Parmar who has electricity connection	
		Divyakant Parmar			from the Respondent with customer no.3281817. The	
					Appellant, Shri Divyakant A. Parmar filed a complaint with the Electricity Ombudsman	
					against the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited,	
à					Ahmedabad. The Appellant contested the meter reading	

				t <sub>a</sub>	and the resulting high	1
	1				electricity bills. The Appellant	
1		F)			argued that the Respondent did	1
4		(II)			not follow proper procedure	1
1		1	*:		when replacing his old meter	1
- 1	1					
	1	1	1		and installing a new one. The	
					Appellant also claimed the new	
		1	1		meter was faulty and registered	l .
- 1		1	1		inaccurate consumption.	
- 1			1	III	The Respondent, Torrent Power	
E .	0					b
					Limited responded by stating	
1				1	they followed standard	
1	1	l.		1	procedures for replacing the	
14		l l			meter and denied any	Y
					discrepancies in the billing	
					process. The Respondent	
		V				
1	1	I .			argued that the consumption	
1		1			recorded by the new meter was	
					accurate.	
1		1		1	The Electricity Ombudsman	l'i
1	1			1	observed that the Respondent	
	1	II.		1	observed that the respondent	
		L			responded to the inquiries of	
	1				the Appellant and that the	
	1				meter replacement process was	
					as per the standard norms.	
					However, the Electricity	
1					Ombudsman found that the	
					1	
1					Respondent failed to properly	
	0	3			notify the Appellant before	
1		1			sending a representative to	
1	1	1			disconnect their power supply.	
1		1			The Electricity Ombudsman	
1	1					
					also ruled that while the new	
					meter appeared to be	
1					functioning correctly, the	
					Appellant has the right to	
1	1				request a third-party test of the	
					meter at their own expense. The	
1	]					
1		U. VI			Electricity Ombudsman	
1	1	K. 11			concluded that the electricity	
1	1	Y			bill issued by the Respondent	
		1			was accurate and should be	
			n j		paid by the Appellant.	
10	05.40000	01 : 10	mnt a	T 1		Vide letter
12	35/2023	Shri Ravatbhai	TPL, Surat	Load	1110 11pp	0.000.000
1	1 1	Vashrambhai		Extension		dated
		Jograna			to the respection	1530
					increase of 6KW in Service No.	dated
	1					10.06.202
					000201300 011 =	4, The
1		Y				
li .	1					Responde
		1			T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	nt has
		1			Due to the action of the	implemen
		1				ted the
		I			Tree Processing	order.
Y	1	1			Grievance Redressal Forum	
7	1	l:	1			1
	1	1			regarding a solution to this	1
1 1	l l	1			matter but aggrieved by the	
1					order of Consumer Grivance	- 1
1			3		Redressal Forum, the Appellant	1
		1				
					approached before the	
1 1					Electricity Ombudsman,	ſ
1 1	li li	NI.			Ahmedabad.	
1					The Respondent argued that	
1 1	1				the existing substation had	
	1	1				
1 1	I				reached its maximum capacity	
					and increasing load would	
	1.0				require a new substation. They	10
			1		claimed they had contacted the	
		1	1		Appellant and nearby societies	
1 1		A)				
					to allot appear for a marri	
					to allot space for a new	

13	36/2023	M/s. N.N.P. Engineers	TPL, Ahmedabad	Service Related	substation but were unsuccessful. They provided documents detailing their efforts to secure a location. The Respondent also pointed out that residents were likely misusing their electricity connections for commercial purposes, further increasing the load demand. While they acknowledged their obligation to provide electricity under the Electricity Act and GERC regulations, they argued technical feasibility needed to be considered.  The Respondent cited a regulation requiring consumers to provide space for substations free of charge. They argued they had made sufficient efforts to collaborate with the Appellant and the community but were unable to secure a location. They further argued that a location proposed by the Appellant was unsafe.  The said situation changed when the Appellant informed the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad that the Surat Municipal Corporation had allotted a new substation site to the Respondent near Ram Rajya Society. With a new substation location secured, the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad concluded the main cause of the grievance had been resolved.  The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad directed the Appellant to specify the purpose of his electricity consumption and category and request to the Respondent for the required load according to the Regulations of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission. So that the further process of the matter of the Appellant can be carried out by the Respondent as per the prevailing rules.  The Appellant has withdrawn the representation stating that a mutual settlement was made	
13	36/2023			T	the representation stating that	
14	37/2023	M/s. Euro Panel Products Pvt. Ltd.	DGVCL, Valsad	Billing Related	The Appellant, M/s. Euro Panel Products Pvt. Limited, a company, argued that the Respondent, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company, Industrial Division Office, Vapi miscalculated their power factor rebate/penalty on	Status of order of Ombuds man is asked from the Responde nt.

electricity bills before Februarybelieve the 2019. They calculation should be based on the energy charge before deducting the night rebate, following the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's tariff order. the Respondent admits that they previously calculated the rebate/penalty after deducting the night rebate. They claim this practice stopped in March-2019 after Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited instructed them to update their billing system. The Appellant, M/s. Euro Panel Products Pvt. Limited appealed Grievance Consumer Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited, Consumer Valsad but Grievance Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited, Valsad rejected their claim for a rebate on pre-March 2019 bills, citing the Law of Limitation Act, 1963. The Appellant, M/s. Euro Panel Products Pvt. Limited believe Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum misinterpreted the rules. The Appellant, M/s. Euro Panel Products Pvt. also argued that Respondent, Dakshin Company, Gujarat Vij Industrial Division Office, Vapi miscalculated electricity duty from May-2020 onwards. They believe the duty should only apply to the cost of electricity consumption, not additional charges like the power factor penalty. The Electricity Ombudsman Ordered to offset the amount in the next electricity bill after checking the calculation of Power Factor Rebate/Penalty done by the Respondent in the Electricity bills prior to March-2019 and after verifying calculation as per the tariff order approved by Gujarat Regulatory Electricity Commission from time to time. The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, after considering the arguments and relevant provisions under Schedule-I, Part-I(3) of The Gujarat Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Electricity Therefore, The Ombudsman, Ahmedabad Appellant to advised the

					1 11	
	1				approach the concerned office	
	15				and officer with their complaint	
14					regarding the electricity duty	1
					miscalculation.	
15	38/2023	M/s. Blueivy	MGVCL,	Estimate	The Appellant, M/s. Blueivy	
	,	Hospitality Pvt. Ltd.	Vadodara	Related	Hospitality Pvt. Ltd., a company	
		1 3			has a power connection with a	
					contracted demand of 100KW.	
					They have been exceeding this	
					limit and the Respondent,	
		l III			MGVCL, Town Division Office,	
				12		
					Anand has informed them	
	1				multiple times to regularise	
		H H	10		their consumption.	
	1 1				As per the documentary	
	1 1	* 1			evidence submitted by the	
	1 1				Respondent, total 7 times in the	
	1 1		16		financial year 2022-23 and	
	1 - 1				total 5 times in the financial	
	-				year 2023-24 (up to September-	
					24) the Appellant has used	
1	j				power demand of 5% or more	
1				-	than the contracted power load.	
1					As per GERC Supply Code,	
					2015, clause No. 4.95, the	
				Law Sto	Respondent proposed to	
					convert the connection from LT	
					to HT. The Appellant, M/s.	
					Blueivy Hospitality Pvt. Ltd.	
					contested this and also	
					requested a separate	
					connection for their banquet	
					hall. Additionally, The	1
					Appellant, M/s. Blueivy	
					Hospitality Pvt. Ltd. stated that	
					they are unable to guarantee	
					fitting are unable to guarantee	30
					future control over their power	
	1				consumption.	
					Consumer Grievance Redressal	
1 1					Forum ruled in favour of The	
1 1					Respondent for the conversion	
1 1					but rejected the request for	5
1 1					maintaining the existing	
		1			connection. The Appellant,	
1 1		1			M/s. Blueivy Hospitality Pvt.	
		1			Ltd. appealed to the Electricity	1
		1			Ombudsman, Ahmedabad.	ŀ
{		1			The Electricity Ombudsman	
		1				8
		I			1	1
					concluded that the Appellant,	
					M/s. Blueivy Hospitality Pvt.	
		1			Ltd. has been exceeding the	
		1			contracted demand and their	
		h			request for a separate	
		ľ			connection depended on	
		I			keeping the existing connection	
					which was not approved. The	l l
					Electricity Ombudsman found	1
		1			the Respondent's actions	
		1			regarding the legality of the	
		1				
	I	*			power load are deemed justified	<u> </u>
		- I			under the GERC Supply Code,	
					2015. This includes the	
20	1				estimated billing adjustments,	
	1	[1			conversion from LT to HT power	
	} <b>I</b>	8 1			connection, and directed the	
	I				Respondent to complete the	
					procedure promptly, reporting	
	1				to the Electricity Ombudsman,	
					Ahmedabad and also directed	
					Millieuabau aliu also directed	

					the Respondent that further	- 1
20	e l	8	1			
	1				actions based on the GERO	
1		* 1			Supply Code may be taken by	
		3			the Respondent if the Appellan	
	*	1	1		chooses to apply for a new	7
	1				electricity connection.	
16	39/202	3 Shri Rakeshbhai	MGVCL,	Billing	The Appellant, Shr	i
10	39/202			Related	Rakeshbhai Prabhudas Patel	1
	0	Prabhudas Patel	Vadodara	Relateu		
- 6		1			is having a commercial purpose	
		1			connection i.e. cold room with	
		1			consumer no. 04317/02022/0	
		1			and load of 20kW of the	:
1	1	l l	1		Respondent, Madhya Gujarat	
	1	1			Vij Company Limited, South	
	1	I.			Sub-division Office, Anand.	
	3		1	1	This case involves a dispute	
1						
		1			between the Appellant and the	
	1		1	1	Respondent regarding seasonal	
					tariff charges, supplementary	
1	1		1		bill of unauthorized charges	
1	1		1		and load shedding process.	
1	1	1	1		The Appellant, who runs a cold	
			1		storage facility, argues they	
	1		1	· i	were unaware of and did not	
			1	T.	apply for seasonal tariffs. They	
1	0			I	also contest a supplementary	
		1			bill for exceeding their	
		1				1
		1		1	contracted load and claim they	
		1			requested load reductions that	1 1
				1	weren't processed.	
		1			The Respondent submitted that	
		1			the Appellant applied for	
	Y				seasonal benefits and that the	6
				1	charges are accurate based on	
1					GERC regulations. They also	
N .					justify the supplementary bill	
1					for exceeding the contracted	1
					load and explain the process for	
			N .		load reduction requests, which	
1		1	1	1	the Appellant allegedly didn't	
		II.	1		follow correctly.	1 1
	1	1			The Electricity Ombudsman	1 1
1	1	1			finds the dispute regarding	
		Ti.			unauthorised load increase and	1
	1	1			load reduction requests falls	1
1	1				outside their jurisdiction.	1
1					However, they criticise the	1
1		1			Respondent's billing	
			1	l l	department for failing to	
0					department for laming to	
	Į.				properly inform the Appellant	
	I)				about seasonal tariffs and the	
				1	process for recovering related	
					charges.	
					While acknowledging the delay	
1		1		1	in billing, the Electricity	
I		1			Ombudsman concludes the	
		1			final bill amount for seasonal	1
					tariff charges is correct based	
1					on GERC regulations. They	1
1					instruct the Respondent to	
1					-	
1					P	
	1		I		communication regarding	
	1		1		seasonal billing and related	
	1				processes. The Appellant is	
	1				liable to pay the outstanding	
					amount for seasonal tariff	
					charges.	
17	40/2023	M/s. Ajay Electrical	UGVCL,	Disconnecti	The Appellant, Shri Ajay R.	Review
* ′	10,2020	Engineering Co.	Sabarmati,	on of Power	Mishra and Shri Sanjay R.	appeal
		Districting Co.	Ahmedabad	Supply	Mishra, claiming to represent	filed by
		L	Anneuabau	Supply	Informa, ciamining to represent	

r	
	M/s. Ajay Electricals Engineering Co., filed a complaint with the Electricity. Ombudsman, Ahmedabad. They allege that the Respondent did not properly verify documents before granting a high-tension (HT) power connection to the company at Plot No.14, G.I.D.C., Kathwada and asked for disconnection of the same. The Respondent counters that the connection was provided following their standard procedures and lists the documents submitted by M/s. Ajay Electricals Engineering Co. These documents included proof of possession from G.I.D.C., partnership details, and power of attorney. Notably, the Respondent emphasizes that these documents showed Shri Sanjay R. Mishra and Shri Sanjay R. Mishra were not partners at the time of the application. During the hearing, both sides presented their arguments. The Appellant insisted that the Respondent should re-verify the documents and potentially disconnect the power supply. The Respondent should re-verify the documents and potentially disconnect the power supply. The Respondent should re-verify the documents and potentially disconnect the power supply. The Respondent should re-verify the documents and potentially disconnect the power supply. The Respondent should re-verify the documents and verification that they followed protocol and the documents showed the Appellant were not partners and argues that the connection was released lawfully following clauses 4.16, 4.17, and 4.18 of GERC Supply Code, Notification No. 4 of 2015. These clauses specify acceptable documents for proof of ownership/occupancy, current address, and partnership authorization. The Respondent claims their actions complied with these regulations. The Electricity Ombudsman directed that the Appellant must submit a written application with signatures from all legal partners. Upon receiving this application, the Respondent, UGVCL is
AI	The Electricity Ombudsman directed that the Appellant must submit a written application with signatures from all partners of M/s. Ajay Electricals or a notarized consent from all legal partners. Upon receiving this application,
18 41/2023 Mo. Iqbal G. Rasul DGVCl Moriswala Surat	
T I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	lab test. The Appendint argued

					VA-0-84-1-760-24	
	5				about technical terms in the	
1					meter report and the slowness	
- 1		N .		1	calculation. They also point out	
1				1	no change in consumption after	.
	1	ωĎ.			the meter replacement and no	
		T.			zero Amp. events showing in	
	1	1			the MRI report.	
	1	1			The Respondent counters that	
	1	1		1.6		
	1				a burnt component and temper	
		1			events were found in the meter,	
		1			justifying the slowness and the	
					bill based on relevant clauses of	I U
		*		1	the GERC supply code. The	do:
				1	Respondent also explained the	
				1	tampering events recorded in	
	I			1	the meter MRI data.	1
		1		1	During the hearing, the	
	78	1		1		
		1		1	Appellant requested a third-	
		l .			party meter inspection, which	
		1	1		was approved. However, their	1
					chosen lab couldn't determine	
1	1		1		accuracy due to meter damage.	
	1				The Respondent confirmed	
1	1			E	meter damage and tampering	
1					events, while the Appellant	
					contested the slowness	
1	1	1			calculation based on the meter	
1					MRI report.	
1		1			The Electricity Ombudsman	
		1				1 1
		1			direct the Respondent to	
		1			recalculate the duration of	
	1	1			slowness considering the exact	1
	1				current make/break event from	
					the MRI data and further, the	
					supplementary bill is to be	
f	1				calculated as per the clause no.	
					6.33 of the GERC supply code	
1					and related matters 2015.	
10	40./0002	M/- CDE Limited	DOVOI	Dilling		The
19	42/2023	M/s. SRF Limited	DGVCL,	Billing	, ,	Responde
1	A .		Surat	Related		
	1	l.			consumer with a contracted	nt has
1	1	1			electricity load of 23,000 KVA,	filed SCA
	1				applied to increase its power	No. 21045
					demand to 66,000 KVA under	of 2023
			1		Option-III. They completed the	before
					necessary agreement and paid	Hon'ble
	1				the estimated cost for the	High
	1 1			1	extension work. As per the	Court of
	1 1			1	agreement, The Appellant, M/s.	Gujarat,
	1		1			Ahmedab
			1		SRF Limited had 180 days to	ad
					complete the work and then 60	
					days to activate the power	aggrieved
	1 1				supply. Failing to meet these	by the
					1 11:	
	1		N.	1	deadlines resulted in charging	order
					minimum demand charges.	passed by
1						
1					minimum demand charges. According to the Respondent,	passed by
1					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF	passed by Consumer
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the	passed by Consumer Grievance s
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The Respondent issued a notice in	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal Forum,
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The Respondent issued a notice in November 2022, giving the	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal Forum, Dakshin
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The Respondent issued a notice in November 2022, giving the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited 60	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The Respondent issued a notice in November 2022, giving the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited 60 days to complete the work and	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The Respondent issued a notice in November 2022, giving the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited 60 days to complete the work and activate the power supply. After	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The Respondent issued a notice in November 2022, giving the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited 60 days to complete the work and activate the power supply. After this period, they would be liable	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The Respondent issued a notice in November 2022, giving the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited 60 days to complete the work and activate the power supply. After this period, they would be liable	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The Respondent issued a notice in November 2022, giving the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited 60 days to complete the work and activate the power supply. After this period, they would be liable to pay minimum demand	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited,
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The Respondent issued a notice in November 2022, giving the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited 60 days to complete the work and activate the power supply. After this period, they would be liable to pay minimum demand charges based on the	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited,
					minimum demand charges.  According to the Respondent, the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited did not complete the work within 180 days. The Respondent issued a notice in November 2022, giving the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited 60 days to complete the work and activate the power supply. After this period, they would be liable to pay minimum demand	passed by Consumer Grievance s Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited,

			N N			
					The Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited challenged the minimum demand charges, arguing that the 60-day notice was invalid and the delay was beyond their control. CGRF partially sided with The Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited, after that The Respondent submitted that as per the approval of competent authority, the Respondent have filed the SCA No. 21045 of 2023 before the Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat against the order of CGRF in case no. 35/2023-24 dated 04.10.2023.  Based on the fact that the Respondent had appealed to a higher court, the appeal cannot	pri
a	ž-	. e)			be decided at this current level because it involves a matter of precedent. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed of the Appellant, M/s. SRF Limited without deciding by the Electricity Ombudsman.	11
20	43/2023	M/s. Farmson Pharmaceutical Gujarat Pvt. Ltd. [Unit-III]	DGVCL, Surat	Billing Related	The Appellant, M/s. Farmson Pharmaceutical Gujarat Pvt. Ltd. [Unit-III], a company with high tension (HT) connections with contracted load 1600kVA, Customer No.39703 from the Respondent believes there are errors in their bills. The Appellant has two main complaints regarding their bill calculations i.e. power factor rebate/penalty and electricity duty. They argue that the Respondent did not calculate the power factor rebate/penalty and the 15% electricity duty according to the relevant regulations. The Appellant believes the rebate/penalty should be based on the energy charge before night rebate, not after, as mandated by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC) tariff order. As stated by the Respondent before March-2019, Power Factor Rebate/Penalty was calculated on the amount after deducting Night Rebate Charge from Energy Charge and GUVNL is instructed to make necessary changes in HT Billing System vide letter dated 29.05.2018. The Appellant argues that a 15% electricity duty is applied to their entire bill, including charges not mentioned in the Gujarat Electricity Dutý Act. The Respondent claims they rectified the error from March-2019 onwards. The Appellant also disputes the way the	The Responde nt has implemen ted the order as per their letter dated 06.05.202 4.

Respondent handled adjustment in their April 2016 bill due to a tariff change. The Respondent acknowledges an error in calculating the Appellant's April 2016 bill due to a tariff change. They claim to have rectified the error by crediting the difference amount in the May 2016 bill as per rules. company Respondent further clarifies their billing process. Meter readings are taken on the 15th of every month, and the fixed charge is calculated for the entire month. Since the new tariff was implemented after the April 2016 meter reading, any necessary adjustments were reflected in the May 2016 bill, following the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory order. The Commission's Respondent maintains that the April 2016 billing error adjustment was made correctly in the May 2016 bill according to the Gujarat Regulatory Electricity Commission's guidelines. The Appellant and their representative attended the hearing. The Appellant explained that a consultant contacted the Appellant about the power factor rebate dispute for the period before March 2019. The consultant helped file a complaint and informed relevant authorities. representative of the Appellant mentioned filing similar disputes before the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot. The Electricity Ombudsman, noted Ahmedabad representative's efforts to raise public awareness. They claim no conflict exists since a billing program change by GUVNL, and they haven't pursued penalties in pre-March 2019 bills. The Respondent worries the representative's that pursuit of old rebates could lead to questions about past They penalty actions. emphasize that both rebates and penalties involve public funds and require seriousness from all parties. The Electricity Ombudsman Ordered to offset the amount in the next electricity bill after checking the calculation of Power Factor Rebate/Penalty done by the Respondent in the Electricity bills prior to March-

2019 and after verifying

calculation as per the tariff order approved by Cujurat Regulatory	-			-		1	
order approved by Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission from time to time. The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, after considering the arguments and relevant purely and the purely of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned officer and officer with their companity of the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Sanday and the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Sanday and the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman amphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty relevant and the Electricity of Consultants representing the Appellant to sudress electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty relevant and the Electricity Chromadsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty relevant and the Electricity Chromadsman. This approach upholds the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it consultants representing the Appellant challenged a high electricity of Consultants can avoid a watting the Appellant challenged a high electricity to Electricity of Consultants can avoid a watting the Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a alow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.0.02023 and				- 585 V	- 8	calculation as per the tariff	19.1
Electricity Regulatory Commission from time to time. The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, after considering the arguments and relevant provisions under Scheduler Recording the arguments and relevant provisions under Scheduler Recording the arguments and relevant provisions under Scheduler Recording the Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant of a sproach the complaint reparating the electricity duty miscalculation. The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman and Rajkot regarding fature power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman and advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman of emphasizes electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes and advised the Appellant and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of control of the consultants abnuld be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Univides and the familiar and the familiar proach universessary strain on government entities, paged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and			1			order approved by Gujarat	21
Commission from time to time. The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, after considering the arguments and relevant provisions under Schedule-I, Part-(3) of The Gujarat Electricity Duty Act, 1984 determined the part of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Duty and advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the clerctricity duty miscalculation. The considering the control of the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman and the Respondent regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman and the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman and the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman and the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty relative similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty relative disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Girevance Redressal Forum on the Elegal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Girevance Redressal Forum on the Elegal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Girevance Redressal Forum on the Elegal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant clustomer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can a sold wasting the Appellant following these recommend			1				
The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, after considering the arguments and relevant provisions under Considering the arguments and relevant provisions under Schedule-I, Part-I(3) of The Gularat Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falis under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Consultation of Electricity Onto Manan, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with tritier complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation.  The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent considering the electricity of the electric					**		
Ahmedabad, after considering the arguments and relevant provisions under Schedule-I, Part-I(3) of The Gujarat Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, Ahmedabad Ahmedabad of Sprayasch the concerned office and efficer with their complaint regarding the dectricity duty miscalculation. The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding fature power factor disputes. Almedabad and Rajkot regarding fature power factor disputes and the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Combudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal proceedints set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility the company. Almedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility to Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the posal is to guide customers efficiently. By following alters, company and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the posal is to guide customers efficiently. By following alters, company and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the posal is to guide customers efficiently. By following alters, consciously and the company and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary s	- 1	1					
Ahmedabad, after considering the arguments and relevant provisions under Schedule-I, Part-I(3) of The Gujarat Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, Ahmedabad Ahmedabad of Sprayasch the concerned office and efficer with their complaint regarding the dectricity duty miscalculation. The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding fature power factor disputes. Almedabad and Rajkot regarding fature power factor disputes and the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Combudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal proceedints set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility the company. Almedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility to Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the posal is to guide customers efficiently. By following alters, company and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the posal is to guide customers efficiently. By following alters, company and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the posal is to guide customers efficiently. By following alters, consciously and the company and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary s					1.0	The Electricity Ombudsman,	
the arguments and relevant provisions under Schedule-I, Part-I(3) of The Gujarat Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar.  Therefore, The Electricity Orbudaman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their compaint regarding the electricity duty may be a supposed the concerned office and officer with their compaint regarding the electricity Guty may be a supposed the concerned office and officer with their compaint regarding the electricity Orbudaman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent judgments from Electricity Orbudaman and Septon of the Respondent judgments from Electricity Orbudaman also advised the Appellant to address electricity Orbudaman also advised the Appellant of the Collector of Electricity Duty.  The Electricity Orbudaman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents so the provention of the Electricity orbudaman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents so the provention of the Electricity orbudaman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents so the provention of the Electricity Duty.  The Electricity			I				
provisions under Schedule-I, Part-I(3) of The Gujarat Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gamdiniagur. Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad adviseine Apparent of the sease of the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation. The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman issues with the Collector of Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman hamedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of complaints and the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity ombudsman. Annedabad and Rajkot for power factor of Electricity forum the propo			1				
Part-I(3) of The Gujarst Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar.  Therefore, The Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the clertricity duty miscaelfulation; many aided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman issues with the Collector of Electricity Ombudsman and a dispute and the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity ombudsman emphasizes the importance of fol						the arguments and relevant	
Part-I(3) of The Gujarst Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar.  Therefore, The Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the clertricity duty miscaelfulation; many aided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman issues with the Collector of Electricity Ombudsman and a dispute and the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity ombudsman emphasizes the importance of fol						provisions under Schedule-I,	
Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collectron of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Combudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation.  The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman and suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman and Sease, Ahmedabad fature power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman and Sease, Ahmedabad fature power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collectro of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal procedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajiot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal first electricity of the Electricity Ombudsman. This electricity of the Electricity Ombudsman in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal first electricity and the legal first electricity and the legal graphers and avoids unmore reflected, upholds the legal graphers and avoids unmore reflected, the position of the processory processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LIP. Billing Related Related the to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		1					
determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar.  Therefore, The Electricity Ombudaman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman sho advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collectro of Electricity Ombudsman almostly sided with the Collectro of Electricity Ombudsman amphabate and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman amphabates and the Electricity Ombudsman amphabates and Rajkot regarding future appears and the Electricity Ombudsman amphabates and Rajkot regarding future appears and the Electricity Ombudsman. Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Refressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's fine, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.	1	1					
under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation.  The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rejker and Re		1	1				
under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation.  The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rejker and Re						determined that the matter falls	
Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation. The Electricity outly miscalculation. The Electricity outly miscalculation. The Selectricity outly miscalculation on the Electricity outly miscalculation of the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents are by the Electricity Ombudsman fallowed the Electricity Elect	311				†		
Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and offices with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation. The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman, emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor of Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor of Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor of Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor of Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor of Electricity Ombudsman, This approach upholds for consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP  Billing Related  TPL, Billing Related  TPL, Billing The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 20 30.06.2023 and							
Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation.  The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity					i	Collector of Electricity Duty,	
Therefore, The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation.  The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to Electricity of Ombudsman also advised the Appellant of Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the inportance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor pensity/rebate disputes. This enaures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the apprepriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Inft.  Billing Related  Ahmedabad Pletted to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 and	1	1				Gandhinagar.	
Ombudsman, Ahmedabad advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation.  The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman slos advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Druty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unmecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficienty. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP  Billing Related  TPL, Billing The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 and 18.01.2023		1					
advised the Appellant to approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation.  The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent gudgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajiot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Dutty. The Electricity Ombudsman amphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajiot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. The ensures consistent and fair decisions in Curre similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer officiency for the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark ITPL, Ahmedabad Related The Fapellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		1				1	
approach the concerned office and office with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation.  The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajleot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty.  The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajleot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark TPL, hiffa LLP Repelant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1	1				1	
and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation. The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related  Billing Related  TPL, Billing Related  TPL, The Pleil was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	11					advised the Appellant to	
and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation. The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related  Billing Related  TPL, Billing Related  TPL, The Pleil was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and						approach the concerned office	- 1
regarding the electricity duty miscalculation.  The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajket regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty celevilation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty.  The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajket for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark ITPL, Ahmedabad Related  Billing Related  TPL, Billing Related  TPL, Billing Related  TPL, The Billing Related Related Relation of the received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1						
miscalculation. The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajket regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman and Electricity Ombudsman also Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP  Ahmedabad  Billing Related  The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1	1	U 8				
The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP  Ahmedabad  Billing Related  The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		1			1		
mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman abdissed the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Duty and the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity of Factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach uploads the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.0.1.2023 to 30.06.2023 and			1		1		
mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman abdissed the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Duty and the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity of Factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach uploads the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.0.1.2023 to 30.06.2023 and			1			The Electricity Ombudsman	
though they suggested the Respondent ipidgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP  Ahmedabad  Billing Related  The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		1			1	mostly sided with the company	
Respondent consider judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty frebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Refressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark ITPL, Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		1		W	1	mostly sided with the company,	
judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark IPL, Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		1	L	1	1		
judgments from Electricity Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		1			1	Respondent consider	
Ombudsman offices, Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark IPL, Infra LLP Billing Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		1	ľ	1	1		
Ahmedabad and Rajkot regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related  Ahmedabad Related  TPL, Billing Related  The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and					1		
regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark TPL, Billing Related  Ahmedabad Related  The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1						
disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Drubudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant consumer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Drubudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant consumer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		1				regarding future power factor	
Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18,01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		I					
Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following recommendations, consultants can avoid wassting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related  TPL, Billing Related  TPL, Billing Related  The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18,01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related  TPL, Ahmedabad  TPL, Billing The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		1					
duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related  TPL, Ahmedabad  TPL, Billing The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1	1				Appellant to address electricity	
Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1	1				duty calculation issues with the	1
The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1						
emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Rhmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1						
following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Rhmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1					emphasizes the importance of	
by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1						
Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
power factor penalty/rebate disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1						
disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1 .				2	Ahmedabad and Rajkot for	
disputes. This ensures consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1 .						
consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1						
future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Flated The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1					all	
highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Related Fig. 12 He Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1						
highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Related Fig. 12 He Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1	100				future similar cases and also	
consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Flated The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1						
Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and						inginights the responsibility of	
should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Fig. 1 The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1					consultants representing the	
legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and						Appellant. Such consultants	
legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
disputes to the appropriate forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
forum, be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1	1					
the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and						Grievance Redressal Forum or	
This approach upholds the legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
legal system and avoids unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Felated Fela	1						
unnecessary processes. Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Felated Fela	1				ľ	legal system and avoids	
Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related Figh electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related Related high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and						1	
following these recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related Figh electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	1						
recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
recommendations, consultants can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and			-			following these	-
can avoid wasting the Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related Fight electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
Appellant/customer's time, money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark TPL, Billing The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
money, and resources, as well as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Related Related TPL, Ahmedabad Related						11	
as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Related high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Related high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and						money, and resources, as well	
on government entities.  21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related Related Related The Appellant challenged a high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and						as prevent unnecessary strain	1
21 44/2023 M/s. Wishpark Infra LLP Billing Related TPL, Ahmedabad Related high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and							
Infra LLP Ahmedabad Related high electricity bill they received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	21	44/2023	M/s. Wishpark	TPL,	Billing		
received due to a slow meter. The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and		, ,					
The bill was for 164 days from 18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and				- IIIII Gadbaa		0	
18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and				,			
		1					
						18.01.2023 to 30.06.2023 and	- 5
1 10000 1000000000000000000000000000000							
	L					2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	

		*1	5		Respondent claimed the meter	
	1			1	wasn't recording all the energy	
		()			used because of a problem with	
1	1	(II)			one phase. The Respondent	
		N.			based the bill on an analysis of	1
				l.	the MRI data of the Meter.	1
1		T .			The Appellant argued the bill	
1	1	-			wasn't calculated correctly	1
	1	1			according to regulations and	
		1			should have been based on past	
		1		W.	usage. The Appellant cited a	
					Clause No. 6.58 that outlines	
					how to handle billing for faulty	
				1	meters.	
				1	The Respondent countered that	
				1	the meter wasn't technically	
	1	1			faulty but had a specific issue	
		l.			causing it to under-record. The	
		II.	1	1	Respondent said the	
		/	1		appropriate regulation for their	
1	1				actions was Clause No. 6.33,	
1		1			which deals with adjusting bills	
		MH.			based on meter testing results.	
1	1		1	E	Both sides presented evidence	
					to support their claims. The	\
					Appellant pointed to the	
					regulation and noted the meter	
			ľ		data showed the problem. The	
				1	Respondent emphasized the	
					meter test results and their	
		1			communication with the	
		1			Appellant about the issue.	
			1		The Electricity Ombudsman	
					found the bill was calculated	
1	T				1	
1				1	correctly according to the	
					relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the	
					relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the	
22	45/0002	M/a Saridhya	TDI Syrot	Penrasan	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.	
22	45/2023	M/s. Sanidhya	TPL, Surat	Represen-	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy	
22	45/2023	Corporation One	TPL, Surat	tation	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm	TPL, Surat	tation Admission	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via E-	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant.	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via E-mail on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a temporary connection. The	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a temporary connection. The Appellant must follow the	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a temporary connection. The Appellant must follow the proper procedure if they desire	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via E-mail on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant.  This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a temporary connection. The Appellant must follow the proper procedure if they desire a permanent connection. This	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a temporary connection. The Appellant must follow the proper procedure if they desire a permanent connection. This involves applying to Torrent	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a temporary connection. The Appellant must follow the proper procedure if they desire a permanent connection. This involves applying to Torrent Power Limited after receiving	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a temporary connection. The Appellant must follow the proper procedure if they desire a permanent connection. This involves applying to Torrent	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a temporary connection. The Appellant must follow the proper procedure if they desire a permanent connection. This involves applying to Torrent Power Limited after receiving	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a temporary connection. The Appellant must follow the proper procedure if they desire a permanent connection. This involves applying to Torrent Power Limited after receiving the temporary connection. In	
22	45/2023	Corporation One Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Ashok Mohanbhai	TPL, Surat	tation Admission stage	relevant Clause No. 6.33 by the Respondent and directed the Appellant to pay it.  The Appellant was unhappy with an order of Complaint No.04/2023-24 from Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Surat regarding a temporary electricity connection. The Appellant filed a case with the Electricity Ombudsman i.e. Case No.33/2023. However, before the hearing, the Appellant withdrew their complaint via Email on 08.09.2023, indicating the issue was resolved. The Ombudsman dismissed the case on 29.09.2023, assuming an amicable resolution with the temporary connection being provided to the Appellant. This clarifies that the previous case addressed obtaining a temporary connection. The Appellant must follow the proper procedure if they desire a permanent connection. This involves applying to Torrent Power Limited after receiving the temporary connection. In case of rejection, the Appellant	

					01	
		4	Ta .		Redressal Forum and then, if	
		1		907	unsatisfied, escalate to the	
	100	1				
		1	. a		Electricity Ombudsman,	IX.
		1			Ahmedabad. The Appellant has	-
	I	1		~~	bypassed the proper channels	
		1				
	I.	1			by directly approaching the	
	1		7.		Electricity Ombudsman,	
	1	I	I		Ahmedabad without following	
					these steps. Therefore, they are	
			1	I		
	1	I	1		directed to file a complaint with	
			I.	I	the Consumer Grievances	
	I ' '			I	Redressal Forum, Torrent	
	1	×				
					Power Limited, Surat.	
23	46/2023	The Swaminarayan	TPL,	Represen-	The Appellant, The	
	1 .5, 2020	Park-2 Co-	Ahmedabad	tation	Swaminarayan Park-2 Co-	
			Annicuabau		1	
		Operative Housing		Admission	Operative Housing and	
		and Commercial		stage	Commercial Service Society	
		Service Society Ltd.		Hearing	Ltd. (Block-D) is a consumer of	
				11caing		
		(Block-D)			the Respondent whose	
					Consumer No.100435067 with	
1					contracted load of 27.38kW for	
					the purpose of Water Pump and	
1		l I			Lift (Common). The Appellant	- (
1					with a high electricity bill	. 1
1		i i		1	suspected a faulty meter. The	
		[·	5			
1		1			Respondent checked and	
					replaced the meter, which	85
1		[			passed their lab test. However,	
		l l				
1			1	-	-FF	
1					unconvinced and filed a	
					complaint before Consumer	
	]				Grievances Redressal Forum.	
	1 1	i i				
	\	y y	1		Consumer Grievances	
1					Redressal Forum allowed the	
	1				Appellant to have the meter	
		- 1				
		1			tested by a third-party lab	
					approved by the Hon'ble	
		I			Gujarat Electricity Regulatory	
					Commission. The Respondent	
		1			informed the Appellant about	
		l l			such labs but claimed the	
		100			Appellant didn't choose one.	
		l				
	1				The Respondent argued that	
	1				based on meter MRI data, the	
			1		consumption of the Appellant	
					actually decreased after	
		I			01.11.2022, whereas the new	
	1	ľ			meter was installed on	
					25.11.2022. They believe the	
1 1	1				meter is accurate.	
1					During a hearing, the Appellant	29
	1				requested a third-party test of	1
		14			their electricity meter. The	
	1	I			Respondent verified a certified	
	1				lab, provided the contact	
1 1	1	-			details and instructed the	
		I				
		I			Appellant to proceed if deemed	
	1	1			necessary. The Appellant	
		I			received a quote for an	
	l l	1				
	l I				accuracy test only, which they	
	1	I			deemed insufficient for their	
		1			concerns. As a result, the	
		I I		_	Appellant decided not to	
		I		=		
		1			proceed with the third-party	
		I	1		testing.	
1 1		I			The Electricity Ombudsman	
		I				
		1			observed that despite the	
1 1		I			Appellant's suspicion of a faulty	
		I			meter, data from the meter	I
		I	2:			
					itself, consumption patterns,	
				- 3		

	1	*:			and the Respondent's meter	.©.
1		1			test report suggest otherwise.	
1		1			Furthermore, considering the	1
- 1		1		3	Appellant's decision to forgo the	
1						
- 1				1	third-party test recommended	
l l			ł		by CGRF and the Electricity	
	l			1	Ombudsman, the meter testing	1
	1			1	report made by the Respondent	
				1	in the presence of the	ľ
					representative of the Appellant	ľ
				1	is accepted and action taken by	
- 1						
		1			the Respondent in this regard	
				2	appears to be appropriate.	
24	47/2023	Shri Yogendra R.	TPL,	Service	The Appellant argued that the	
47	71/2020		Ahmedabad	Related	name change form provided by	
		Agrawal	Annedabad	Related		
1	1			1	the Respondent lacked a	(1
		/			column for "Purpose of Power	
					Supply." This column, they	
					argued, was mandatory	
				1		
	1				according to the Hon'ble	
1	1	l'			Gujarat Electricity Regulatory	
	1	I)			Commission. Consumer	
1		li,			Grievance Redressal Forum	
1	r n	()			partially upheld complaint of	
1 1					the Appellant, requiring the	
		59			Respondent to either use the	
1 1		法			Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity	
	li l	mid:			Regulatory Commission form or	
1 1						
				1	the Respondent has the option	
1) 11		J.		1	to continue using their current	
.B U					form if they follow the	
illi li					provisions outlined in Clause	
1 1						
1 1					No. 3 of the Supply Code-2015	
1 1	1				within 60 days of this	
11					Consumer Grievance Redressal	
1 1	1				Forum order.	
1 1						
1					The Appellant claims the	
1 1					Respondent did not comply	
1 1		1			with the order. They point out	
1 1		1			that Clause 3 of the Supply	
1 1		1		1	Code allows the Respondent to	
1 1	1	1				1
1 1		1			modify forms with prior	
1 1					approval of the Hon'ble Gujarat	
1 1	1	1			Electricity Regulatory	
1 1		1			Commission. The Respondent,	
1 1						
					however, argues their form	1
1 1	1	i			contains the same information	
					as the Hon'ble Gujarat	
					Electricity Regulatory	
1 1	1				Commission form and	
1 L			I			
1 1	1		П		simplifies the process for	
1 E					customers. They mentioned a	
1 1		II.	j)		customer satisfaction survey	
1 1		l)			taken in the year 2016 that	
V 1	- 1					1
1 1		L			supposedly supported this	
1 1	1	li li			simplification.	
		IA			The Respondent also	
1 1	1	II.			highlighted that they hadn't	
1 1	1	4				1
1 1	1					
1	1	T)			besides the Appellant's	1
1 1	J	N.			regarding the new form. They	
1 1	1	11			submitted a letter to the	
1					Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity	1
1 1	1	d'	1			1
1 1					Regulatory Commission	1
] [		1			mentioning a customer	1
		T.	1		satisfaction survey but it didn't	- 1
1 1			1		explicitly seek approval for the	
1			1			
1					modified form.	
		1			While the Appellant couldn't	1
[ [		I .			demonstrate any personal	
					demonstrate any personal	

_					17-	
- 1		3		•	difficulty due to the form	
		2.		*	change, they expressed	
1		1 :	2			1
1		1	1	1	concern about potential future	ľ
	1				problems for consumers. The	
	1		1		Respondent reiterated their	
		-				
	-				desire to simplify the form and	
					emphasized they can make	1
1			100			
	1 -		1		changes with the proper	
1	1		II.	75-6	approval of the Hon'ble Gujarat	
11	1		1)	V		
1	1				Electricity Regulatory	
4			1)		Commission. Both parties	
1			1			
		li .		1	agreed the Hon'ble Gujarat	
Al .		N .			Electricity Regulatory	
1		1)	1.14			×
1					Commission regulations govern	
1		k .				
1		1			the name change process.	
1					The Electricity Ombudsman,	
				1	Ahmedabad, directed that the	
				1	Respondent has the liberty to	
1	1				propose a simplified application	
1		l'	316			
1		1.2		1	form for the name change	1
1			II.		_	
1			1			
1				1	modifications to the existing	100
1				1		
1			1		format require prior approval	
1			1	1	from the Hon'ble Gujarat	
				1		
1			18	1	Electricity Regulatory	0 1
1			1	I	Commission. This aligns with	
1				1		
1					the provisions outlined in	
1	1	ľ.	1	×	Notification No.4/2015 of the	
			1	1		
1					Electricity Supply Code and	
1			1		Related Matters, Regulations	
					set forth by the Hon'ble Gujarat	
		00	1		Electricity Regulatory	
1	'		1		, ,	1
					Commission.	
25	49/2023	M/s. NCR	TPL,	New	The Appellant, M/s. NCR Build	
			A 10 1 - 1	Onmontino	Took A construction company	
		Buildtech	Ahmedabad	Connection	Tech, A construction company	
	- "		Ahmedabad	Connection		
	-		Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant	
	air a		Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property	·
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC)	*
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC)	186
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement	38
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation	38
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation	18
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no	:#s
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no	: *
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation	: :
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property	<b>1%</b>
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing	: :
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power	•
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises.	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises.	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations allowing for a free substation	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations allowing for a free substation on their property with mutual	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations allowing for a free substation on their property with mutual	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations allowing for a free substation on their property with mutual consent. The Appellant believe	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations allowing for a free substation on their property with mutual consent. The Appellant believe the current situation doesn't	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations allowing for a free substation on their property with mutual consent. The Appellant believe	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations allowing for a free substation on their property with mutual consent. The Appellant believe the current situation doesn't involve mutual consent as the	
		Buildtech	Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations allowing for a free substation on their property with mutual consent. The Appellant believe the current situation doesn't involve mutual consent as the Respondent want a lease	
			Ahmedabad	Connection	applied for a new electricity connection i.e. 23.40KW from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited. The Appellant approved the location for a substation on their property within the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation (AMC) plans. However, a disagreement arose regarding the substation lease. The Appellant argues that while they have no objection to the substation being built on their property but the Respondent want to lease the land before providing the electricity connection. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited cites Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. The Appellant counters with another Section 5.13 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations allowing for a free substation on their property with mutual consent. The Appellant believe the current situation doesn't involve mutual consent as the	

Appellant réferences Electricity Act, 2003, Section 43(1) requiring electricity provide companies to connections within a month. The Appellant raised previous case of the Appellant, M/s. Vega Infra filed a complaint against The Respondent for not providing an electricity Consumer connection. Grievance Redressal Forum previously ruled in favour of the Appellant i.e. Complaint No. 7/2021. The ruling stated that the location of the substation should be decided by mutual agreement and registering a lease deed was not mandatory. M/s. Vega Infra had already provided written consent for the substation location. In present Case, The Appellant demands immediate electricity connection for construction, a declaration from the Respondent acknowledging compliance with the previous decision in case forum's no.7/2021, closure of the requirement for a registered lease deed for the substation, and compensation of Rs.500/for the delay in providing the connection. The Respondent claims customers often retract their initial consent for substation placement, hence the requirement for a registered lease deed. Since the Appellant hasn't provided the lease deed, the Respondent believes the delay in connection is their fault and compensation is not warranted. The issue remains unresolved. The Appellant wants the connection based on the previous ruling, while the Respondent insists on a lease deed to avoid future disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman is reviewing a case involving an electricity dispute between the Appellant and the Respondent regarding a sub-station on the Appellant's property. Electricity Ombudsman will be focusing on the main issues raised as under: The Respondent demands a registered lease for the substation, while the Appellant is willing to provide space but opposes a registered lease.

seeks

11		(0)				
31		4	2.00		insists on a lease	
		l			agreement before	
	100		1		providing it.	
1					• The Respondent is	
1	1				concerned about past	
		1				1
1			k.	1	cases where builders or	
				T .	societies revoke	
					permission for	
1				1	substations after initial	
				1	approval.	
	1			1		1
1	-				• The Appellant argues	
1	1			2:	that a registered lease is	
-			1		not mandatory as per the	
					Electricity Supply Code.	
1					The Appellant proposes a	
1			II.		notarized undertaking	
1					instead of a registered	
1		II.	1		lease.	
1			1		The Appellant contests	
- 1					the 99-year lease term	
		1			and the annual lease fee	
		II.				
		I.			of Rs. 100/	
		I .			• the Appellant believes	1
		I .		1	CGRF's order in their	
		1		1	case doesn't address	
		II.		}	whether the M/s. Vega	
				1	Infra decision was	
					followed.	
					• The Appellant argues	
					that the power company	0.1
					needs approval from the	
						12
					Hon'ble Gujarat	
					Electricity Regulatory	
		-			Commission for	
		1			demanding a registered	
					lease.	
					The Appellant raised new	
					points in the appeal that	
					require a decision by	
			l .		Consumer Grievance	
					Redressal Forum (CGRF)	
de l			1		before the Electricity	
					Ombudsman can decide.	
	1					
					The Electricity Ombudsman	
18 1					concludes that Consumer	
					Grievance Redressal Forum	
					(CGRF) has not addressed	
	1				these issues adequately and	
	1				directs them to rehear the	
					complaint of the Appellant and	
					considering all points raised	
					during this case and issue a	
					clear decision on each point.	
		1		ľ	Further, decide on the new	
					points raised during this case	
11		=			before this case escalate to the	
	(2)				Electricity Ombudsman.	
					Hence, the case is remanded	12
					back to Consumer Grievance	
		1			Redressal Forum (CGRF) to	
					decide.	
100	50 10000	01 1 2711 1 1	MONO	0-1		The
26	50/2023	Shri Niteshkumar	MGVCL,	Solar	The Appellant, an agricultural	
1		Bhikhabhai Patel	Vadodara	Related	consumer filed a complaint	Responde
					with the Electricity	nt has
					Ombudsman regarding the	implemen
					Suryashakti Kisan Yojana (Sky	ted the
						order as
1 1						
					provides solar panels to	per their
	2				farmers. The Appellant claimed	letter
1					the agreement for the Sky	dated
		3				

22.03.202

Scheme was fraudulent, the solar panels were of low quality, and he received poor technical support.

The Electricity Ombudsman case. reviewed the Respondent explained benefits of the Sky Scheme, including financial incentives for farmers who participate. The Respondent also stated that 15 farmers participated in the program on the Sandeshar Feeder and signed a bilateral purchase power agreement. These farmers then received solar panels installed on their farms.

The Appellant argued that the solar panels produced less electricity than expected, resulting in high electricity bills. The Appellant and other consumers wanted to withdraw from the said scheme.

The Respondent argued that the power generation of the solar panels depended on factors, including various availability, sunlight maintenance, and shadows cast by objects near the panels. The Respondent also claimed they informed the farmers about these factors and their maintenance responsibilities. They provided data on power generation from the solar panels to support their claims. The tripartite agreement between the Appellant, the Respondent, and M/s. Solex Energy Limited, solar panel installation company stipulated guaranteed Capacity Utilization Factor (CUF) of 18.3%. This CUF is a measure of how much power a solar panel generates compared to its maximum potential. As per submission of the Respondent which appears that the solar underperformed, meaning it produced less electricity than the guaranteed 18.3% CUF. However, the Respondent hadn't penalized the solar panel installation company i.e., M/s. Solex Energy Limited or compensated the consumers for the shortfall. The Electricity Ombudsman ordered the Respondent to address the Appellant/farmers' grievances within 30 days. This included calculating amount of compensation owed to the Appellant/farmers for the shortfall in electricity generation and recovering this

compensation from the solar panel installation company according to the terms of the tripartite agreement. The Electricity Ombudaman along the coordinate with the solar panel installation company to find solutions to the problems raised by the Appellant and other farmers.  The Ombudaman clarified that the Appellant conditor options of the Sky Sheme through this conditions to the problems raised by the Appellant and other farmers.  The Ombudaman clarified that the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the provision of the condition of the Compellant of the Appellant could provide space and the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent went unanswered from the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The complying the complete of the substation field a complying the complete of the substation field a complying the complete of the substation field a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer of Glusare Reduction (Consumer Glusare Section 4.36 of Glusare Association field a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Glusare Reduction of Columna and stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Recurricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Glusare and stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Recurricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Glusare Recurricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.3		2					
panel installation company according to the terms of the triparitie agreement. The Electricity Ombudaman also directed the Respondent to coordinate with the solar panel installation company to fine a related by the Appellant couldn't opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant couldn't opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant couldn't opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide open the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide open the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide open the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide open the solar panels. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sun-station promises and payment of remember of the provision of a registered lease deed of sun-station promises and payment of remember of the provision of a registered lease deed of sun-station promises and payment of remember of the provision of a registered lease deed of sun-station promises and payment of remember of the provision of a registered lease deed of sun-station promises and payment of remember of the provision of a registered lease deed of sun-station promises and payment of remember of the provision of the payment of the payme		19	*			compensation from the solar	70 L
Signature   Secure	1				1		
tripartite agreement. The Electricity Ornhudsman also directed the Respondent to coordinate with the solar panel installation company to find solutions to the problems raised by the Appellant and Other Conductions and Larlfied that the Appellant couldn't opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing roles at that time. Appellant and the Appellant and the Appellant and the prevailing roles at that time are recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellants association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant regarding the provision of a Respondent. The Appellant, May Leves Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant, May Leves Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant work is a wickston of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Appellant, May Leves Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a wickston of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Appellant, May Leves Welfare Association field a complaint against the Respondent before Consumers of the Respondent December of the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section No.41(10) stating The	1	1		14	1		
Electricity Ombudarnan also directed the Respondent to coordinate with the solar panel installation company to find solutions to the problems raised by the Appellant and other farmers.  The Ombudannan clarified that the Appellant and other farmers. The Ombudannan clarified that the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the provision of a respondent would then decide on the request based on the provision of a respondent would then decide on the request based on the provision of a respondent would then decide on the request based on the provision of a respondent with the provision of a respondent of the provision of a respondent of the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The matrix is and to flowing Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant helieves this is a recognized association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant helieves the Respondent is not complying the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Recursive Supplement and the force Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 1,43 (2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1	1				according to the terms of the	
Electricity Ombudarnan also directed the Respondent to coordinate with the solar panel installation company to find solutions to the problems raised by the Appellant and other farmers.  The Ombudannan clarified that the Appellant and other farmers. The Ombudannan clarified that the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the provision of a respondent would then decide on the request based on the provision of a respondent would then decide on the request based on the provision of a respondent would then decide on the request based on the provision of a respondent with the provision of a respondent of the provision of a respondent of the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The matrix is and to flowing Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant helieves this is a recognized association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant helieves the Respondent is not complying the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Recursive Supplement and the force Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 1,43 (2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The		l .			1	tripartite agreement. The	
directed the Respondent to coordinate with the solar panel installation company to find solutions to the problems raised by the Appellant and other farmers.  The Ombudsman clarified that the Appellant couldn't opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant couldn't opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant couldn't opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant process. However, the Appellant process. However, the Appellant process have been deed on the request based on the providing rules at that time.  27 51/2023 Users Welfare Association  Almedabad  TPL, Association Related Dispute  Sub Station Related Dispute  Welfare Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant Regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station promises and bayounent of rem from the Appellant, Boy Sub Station Provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station from the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with states that the Appellant should provide space for the Supply Code, which allows the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association field a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015, As per Section 4.36 of Guisard Provision of a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015, As per Section 4.36 of Guisard Provision of the Supply Code, 2015, As per Section 4.36 of Guisard Provision of Section 4.36 of Guisard Provision of the Supply Related to the Supply Relate	2.5				1		
coordinate with the solar panel installation company to find solutions to the problems raised by the Appellant and other farmers.  The Ombudsman clarified that the Appellant couldn't opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent two remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request set that time.  Sub Station  Abmedabad  Sub Station on the request set that time.  The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant regarding the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The maint issue is that the Codes 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association field and complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association field a complaint asgainst the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Believes the Respondent before Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Believes the Respondent to the Supply Code, 2015, As per Section 4.36 of Guigarat Electricity Commission's care the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.41(0) stating The	1				1		
coordinate with the solar panel installation company to find solutions to the problems raised by the Appellant and other farmers.  The Ombudsman clarified that the Appellant couldn't opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent two remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request set that time.  Sub Station  Abmedabad  Sub Station on the request set that time.  The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant regarding the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The maint issue is that the Codes 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association field and complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association field a complaint asgainst the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Believes the Respondent before Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Believes the Respondent to the Supply Code, 2015, As per Section 4.36 of Guigarat Electricity Commission's care the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.41(0) stating The					1	directed the Respondent to	
installation company to find solutions to the problems raised by the Appellant and other farmers.  The Ombudsman clarified that the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the country of the Street that the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the country of the trought that decide on the request based on the request based on the request based on the request based on the revealing rules at that time.  Belated Dispute  The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant is association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant Against the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent is following clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation fee of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.3 6 of Gujarat Pode Code Consumers (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating the Code Consumers (Rights of Cons	1				1		
solutions to the problems raised by the Appellant and other farmers. The Ombudsman clarified that the Appellant could not opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the problems of the p	1			1			
raised by the Appellant and other farmers.  The Ombudsman clarified that the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  TPL, Sub Station Related Dispute whether the Respondent is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent is int following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant Mys. Users Welfare Association delives the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant Mys. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent of Clause and as per the Respondent of Clause Respondent Defore Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Sect	1					installation company to find	
raised by the Appellant and other farmers.  The Ombudsman clarified that the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  TPL, Sub Station Related Dispute whether the Respondent is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent is int following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant Mys. Users Welfare Association delives the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant Mys. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent of Clause and as per the Respondent of Clause Respondent Defore Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Sect	1					solutions to the problems	
other farmers. The Ombudsman clarified that the Appellant could not opt-out of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  27 51/2023 Users Welfare Abmedabad Related Dispute  But Abmedabad Related Dispute Substation Related Dispute Substation Abmedabad Dispute Substation Abmedabad Dispute Substation Related Dispute Substation Provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the Respondent is substation complained after their letters to the Respondent is substation complained after their letters to the Respondent is substation from the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant MyS. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant plus users the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant plus users welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant plus users welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent from for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22), and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The							
The Ombudsman clarified that the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent is in following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant solar panels are the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant panels are the Respondent in the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Guijarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Guijarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Acq. 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The							
The Ombudsman clarified that the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent is in following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant solar panels are the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant panels are the Respondent in the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Guijarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Guijarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Acq. 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The						other farmers.	
the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to receive a complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the provailing rules at that time.  27 S1/2023 Users Welfare Ahmedabad Substation Related Dispute The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant association receives a complaint regarding the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of clause, but with a substation free of clause, but with a substation free of clause. The Appellant should provide space for the Substation free of clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, volicial against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, volicial paginate Electricity (Nights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.44(10) stating The							
of the Sky Scheme through this complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  27 51/2023 Users Welfare Abmedabad Selected Dispute Substation Related Dispute Welfare Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent sint following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant policies is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1				51 5		
complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association  Related Dispute  Sub Station  Related Dispute  The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant as association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant helieves the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.44(10) stating The	1		l'			the Appellant couldn't opt-out	
complaint process. However, the Appellant could apply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association  Related Dispute  Sub Station  Related Dispute  The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant as association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant helieves the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.44(10) stating The							
the Appellant could spply separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  Sub Station Related Dispute Welfare Association a Related Dispute Welfare Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent sint following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Quijarat Electricity Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1						
separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  27 51/2023 Users Welfare Association Related Dispute  Respondent is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent is sufficient in the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a wielation of Clause and as per the Clause Role of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Porum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity (Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Kat, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Kights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The							
separately to the Respondent to remove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  27 51/2023 Users Welfare Association Related Dispute  Respondent is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent is sufficient in the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a wielation of Clause and as per the Clause Role of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Porum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity (Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Kat, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Kights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1					the Appellant could apply	
reinove the solar panels. The Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  Sub Station Related Dispute Respondent solar Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent issue is that the Respondent issue is that the Respondent issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity (Regulatory Commission's Stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Regulatory Commission's Stating The Electricity (Regulatory Commission's Stating The Electricity (Regulatory Commission's Stating The Electricity (Regulatory Stating The Commission's Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Regulatory Commission's Stating The Commission's Calcus No.4(10) stating The Commission's Calcu							
Respondent would then decide on the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Ahmedabad Related Dispute  Respondent is association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant gainst the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-tation premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unnenswered. The main issue is that the Respondent should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Constumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Regulatory Commission's and Electricity Regulatory Commission's and Electricity Regulatory Commission's and Electricity Regulatory Commission's Satting the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Regulatory Commission's Satting The Substation on their premises.							
On the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  Sub Station Related Dispute Respondent is not complained after their letters to the Respondent is not complained association of Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint release this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, 2015 to Respondent is not complying. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent is shat the Respondent is shat the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulators stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1					remove the solar panels. The	
On the request based on the prevailing rules at that time.  Sub Station Related Dispute Respondent is not complained after their letters to the Respondent is not complained association of Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint release this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, 2015 to Respondent is not complying. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent is shat the Respondent is shat the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulators stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1					Respondent would then decide	
27 51/2023 Users Welfare Association  Ahmedabad Ahpellant, M/s. Users Welfare Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Association Association Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Association Association Association Anpellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Association Association Association Arpellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Association Association Anpellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Association Arpellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Arpellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Association Arpellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Association Arpellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Association Association Association Arpellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Association Association Arpellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association Association Association Association Association Association Association Associat					ľ		-
Sub Station			5				
Sub Station				,		prevailing rules at that time.	
Abmedabad Dispute  Related Dispute  Welfare Association is a recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant Mys. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Toply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Toply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.41(0) stating The	07	E1 /0000	Ilaana Walfar-	TDI	Cub Ctation		
Dispute recognised association, which works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent is that the Respondent is the total responsibility of the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 6.41 of Supply Supply Supply Supply Supply Supply Supply S	2/	31/2023					l l
works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Guijant Electricity Regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1		Association	Ahmedabad	Related	Welfare Association is a	
works for consumer's interests. The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Guijant Electricity Regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1-6					recognised association which	
The Appellant's association receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 H				Dispute		
receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that he Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1						
receives a complaint regarding the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that he Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The						The Appellant's association	1
the provision of a registered lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, My. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10), stating The	1 3						
lease deed of sub-station premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	11 11						
premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	4 1					the provision of a registered	
premises and payment of rent from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, Mys. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1					lease deed of sub-station	
from the Appellant against the provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association file a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1						
provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The							
provision of Supply Code, 2015 by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1					from the Appellant against the	
by the Respondent. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1						- 1
Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1						- 1
Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1					by the Respondent. The	
Association complained after their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The						Appellant M/s. Users Welfare	
their letters to the Respondent went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1						
went unanswered. The main issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1						
issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The						their letters to the Respondent	
issue is that the Respondent isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1					went unanswered The main	
isn't following Clause 5.13, which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1						
which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity As per Bectricity As (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1					issue is that the Respondent	
which states that the Appellant should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity As per Bectricity As (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1					isn't following Clause 5.13,	1
should provide space for the substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1		l l				1
substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1						
substation free of charge, but with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	- 1				should provide space for the	
with mutual agreement on location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The							1
location and size. The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	- 1					
Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	- 1					
Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	- 1				location and size. The	
Association believes the Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	- 1					
Respondent is not complying. The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	ı					
The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises.  As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1						
The Appellant believes this is a violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises.  As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1	- 1					
violation of Clause and as per the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises.  As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity, Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	1			1		
the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	- 1	1	1			
the Clause No.9.11 of the Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1	I	1			violation of Clause and as per	
Supply Code, which allows them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1			1	I		
them to file a complaint, The Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises.  As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1			1	I		
Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1		1	1	I		
Appellant, M/s. Users Welfare Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1			1	l	them to file a complaint, The	
Association filed a complaint against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises.  As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	ŀ		1			
against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	l	-	1			
against the Respondent before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1			I			
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1		1	I.			
Forum for not following the Electricity Supply Code, 2015.  As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises.  As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	1.1	1			Consumar Cristones Dadres-1	
Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The			1	1			
Electricity Supply Code, 2015. As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1		l l	I		Forum for not following the	
As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1		1				
Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1			1			
Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1		1	I		As per Section 4.36 of Gujarat	
Commission's regulations stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises.  As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1		1	I			
stating the Appellant must provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1						
provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The				I		Commission's regulations	
provide space for the substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The		- 1	I			stating the Appellant must	
substation on their premises. As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	3 (		I			
As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	j 1				I	I	
As per the Electricity Act, 2003, Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	] [						
Clause No.43(1), 43(2), 2(22) and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1						
and Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The	j 1	1					
Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The							
Consumers) Rules, 2020, Section No.4(10) stating The			9			and Electricity (Rights of	
Section No.4(10) stating The	1 1	1			ű.		
	j 1		I				
	] [		I			Section No.4(10) stating The	
Respondent must supply							
	r N					respondent must supply	

to requesting electricity property owners or occupiers within a timeframe (or upon infrastructure upgrades) and provide necessary electrical equipment. Consumers with a separate connection cannot demand extra supply without agreeing to a set price. The definition of "electrical plant" is also covered, excluding lines, consumerand meters, controlled equipment. Finally, the summary mentions that required agreements become part of the application form, streamlining the process. The Appellant raised previous case of the Appellant, M/s. Vega Infra filed a complaint against The Respondent for not an electricity providing connection. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum previously ruled in favour of the Appellant i.e. Complaint No. 7/2021. The ruling stated that the location of the substation should be decided by mutual agreement and registering a lease deed was not mandatory. M/s. Vega Infra had already provided written consent for the substation location. In present Case, The Appellant demands immediate closure of the requirement for a registered lease deed for the substation and asked for order of not following Clause 5.13. The Respondent claims customers often retract their initial consent for substation hence the placement, requirement for a registered lease deed. Since the Appellant hasn't provided the lease deed. The issue remains unresolved. As the Respondent insists on a lease deed to avoid future disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman is reviewing a case involving an electricity dispute between the Appellant and the Respondent regarding a sub-station on the property. Appellant's Electricity Ombudsman will be focusing on the main issues raised as under: • The Respondent need to advise the Appellant on who the appropriate party should be. The Respondent forced to implement any such

provision without the permission of the Hon'ble

Regulatory Commission.

Gujarat

Electricity

					• The Respondent is	2.0
					concerned about past	
	36				cases where builders or	
					societies revoke	
		13			permission for	
	1				permission for	
					substations after initial	
					approval.	
					• The Appellant argues	
					that a registered lease is	
				1	not mandatory as per the	
					Electricity Supply Code.	
					The Appellant proposes a	
					notarized undertaking	
					instead of a registered	
	1					
				I	lease.	
		'	1		The Appellant contests	- 2
			1		the 99-year lease term	
	1				and the annual lease fee	
	1				of Rs. 100/	
	1				• the Appellant believes	
					CGRF's order in their	
					case doesn't address	
1					whether the M/s. Vega	
	1				Infra decision was	
	1				followed.	
	1					
1					The Appellant argues     that the power company	
1	1	2			that the power company.	
	1	7			needs approval from the	
					Hon'ble Gujarat	
	1				Electricity Regulatory	
		l l			Commission for	
					demanding a registered	
				1	lease.	
	1		1.		The Appellant raised new	i
			1	1	points in the appeal that	
					require a decision by	
					Consumer Grievance	
1					Redressal Forum (CGRF)	
				1	before the Electricity	
				1	Ombudsman can decide.	
				1	The Electricity Ombudsman	
			1		concludes that Consumer	
			I		Grievance Redressal Forum	
					(CGRF) has not addressed	
5					these issues adequately and	
1					directs them to rehear the	
1					complaint of the Appellant and	
					considering all points raised	
					during this case and issue a	
	1		2:		clear decision on each point.	
						1
					Further, decide on the new	
			1		points raised during this case	
					before this case escalate to the	
1					Electricity Ombudsman.	
					Hence, the case is remanded	
				ľ	back to Consumer Grievance	
				· · ·	Redressal Forum (CGRF) to	
					decide.	
28	52/2023	M/s. Puja	TPL,	Refund of	The Appellant with a long	
20	02/2020	Corporation,	Ahmedabad	amount	history of on-time payments for	
			/ minicuabau	1 - 11	electricity connection	
		Proprietor		paid	no.2134463 received a notice	
					from the Respondent	
					demanding an additional	
					security deposit of Rs.13,400/-	
					. The Appellant contested this	
					demand, arguing that they had	
					already paid a deposit and their	
					bill payments were consistent.	
1					pagamente noto contolocolte.	

F	Te Te	×			The dispute centered on tw	0
		* ·		1		
1	1	. 1		1	key provisions of the Securit	
- 1		7:	*		Deposit Regulation-2005	5:
			1		Clause-4.1 requires a securit	y
s 1	18	h.	1		deposit equivalent to thre	
	1	125			months' average electricit	
	1	i				
		l)			consumption for bi-monthly	У
		10			billing customers. The	e
		11		0	Respondent claimed the	e l
			1		additional deposit was	
- 1					1	1
		(1)		1	1 3	
	N	A .		1	requirement based on the	2
¥.,		1			consumer's past year's	3
		1			consumption. Clause-4.11, or	1
					the other hand, mandates	
		1			alesticity appliant to pay	,
		1	1	N .	electricity suppliers to pay	<u> </u>
					interest on the security deposi-	
	1	1			at the bank rate set by the	
		1		1	Reserve Bank of India. The	:
1	1			1	Respondent assured the	
	1	1	1		1100P	L .
		1		1		
	1	1	1		interest on their initial deposit	
	1	1	1	1	i.e. Rs. 3,000 as per this	
	1	1			regulation.	I .
	1	1	1		The Appellant appealed to the	: 1
	1				Consumer Grievance Redressal	
	1				Forum after their initial	
	1	s ::				
1	1				complaint to the Respondent	
		A Company of the Comp			was rejected. Consumer	
		1			Grievance Redressal Forum's	1
					decision sided with the	
					Respondent, upholding the	
		N.				1
		4				
					security deposit and interest	
	4			1	payment on the initial deposit.	
			II .	Y .	The consumer appealed to the	
	1				Electricity Ombudsman,	
	1	1			Ahmedabad seeking a refund of	
		1				1
		1		1	the additional deposit.	1 1
		1	1		The Electricity Ombudsman,	1 1
1		1			Ahmedabad concluded that the	1 1
		1			additional security deposit	
		1			demand and the interest	
1					payment on the initial deposit	
	1	1				1 1
					were both justified. Clause-4.1	
	1				required the additional deposit	
1	1			1	as the Appellant's previous	
1	1			1	deposit didn't meet the three-	1
1		L			month average consumption	1
					requirement, and Clause-4.11	
		N.			ensured the Respondent	1
		I				1
		I .			followed regulations by paying	1
		I .			interest on the initial deposit of	
		Fi .			the Appellant.	
					Therefore, the Electricity	1
			-		Ombudsman, Ahmedabad	
1	li i				found no fault with the	
					Consumer Grievance Redressal	
		1				
	1.	1			Forum's decision, and the	
					additional security deposit	
		l			requirement remained.	
29	54/2023	M/s. Plastene India	UGVCL,	Billing	The Appellant, M/s. Plasten	Status of
-	0.72020	Ltd.	Sabarmati,	Related	India Limited, a company with	order of
		Lia.		Nelateu		Ombuds
1			Ahmedabad		two high tension (HT)	
					connections i.e. (1) M/s.	man is
					Plasten India Limited,	asked
					Contracted Load 1370kVA,	from the
					Customer No.19701 and (2)	Responde
					M/s. HCP Plasten Bulkpack	nt.
1					I WIZE TIME TRANSMIT DUINDAUN	
1						
					Ltd., has a contracted load of	

100kVA, Customer no.20110 from the Respondent. The Appellant believes there are errors in their bills.

The Appellant has two main complaints regarding their bill

calculations i.e. power factor rebate/penalty and electricity duty. They argue that the Respondent did not calculate the power factor rebate/penalty and the 15% electricity duty according to the relevant regulations. The Appellant believes the rebate/penalty should be based on the energy charge before night rebate, not after, as mandated by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC) tariff order. As stated by the Respondent before March-Factor 2019, Power Rebate/Penalty was calculated on the amount after deducting Night Rebate Charge from Energy Charge and GUVNL is instructed to make necessary changes in HT Billing System vide letter dated 29.05.2018. The Appellant argues that a 15% electricity duty is applied to their entire bill, including charges not mentioned in the Gujarat Electricity Duty Act. The Respondent claims they rectified the error from March-2019 onwards. The Appellant also disputes the way the Respondent handled adjustment in their April 2016 bill due to a tariff change. The Respondent acknowledges

an error in calculating the Appellant's April 2016 bill due to a tariff change. They claim to have rectified the error by crediting the difference amount in the May 2016 bill as per rules. company Respondent further clarifies their billing process. Meter readings are taken on the 15th of every month, and the fixed charge is calculated for the entire month. Since the new tariff was implemented after the April 2016 meter reading, any necessary adjustments were reflected in the May 2016 bill, following the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's The Respondent order. maintains that the April 2016 billing error adjustment was made correctly in the May 2016 bill according to the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's guidelines.

The Electricity Ombudsman mostly sided with the company, though they suggested the consider Respondent Electricity judgments from Ombudsman offices, and Rajkot Ahmedabad regarding future power factor disputes. The Electricity Ombudsman also advised the Appellant to address electricity duty calculation issues with the Collector of Electricity Duty. The Electricity Ombudsman Ordered to offset the amount in the next electricity bill after checking the calculation of Power Factor Rebate/Penalty done by the Respondent in the Electricity bills prior to March-2019 and after verifying calculation as per the tariff order approved by Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission from time to time. The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, after considering the arguments and relevant provisions under Schedule-I, Part-I(3) of The Gujarat Electricity Duty Act, 1958, determined that the matter falls under the purview of the Collector of Electricity Duty, Gandhinagar. Therefore, The Electricity Ahmedabad Ombudsman, Appellant to advised the approach the concerned office and officer with their complaint regarding the electricity duty miscalculation. The Electricity Ombudsman emphasizes the importance of following legal precedents set by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and Rajkot for power factor penalty/rebate This ensures disputes. consistent and fair decisions in future similar cases and also highlights the responsibility of consultants representing the Appellant. Such consultants should be familiar with the legal framework and direct disputes to the appropriate be it Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum or the Electricity Ombudsman. This approach upholds the legal system and avoids processes. unnecessary Ultimately, the goal is to guide customers efficiently. By following these recommendations, consultants avoid wasting the time, Appellant/customer's money, and resources, as well

		* :			as prevent unnecessary strain on government entities.	(€
)	1/2024	Shri Dinesh	TPL,	Name	The Appellant, Shri Dinesh	
	_,	Ramjibhai Patel	Ahmedabad	Change	Ramjibhai Patel lives at a	a .
		111111111111111111111111111111111111111	12111044544	0	residence since 1985 with	
		-			electricity connection customer	
					1101	
	1.				Respondent-1, Torrent Power	
					Limited registered in the name	
					of the Respondent-2, Shri	
		1			Rajnikant Ramjibhai Patel. The	
		1		1))	Appellant, Shri Dinesh	
		1			Ramjibhai Patel pays the bills	
		1				
				(5)	and wants the name changed to	
	l'		1		his own or a new connection.	
					The Respondent-1, Torrent	
	H		1		Power Limited says the name	
			1		change requires a "No	
	1				1	
	1					
				50	from the current owner the	
			1		Respondent-2, Shri Rajnikant	
					Ramjibhai Patel. The Appellant,	
					Shri Dinesh Ramjibhai Patel	
	10				offered to pay a new deposit but	
		*			was denied. The Appellant	
					claims co-ownership of the	
					property through a written	
			1		agreement and argues the NOC	
					shouldn't be required.	
					The Respondent-1, Torrent	
					Power Limited cites regulations	
	l h				requiring NOC for name	
					changes unless the applicant	
	i ii				gets a new connection with a	
			1 1		fresh deposit. However, the	
			1		Respondent-2, Shri Rajnikant	
					Ramjibhai Patel submitted a	
			1 1		written objection to the name	
			1		change.	
					The Respondent-2, Shri	
					Rajnikant Ramjibhai Patel	
			1		claims he is the sole owner of	
					the property purchased in 1985	
- 1						
- 1				10	and considers The Appellant,	
					Shri Dinesh Ramjibhai Patel an	
			1		illegal occupant. He doesn't	
					want additional connections or	
					transfer the existing one. He	
					submitted documents as proof	
- 1					of ownership.	
					The Electricity Ombudsman,	
- 1	ļ .					
- 1	1				Ahmedabad concludes a	
- 1					dispute exists between The	
- 1					Appellant, Shri Dinesh	
	1				Ramjibhai Patel, and the	
	1				Respondent-2, Shri Rajnikant	
	1					
	I				Ramjibhai Patel regarding	
					ownership. This is a civil matter	
	1		1		outside their jurisdiction.	
	I				The Appellant, Shri Dinesh	
			1		Ramjibhai Patel, and the	
	- 1				Respondent-2, Shri Rajnikant	
					Ramjibhai Patel, both parties	
	- 1				are brothers with a conflict over	
					ownership. Since the	T.
					Respondent-2, Shri Rajnikant	
			1			
					Ramjibhai Patel objects,	
			I I		processing the name change is	
					not possible.	

					The Electricity Ombudsman	
- 1		1			Ahmedabad advises both	.
					brothers to settle the ownership	.
		1			dispute through mutual	
					agreement or legal means.	
	ŀ					
		1			Once resolved, The Appellant,	
		1			Shri Dinesh Ramjibhai Patel	
		1			can reapply for the name	
		1		1	change, and the Respondent-1,	
1	1	1		1	Torrent Power Limited must	
						1
1	W.				follow regulations for	
					processing the application.	
31	3/2024	M/s. Vinod Realties	UGVCL,	Represen-	The Appellant filed a complaint	
1 51	3/2021	Private Limited	Sabarmati,	tation	against M/s. SFC Global	
		Filvate Limited	Ahmedabad	Admission	Commodity Pvt. Ltd. for having	
1		17	Anmedabad		Commodity I vt. Btd. for maring	
	1	1	1	stage	an illegal electricity connection	
1			1	Hearing	as connection No.	T I
1		11			23001/13249/3. Despite a	
1					disconnection order, the	
		1			connection remains active. The	
1		T.			Appellant argues the	
1	I				11ppoince1t	1
	1			1	connection is illegal based on	
1		N			section 135(1)(E) and 135(1A) of	
		1	I.		the Electricity Act, 2003.	
					The Respondent states that the	
		1			connection belongs to M/s.	
		I			SFC Global Commodity Pvt.	]
					Ltd., a paying customer, and	
					the dispute is a property issue.	
					They also point out that	
1	1				Consumer Grievance Redressal	
					Forum has already dismissed	
1	1		ľ		the seed due to a pending court	
1		1			the case due to a pending court	
1					case i.e. RCS No.53/2018 filed	
				1	by the Appellant is pending in	
		1			the Hon'ble Taluka Court,	
					Kalol, SSRD HKP/GDHAN/49/	
		1		1	2022 and 50/2022 is also	
		1		1		
		l I			pending before other	1
					authorities.	
					According to the regulations,	1
		1			the Appellant cannot file a	l f
					complaint because a court case	
		ľ l			is already underway concerning	
		i I			the same issue. The regulations	
					also specify limitations for filing	
					complaints and	
					representations.	
					Therefore, due to the ongoing	
					court case, the Appellant's	
				ľ	complaint is dismissed without	
					any decision at this level by the	
					Electricity Ombudsman,	
	l l				Ahmedabad. They are free to	
	l l		l II		file a fresh complaint after the	
	/				court case concludes. Following	
		l l'				
		1			the proper regulations, the	1
					Appellant could file the	
		I			representation before the	
		1			appropriate authority.	
20	4.10004	M/= D=:-1	MCVCI	Estimate	The Appellant, M/s. Rajul	Status of
32	4/2024	M/s. Rajul	MGVCL,			order of
		Industries	Godhara	Related	Industries is a customer of the	
					Respondent having a	Ombuds
					contracted load is 90KW under	man is
		1			LTMD Tariff with Consumer	asked
					No.17101/52571/7. The	from the
	1					
	I.				Appellant has challenged the	Responde
	1				Suo-Moto estimate issued by	nt.
	-	1			the Respondent to regularize	
- 1	- 1				the contracted demand.	
					Caro Octata Golda Goldana	

		T		-		
	1	)			The Respondent argued they	W.
1000	F	1	1		had previously notified The	
		1	1		Appellant, M/s. Rajul	
1		1			Industries about exceeding	
		l .				
1	· · ·				their contracted usage and	
	1	1			offered them opportunities to	1
					adjust their consumption or	1
	, ×				upgrade their connection.	1
	116	1			Evidence showed usage	
		1			exceeding the contracted limit	
		1			in both 2022-23 and 2023-24.	
		1				
		ł.			Acknowledging similar past	
	1	1			decisions by the Electricity	
	1	1			Ombudsman allowing	
		1			consumers to maintain their	1
		1	1.		connection level with additional	
		1			1	
				10	charges, the final decision	
1		1			suggests a compromise. The	
					Appellant, M/s. Rajul	
11					Industries can stay on the LT	
				2	connection level if the Appellant	] [
	1		1		restrict their demand and also	
1 .	4				undertake that they will not use	
1 '	VI.		1		the excess demand beyond	
1		"/A			1	
1	1				their contract demand.	
	1				the Appellant must apply to	
	1	I .	1		extend their LT connection to	
1		I.	1		the maximum permissible	1 1
		2				1
1		ľ	1		limit. This application to the	
	1		l .		Respondent to increase their	1
					allowed power usage under the	1 1
1			1		LT voltage level, ensuring that	t I
		1				
1		l'			they are authorized to use the	
1		V.		1	maximum limit allowed within	
1		1			the LT category and they must	
1		1	1	T .	pay the minimum charges	
1		l				1
1		1		Į.	proposed by the Respondent for	
1					the past two years of exceeding	l I
					their contracted demand. This	
1					charge, likely calculated based	
1					on the difference between their	
1						
					contracted demand and actual	
					Demand, acknowledges the	
					past violation and serves as a	
1					penalty to stop future	
	J		1	2		
		l			overconsumption. The	
		l			Respondent shall monitor the	l I
					maximum demand utilized by	
					the Appellant regularly and in	
					case of violation, they may take	
					action as per regulation 4.95 of	
					the GERC's Electricity Supply	
					code and related matters	
1					Regulation-2015.	
33	6/2024	M/s. Inara Polyfab	DGVCL,	Review	The Appellant, aggrieved with	Review
100	0/2024					
1		Pvt. Ltd.	Surat	Case	an order issued by the	appeal
				No.15/	Electricity Ombudsman,	filed by
				2023	Ahmedabad on 25.09.2023 in	the
				(Admission	Case No. 15/2023, filed a review	Appellant
					1ition 00 00 0004	
				Stage	application on 03.02.2024.	against
				Hearing)	This review application,	the order
					registered as Case No. 6/2024	passed by
					(Review of Case No. 15/2023)	the
			1		(Admission Stage), resulted in	Ombuds
					hearings on 29.02.2024.	man
					Interestingly, the Appellant's	which is
			l l		review primarily reiterates their	rejected.
	) I					- Ojootou.
		-			original arguments and doesn't	1
		1			raise any new issues with the	
1 1					electricity supply.	

			**	Section No. 3.47 of the Gujarat
			1,8	Electricity Regulatory
	~			Commission (Consumer
	B			Grievance Redressal Forum
				and Ombudsman) Regulations,
				2019 allow for order reviews
1 1				within 30 days for reasons like
1 1				new evidence, errors in the
	1	1		record, or other sufficient
1 1				reasons. However, the
				Appellant's application is
				significantly delayed i.e. 131
				days and lacks any explanation
				for the delay. Additionally, the
				review doesn't present new
				evidence, identify clear errors in
				the original order, or establish
				legal grounds for revision.
				Therefore, due to the delay and
				lack of a compelling reason for
				review, the Electricity
				Ombudsman, Ahmedabad
				dismiss the Appellant's
				application.

Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad

## OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, AHMEDABAD

Status of representations disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad during the Second half-year (i.e. October.2023 to March.2024) of the year 2023-24.

	1	Representations			Representations disposed of				Represe-	Disposed	Disposed	
		Pending	Received	Total	In favour	In	Others	Total	ntations	of within	of after	seatings.
Sr.	CGRF	as on	during		of	favour of			pending at	45 days.	45 days.	
No.		01.10.'23	Oct.'23 to		Appellant	Licensee			the end of			
			March, '24						31.03.2024			
1	MGVCL- Vadodara	5	5	10	4	4	0	8	2	0	8	4
2	MGVCL- Godhara	0	3	3	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	1
3	DGVCL- Surat	3	5	8	2	2	2	6	2	1	5	8
4	DGVCL- Valsad	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
5	UGVCL- Sabarmati	1	3	4	1	2	1	4	0	1	3	3
6	UGVCL- Mahesana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	TPL- Ahmedabad	2	9	11	0	6	4	10	1	2	8	13
8	TPL- Surat	2	2	4	1	0	2	3	1	1	2	4
9	TPL- Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	13	28	41	10	14	9	33	8	6	27	34

Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad

## OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, AHMEDABAD Status of representations disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad during the Yearly (i.e. April.2023 to March.2024) of the year 2023-24.

the state of the s											
				Representations disposed of				Represe-	Disposed	Disposed	No. of
	Pending	Received	Total	In favour	In	Others	Total	ntations	of within	of after	seatings.
CGRF	as on	during		of	favour of			pending at	45 days.	45 days.	
	01.04.'23	April.'23 to		Appellant	Licensee			the end of			
		March.'24						31.03.2024			
MGVCL- Vadodara	3	10	13	5	6	0	11	2	0	11	11
MGVCL- Godhara	2	4	6	2	1	1	4	2	1	3	5
DGVCL- Surat	4	10	14	3	4	5	12	2	1	11	16
DGVCL- Valsad	2	1	3	1	1	1	3	0	0	3	7
UGVCL- Sabarmati	4	6	10	3	4	3	10	0	2	8	11
UGVCL- Mahesana	2	1	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	3	3
TPL- Ahmedabad	2	11	13	2	6	4	12	1	2	10	15
TPL- Surat	1	6	7	2	0	4	6	1	2	4	7
TPL- Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	20	49	69	18	25	18	61	8	8	53	75
	MGVCL- Godhara DGVCL- Surat DGVCL- Valsad UGVCL- Sabarmati UGVCL- Mahesana TPL- Ahmedabad TPL- Surat TPL- Dahej	CGRF  CGRF  Pending as on 01.04.'23  MGVCL- Vadodara  MGVCL- Godhara  DGVCL- Surat  DGVCL- Valsad  UGVCL- Sabarmati  UGVCL- Mahesana  TPL- Ahmedabad  TPL- Surat  1  TPL- Dahej  O	CGRF  CGRF  Pending as on of during of the properties of the prope	Representations           CGRF         Pending as on 01.04.'23         Received during April.'23 to March.'24         Total           MGVCL- Vadodara         3         10         13           MGVCL- Godhara         2         4         6           DGVCL- Surat         4         10         14           DGVCL- Valsad         2         1         3           UGVCL- Sabarmati         4         6         10           UGVCL- Mahesana         2         1         3           TPL- Ahmedabad         2         11         13           TPL- Surat         1         6         7           TPL- Dahej         0         0         0	Representations         Representations           CGRF         Pending as on 01.04.'23         Received during April.'23 to March.'24         Total Appellant Notes of App	Representations   Representations   Pending as on 01.04.'23   April.'23 to March.'24   MGVCL- Vadodara   3   10   13   5   6   MGVCL- Godhara   2   4   6   2   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1	Representations   Representations   Representations   Representations   Received during as on 01.04.'23   April.'23 to March.'24   Appellant   Licensee   Appellant   Licensee   Representations disposed   Appellant   Licensee   Representations   Representations	Representations	Representations   Representations disposed of   Pending as on   O1.04.'23   April.'23 to   MGVCL- Vadodara   O3   O4   O5   O5   O5   O5   O5   O5   O5	Representations   Representa	Representations   Representa

Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad