



GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

Block no.-1, 3rd Floor, Jilla Seva Sadan-3

Govt. Press Road, Rajkot-360001

Ph.No.-0281-2994125 e-mail: eleombrijt@gercin.org / sorjtomn@gercin.org

ગુજરાત વિદ્યુત નિયંત્રક આયોગ
વિદ્યુત લોકપાલની કચેરી,
બ્લોક નં-૧, ત્રીજો માળ, જિલ્લા સેવા સદન-૩,
સરકારી પ્રેસ રોડ, રાજકોટ-૩૬૦૦૦૧.

Ombudsman-Rajkot/03
Date: 01.04.2024

To,
The Secretary,
Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission,
6th floor, Gift One,
Road 5-C, Zone 5, Gift City,
Gandhinagar-382355.

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

.....

Sir,

With reference to above subject, please find enclosed herewith Second
Half-Yearly report (Oct.-2023 to March-2024) of the F.Y. 2023-2024, on
all the representations filed before the Electricity Ombudsman, as per
provision of Chapter 3.51 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission
(Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman)
Regulations, 2019 (Notification No. 2 of 2019), for your kind information
please.

Thanking you.

Yours faithfully

(S.H. Upadhyay)

Electricity Ombudsman
Rajkot

Tech II

Encl: as above.

	G.E.R.C.
Inward No.:	No - 1736
Date:	5 APR 2024

REPORT FOR THE
FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 2023-24
(April- 2023 TO September- 2023)

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

The Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission has established office of the Electricity Ombudsman, 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 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 under Section 42(6) of The Electricity Act, 2003. However, aggrieved by the order of the Electricity Ombudsman, dis-satisfied 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 against CGRF Decisions during the FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 2023-24, is enclosed as Annexure-I**

(3) **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 approaches 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.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN 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 Concern	Subject	Comments of Ombudsman	Response of Licensee
1	03/2023	Sh. Chintan Kiranbhai Gandhi	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the respondent having a residential connection. The appellant received the supplementary bill from the respondent. It is not clarified by the respondent that the supplementary bill is of which time period. As the due amount is older than 2 years. The Appellant has represented that as per section 56 (2) of The Electricity Act 2003, the specified amount of the supplementary bill is not recoverable. The Respondent has represented that, as the appellant has installed Rooftop solar plant, electricity meter of the said connection was replaced with Bi-Directional meter. Respondent has charged 0 Unit consumption bill for the month of Feb-Mar-2020 and Apr-May-2020 due to Corona restrictions. Later, during audit inspection, it was noticed about error in billing for Feb-Mar-2020 and Apr-May-2020, as meter was declared defective, it was required to recover average consumption for the said period instead of 0 units. Therefore, $280+280=560$ units amounting to Rs. 3326.05 was debited to consumer account. Further, the Respondent represented that as per section 56(2) of The Electricity Act-2003, the Supplementary bill is recoverable as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal no. 1672/2020.</p> <p>It was noted that, in the present case, the period of limitation would commence from the date of discovery of the mistake by audit i.e. 17.11.2022, therefore as per the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Respondent may take recourse to any remedy available in law for recovery of supplementary bill but barred from taking recourse to disconnection of supply of electricity. Accordingly, it was decided that the due amount of the supplementary bill can be recovered from the Appellant.</p>	

					Therefore, the representation of the Appellant was not accepted.	
2	04/2023	Sh. Mungra Jaivinbhai Vitthalbhai	PGVCL, Rajkot	Transfer of Connection	<p>The Appellant is a residential consumer of the respondent. Appellant applied for the change of name process for his existing connection having in the name of Dilip Vallabh Maraviya. The Appellant had applied for transfer of connection from Dilip Vallabh Marviya to Mungra Jaivinbhai Vitthalbhai. But, the Appellant has rejected the application stating that, NOC from appellant was not submitted. The Respondent has represented that the Appellant didn't submit appropriate NOC of the existing consumer along with the application also name of existing consumer is not any where is sale deed submitted by the Appellant.</p> <p>It was noted that, in case of transfer of connection, it is required to follow the regulation 4.69 onwards of the Supply Code, more particularly 4.71 in respect of submission of NoC in case of transfer of connection through sale deed.</p> <p>Therefore, in case of non-submission of NoC, the licensee may recover fresh security deposit from the Applicant, accordingly, the Respondent was directed to process the application of the Appellant observing provisions of the Supply code-2015 regulation no. 4.71.</p>	The Respondent has implemented as per their letter dated 25/07/2023
3	05/2023	M/s. Antila Ceramic Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a HT consumer of the Respondent. The Appellant has received a bill of 1,70,462 units for September 2022, which included assessed 1,53,194 unit average consumption due to display off of Meter of the said connection during the partial billing period of Sept.-2022 i.e. from 01.09.2022 to 15.09.2022. The Appellant further represented that during the specified period production activity was closed in support of strike declared by Ceramic Manufacturers Association. Therefore, consumption was very less in comparison to regular average consumption.</p> <p>The Appellant represented two alternative methodologies to calculate consumption for the period of 01.09.2022 to 15.09.2022 and also submitted supportive evidence (1) Gas bill of Gujarat Gas Ltd. (2) Their response in respect of supporting strike declared by Morbi Ceramic</p>	The Respondent has submitted through e-mail dated 15.09.23 that, it has decided to challenge the order before Hon'ble Gujarat High court.

					<p>Manufacturers Association strike, (3) Letter to the GST Department intimating about ceasing production activity during strike period (4) C.A. Certificate stock register. The Appellant also submitted details of sub-meter provided to record consumption for the purpose of exemption in ED.</p> <p>The Respondent has represented that, due to defective CTPT unit, display of the meter was off during billing period of the Sept-22, as during that period consumption was in place but it was not recorded in the meter. So, consumption during that period was not recorded in MRI. Therefore, as per regulation 6.58 of the Supply Code, consumption was assessed.</p> <p>It is noted that, during that time consumption recorded in sub-meter, which was provided for ED exemption purpose was also less in comparison with previous months. Also, considering the other supportive evidences, it was established that, the consumption was much lesser than the past month average consumption, therefore it was not appropriate to assessed average consumption for that period. Accordingly, it was directed to cancel the bill of 1,70,462 units and bill should be issued considering the data of sub-meter i.e. 55273 units.</p>	
4	06/2023	M/s. Midland Concrete Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing related	<p>The Appellant is a HT consumer of the Respondent having a contract demand 475 KVA. The Appellant had applied for an additional demand 750 KVA and in reference to that has paid estimate amount on 15.12.2020 and executed agreement on 16.12.2020. The Appellant had restricted consumption up to 475 KVA till replacement of the CTPT unit by the Respondent i.e. Sept-21. But, without replacing CTPT unit from March-21 onwards the Respondent has recovered demand charges considering additional demand of 750 KVA i.e. for 1225 KVA. As per Suppl Code regulation 4.42, the Respondent can't recover charges for additional load until work completion including replacement of CTPT. The Appellant has represented to refund demand charges Rs.9,83,250 recovered towards additional demand during March 2021 to August 2021.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, augmentation of CTPT unit</p>	

					<p>is not a part of work to be carried out, it is to be provided after submission of Test Report by the consumer. In this case, after payment of estimate, the Appellant didn't submit Test Report as per the provisions, even after notice informing about recovery of demand charges on failing of submission of Test Report within 60 days from the date of notice was served to the Appellant, Test Report didn't submit during notice period. Therefore, demand charges were recovered for additional demand after notice period of 60 days. It is noted that, due to the non-submission of Test Report by the the Appellant within the stipulated time, the Respondent has initiated recovery of demand charges on additional demand also, which is as per the provisions of the regulation. Also, CTPT unit is a part of 'Meter', therefore, replacement of CTPT unit can't be considered as pending work. Accordingly, the representation of the Appellant was not accepted.</p>
5	07/2023	M/s. Shining Engineers & Founders Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant has represented that, its induction furnaces are connected with electricity connection and Collector of Electricity Duty as issued certificate for recovery of electricity duty (ED) @10% instead of 15%. Also, the furnaces working on 575 volt., therefore Potential Transformer (PT) is provided to record the consumption along with Current Transformer. For recording consumption of the furnaces, separate meters were provided using CT and PT, however, to calculate consumption of the furnaces, the Respondent considered Multiplying Factor (MF) of CT only, where as MF of PT was not considered. Therefore, the Appellant has represented to calculate consumption considering MF of PT also.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that the Appellant didn't inform about installation of PT with Meters. Also, there is no record of testing of PT in meter testing laboratory.</p> <p>It is noted that, Collector of Electricity Duty has informed the Appellant to provide Meter with ancillary duly tested at Meter Testing Laboratory of the Respondent.</p> <p>But, the Appellant didn't submit documents confirming testing of</p>

					testing of Meter and ancillaries including PT, therefore, it was decided that, it was responsibility of the Appellant to test Meter and ancillaries as directed by the Collector of ED and in absence of the same, the representation of the Appellant can't be acceptable and hence rejected. Further, the Respondent was directed to grant relief as certified by Collector of ED, after submission of required documents.	
6	08/2023	M/s. Narnarayan Construction Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Bhuj	New Connection	<p>The appellant applied for 100 KW new LT connection to Rural Sub-Division office of the Respondent. In reference to that, the appellant had received an estimate on 12.05.2022. The appellant had paid the estimate on 26.05.2022. After payment, the Appellant frequently approached the Respondent office requesting to release the connection, though the Respondent has released the connection on 30.09.2022. The Appellant has represented that, after payment of the estimate the Respondent has to release supply within 60 days as defined in relevant GERC regulations. However, the Respondent has released the connection after 124 days.</p> <p>The Respondent has represented that, it was required to erect 340 meter HT Line and 100KVA transformer to release supply of the Appellant, but due to a shortage of materials including Transformer etc., supply couldn't be released within time limit. Also, certain lapses were observed on part of dealing officers, so disciplinary actions were initiated against defaulter. It is noted that, as per the provisions of the Hon'ble GERC notification no.10/2005, in case of the Appellant, the licensee is required to release new connection within 60 days after payment of the estimate of the new connection and also needs to take care of the availability of required materials. It was directed to the Respondent to take disciplinary actions against defaulters in the matter.</p>	Implementation of order confirmed by respondent vide letter dt.07.06.2023
7	09/2023	M/s. Gravity Cast Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing Related-Credit of solar generation	<p>The appellant is HT consumer of the Respondent. The Appellant has represented that, 900 KW solar plant was commissioned on 27.07.2022 for the purpose of captive use. As per the terms of the agreement executed with the Respondent, units generated from the solar plant should be adjusted against the</p>	

					<p>consumption, instead of that, the Respondent didn't give any credit towards generation from 27.07.2022 to 03.10.2022. CGRF has directed the Respondent to take actions as per agreement, however it was not implemented. The Respondent has represented that, information about commissioning of the solar plant was came to know after receipt of commissioning certificate from GEDA on 21.10.2022, therefore load survey data of meter of the Appellant was collected from that date and due to limitation of data storage, it was available from 04.10.2022 only. Therefore, due to non-availability of load survey data from 27.07.2022 to 03.10.2022, credit adjust was not possible, however generation during that period was considered as surplus energy and the Respondent will purchase the energy as per agreement. Since, the issue raised by the Appellant was about implementation of terms of the Agreement executed between the Appellant and the Respondent, further as per the provisions of the agreement, it is required to approach appropriate commission. Further, the Appellant is generator as per the Solar Policy, therefore the representation does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman and hence rejected without any observation.</p>	
8	10/2023	Smt. Ansoyaben Parbatbhai Patel	PGVCL, Rajkot	New AG Connection	<p>The Appellant has participated in solar off-grid pump scheme. The Appellant has represented that, due to inadequate power generation from an existing off-grid solar pump, the Appellant has applied for conventional agriculture connection on 14.06.2021 and paid estimate on 21.05.2022. The Respondent has carried out certain line work to supply the connection but later didn't install transformer and refused to release new connection.</p> <p>The Respondent has represented that, the off-grid solar pump was released on the condition that after initial period of 5 years ownership of the solar pump will transfer to consumer and after that for period of 5-years, connection will not be granted in conventional way from electric line in the same survey number. The agreement with this condition was executed with the Appellant.</p>	Amount of estimate is refunded to the Appellant as per letter dated 06.07.2023 of the Respondent

					<p>After payment of estimate and partial work execution, during audit of the application it was came to knowledge of the Respondent that at the same premises off-grid solar pump is already exist, so the Respondent has denied to release the connection.</p> <p>It was also submitted that, as per the GoG recent GR, the Appellant may opt to connect the off-grid solar pump with grid following the provisions of the GR. Also, The Respondent has initiated disciplinary action against the defaulters.</p> <p>It was observed that, as per the agreement executed between the Appellant and the Respondent, the Appellant is not eligible to get connection through conventional source as off-grid solar pump is already exist. Further, even payment of estimate can't be considered as eligibility for getting connection, therefore, the Respondent was directed to refund the estimate charges and also directed to take disciplinary actions on defaulters. Further, as per the provisions of GR, if the Appellant will opt to connect the off-grid solar pump with grid, same should be considered as per the provisions of GR.</p>
9	11/2023	Shri Mandabhai Kanabhai Vasan	PGVCL, Junagadh	Interest on refunded amount of solar generation	<p>The appellant is a residential consumer of the Respondent. The appellant represented that; 1.92 K.W. Solar Rooftop plant was installed with the said connection in March 2018. From the solar plant, the Respondent has purchased surplus energy amounting Rs. 13204.10, whereas the Respondent has transferred only Rs. 5400.18. Later, after order of the CGRF, the Respondent has transferred remaining Rs. 7704.00 to his bank account. The Appellant has represented for interest on late payment of Rs.7704/- @ 228%, the Appellant has mentioned that, in another connection, the Respondent has charges DPC @228%, therefore, same rate should be applied on late transfer of surplus amount also.</p> <p>The Respondent has represented that; the surplus units of the connection was purchased as per the agreement, however there was no provision transfer credit amount to bank account of the consumer. However, later on it was decided from 2020-21 that amount which remained credit in account of the consumers at the end of financial year, will be</p>

					<p>transferred to bank account of the consumer and accordingly, in case of the Appellant amount of surplus energy was transferred to bank account. But for credit amount of year 2018-19 and 2019-20, there was no instruction from Corporate Office. In case of the Appellant, remaining Rs. 7704/- was of 2018-19 and 2019-20, therefore after order from CGRF, the amount was transferred to bank account of the Appellant, it was also submitted that, on credit amount, the Respondent has paid interest @ 4%.</p> <p>It is noted that, there is no provision in agreement executed between the Appellant and the Respondent about transfer of credit amount to bank account, further the Respondent has paid interest on credit amount @4%, whereas there is no logic in pray for interest @228%, therefore, the representation of the Appellant was not accepted.</p>
10	12/2023	M/s Simpulo Vitrified Pvt Ltd	PGVCL, Rajkot	Credit of wind energy generation	<p>The Appellant is EHT consumer of the Respondent. The Appellant has represented that, its another unit M/s. Sims Ceramic Pvt. Ltd. was merged on 11.01.2021.</p> <p>M/s. Sims Ceramic Pvt. Ltd. owned a Wind Turbine Generator(WTG) of 2.1 MW capacity at Banugar wind farm and a wheeling agreement with the Respondent company was executed on 27.03.2017 for wheeling of power to their recipient consumption unit of M/s. Sims Ceramic Pvt. Ltd. The Respondent has issued last bill in Jan-2021 for Sims Ceramic, whereas afterwards bills were issued for merged connection as single entity. However, units generated by WTG during January 2021 neither considered for set off against consumption of M/s. Simpulo Vitrified Pvt. Ltd. nor against the consumption of M/s. Sims Ceramic Pvt. Ltd. The Respondent has considered the generated units as surplus units and issued a certificate for the same. The Appellant was compelled to claim generated units from the said WTG during January 2021 and February 2021 as surplus units and submitted an invoice to the Respondent, for which the Appellant has received payment from the Respondent as per claim.</p> <p>The Respondent represented that, M/s Sims Ceramic Pvt. Ltd. was consumed captive power</p>

					<p>generated from the WTG. After merging of both the connections. M/s. Simpolo Vitrified Pvt. Ltd. had applied for an amendment to the agreement in respect of the above WTG, which was executed on 02.02.2021, and as per the provision of the amended agreement, it was effective from 01.03.2021. therefore, it was not possible to give a setoff of generated energy from the said WTG during January 2021 and February 2021 to M/s. Simpolo Vitrified Pvt. Ltd.</p> <p>It was observed that as per the provisions of the wheeling agreement, the issue is between the generator and the distribution licensee. Therefore, the Appellant can't be considered as "complainant" as defined in 1.5(C) of Hon'ble GERC, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman, Regulation 2019 and as the representation does not fulfill the condition as per regulation 3.19 of Hon'ble GERC, Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman Regulation 2019, it was not entertained.</p>	
11	13/2023	Shri Liladhar Maganbhai Modi	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a residential consumer of the respondent. Appellant represented that, due to the abnormal consumption of May-June-2022 billing period, the Respondent has issued bill of 430 units under faulty status. Later, during billing period of July-August-2022, meter was replaced and bill for 3029 units was issued. In fact, during that billing period, no additional electric equipment was installed or used. It is also represented that, the Respondent has issued bill under faulty status, whereas later on it was declared OK during inspection, which is not appropriate.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, on the basis of complainant of the Appellant, average consumption bill was issued for May-June 2022. Later, it was replaced and inspected in Meter Testing Laboratory, where no abnormality noticed. Therefore, bill for the month of July-Aug.-2022 was issued as per actual consumption.</p> <p>On the basis of meter MRI data and consumer ledger report, it was observed that, the meter reading was not done properly by the meter reader from March-April-2022. It was directed the Respondent to take disciplinary action against the responsible</p>	Respondent confirmed action taken vide letter no-8893 dt. 17.07.23

					meter reader and also directed to revise the bill for the months of March-April 2022, May-June 2022, and July-August 2022 as per the available MRI data.	
12	14/2023	Shri Kailash Ravji Busa	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing Related	<p>The appellant is the commercial consumer of the respondent. The appellant represented that, At the time of checking The respondent found the meter recording 57.82% less energy. The respondent replaced the meter and tested the same at the meter testing laboratory and took the MRI report. As per the MRI report, the respondent issued a supplementary bill amounting to 1,54,044.52 Rs. The appellant never tampered with the meter.</p> <p>As per the MRI report, the Y-phase of the PT is reported the zero volt. This is gross negligence of the respondent if the respondent checked the said meter regularly then this type of problem couldn't have occurred. The Respondent represented that, at the time of installation checking it was detected that the Appellant's meter displayed 0 voltage of Y-phase but it was showing voltages on the clip-on meter. the specified meter's accuracy was checked by an accue check meter and it was found that the meter recording 57.82% energy less. The specified meter was replaced and tested at the meter testing laboratory and generated an MRI report. As per the MRI report, it has come to the knowledge that said meter Y-phase has not detected the voltage during the period of 14.10.2022 to 25.08.2019, due to that meter recording less energy. The respondent issued a supplementary bill for the specified time period amounting to 1,54,044.52 Rs. on the date 23.11.2022.</p> <p>It is observed that the respondent has not checked the appellant's connection regularly. as defined in provision 6.33 of Hon'ble GERC, Supply Code, Regulation Notification No. 4 of 2015. In the case of a defective meter licensee can charge a supplementary bill for a maximum period of 6-months. It directed the respondent to cancel the existing supplementary bill and issue the bill for a maximum period of 6-months. i.e. Before the six-month period time from the date of checking (14.10.2022).</p>	The Respondent Confirmed Implementation of order vide letter No 2051/02.08.2023
13.	15/2023	Shree Jaggnath Enterprise	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing related	The Appellant is having LTMD connection, during the course of Installation checking, the Meter	

					<p>was found slow in recording consumption.</p> <p>Therefore, as per the MRI report of the Meter, the Respondent has issued supplementary bill for the slowness from Oct.2020 to Oct.-2022.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented that the Respondent didn't issue any notice to the Appellant before issuing supplementary bill.</p> <p>It is noted from the MRI report that, ampere recorded in 'R' phase is continuously zero from Oct.-2020 to Oct.-2022 therefore the slowness detected during installation checking is supported with the event recorded. Therefore, the Meter can be considered as Defective and in that case, as per regulation 6.33, the Respondent can rectify for a maximum period of six months. Accordingly, the bill issued by the Respondent for 2 years was not as per the provisions.</p> <p>Therefore, the Respondent was directed to cancel the supplementary bill and can issue supplementary bill for the period of six months.</p>	
14.	16/2023	Sh. Udaiya Mohammad Amin Isha	PGVCL, Junagadh	PDC to Reconne ction- Ag.Conn ection	<p>The Appellant has applied for Reconnection to their earlier permanently disconnected connection of Agriculture Category on 23.09.2021. The land for which the connection was demanded is granted on lease to the predecessor of the Appellant by the GoG. On death of the grantee, the lease was assigned to the legal heirs of the grantee up to dated 15.07.2021. The Appellant is one of the legal heir of the grantee.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented that, the approval for PDC to Reconnection was sanctioned by the Circle Office of the Respondent on 13.01.2021, however the Respondent didn't take any action on the approval. Later on, informed the Appellant to submit extended period of the lease as well as informed to install drip irrigation system in agriculture land as the area of the Appellant is falls within the Dark Zone. The Appellant has requested to grant exemption from installation of drip irrigation system.</p> <p>The Appellant has applied before the Collector Office for extension of lease period from 15.07.2021, however, which is pending. Therefore, the Appellant is not able to execute FPA for</p>	The Respondent has implemented as per their letter received on dated 01.09.2023

					<p>installation of Drip Irrigation System.</p> <p>It is noted that, the Respondent didn't take actions in time regarding intimation to the Appellant after approval from the Circle Office.</p> <p>It is also noted that, the application of the Appellant for extension of lease is pending before the Collector Office, therefore ownership of the land, where connection is demanded yet to decide by the competent authority.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not possible to accept representation of the Appellant and hence rejected.</p>	
15.	17/2023	M/s. Komex Food Industries	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing related	<p>The Appellant is having LTMD connection, during the course of Installation checking, the Meter was found slow in recording consumption.</p> <p>Therefore, as per the MRI report of the Meter, the Respondent has issued supplementary bill for the slowness from Oct.2020 to Oct.-2022.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented to issue supplementary bill as per the regulation 6.33 of the supply code.</p> <p>It is noted from the MRI report that, ampere recorded in 'B' phase is continuously zero from Oct.-2020 to Oct.-2022 therefore the slowness detected during installation checking is supported with the event recorded. Therefore, the Meter can be considered as Defective and in that case, as per regulation 6.33, the Respondent can rectify for a maximum period of six months. Accordingly, the bill issued by the Respondent for 2 years was not as per the provisions.</p> <p>Therefore, the Respondent was directed to cancel the supplementary bill and can issue supplementary bill for the period of six months.</p>	The Respondent has implemented as per their letter dated 18.09.2023
16.	19/2023	M/s. Gayatri Mineral	PGVCL, Bhuj	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a HT consumer of the Respondent. On 25.01.2022, the connection of the Appellant was inspected by the team of Respondent and found that, the Meter was slow and recording 83.70% less energy. Therefore, the Respondent has issued supplementary bill for last six months.</p> <p>On retrieving data through MRI, events from 13.01.2022 was recorded, however events before 13.01.2022 was not available.</p> <p>It was noted that, ampere of 'Y' phase was 'zero' and event was</p>	The Respondent has implemented as per their letter dated 07.08.2023

					started before 13.01.2022, exact date of occurrence was not available. Also, certain events of occurrence and restoration of voltage/current failure were noted in MRI. It was appeared that, the meter was defective. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to revised supplementary bill according to details of events recorded from 13.01.2022 to 25.01.2022 and for the remaining period of six months prior to 13.01.2022, supplementary bill can be assessed as per the provisions of the regulations.	
17.	20/2023	Shri Mahida Mukesh Madhavjibhai	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing related	<p>The Appellant is a residential lighting consumer of the Respondent. At the time of preparation of bill for the month of Aug.-Sept.-2022, the Meter Reader had noticed abnormal consumption, therefore, the meter of the Appellant was replaced and tested at Meter Testing Laboratory. It was noticed that, the display of the Meter was off and data were not retrieved.</p> <p>But, the Respondent had issued bill of 3122 units as per the consumption recorded. After representation of the Appellant, the Respondent had sent meter to manufacturing company to get meter data through MRI.</p> <p>The meter manufacturing company had declared meter as defective and accordingly the Respondent had accepted the meter as defective.</p> <p>Therefore, the Respondent was directed to cancel the bill of 3122 units and process it as per regulation 6.58 of the Supply Code. Also, on request of the Appellant, it was directed to refund excess amount, if any to bank account of the consumer.</p>	The Respondent has submitted on dated 19.08.23 that, the bill was revised as per the Order and remaining amount credited to the bank account of consumer.
18.	21/2023	M/s. Hans Ship Breaking Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Junagadh	Supplementary bill of slowness	<p>The Appellant has represented about the supplementary bill issued by the Respondent towards slowness @12.44% detected during the installation checking. The Appellant has represented that, in case of slowness, the Respondent should follow the provisions of Hon'ble GERC-Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters-Notification no.04/2015.</p> <p>As per the data retrieved through MRI from 08.11.2020, certain 'Voltage Related Events' were recorded, however as per the Supply Code and Related Matter-Notification no. 04 of 2015, regulation 6.33, the Respondent</p>	The Respondent has submitted on dated 23.08.23 that, the bill was revised as per the Order.

					<p>can rectify the same for a maximum period of six months. As per the order of CGRF, the Respondent has issued revised bill considering slowness 12.44% on total consumption instead of relevant period of slowness as per MRI Data.</p> <p>It is noted that, CGRF has in its Order directed the Respondent to revise supplementary bill considering slowness @ 12.44% for the period of six months for total consumption. Therefore, it appears that, the Respondent has issued revised supplementary bill following the Order of CGRF.</p> <p>As per the provisions, the Respondent should issue bill as per the MRI data, the Respondent was directed to cancel the revised supplementary bill issued to the Appellant and directed to issue revised bill to the Appellant considering slowness @ 12.44% for energy consumed/generated during the period of last six months from dated 10.08.2022 for duration recorded as 'Voltage Related Events' only.</p>	
19.	22/2023	Shri Magan Ramji C/o. Premji Chauhan	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a residential lighting consumer, bill for the month of Feb.-March-22 was issued for 11841 units, which was abnormal in respect of his regular consumption. The Appellant had requested to issue bill as per MRI data. The said meter was replaced by the Respondent and the Meter was found burnt at the time of testing at Meter Testing Laboratory.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented that, at the time of meter replacement 405 watt was found connected with the connection. In case of consumption of total load during billing period, it was not possible to consume 11841 units.</p> <p>The Respondent has represented that, at the time of meter reading of the connection of the Appellant, the Meter Reader had taken snapshot of the Meter Reading, so consumption recorded was supported by it. Earlier, work of Meter Reading was carried out by the Agency, therefore, in case of the Appellant, due to inappropriate meter reading, consumption was accumulated by the agency.</p> <p>It was noted that, after meter replacement average bi-monthly consumption was 726 units, whereas before meter replacement it was around 407</p>	The Respondent has submitted on dated 27.09.23 that, the bill was revised as per the Order.

					<p>units. Therefore, even if meter reading were not carried out properly, after almost 36 billing cycle 11841 units would be accumulated.</p> <p>Further, connected load of the Appellant is recorded by the Respondent at the time of meter replacement, therefore considering that, technically it is not possible to consume 11841 units in a bi-monthly billing cycle, also bills of billing period before Feb-Mar-2022, were issued as per actual meter reading. In that case, no evidence to believe that, consumption recorded is due to pending units and as meter is found burnt, it was appropriate to consider meter as defective. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to cancel the bill of Feb-Mar-2022 and to issue bill as per regulation 6.58 of the supply code.</p>	
20.	23/2023	Shri Makwana Himmatsinh Udaysinh	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing related	<p>The Appellant is a residential lighting consumer, the Appellant has represented that bill for the month of Aug.-Sept.-2022 was issued for 1972 units, which was abnormal, therefore the meter was replaced and tested by the Respondent.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the meter of the Appellant was tested and error was noticed within limit. Also, MRI data was extracted through meter manufacturing company, as per the data, it was noticed that billing for the month of June-July-2022 wasn't carried out properly.</p> <p>It was noted that, no abnormality noticed while inspection of the Meter of the Appellant. Also, consumption for the month of Aug-Sept-2022 noted by the Meter Reader is in consistence with MRI, however consumption noted by the Meter Reader for the month of June-July-2022 is not consistent with the MRI. So, pending units of June-July-2022 was accumulated in Aug.-Sept-2022, therefore consumption recorded in the Meter can't be ignored.</p> <p>The Respondent was directed to bifurcate consumption of June-July-2022 and Aug.-Sept-2022 as per the MRI report.</p>	The Respondent has submitted on dated 18.09.23 that, the bill was revised as per the Order.
21.	24/2023	Shri Anilkumar Chandrakant Joshi	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing related	<p>The Appellant is a residential lighting consumer, the Appellant has represented that bill for the month of Dec.-Jan.-2023 was issued for 1135 units, which was abnormal, therefore the meter of was replaced and tested by the Respondent.</p>	

					<p>The Respondent has submitted that, the meter of the Appellant was tested and error was noticed within limit. Also, MRI data was extracted through meter manufacturing company, as per the data, it was noticed that billing for the month of Dec.-Jan.-2023 carried out properly. It was noted that, no abnormality noticed while inspection of the Meter of the Appellant. Also, consumption for the month of Dec.-Jan.-2023 noted by the Meter Reader is in consistence with MRI, therefore consumption recorded in the Meter can't be ignored. Therefore, the representation of the Appellant was rejected.</p>	
22.	25/2023	M/s. Gokul Plastic Industries	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing related	<p>The Appellant is a LTMD consumer. The Appellant has represented that, during billing period March-2022 and April-2022, display of the Meter was off. So, the Respondent has prepared bill as per regulation 6.58 of the supply code. The Appellant has represented to prepare bill as per MRI report, also represented that, during March and April-2022, consumption was quite low in comparison to other months. The Respondent has represented that, as per MRI report consumption from 26.02.2022 to 30.03.2022 due to power off-event, no consumption was recorded in the meter. So, in absence of data, billing was carried out as per provisions. Since, the meter was defective, it is required to carried out billing as per 6.58 of the supply code. Also, as per partial consumption recorded during the billing period of March-2022 and April-2022 was as per average consumption of remaining billing period of the year, so representation of the Appellant was not accepted. CGRF has revised the bill considering the average consumption of the Appellant, which is appropriate as per provisions, therefore the representation of the Appellant is rejected.</p>	
23.	26/2023	Shri Jariya Rajesh Nizarbhai	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing related	<p>The Appellant has represented about bill issued for 1786 units towards consumption of Aug.-Sept.-2022 period from his residential lighting connection. It was also represented that, bill for June-July-2022 was issued for 0 units, whereas actually consumption was made during that period. The Appellant has further represented that, another</p>	<p>The Respondent has submitted action taken report vide letter dated 30.09.23.</p>

					<p>three phase agriculture category connection was also at same premises and meter reader has issued bill for three phase connection on same day as per actual meter reading.</p> <p>On application of the Appellant, the meter was replaced by the Respondent and during testing no abnormality was observed. The Respondent has submitted that, at the time of inspection of Meter, MRI data was collected and it was observed that, consumption during billing period of June-July-2022 was around 751 units and Aug.-Sept.-2022 was 1035 units. Therefore, after order of CGRF-Junagadh, bill for the month of June-July-2022 and Aug.-Sept.-2022 was revised according to MRI report.</p> <p>Also, after site survey it was found that, at premises two connections exists, therefore during billing of June-July-2022, meter reader has issued 0 unit consumption for single phase connection whereas bill for three phase connection was issued as per actual meter reading.</p> <p>The Respondent was directed to take disciplinary actions against defaulter meter reader for not taking appropriate meter reading as well as informed Appellant to pay revised bill issued by the Respondent as per MRI report.</p>	
24.	27/2023	Kaniyalal Babulal Khambhaliya	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing related	<p>The Appellant is a residential lighting consumer and represented that, bill for the month of March-April-2022 and May-June-2022 was issued for average consumption considering meter as defective. After meter replacement and inspection at Meter Testing Laboratory of the Respondent, Rs.1964.39 debited to consumer account.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, during billing period of March-April-2022 and May-June-2022 display of the Meter was Off, therefore billing was done as per average consumption but at the time of inspection of the meter at Laboratory actual consumption was found through battery mode, so bill for March-April-2022 and May-June-2022 was revised as per actual consumption and remaining amount was debited to consumer account.</p> <p>It was noted that, MRI data was not retrieved during meter inspection also no test was</p>	The Respondent has submitted action taken report vide letter dated 21.09.23.

					<p>carried out about accuracy of the meter. The meter was declared defective by the Respondent during billing cycle of March-April-2022 and May-June-2022, however without any accuracy test, reading noticed which is too through DC-battery supply can't be sufficient to declare meter as 'OK' after declaring defective. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to cancel the action of debiting Rs.1964.39 to consumer account.</p>	
25.	28/ 2023	Bhil Kalubhai Bachubhai	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	New Connect ion	<p>The Appellant has registered application for new residential lighting category connection and paid estimate on 06.03.2017. Even after follow ups, his connection was not released. The Appellant has represented to grant new connection.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the estimate of the Appellant was 'paid cancelled' in the system for the unknown reason at that time also application of the Appellant was not traceable.</p> <p>During the hearing of the case before CGRF, as per the directive, the Appellant and the Respondent has carried out site Rojkam and concluded that, premises at where connection is demanded is situated outside the 'Gamtal' area within Govt. waste land. Therefore, the Appellant has required to pay additional charges as per the provisions.</p> <p>It was noted that, as per the provisions of the Supply Code, the Appellant has required to submit required documents of ownership and identity. Therefore, the Appellant was directed to submit required documents towards registered application and the Respondent was directed to assist the Appellant and on submission of required documents, directed to release the connection as per the provisions of the Supply Code.</p>	The order was issued on 25.09.23, the action taken report is awaited.
26.	29/ 2023	Smt. Jyotsnaben B.Dabhi	PGVCL, Bhuj	Erection of pole	<p>The Appellant has represented that, at the time of registration for new residential lighting connection, the Respondent has surveyed to provide service line by erecting a pole near his residence.</p> <p>After, payment of estimate, at the time of erection of pole near residence of the Appellant, her neighbor had objected the work. The Appellant has represented that, presently power supplied using almost 35 meter long</p>	

					<p>service line, there were chance of accident and as decided earlier by the Respondent, pole should be erected at place decided.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the service connection was provided as per norms and due to objection raised by neighbor of the Appellant, it was not made possible to erect pole. Also, alternate location was decided to erect pole, however the Appellant was disagree for that location.</p> <p>Further, the Appellant has accepted that, there is no problem regarding quality of power supply with existing service line.</p> <p>It was noted that, provide safe, reliable and quality power to consumers is a duty of the Respondent, also to study technical parameter and to decide route and requirement of erection/modification of electric line is sole jurisdiction of the Respondent, therefore, it is on part of the Respondent to decide route of line and requirement of line and alteration. Also, if any objection raised by any one, it is responsibility of the Respondent to sort out the issues by the power vested in EA 2003.</p>	
27.	30/2023	M/s. SteelCon Metal Cast	PGVCL, Rajkot	Wrong recovery of ED	<p>The Appellant has represented that, two induction furnaces are connected with electricity connection and Collector of Electricity Duty as issued certificate for recovery of electricity duty (ED) @10% instead of 15%. Also, the furnaces working on 575 volt., therefore Potential Transformer (PT) is provided to record the consumption along with Current Transformer. For recording consumption of the furnaces, separate meters were provided using CT and PT, however, to calculate consumption of the furnaces, the Respondent considered Multiplying Factor (MF) of CT only, where as MF of PT was not considered.</p> <p>Therefore, the Appellant has represented to calculate consumption considering MF of PT also.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that the Appellant didn't inform about installation of PT with Meters. Also, there is no record of testing of PT in meter testing laboratory.</p> <p>It is noted that, Collector of Electricity Duty has informed the Appellant to provide Meter with ancillary duly tested at Meter</p>	

					<p>Testing Laboratory of the Respondent.</p> <p>But, the Appellant didn't submit documents confirming testing of testing of Meter and ancillaries including PT, therefore, it was decided that, it was responsibility of the Appellant to test Meter and ancillaries as directed by the Collector of ED and in absence of the same, the representation of the Appellant can't be acceptable and hence rejected. Further, the Respondent was directed to grant relief as certified by Collector of ED, after submission of required documents.</p>
28.	31/2023	Sh. Dineshbhai Devjibhai Meghani	PGVCL, Rajkot	New Connection	<p>The Appellant has applied for new residential lighting connection, but the Respondent has denied for new connection mentioning reason of insufficient document of land ownership. The Appellant has submitted that, after order of the CFRF, he has applied again with all relevant document also receipt of property tax was submitted even though application was rejected.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the Appellant has submitted land ownership documents of agriculture land, which is too for certain survey number, whereas the premises having four survey number. Simultaneously, the Appellant has submitted property tax receipt, which would be for non-Ag land. So, it is required to clarify by the Appellant with authentic land ownership documents, other than that there is no deficiency in application.</p> <p>It was noted that, property tax receipt submitted was in name of 'Dineshbhai Devshibhai Meghani' whereas name of Appellant is 'Dinesh Devjibhai Megani', so property tax receipt submitted by the Appellant can't be considered as valid evidence.</p> <p>It was directed that, as per the provisions of the regulations of Supply Code, the Appellant has required to submit valid evidence of land ownership.</p> <p>It was directed to the Respondent that, on submission of required documents by the Appellant, his connection should be released in priority.</p>



Electricity Ombudsman.

**REPORT FOR THE
SECOND HALF OF THE YEAR 2023-24
(October- 2023 TO March- 2024)**

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

The Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission has established office of the Electricity Ombudsman, 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 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 under Section 42(6) of The Electricity Act, 2003. However, aggrieved by the order of the Electricity Ombudsman, dis-satisfied 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 against CGRF Decisions during the SECOND HALF OF THE YEAR 2023-24, is enclosed as Annexure-I

(3) 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 approaches 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.

**REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN 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 and amendments thereof:**

: Annexure-I:

Sr. No.	Case No.	Name of Applicant	Forum Concern	Subject	Comments of Ombudsman	Response of Licensee
1	32/2023	Sh. Chauhan Dalsukhbhai Khushaldas	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the respondent having a residential connection. The appellant represented that, He never purchased EESL Ujala appliances on EMI. The appellant only purchased an EESL Ujala Tube Light by Cash payment. As part of the discount scheme appellant has submitted copy of his Adhar card and electricity bill at the time of purchasing the EESL Ujala tube light.</p> <p>The Appellant was paying bills only by considering the total bill amount. Later, it was came to his notice that EMI towards Ujala Appliances was recovered thorough his electricity bill. After complaining in this regards to PGVCL, the respondent has stopped recovery towards EESL Ujala appliances from the Appellant's electricity bill.</p> <p>The appellant has represented to refund the amount of wrongly recovered EESL Ujala EMI.</p> <p>The Respondent represented that, as per the appellant's complaint regarding the recovery of EESL Ujala EMI through electricity bill. The Respondent has stopped recovery. As per the office record of EESL, it is reported that, the appellant has purchased 2 Fans and 10 Bulbs on an EMI basis total amounting Rs. 3220, out of which Rs.2170 was recovered from the Appellant's through bill. EESL has submitted 'Cash memorandum cum letter of consent' before CGRF.</p> <p>It is observed that the "Cash memorandum cum Letter of consent" was in the name of Dalsukhbhai while the EESL Ujala Appliances EMI is being deducted from the electricity bill named Vasantben D. Chauhan.</p> <p>It seems that, amount of other person is being recovered through bill of Vasantben D. Chauhan, which is not proper. Therefore, it directed the respondent to stop the recovery</p>	The Respondent has confirmed vide letter no.4605 dated 11.12.2023 about implementation of order.

					of EESL UJALA EMI from the bill of Vasantben D. Chauhan and refund the amount of previously recovered towards EESL Ujala EMI.	
2	33/2023	Sh. Himiben Rajsibhai Ambaliya	PGVCL, Junagadh	Refund of charges recovered toward the estimate	<p>The Appellant is an industrial consumer of the respondent. The Appellant represented that, he had applied for new industrial connection of 6.5 KW capacity at government waste land, which is allotted on lease by the District Magistrate of Dev Bhumi Dwarka. As per the provision, it was required to recover Fixed cost Rs.12,000 towards estimate as per GERC Circular No. GERC/Tech/1378 Dt. 24.06.2014, instead of that, the respondent has recovered actual cost Rs. 1,26,696 towards infrastructural development considering land as agricultural land. The Electricity connection was released after payment of the full cost estimate. The Appellant represented to refund the differential amount of the paid estimate. Also represented to consider the similar type case No. 62/2020 judgment passed by the electricity ombudsman, Ahmedabad.</p> <p>The Respondent represented that, The Government land allotted to the appellant on lease by the District Collector can't be treated as non-agricultural land. Hence, as per the GUVNL's circular No. GUVNL/Tech-2/RNR/2719 DT.30.01.2017 regarding the new connection of the outside village area, the amount of Rs. 1,26,696 towards actual cost of infrastructural development like a transformer and electricity line is included in the estimate. After payment of the estimate amount the connection was released.</p> <p>It is noted that KW-based fixed cost recovery is already defined by the GERC in regulation 9 of 2005. As per power conferred under sections 45, 46, and 50 of the Electricity Act, 2003 to GERC. The licensee is supposed to strictly adhere to the regulations defined by the GERC. Therefore, it is directed the Respondent to recover KW-based fixed cost against the paid amount of Rs. 1,26,696 and refund the differential amount to the appellant.</p>	The Respondent has challenged the order before High Court.
3	34/2023	Shri Ramde Vajsibhai Nandaniya	PGVCL, Junagadh	Refund of charges recovered	<p>The Appellant is an industrial consumer of the respondent. The Appellant represented that, he</p>	The Respondent has

				toward the estimate	<p>had applied for new industrial connection of 6.0 KW capacity at government waste land, which is allotted on lease by the District Magistrate of Dev Bhumi Dwarka. As per the provision, it was required to recover Fixed cost Rs.6,500 towards estimate as per GERC Circular No. GERC/Tech/1378 Dt. 24.06.2014, instead of that, the respondent has recovered actual cost Rs. 1,32,419 towards infrastructural development considering land as agricultural land. The Electricity connection was released after payment of the full cost estimate. The Appellant represented to refund the differential amount of the paid estimate. Also represented to consider the similar type case No. 62/2020 judgment passed by the electricity ombudsman, Ahmedabad.</p> <p>The Respondent represented that, The Government land allotted to the appellant on lease by the District Collector can't be treated as non-agricultural land. Hence, as per the GUVNL's circular No. GUVNL/Tech-2/RNR/2719 DT.30.01.2017 regarding the new connection of the outside village area, the amount of Rs. 1,26,696 towards actual cost of infrastructural development like a transformer and electricity line is included in the estimate. After payment of the estimate amount the connection was released. the specified GERC circular.</p> <p>It is noted that KW-based fixed cost recovery is already defined by the GERC in regulation 9 of 2005. As per power conferred under sections 45, 46, and 50 of the Electricity Act, 2003 to GERC. The licensee is supposed to strictly adhere to the regulations defined by the GERC. Therefore, it is directed the Respondent to recover KW-based fixed cost against the paid amount of Rs. 1,32,419 and refund the differential amount to the appellant.</p>	challenge d the order before High Court.
4	35/2023	Shri Lakhmanbhai Meragbhai Kambariya	PGVCL, Junagadh	Refund of charges recovered toward the estimate	<p>The Appellant is an industrial consumer of the respondent. The Appellant represented that, he had applied for new industrial connection of 100.00 KW capacity at government waste land, which is allotted on lease by the District Magistrate of Jamnagar. As per the provision, it was required to recover Fixed</p>	The Respondent has challenge d the order before High Court.

					<p>cost Rs.1.01.000 towards estimate as per GERC Circular No. GERC/Tech/1378 Dt. 24.06.2014, instead of that, the respondent has recovered actual cost Rs. 9,42,390 towards infrastructural development considering land as agricultural land. The Electricity connection was released after payment of the full cost estimate. The Appellant represented to refund the differential amount of the paid estimate. Also represented to consider the similar type case No. 62/2020 judgment passed by the electricity ombudsman, Ahmedabad.</p> <p>The Respondent represented that, the leased land allotted to the applicant by the District Magistrate is not an non-agricultural land, Hence, as per the GUVNL's circular No. GUVNL/Tech-2/RNR/2719 DT.30.01.2017 regarding the new connection of the outside village area, estimate for actual amount Rs.12,52,304 was issued to the Appellant, which includes Rs. 9,25,111 towards infrastructure development. After payment of the estimate amount the connection was released.</p> <p>It is noted that KW-based fixed cost recovery is already defined by the GERC in regulation 9 of 2005. As per power conferred under sections 45, 46, and 50 of the Electricity Act, 2003 to GERC. The licensee is supposed to strictly adhere to the regulations defined by the GERC. Therefore, it is directed the Respondent to recover KW-based fixed cost against the paid amount of Rs. 9,42,390 and refund the differential amount to the appellant.</p>	
5	36/2023	M/s. Microtech Seamless Tube Pvt Ltd	PGVCL, Rajkot	Change of Power Supply from JGY to Industrial Feeder	<p>The Appellant is an H.T. Consumer of the respondent. The Appellant has represented that, its manufacturing process is continuous process-based industry and as power supplied is from JGY feeder, due to frequent interruptions, it is suffering huge loss. The Appellant has applied for load extension in existing contracted demand, but the Respondent has considered feasibility from existing JGY feeder instead of guideline issued by GUVNL to supply power to continuous industry from Industrial Feeder. Even after the order of CGRF,</p>	

					<p>there was no improvement in reliability of power supply. To get an reliable power supply the Appellant has represented to supply from Industrial Feeder. The Respondent represented that, power supplied to the Appellant is provided from 11 KV Chhapra JGY feeder. The Appellant did not mention that its industry is included in the continuous process based industry at time of application for new connection or load extension. It was mentioned as 2-shift based industry. Also, didn't submit approval of EPD in regards to continuous process based industry. Presently, no Industrial, Urban or GIDC category feeder exists under Lodhika Sub-Division. In case of attending routine complaints of power failure and Transformer failure, it is required to interrupt power supply of the feeder for safety purpose. After the order of CGRF, maintenance activities were carried out and also able to reduce interruption at certain extent.</p> <p>It is the primary duty of the Respondent ' to ensure that reliable power supply is available to the Appellant as well as all other consumers of the chhapra JGY feeder. It seems more appropriate that the respondent should maintain reliable power supply on the existing feeder instead of accepting the Appellant's prayer for providing supply from Industrial category feeder. Therefore, it is directed to the respondent to carry out necessary maintenance on chhapra JGY feeder and other operations for which power interruption is inevitable and to minimize power interruption by prior planning and coordination so as to ensure reliable power supply to the appellant.</p>	
6	37/2023	M/s. Finex Technocast	PGVCL, Rajkot	Excess Recovery of Electricity Duty	<p>The Appellant is an H.T. Consumer of the respondent, it is represented that as per the electricity duty exemption certificate issued to the appellant by the ED collector office for the period from 24.07.2020 to 17.12.2024, exemption from payment of ED has been granted on all electricity consumption except residential and canteen consumption. Also separate meter was installed for recording the electricity consumption of the staff quarter lighting. As the</p>	

					<p>electricity connection of the Appellant is situated in a rural area, instead of charging 7.5% ED as per part 1(1) of schedule-1 of the Gujarat Electricity Duty Act, 1958 for residential consumption, the Respondent has misinterpreted the schedule-1 and charges ED at the rate of 15% as per part 1(3) of schedule -1 of the electricity duty act, 1958. The Appellant prayed to refund the differential amount of the recovered ED with interest and henceforth on the residential consumption ED should be charged at the rate of 7.5%. According to part 1(3)(A) rates of duty of schedule-1 of the Gujarat Electricity Duty Act 1958, 15% of consumption charge is shown, that is, Despite the law of levying 15% ED only on energy charge the respondent considered energy charge, fixed charge, fuel charge and other charges to calculate ED.</p> <p>The Respondent represented that, ED is collected as mentioned in the ED exemption certificate and as per point No - 1(3) of schedule-1 of the ED Act, ED is collected @ 15%.</p> <p>As per the provisions of part 2 of schedule-1 of the Gujarat Electricity Duty Act 1958, the competent authority of the State Government is empowered to decide in case of dispute in respect of ED. Therefore, the representation don't fall within the jurisdiction of Electricity Ombudsman, therefore no observation is made regarding the representation.</p>	
7	38/2023	Shri Lilubhai Lakhambhai Gosiya	PGVCL, Junagadh	Restoration of power supply and refund of electricity bill amount	<p>The appellant has represented about non availability of power supply to agricultural connection, which is existing in name of Lakham karshan kharva having consumer No. 80417/00277/7. The Appellant has represented that, he didn't consume electricity from above referred connection as electricity pole and line of the electricity connection did not exist at the place. However, the electricity bill was recovered by the Respondent. Therefore, a complaint was filed by the Appellant before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Junagadh. In pursuant to the complaint of the Appellant, the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Junagadh directed the Respondent to restore the power</p>	<p>The Respondent has confirmed vide letter dated 22.12.2023 about implementation.</p>

					<p>supply as soon as possible. The Appellant has represented that, the order yet not implemented by the Respondent and also prayed for interest on amount of last three years bill, which was recovered by the Respondent.</p> <p>The Respondent represented that, after receipt of the Order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Junagadh, their concerned field office has obtained required approval of competent authority for erection of required line and Transformer Centre. On 27.11.2023, they have initiated work of erection of line and transformer, however brother of the Appellant and others have objected the work, due to which they were not able to complete the work for providing power supply to above referred connection. The Respondent has further submitted that, the bill amount of last three years of the said connection was credited to consumer account.</p> <p>The Appellant was not able to confirm about duration during which power supply was not available, also the Appellant didn't represented before the Respondent about non-availability of power supply during the said period of non-availability of power supply, therefore, the representation of the Appellant regarding interest on amount of past three years bills was not accepted.</p> <p>It was observed that the Respondent has carried out necessary restoration process but, it could not be completed due objection raised by brother of the Appellant and others Therefore, it was directed to the Respondent to restore the power supply of said electricity connection as soon as possible as per the prevailing norms and simultaneously the Appellant was informed to co-operate the Respondent in work of power supply restoration.</p>	
8	39/20 23	M/s. Rudra Enterprise	PGVCL, Rajkot	Supplementary bill of slowness	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent having an LTMD tariff connection No. 87202/02443/8. The Appellant represented that, the checking of the said electricity connection of was carried out by the Respondent on 25.07.2023 in</p>	<p>The Respondent has confirmed vide letter dated 06.03.2024 about</p>

				<p>respect of which a supplementary bill amounting Rs. 14,54,438.37 towards slowness of meter for period from June 2019 to July 2023 was issued to the Appellant.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented that, the supplementary bill is not in line with the regulation 6.33 of the GERC supply code 2015, supplementary bill for meter slowness can not be issued for the period of more than 6 months. It is further represented that, as per Hon'ble GERC regulation, the Respondent is supposed to carry out inspection of electricity connection once in every six months. The Respondent did not carry out the checking of the meter even when the process of change of the name and extension of contract load was done. The Appellant prayed to revise and issue the supplementary bill only for period of 6 months from the date of checking as per the Hon'ble GERC regulations 6.33 of Electricity Supply Code 2015.</p> <p>The Respondent has represented that, the Appellant's meter was replaced with solar bi-directional meter number PGBCT000269 on date 21.06.2019. As doubt arose in the meter reading of the said bi-directional meter, the meter was replaced on date 13.07.2023 with the meter box and the same were tested at the meter testing laboratory on date 25.07.2023. At the time of meter testing polarity of the B-phase C.T. was found to be reversed. As a result, it is found that the import reading was recorded 32.963% less energy and the export reading was recorded 33% more energy. Due to a human error during installation of the said bi-directional meter, the consumption was not recorded properly into the meter. Hence, the Respondent issued supplementary bill amounting Rs.14,54,438.37 to the Appellant. In this case, due to improper wiring due to human error, the consumption was recorded incompletely into the meter. So the supplementary bill was issued at the normal tariff rate. As per the previous similar type case ombudsman order, and chapter 17.1 of the limitation act, incomplete recorded consumption could be recovered.</p>	<p>implemen tation.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------

					<p>It is observed that from June 2019 to July 2023 approx. during 4 years total of 98,060 units were generated by solar Rooftop plant whereas total 1,39,905 units were exported to the electricity grid. However, the Respondent didn't notice such abnormality at the time of billing. Hence, there was gross negligence at every level right from installation of Bi-directional meter to billing, therefore it was directed the respondent to take disciplinary action against all responsible defaulter employees. It was observed from the data collected through MRI that, 'Y' phase CT is connected in reverse direction, therefore Ampere recorded during certain events were having 'Negative' sign whereas remaining two phases having 'Positive' sign. It is also noted that, in certain time slot, 'Export Units' are more than the 'Generated Units' which are recorded in same time slot in Generator Meter.</p> <p>In fact, real time it is difficult to decide as to whether, energy recorded in Meter is actually 'Import' or 'Export' energy as it depends on real time generation and consumption.</p> <p>Therefore, it was concluded that, 61411 units which were recorded as 'Export Unit' in Bi-directional Meter during non-solar hrs. i.e. (19:00 to 6:00 Hrs.) were actually 'Import Unit' as at that time there was no question of solar generation. Further, settlement of 'Import' and 'Export' unit is carried out as per provisions spelled out in 'Inter connection' agreement executed between the 'Appellant' and 'Respondent'. Therefore, it is required to carry out settlement accordingly. Therefore it was directed the Respondent to deduct 61411 units from the total 139905 export units and consider them as import units and accordingly calculated revised 'Export' and 'Import' unit and recalculate 'Net Energy' as per the provisions of agreement and revised the bills from 2019 to 2023 period.</p>	
9	40/2023	Nagibhai Bhimabhai Ambaliya	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	New Agriculture connection	<p>The Appellant has applied for new agriculture connection, later on which was switched to Off-grid solar pump connection on 06.10.2016. The Appellant has paid demand note on 01.06.2022 for new agriculture connection through conventional grid at</p>	<p>The Respondent has confirmed vide letter dated 14.03.2023 about</p>

					<p>same land parcel where off-grid solar pump connection was granted.</p> <p>After payment of demand note, the Respondent denied for granting connection stating that as per the GR of EPD, GoG it is not possible to grant new connection at same land parcel.</p> <p>In case of Appellant, as per provisions of the GR of GoG, off-grid solar pump was granted on 06.10.2016 and as per the provisions of the GR, ownership of off-grid solar pump will be transferred to consumer after completion of five years and consumer shall not entitle to get electricity connection through conventional grid for next five years.</p> <p>Further, in case of area of land parcel is more than 8 acre, there is a provision to grant second connection, however the land parcel of the Appellant is less than 8 acre, therefore it is not possible to grant second connection to the Appellant.</p> <p>It was also noted that, concerned employee of the Respondent has processed application of the Appellant for new connection, whereas the provisions of the GR don't permit for second connection, therefore merely processing application didn't create right for new connection. However, the Appellant was directed to take disciplinary action on defaulter. Also, the Respondent was directed to refund demand note charges to the Appellant.</p> <p>The Appellant has also represented certain issues about off-grid solar pump, however there was tri-parted agreement among parties including the Appellant and the Respondent, therefore issues arose in respect of agreement would require to be settled through arbitration as per the terms of agreement, hence no observations were made in this regards.</p>	implemen tation.
10	42/20 23	Gohil Dilubhai Jethabhai	PGVCL, Bhavnaga r	Re- connectio n	<p>The Appellant has represented to reconnect agriculture connection which was disconnected by the Respondent. On 24.03.2021 the Respondent has disconnected power supply of the connection due to arrears. However, the consumer has paid due amount as well as paid reconnection charges, though connection didn't reconnect for any reason. The Respondent has continued</p>	The Responde nt has confirmed vide letter dated 09.02.24 about implemen tation.

					<p>billing till March-2022 mentioning regular consumption whereas 'Meter' of the said connection was removed by the Respondent.</p> <p>The Appellant has filed grievance before CGRF-Bhavnagar, in which it was ordered to reconnect power supply, however the Respondent has informed the Appellant to submit application for reconnection with required documents. The Appellant has submitted the application where in land is co-owned by other owners with consumer, therefore the Respondent has informed the Appellant to submit NOC of other co-owners.</p> <p>Since, it was gross negligence of the Respondent as even after payment of reconnection charges by the consumer, power supply didn't restore at relevant point of time, therefore it is not appropriate now to ask documents from the Appellant. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to restore power supply without insisting for any documents from the Appellant.</p>	
11	43/2023	Jayeshbhai Karshanbhai Padariya	PGVCL, Rajkot	Transfer of connection	<p>The Appellant has applied for change of name in existing residential lighting connection. The Respondent has denied for change of name mentioning that, there is no reference of existing consumer in sale deed, which is produced by the Appellant. Also, NoC of existing consumer was also not submitted.</p> <p>The Respondent has also submitted that, address mentioned in electricity bill, sale deed and property tax receipt are not same.</p> <p>During hearing of the case, it was informed the Respondent and the Appellant to carry out joint inspection report to verify as to whether power boundary of existing connection and boundary as per sale deed are same or different.</p> <p>Accordingly, it was decided that power boundary of electricity connection are same as per sale deed.</p> <p>Therefore, the Respondent was directed to process the application of the Appellant as per the supply code-2015 regulation 4.71, and in case the Appellant don't provide NoC of existing consumer, required security deposit should be recovered as per regulations.</p>	The Respondent has confirmed vide letter dated 25.01.2024 about implementation.

12	44/20 23	M/s. Hi-Bond Cement India Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Rajkot	Recovery of peak hour charges	<p>The Appellant has setup Solar Power Plant and Hybrid Power Plant for captive use purpose. The Appellant has represented that the Respondent has recovered peak hour charges on energy which was generated and setoff during peak hours, whereas as per the wheeling agreement and provisions of policies, peak hour charges should not be applicable.</p> <p>In fact, the issue raised is in respect of power plant setup by the Appellant, therefore the representation was kept on admission stage to decide eligibility for admission.</p> <p>Since power plant is setup under respective solar policy and hybrid power plant policy as 'Generator' and settlement of generated energy is required to be carried out as per the terms of wheeling agreement, which is executed by the Appellant in capacity of 'Generator'.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented that, the issue raised is among 'Consumer' and 'Distribution Licensee', therefore the Ombudsman has jurisdiction to adjudicate the issue.</p> <p>Since the Appellant is 'Generating Company' as defined in the EA-2003, therefore the Appellant can't be termed as 'Consumer' where issue is in regards to power plants.</p> <p>In view of the above, it was decided that the Appellant doesn't falls withing definition of 'Complainant' as per the provisions of regulations of notification no.2 of 2019 and accordingly the representation don't fulfil the conditions to register representation. Hence, it is disposed on admission stage without going in to merits of the case.</p>
13.	45/20 23	Shri Kanabhai Lakhabhai Chavada	PGVCL, Bhuj	Installatio n of Meter	<p>The Appellant has applied for new electricity connection for residential lighting connection on 09.10.2019 and paid demand note on 15.11.2019.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent has commenced power supply without installation of Meter to the connection and at that time staff of the Respondent has stated about shortage of Meter. The Appellant has followed many times before the Respondent for providing Meter to the connection.</p>

					<p>The Respondent has stated that, the connection of the Appellant was released on 18.03.2020 with Meter and submitted Performa having details of Meter, however Performa was not signed by the Appellant acknowledging the installation of Meter and power supply.</p> <p>The Respondent has carried out installation checking of the said connection on 27.07.2023, wherein it was detected that, at the premises of the Appellant power theft was detected and the Respondent has issued supplementary bill amounting Rs. 279513.95 in name of Chavda Lakhubhai Naranbhai, who is father of the Appellant. Since the bill issued under Section -135 of the EA-2003, the representation in this regards, doesn't fall within jurisdiction of the Ombudsman, therefore merits in this respect were not discussed, however it was noted about dues on premises.</p> <p>It is also noted that, the Respondent has carried out regular meter reading of the connection and issued bill as per the actual consumption recorded in the Meter, but out of 22 bills, 19 bills were issued for '0' consumption and meter reading as of now shown as '1' unit, which shows gross negligence of the Respondent.</p> <p>It is accepted by the Respondent and the Appellant that as of now, Meter doesn't exist at the connection.</p> <p>As per the provisions of the Supply Code-2015, regulation 4.30, as dues is pending on the premises of the Appellant, the Respondent is directed to provide power supply to the Appellant after clearance of issue regarding pending dues.</p>
14.	46/20 23	Shri Daki Jethabhai Devabhai C/o. Daki Hardasbhai Jethabhai	PGVCL, Junagadh	Shifting of Line	<p>The Appellant has represented about action taken by of the Respondent in regards of shifting of 11 KV line, which was originally erected in govt. land. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent has illegally shifted that line to favour certain persons. He also alleged about encroachment of land and about bribe.</p> <p>The Appellant is not a consumer of the Respondent company as well as didn't mention what deficiency observed in services of the Dist. Licensee. Therefore, it was informed to submit that,</p>

					<p>how his representation fulfills conditions as per the regulations of Notification no.02/2019. The Appellant didn't submit any clarification and again submit same representation, therefore in the interest of justice his representation is registered on 'Admission Stage' to decide admissibility during hearing. However, even after sufficient opportunities granted to attend hearing, the Appellant didn't prefer to attend it.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the line was shifted as per the application of consumer and after payment of requisite charges as per norms. Further, line is shifted in such a way that, it doesn't obstruct anyone including the Appellant.</p> <p>It was noticed that, the Appellant neither submit clarification nor remain present during hearing. It is also not submitted how line shifted creates any obstructions to him. In fact, Distribution licensee has inherent rights to decide line route.</p> <p>Further, his allegation about encroachment of land and about bribe doesn't fall in jurisdiction of this office.</p> <p>Therefore, his application is rejected on admission stage.</p>
15.	47/20 23	Jaybharat Steel Corporation	PGVCL, Bhuj	Non implementation of CGRF Order	<p>The Appellant has represented that, order of the CGRF-Bhuj was not implemented by the Respondent.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, as per their departmental procedure it was required to obtain approval from competent authority to acquiesce with the order of CGRF and the procedure for obtaining such approval was in process.</p> <p>During the day of hearing, the Appellant has submitted that, the Respondent has credited amount as per the order of CGRF.</p> <p>As, the order is implemented by the Respondent, therefore, no other observation made in respect of merits of the case and disposed it.</p>
16.	01/20 24	Jadeja Narendrasinh Ladhubha	PGVCL, Bhuj	Billing related	<p>The Appellant has represented about the higher consumption recorded in May-June-2023 billing period. The Appellant has represented that, it was a quite higher consumption in respect of other months.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, on request of the Appellant</p>

					<p>the Meter was replaced and tested in Laboratory, at that time no defect was observed. Also, data through MRI was collected which is in consistent with the billing data.</p> <p>It was observed that, data collected through MRI is in line with billing data also no defect observed in Meter during inspection, therefore, mere doubt of higher consumption can't be considered as valid proof.</p> <p>Therefore, consumption recorded by the Respondent is OK and accordingly the representation is rejected.</p>	
17.	02/20 24	Poapt Lalitbhai Liladharbhai	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing related	<p>The Appellant has setup 10 KW solar plant with his NRGp connection. The Respondent has issued revised bill for duration form July-2021 to Sept.-2023 mentioning that, previously billing series of 'Import' and 'Export' reading was interchanged inadvertently, therefore, revised bills were issued as per actual 'Import' and 'Export' energy.</p> <p>It was observed that, during July-2021 to Sept.-2023, 28 bills were served. Out of 28, in 20 bills 'Export' units are higher than 'Generated unit' recorded in Generator Meter, which is technically not possible.</p> <p>It was also noted that, Bi-directional meter and Generator Meter are tested in laboratory and found OK.</p> <p>As per data collected through MRI, Generator Meter reading recorded during billing are in consistent with MRI. Whereas, in data of Bi-directional meter, 'Import' series data is matched with 'Export' units recorded in billing data and vice versa.</p> <p>It was also observed that, during 28 billing cycles, meter readers remained careless as well as other connected staff, therefore the Respondent was directed to take action on part of defaulters. As, it reveals from the MRI data that, reading series interchanged between Import and Export, the Respondent was directed to recalculate bill as per the reading series abstracted from MRI and also directed to grant 12 equal installments for payment of revised bills.</p>	
18.	03/20 24	Atlantis Infraspace LLP	PGVCL, Rajkot	Work under Option-2	<p>The Appellant has registered for 107 NRGp connections, the Respondent has released all connection by erecting HT line, TC and 110 Mtr. LT line.</p>	Under implemen tation

					<p>After release of the connections, the Appellant has represented to remove LT overhead line by laying underground cable under Option-2.</p> <p>The Respondent has denied for it stating that, there is no provision to provide U/G cable by removing LT line in existing connections.</p> <p>It was observed that, the Respondent has allowed LT using U/G cable under option-2 in case of New Connections.</p> <p>There is no specific provisions which restrict work carried out under Option-2 by the Applicant. Therefore, the action of the Respondent to restrict the Appellant to carry out work under Option-2 whereas allows applicants of new connections to carryout work under Option-2 creates discrimination between applicants.</p> <p>Therefore, the Respondent was directed to allow the Appellant to work under Option-2.</p>	
19.	06/20 24	Dilipsinh Devisinh Jadeja	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing related	<p>The Appellant has represented to grant 36 installments to pay supplementary bill issued by the Respondent towards pending units.</p> <p>In fact, the meter reading of the Appellant was carried out since 2014 under 'Lock' or 'Not approachable' status, so continuously '0' unit bills were issued to the Appellant.</p> <p>During installation checking, it was noticed that actual consumed units are quite higher than recorded in bills, therefore the Respondent has replaced the meter and inspected in Meter Testing Laboratory, and it was found OK.</p> <p>The Appellant didn't represent about pending units, he has only prayed for installment for payment of supplementary bill.</p> <p>It was noticed that, the Respondent didn't take care to record actual consumption for more than 9 years, which was resulted in accumulation of units. Therefore, the Respondent company was directed to take action on defaulters. Further supplementary bill was served amounting Rs. 4.40,609.00, so the Appellant has requested for 36 installments, as in the matter it was noticed that, the issue was arose due to negligence of the Respondent, therefore it appears justified to grant interest free installments, therefore 12 installment were granted, which</p>	Under implemen tation

					required to be paid along with regular bill amount within grace period of bill payment, otherwise the Respondent can recover delay payment charges.
20.	07/20 24	M/s. Niva Green Industries India Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Rajkot	Refund of Electricity Duty	<p>The Appellant has represented to refund Electricity Duty which was recovered @20% on consumption charges instead of 10%, which is applicable to manufacturing units during period from Feb.-2023 to Aug.-2023.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented before the Respondent to recover applicable Electricity Duty, therefore, from Sept.-2023 onwards the Respondent has recovered Electricity Duty @10% on consumption charges.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented that, the purpose of consumption was mentioned in Application Form which was submitted to the Respondent for new electricity supply, however the Respondent didn't take note of it and recovered Electricity Duty @20% instead of 10%. The Respondent has also accepted the same and submitted that, as per the letter of the Commissioner of Electricity Duty, it was advised that, in no case ED should be refunded to consumer even if ED was recovered at different rate than applicable rate.</p> <p>The letter of the Commissioner of Electricity Duty was taken on note, also the matter of Electricity Duty didn't fall within jurisdiction of the Electricity Ombudsman, therefore without any further observation, the Appellant was advised to approach competent authority in this regard and informed the Respondent to help the Appellant if any required in representation before such authority.</p>
21.	41/20 23	M/s. Astron Paper and Boarf Mill Limited	PGVCL, Bhuj	Non-implementation of CGRF order	<p>The Appellant has represented about implementation of CGRF order dated 25.01.19. The representation was registered on admission stage as it was represented after stipulated timeline. It is also informed CGRF to submit case file. In reply to that, CGRF has submitted that, the Appellant has already represented before the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad at relevant time, which was registered as case no.75/2021 and decided at that time. The Appellant has again represented before Electricity Ombudsman, Rajkot hiding the fact about</p>

					earlier order of Electricity Ombudsman. As there is no provision to hear again afresh, its representation is disposed without any order.
22.	05/20 24	Shri Bhartbhai Karshanbhai Parmar	PGVCL, Bhuj	Non- implemen tation of CGRF order	The Appellant has represented about implementation of CGRF order. The representation was about new electricity connection. The representation was registered and conveyed to the Appellant, Discom and CGRF. It was decided to conduct hearing on 12.03.2024 and conveyed to all parties. Meantime, the Appellant has represented that, as per the Order of CGRF, PGVCL has released new electricity connection and requested to disposed representation. Accordingly, his representation is disposed without any order.

S/d.
Electricity Ombudsman.

OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN-RAJKOT

**Status of representations disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman during the
First half-year (i.e. Apr.2023 to Sept-2023) of the year 2023-24.**

Sr. No.	CGRF	Representations			Representations disposed of				Representations pending at the end of 30.09.2023	Disposed of within 45 days.	Disposed of after 45 days.	No. of seatings.
		Pending as on 01.04.23	Received during Apr.23 to Sept-23	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
1	PGVCL- Bhavnagar	1	5	6	3	2	1	6	0	0	6	9
2	PGVCL- Rajkot	7	5	12	4	5	0	9	3	1	8	9
3	PGVCL- Bhuj	1	2	3	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	4
4	PGVCL- Junagadh	4	10	14	7	4	0	11	3	0	11	12
	Total	13	22	35	17	11	1	29	6	1	28	34


Electricity Ombudsman

OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN-RAJKOT

**Status of representations disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman during the
Second half-year (i.e. Oct.2023 to Mar-2024) of the year 2023-24.**

Sr. No.	CGRF	Representations			Representations disposed of				Representations pending at the end of 31.03.2024	Disposed of within 45 days.	Disposed of after 45 days.	No. of seatings.
		Pending as on 01.10.23	Received during Oct.23 to Mar-24	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
1	PGVCL- Bhavnagar	0	5	5	2	0	0	2	3	1	1	3
2	PGVCL- Rajkot	3	8	11	5	1	3	9	2	6	3	9
3	PGVCL- Bhuj	0	6	6	2	1	1	4	2	2	2	4
4	PGVCL- Junagadh	3	4	7	4	2	1	7	0	2	5	9
	Total	6	23	29	13	4	5	22	7	11	11	25

S/d.
Electricity Ombudsman

OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN-RAJKOT
Status of representations disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman during the
Financial Year 2023-2024

Sr. No.	CGRF	Representations			Representations disposed of				Representations pending at the end of the year	Disposed of within 45 days.	Disposed of after 45 days.	No. of seatings.
		Pending at the beginning of the year	Received during the year	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
1.	PGVCL,Bhavnagar	1	10	11	5	2	1	8	3	1	7	12
2.	PGVCL,Rajkot	7	13	20	9	6	3	18	2	7	11	19
3.	PGVCL- Bhuj	1	8	9	5	1	1	7	2	2	5	8
4.	PGVCL- Junagadh	4	14	18	11	6	1	18	0	2	16	20
	Total	13	45	58	30	15	6	51	7	12	39	59

S/d.
Electricity Ombudsman