

**AGENDA NOTE  
FOR  
THE 26<sup>TH</sup> MEETING TO REVIEW THE PERFORMANCE OF  
CGRFs AND OMBUDSMAN**

---

Date:	<b>19<sup>th</sup> January, 2026</b>
Time:	<b>11:30 AM</b>
Venue:	Hotel Grand Mercure, GIFT City, Gandhinagar - 382 050.

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>
1.	Confirmation of the Minutes of the 25 <sup>th</sup> Meeting
2.	Action Taken Report on Minutes of 25 <sup>th</sup> Meeting
3.	Constitution of New Forums in line with GERC (CGRF & Ombudsman) (First Amendment) Regulations, 2023
4.	Timely submission of Quarterly / Annual Reports by the Forums as per Specified Format
5.	Intimation about changes in Members / Convener of Forum
6.	Review of Performance of CGRFs & Ombudsman
7.	Status of implementation of orders of the Ombudsman by distribution licensees
8.	Presentation by Forums
9.	Any other item with permission of the Chair

**Item No. 1: Confirmation of the Minutes of the 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

GERC vide its letter no. GERC/Tech-II/5923/1767 dated 14.09.2023 circulated minutes of the 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting to review the performance of CGRFs and Ombudsman held on 19.08.2023 at Hotel Grand Mercure, GIFT City, Gandhinagar. Since, no comments have been received from the members, Minutes of the 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting may be treated as approved.

**Item No. 2: Action Taken Report on Minutes of 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Item No. 4: Review of performance

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

In this regard, CGRF – MGVL, vide letter dated 20.09.2023, informed the Commission that it has issued order to the complainant in stipulated time as per the rules and regulations of the Commission. However, instruction of the Commission is noted for implementation.

Other Forums shall apprise the Commission about the present status.

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

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

In this regard, CGRF – MGVL, vide letter dated 20.09.2023, informed the Commission that it has noted the advice of the Commission.

Other Forums shall apprise the Commission about the present status.

**Item No. 3: Constitution of New Forums in line with GERC (CGRF & Ombudsman) (First Amendment) Regulations, 2023**

The Commission has issued GERC (CGRF & Ombudsman) (First Amendment) Regulations, 2023, Notification No. 3 of 2023 dated 06.12.2023. The Commission, vide letters dated 05.09.2024, has directed all the Discoms (DGVCL, MGVL, PGVL, UGVCL, TPL – Ahd., Surat, Dahej, Dholera & MBSIR, MUL, DPA, GIFT PCL, AIVPL and JIL) to establish Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) at Circle / Zonal level and at Corporate Office

level in line with Clause 3 of the GERC (CGRF & Ombudsman) (First Amendment) Regulations, 2023 (Amendment Regulations).

The present list of the forums which have started functioning is as shown in Table below:

List of functioning CGRFs in Discoms				
Name of Discom		Level	Location of New Forums	
A. State DISCOMs	DGVCL	Corporate (1 no.)	1	Surat Corporate Office
		Circle (4 nos.)	2	Surat City Circle
			3	Surat Rural Circle
			4	Valsad Circle
			5	Bharuch Circle
		No. of Forums: 5	-	-
	MGVCL	Corporate (1 no.)	1	Vadodara Corporate Office
		Circle (5 nos.)	2	Baroda O&M Circle
			3	Baroda City Circle
			4	Anand O&M Circle
			5	Nadiad O&M Circle
			6	Godhra O&M Circle
		No. of Forums: 6	-	-
	PGVCL	Corporate (1 no.)	1	Rajkot Corporate Office
		Circle (12 nos.)	2	Rajkot City Circle
			3	Rajkot Rural Circle
			4	Morbi Circle
			5	Junagadh Circle
			6	Porbandar Circle
			7	Jamnagar Circle
			8	Anjar Circle
			9	Bhuj Circle
			10	Amreli Circle
			11	Bhavnagar Circle
			12	Botad Circle
			13	Surendranagar Circle
		No. of Forums: 13	-	-
	UGVCL	Corporate (1 no.)	1	Mehsana Corporate Office
		Circle (4 nos.)	2	Mehsana Circle
			3	Sabarmati Circle
			4	Palanpur Circle
			5	Himmatnagar Circle
		No. of Forums: 5	-	-
	Total No. of Forums for State Discoms: <u>29</u>			

Name of Discom		Level	Location of New Forums	
B. Torrent power	TPL-D (Ahd.)	Corporate (1 no.)	1	Ahmedabad Corporate Office
		Zone (3 nos.)	2	Gandhinagar
			3	Ahmedabad East
			4	Ahmedabad West
		No. of Forums: 4	-	-
	TPL-D (Surat)	Corporate	1	Surat
	TPL-D (Dahej)	Corporate	1	Dahej
	TPL-D (Dholera)	Corporate	-	(Forum not constituted)
	TPL-D (MBSIR)	Corporate	-	(Forum not constituted)
Total No. of Forums for TPL: <u>6</u>				

Name of Discom		Level	Location of New Forums	
C. SEZs	MUL	Corporate	1	Mundra
	DPA	Corporate	-	(Forum not constituted)
	GIFT PCL	Corporate	1	GIFT City
	AIVPL	Corporate	1	Pipaliya
	JIL	Corporate	1	Vilayat
	Total No. of Forums for SEZs: <u>4</u>			

**Item No. 4: Timely submission of Quarterly / Annual Reports by the Forums as per Specified Format**

As per Clause 2.55 of the GERC (CGRF & Ombudsman) (First Amendment) Regulations, 2023, the Forum shall submit a quarterly report on disposal of Complaints/Grievances to the Licensee, the Commission and Ombudsman. The report should be submitted within 15 days of close of the quarter to which it relates. The licensee shall send quarterly report to the Ombudsman and to the Commission in respect to consumer grievance related information showing the extent to which the time schedule specified in these Regulations related to grievance redressal has been followed by the Forums.

- In this regard it is observed that the quarterly reports are not submitted timely by some of the forums.



- It is also observed that in the reports submitted by the forums, there are issues regarding mismatch of opening-closing figures among consecutive quarters.
- Further, the quarterly reports submitted by some of the forums are not prepared as per Format-I and Format-II of Annexure-II of the Regulations. The Regulations provides that in the event of grievance being disposed of after the maximum period of 30 days as stipulated in the Regulations, the Forum should record in writing, the reasons for the same at the time of disposing off the said grievance.
- The Sr. No. 6 of the Table specified in Format-I of Annexure-II of the Regulations specifies that CGRFs shall submit the details of '*Grievances successfully redressed during the quarter – After 30 days along with reasons in brief*'. Further, Sr. No. 8 of the Table specifies that that CGRFs shall submit the details of '*Grievances pending for more than 30 days along with reasons in brief*'. It is observed that the reason for delay / pendency in disposal of grievance is not submitted by some of the CGRFs.  
(Sample Reports are kept at **Annexure-1 & Annexure-2**)
- Similarly, in the Table specified in Annexure-IV of the Regulations, the Electricity Ombudsman are required to submit the details of '*Representation disposed of after 45 days along with reasons in brief*'.
- All the forums / licensees shall submit the quarterly reports complete in all aspects as per the Regulations.

Moreover, as per the Clause 2.57 (Clause 2.58 of Principal Regulations), the Forum shall also furnish a yearly report containing a general review of activities of the Forum during the financial year to the Licensee, Commission and Ombudsman. The report should be submitted within 45 days of close of the financial year to which it relates.

- All the forums shall submit the yearly report within the time limit specified in the Regulation.

#### **Item No. 5: Intimation about changes in Members / Convener of Forum**

It is observed that timely intimation by the forums to the Commission regarding changes in Members / Convener is not done. Moreover, any change in e-mail ID of forum / Convener is also not intimated to the Commission.

All the forums are directed to assign one permanent e-mail ID for regular correspondence with the Commission and any changes in e-mail ID, Member or Convener shall be immediately informed to the Commission so that same can be updated on the Commission's website. Moreover, the changes shall also be made on the website of the respective Discoms.

**Item No. 6: Review of Performance of CGRFs & Ombudsman**

The summary of Annual Reports for FY 2024-25 and Quarterly Reports for Q1 and Q2 of FY 2025-26 received from the CGRFs & Ombudsman are enclosed as **Annexures 3 to 6**. This may be discussed.

The Chairperson of all the Corporate Level Forums shall apprise the Commission about the delay in redressal of cases and pending cases of the respective corporate and circle level forums.

**Item No. 7: Status of implementation of orders of the Ombudsman by distribution licensees**

The GERC (CGRF and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 provides for the Electricity Ombudsman to submit yearly report with status of implementation of orders of the Ombudsman by distribution licensees. The Annual Report for FY 2024-25 and Half-Yearly Report for FY 2025-26 submitted by the Electricity Ombudsman – Ahmedabad and Rajkot are kept at **Annexure 7 to 10**. This may be discussed.

Further, Electricity Ombudsman - Ahmedabad and Rajkot are requested to give their observations on the performance of the CGRFs.

**Item No. 8: Presentation by Forums**

The representatives of MGVCL - Vadodara Corporate Forum, PGVCL - Rajkot Corporate Forum and TPL - Ahmedabad Corporate Forum will make presentation on a typical case highlighting the legal aspects and general observations in the orders.

**Item No. 9: Any other item with permission of the Chair.**

Sd/-  
(S.T. Anada)  
Joint Director  
Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Gandhinagar

## Annexure - 1

CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM : (BHAVNAGAR FORUM)									
Paschim Gujarat Vij Company Limited, Zonal Office, Vij Seva Sadan, Chavdi Gate, Bhavnagar.									
QUARTERLY REPORT : OF :		Quater-02	2025-26	Format-I					
Sr. No.	Parameter		Delay in Restoring supply	Quality of Supply	Meter Problems	Billing Problems	Quality of service	Others	Total
1	Grievances pending at end of previous quarter		0	1	1	2	1	5	10
2	Grievances received during this quarter		0	1	1	3	0	4	9
3	Total grievances (1 + 2)		0	2	2	5	1	9	19
4	Grievances redressed during this quarter		0	1	0	2	0	3	6
5	Balance Grievances to be attended (3-4)		0	1	2	3	1	6	13
6	Grievances successfully redressed during this quarter.	a) Within 30 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		b) After 30 days	0	1	0	4	0	1	6
		Total	0	1	0	4	0	1	6
7	Grievances in the process of redressal (*)		0	0	0	1	1	3	5
8	Grievances pending for more than 30 days (**)		0	1	2	2	1	3	9
9	No of cases redressed in favour of licensee		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	No of cases redressed in favour of consumer		0	1	0	1	0	3	5
11	Others		0	0	0	1	0	0	1
12	No of sittings in the quarter		2						
13	No of sittings attended by Chair Person		2						
14	No of sittings attended by Member Finance		2						
15	No of sittings attended by Independent Member		2						
16	No of sittings attended by Prosumer Member		1						
17	No of sittings attended by Consumer Member		2						

Note : (\*) Grievances successfully redressed during this quarter(More Than 30 Days) 1. 03 nos cases delayed due to new formation of circle level CGRF.

2. 01 No Cases applicant not present in 3 meeting.

3. 02 Case delayed due to Decide meeting within 30 Days but Judgement singed delayed due to not received deatil by division office.

(\*\*): 07 Cases delayed due to adjourned next meeting and 02 under judgement process

**Quarter : SECOND    Quarter Financial Year : 2025-26**

Sr. No	Parameters		Delay in restoring supply	Quality of supply	Meter problem	Billing problems	Quality of service	Others	Total
1	Grievances Pending at the end of previous quarter		0	1	0	1	0	1	3
2	Grievances received during the quarter		0	0	3	2	0	7	12
3	Total Grievances (1+2)		0	1	3	3	0	8	15
4	Grievances redressed during the quarter		0	1	3	3	0	7	14
5	Balance Grievances to be redressed (3-4)		0	0	0	0	0	1	1
6.	Grievances Successfully redressed during the quarter	a) Within 30 days	0	0	1	2	0	2	5
		b) After 30 days	0	1	2	1	0	5	9
7.	Grievances in the process of Redressal		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.	Grievances pending for more than 30 Days		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	Number of Cases redressed in favor of the Licensee		0	1	2	3	0	0	6
10	Number of Cases redressed in favor of the Consumers		0	0	1	0	0	0	1
11	Others		0	0	0	0	0	7	7
12	No. of sittings in the quarter		03						
13	No. of sitting attended by the Chairperson		03						
14	No. of sitting attended by the Technical Member		03						
15	No. of sitting attended by the Independent Member		00						

## Annexure - 3

## Grievances redressed by CGRFs during FY 2024-25

CGRF	Grievances pending at the end of previous Year	Grievances received during the Year	Total Grievances	Grievances redressed during the Year	Balance Grievances to be attended	Grievances successfully redressed during the Year			Number of cases redressed in favour of the Licensee	Number of cases redressed in favour of the Consumers	Others	No. of sittings
	1	2	3=1+2	4	5=3-4	Within 30 days	After 30 days	Total				
DGVCL Surat*	4	56	60	55	5	35	20	55	15	32	8	24
DGVCL Valsad	2	14	16	15	1	14	1	15	4	5	6	9
MGVCL Vadodara	0	43	43	43	0	43	0	43	13	30	0	12
MGVCL Godhra	2	32	34	32	2	32	0	32	5	26	1	11
PGVCL Rajkot*	4	57	61	50	11	10	40	50	22	23	5	14
PGVCL Bhavnagar*	12	138	150	129	21	41	88	129	54	47	28	40
PGVCL Bhuj*	4	26	30	25	5	12	13	25	15	10	0	10
PGVCL Junagadh*	11	54	65	53	12	23	30	53	23	24	6	15
UGVCL Mehsana*	0	25	25	25	0	15	10	25	13	12	0	11
UGVCL Ahmedabad*	4	41	45	43	2	33	10	43	17	19	7	22
TPL-D Ahmedabad*	2	23	25	24	1	15	9	24	18	0	6	43
TPL-D Surat*	0	29	29	28	1	18	10	28	18	1	9	48
TPL-D Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>270</b>

\* More number of grievances redressed after 30 days

**Types of grievances redressed by the CGRF during FY 2024-25**

<b>CGRF</b>	<b>Delay in restoring supply</b>	<b>Quality of supply</b>	<b>Meter Problems</b>	<b>Billing Problems</b>	<b>Quality of Service</b>	<b>Others</b>	<b>Total</b>
DGVCL Surat	0	5	2	11	0	37	55
DGVCL Valsad	0	1	2	5	0	7	15
MGVCL Vadodara	3	1	0	25	1	13	43
MGVCL Godhra	0	0	0	20	5	7	32
PGVCL Rajkot	0	1	7	23	19	0	50
PGVCL Bhavnagar	0	9	10	52	16	42	129
PGVCL Bhuj	2	1	6	9	0	7	25
PGVCL Junagadh	0	4	0	25	7	17	53
UGVCL Mehsana	1	1	5	7	0	11	25
UGVCL Ahmedabad	1	3	0	31	0	8	43
TPL-D Ahmedabad	0	1	0	2	0	21	24
TPL-D Surat	0	4	3	0	1	20	28
TPL-D Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>522</b>

---

## Annexure - 4

## Grievances redressed by CGRFs during FY 2025-26 (Q-1 &amp; Q-2)

CGRF	Grievances pending at the end of previous Year	Grievances received during the Year	Total Grievances	Grievances redressed during the Year	Balance Grievances to be attended	Grievances successfully redressed during the Year			Grievances pending for more than 30 days	Number of cases redressed in favour of the Licensee	Number of cases redressed in favour of the Consumers	Others	No. of sittings
	1	2	3=1+2	4	5=3-4	Within 30 days	After 30 days	Total					
DGVCL - Surat Corporate	5	25	30	29	1	15	14	29	0	7	6	16	8
DGVCL - Valsad Circle	1	9	10	9	1	8	1	9	1	2	7	0	3
MGVCL - Vadodara Corporate	0	26	26	26	0	26	0	26	0	8	18	0	5
MGVCL - Baroda O&M Circle	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
MGVCL - Baroda City Circle	0	49	49	49	0	48	1	49	2	48	1	0	1
MGVCL - Anand Circle	0	7	7	7	0	7	0	7	0	0	0	7	0
MGVCL - Nadiad Circle	0	5	5	4	1	4	0	4	0	0	4	0	4
MGVCL - Godhra Circle	2	15	17	17	0	17	0	17	0	0	15	2	5
PGVCL - Rajkot Corporate	11	31	42	39	3	1	38	39	8	15	6	18	6
PGVCL - Rajkot City Circle	0	9	9	8	1	4	4	8	1	3	0	5	2
PGVCL - Rajkot Rural Circle	0	3	3	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	0

AGENDA NOTE FOR 26<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF CGRF & OMBUDSMAN

CGRF	Grievances pending at the end of previous Year	Grievances received during the Year	Total Grievances	Grievances redressed during the Year	Balance Grievances to be attended	Grievances successfully redressed during the Year			Grievances pending for more than 30 days	Number of cases redressed in favour of the Licensee	Number of cases redressed in favour of the Consumers	Others	No. of sittings
	1	2	3=1+2	4	5=3-4	Within 30 days	After 30 days	Total					
PGVCL - Morbi Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Junagadh Circle	12	17	29	29	0	19	10	29	0	6	21	2	7
PGVCL - Porbandar Circle	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
PGVCL - Jamnagar Circle	0	12	12	5	7	1	4	5	4	1	2	2	1
PGVCL - Anjar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Bhuj Circle	5	8	13	13	0	6	7	13	3	4	8	1	5
PGVCL - Amreli Circle	4	1	5	2	3	0	2	2	3	2	0	0	2
PGVCL - Bhavnagar Circle	10	39	49	34	15	0	34	34	17	6	20	8	7
PGVCL - Botad Circle	4	5	9	8	1	1	7	8	1	1	4	3	2
PGVCL - Surendranagar Circle	3	12	15	1	14	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
UGVCL - Mehsana Corporate	0	15	15	15	0	13	2	15	0	5	10	0	6
UGVCL - Mehsana Circle	0	4	4	4	0	4	0	4	0	3	1	0	3
UGVCL - Sabarmati Circle	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
UGVCL - Palanpur Circle	3	20	23	23	0	18	5	23	0	2	0	21	3



AGENDA NOTE FOR 26<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF CGRF & OMBUDSMAN

CGRF	Grievances pending at the end of previous Year	Grievances received during the Year	Total Grievances	Grievances redressed during the Year	Balance Grievances to be attended	Grievances successfully redressed during the Year			Grievances pending for more than 30 days	Number of cases redressed in favour of the Licensee	Number of cases redressed in favour of the Consumers	Others	No. of sittings
	1	2	3=1+2	4	5=3-4	Within 30 days	After 30 days	Total					
UGVCL - Himmatnagar Circle	1	30	31	31	0	22	9	31	0	7	21	3	5
TPL-D (A) - Ahmedabad Corporate	1	6	7	6	1	5	1	6	0	5	0	1	25
TPL-D (A) - Ahmedabad East Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
TPL-D (A) - Ahmedabad West Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
TPL-D (A) - Gandhinagar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TPL-D (S) - Surat Corporate	1	4	5	5	0	5	0	5	0	4	0	1	26
TPL-D (D) - Dahej Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
MUL - Mundra Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
GIFT PCL - GIFT City Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
AIVPL - Pipaliya Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
JIL - Vilayat Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>148</b>

## Types of grievances redressed by the CGRF during FY 2025-26 – Q1 &amp; Q2

CGRF	Delay in restoring supply	Quality of supply	Meter Problems	Billing Problems	Quality of Service	Others	Total
DGVCL - Surat Corporate	0	4	8	5	0	12	29
DGVCL - Surat City Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DGVCL - Surat Rural Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DGVCL - Bharuch Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DGVCL - Valsad Circle	0	0	0	7	0	2	9
MGVCL - Vadodara Corporate	0	0	0	20	0	6	26
MGVCL - Baroda O&M Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
MGVCL - Baroda City Circle	0	8	3	9	1	28	49
MGVCL - Anand Circle	1	1	2	3	0	0	7
MGVCL - Nadiad Circle	0	1	0	2	0	1	4
MGVCL - Godhra Circle	2	2	1	1	0	11	17
PGVCL - Rajkot Corporate	0	0	0	25	14	0	39
PGVCL - Rajkot City Circle	0	1	1	2	4	0	8
PGVCL - Rajkot Rural Circle	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
PGVCL - Morbi Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Junagadh Circle	0	0	0	12	8	9	29
PGVCL - Porbandar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
PGVCL - Jamnagar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
PGVCL - Anjar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Bhuj Circle	1	0	3	5	0	4	13
PGVCL - Amreli Circle	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
PGVCL - Bhavnagar Circle	5	1	1	10	4	13	34
PGVCL - Botad Circle	0	3	0	5	0	0	8

AGENDA NOTE FOR 26<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF CGRF & OMBUDSMAN

<b>CGRF</b>	<b>Delay in restoring supply</b>	<b>Quality of supply</b>	<b>Meter Problems</b>	<b>Billing Problems</b>	<b>Quality of Service</b>	<b>Others</b>	<b>Total</b>
PGVCL - Surendranagar Circle	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
UGVCL - Mehsana Corporate	0	0	0	13	0	2	15
UGVCL - Mehsana Circle	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
UGVCL - Sabarmati Circle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
UGVCL - Palanpur Circle	2	10	2	3	2	4	23
UGVCL - Himmatnagar Circle	0	3	2	9	7	10	31
TPL-D (A) - Ahmedabad Corporate	0	0	0	1	0	5	6
TPL-D (A) - Ahd. East Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TPL-D (A) - Ahd. West Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TPL-D (A) - Gandhinagar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TPL-D (S) - Surat Corporate	0	0	0	1	0	4	5
TPL-D (D) - Dahej Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MUL - Mundra Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DPA - New Kandla Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GIFT PCL - GIFT City Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AIVPL - Pipaliya Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
JIL - Vilayat Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>369</b>

## Number of sittings of CGRF during FY 2025-26 – Q1 &amp; Q2

CGRF	No. of sittings in the quarter	No. of sittings attended by Chairperson	No. of sittings attended by Independent Member	No. of sittings attended by Representative of Consumers	No. of sittings attended by Representative of Prosumers	No. of sittings attended by Finance / Accounts / Tech. Member
DGVCL - Surat Corporate	8	8	5	3	0	5
DGVCL - Surat City Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0
DGVCL - Surat Rural Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0
DGVCL - Bharuch Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0
DGVCL - Valsad Circle	3	3	3	0	0	3
MGVCL - Vadodara Corporate	5	5	5	5	5	5
MGVCL - Baroda O&M Circle	1	1	1	1	1	1
MGVCL - Baroda City Circle	1	1	1	1	1	1
MGVCL - Anand Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0
MGVCL - Nadiad Circle	4	4	4	4	4	4
MGVCL - Godhra Circle	5	5	5	5	5	5
PGVCL - Rajkot Corporate	6	6	6	3	3	6
PGVCL - Rajkot City Circle	2	2	2	2	0	2
PGVCL - Rajkot Rural Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Morbi Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Junagadh Circle	7	7	7	0	1	5
PGVCL - Porbandar Circle	2	2	2	2	0	2
PGVCL - Jamnagar Circle	1	1	1	1	0	1
PGVCL - Anjar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Bhuj Circle	5	5	5	1	0	4

AGENDA NOTE FOR 26<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF CGRF & OMBUDSMAN

<b>CGRF</b>	<b>No. of sittings in the quarter</b>	<b>No. of sittings attended by Chairperson</b>	<b>No. of sittings attended by Independent Member</b>	<b>No. of sittings attended by Representative of Consumers</b>	<b>No. of sittings attended by Representative of Prosumers</b>	<b>No. of sittings attended by Finance / Accounts / Tech. Member</b>
PGVCL - Amreli Circle	2	2	2	2	0	2
PGVCL - Bhavnagar Circle	7	7	7	2	1	7
PGVCL - Botad Circle	2	2	2	2	0	2
PGVCL - Surendranagar Circle	1	1	1	1	0	1
UGVCL - Mehsana Corporate	6	6	6	6	6	6
UGVCL - Mehsana Circle	3	3	3	3	3	3
UGVCL - Sabarmati Circle	1	1	1	1	1	1
UGVCL - Palanpur Circle	3	3	3	3	2	3
UGVCL - Himmatnagar Circle	5	5	5	4	1	5
TPL-D (A) - Ahmedabad Corporate	25	25	25	25	23	25
TPL-D (A) - Ahd. East Circle	2	2	2	2	2	2
TPL-D (A) - Ahd. West Circle	2	2	2	2	2	2
TPL-D (A) - Gandhinagar Circle	1	1	1	1	0	1
TPL-D (S) - Surat Corporate	26	26	26	26	11	26
TPL-D (D) - Dahej Corporate	6	6	6	6	6	6
MUL - Mundra Corporate	3	3	3	3	3	3
DPA - New Kandla Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0
GIFT PCL - GIFT City Corporate	1	1	1	1	1	1
AIVPL - Pipaliya Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0
JIL - Vilayat Corporate	2	2	2	2	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>142</b>

## Annexure - 5

## Appeals redressed by the Electricity Ombudsman - Ahmedabad during FY 2024-25

CGRF	Representation			Representations disposed of				Representations disposed of within 45 days	Representations disposed of after 45 days	No. of sittings in a Year	Pending at the end of the Year
	Pending at the start of the Year	Received during the Year	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
DGVCL Surat	2	13	15	2	5	6	13	9	4	13	2
DGVCL Valsad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MGVCL Vadodara	2	10	12	5	1	6	12	6	6	15	0
MGVCL Godhra	2	4	6	4	1	1	6	6	0	6	0
UGVCL Mehsana	0	5	5	0	3	1	4	2	2	4	1
UGVCL Ahmedabad	0	14	14	2	2	6	10	5	5	14	4
TPL-D Ahmedabad	1	17	18	2	6	6	14	6	8	17	4
TPL-D Surat	1	2	3	2	0	1	3	3	0	3	0
TPL-D Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>11</b>

## Appeals redressed by the Electricity Ombudsman - Rajkot during FY 2024-25

CGRF	Representation			Representations disposed of				Representations disposed of within 45 days	Representations disposed of after 45 days	No. of sittings in a Year	Pending at the end of the Year
	Pending at the start of the Year	Received during the Year	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
PGVCL Rajkot	2	5	7	4	2	1	7	2	5	8	0
PGVCL Bhavnagar	3	18	21	5	10	4	19	8	11	23	2
PGVCL Bhuj	2	10	12	6	4	2	12	2	10	20	0
PGVCL Junagadh	0	9	9	4	3	2	9	5	4	13	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>2</b>

## Annexure - 6

## Appeals redressed by the Electricity Ombudsman - Ahmedabad during FY 2025-26 (Q-1 &amp; Q-2)

CGRF	Representation			Representations disposed of				Representations disposed of within 45 days	Representations disposed of after 45 days	No. of sittings in a Year	Pending at the end of the Year
	Pending at the start of the Year	Received during the Year	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
DGVCL - Surat Corporate	2	2	4	0	2	2	4	2	2	4	0
DGVCL - Surat City Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DGVCL - Surat Rural Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DGVCL - Bharuch Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DGVCL - Valsad Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MGVCL - Vadodara Corporate	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	0	3	0
MGVCL - Baroda O&M Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MGVCL - Baroda City Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MGVCL - Anand Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MGVCL - Nadiad Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MGVCL - Godhra Circle	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
UGVCL - Mehsana Corporate	0	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	0	2	0
UGVCL - Mehsana Circle	1	1	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	0
UGVCL - Sabarmati Circle	4	0	4	0	0	4	4	3	1	3	0

AGENDA NOTE FOR 26<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF CGRF & OMBUDSMAN

CGRF	Representation			Representations disposed of				Representations disposed of within 45 days	Representations disposed of after 45 days	No. of sittings in a Year	Pending at the end of the Year
	Pending at the start of the Year	Received during the Year	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
UGVCL - Palanpur Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UGVCL - Himmatnagar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TPL-D (A) - Ahmedabad Corporate	4	2	6	0	4	2	6	4	2	8	0
TPL-D (A) - Ahmedabad East Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TPL-D (A) - Ahmedabad West Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TPL-D (A) - Gandhinagar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TPL-D (S) - Surat Corporate	0	3	3	3	0	0	3	3	0	3	0
TPL-D (D) - Dahej Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MUL - Mundra Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DPA - New Kandla Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GIFT PCL - GIFT City Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AIVPL - Pipaliya Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
JIL - Vilayat Corporate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>



**Appeals redressed by the Electricity Ombudsman - Rajkot during FY 2025-26 (Q-1 & Q-2)**

CGRF	Representation			Representations disposed of				Representations disposed of within 45 days	Representations disposed of after 45 days	No. of sittings in a Year	Pending at the end of the Year
	Pending at the start of the Year	Received during the Year	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
PGVCL - Rajkot Corporate	0	9	9	0	3	1	4	4	0	4	5
PGVCL - Rajkot City Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Rajkot Rural Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Morbi Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Junagadh Circle	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	1	1	3	0
PGVCL - Porbandar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Jamnagar Circle	0	3	3	0	2	1	3	1	2	3	0
PGVCL - Anjar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Bhuj Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PGVCL - Amreli Circle	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
PGVCL - Bhavnagar Circle	2	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	2	5	0
PGVCL - Botad Circle	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
PGVCL - Surendranagar Circle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5</b>

**REPORT FOR THE**  
**FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 2024-25**  
**(April, 2024 TO September, 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 First Half of Year 2024-2025 (April, 2024 to September, 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 FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 2024-25, 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.	-	-

**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 of shifting from old office premises at Barrack No.3, Polytechnic Compound, Ambawadi, Ahmedabad-380015 to 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.

**REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, AHMEDABAD FOR THE FIRST HALF OF YEAR 2024-2025 (APRIL, 2024 TO SEPTEMBER, 2024) 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	48/2023	Smt. Teekshna Arihant Jain	DGVCL, Surat	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant, a tenant since March 2021 at 1-D, Arjav Apartment, Building No.2, City light, Surat having Consumer No.15001/01927/3, under the RGPU category from the Respondent with a contracted load of 1KW. The Appellant has been receiving abnormally high electricity bills since May 2022. After registering a complaint, the Respondent replaced the meter on 29.03.2023. However, the high bills persisted, leading the Appellant to believe that the meter was faulty. Upon further investigation, both meters were found to be accurate. The Respondent determined that the increased consumption was likely due to the summer season and increased usage of appliances. The Appellant, however, remained unconvinced, insisting that their usage had not changed significantly. to resolve the dispute, the Respondent replaced the meter again on 19.08.2023 and conducted laboratory tests on both meters. The results confirmed the accuracy of both meters, dispelling any doubts about their functionality. Despite the confirmed accuracy of the meters, the Appellant continued to believe that they were being overcharged. They argued that their usage had not changed significantly and that there must be an error in the billing.</p> <p>The Respondent, however, mentioned that the increased consumption was due to the summer season and increased usage of appliances. They explained that the Appellant's usage of air conditioning and other appliances during the summer months would naturally lead to higher</p>	

					consumption. The Appellant, however, refused to accept this explanation. They insisted that they had taken steps to reduce their consumption. Ultimately, the Respondent was able to prove that the meters were accurate and that the Appellant was not being overcharged. The Appellant was advised to monitor their consumption and consider potential issues with appliances or wiring.	
2	53/2023	M/s. Alembic Pharmaceuticals Limited	MGVCL, Vadodara	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant, M/s. Alembic Pharmaceuticals (formerly M/s. Aleor Dermaceuticals) has three HT connections named (1) M/s. Aleor Dermaceuticals Ltd. having contract Demand 1300KVA, Consumer No.13799 (2) M/s. Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd. having contract Demand 2475 KVA, Consumer No.13797, and (3) M/s. Alembic Pharmaceuticals Ltd. having contract Demand 3950 KVA, Consumer No.13515 located at Village-Karkhadi, Ta. Padra at the same location. Following a merger, The Appellant, M/s. Alembic Pharmaceuticals applied for a name change for one connection.</p> <p>The Respondent merged all three connections (suomotu) and issued a supplementary bill for the increased demand, effective from December-2022. The Appellant, M/s. Alembic Pharmaceuticals contests this date, arguing the merger should be effective from the name change date i.e. August-2022 and the supplementary bill should be withdrawn.</p> <p>The Respondent defends the merger citing company regulations and The Appellant, M/s. Alembic Pharmaceuticals' failure to request separate connections. CGRF, MGVCL, Vadodara partially supports The Appellant, M/s. Alembic Pharmaceuticals by setting the effective merger date to August-2022 and requiring The Respondent to issue a bill for the intervening period i.e. August-2022 to November 2022. CGRF, MGVCL, Vadodara ordered the Respondent to charge higher rates for billing quantities exceeding 4000 KVA, aligning with Hon'ble GERC's order. The Respondent is entitled to recover losses due to supplying at 11KV voltage. CGRF, MGVCL, Vadodara rejected the Appellant's argument regarding</p>	Status of order of Ombudsman is asked from the Respondent.

					the supplementary bill period and concluded that the bill should be issued from the date of the name change as per the NCLT order. However, the reasoning behind this decision is not explicitly stated in the CGRF order and hence not acceptable.	
3	2/ 2024	Chairman, Zahir Owners Association	TPL, Ahmedabad	Service Related	<p>The Appellant, concerned about the safety of their 25-year-old electrical services, requested the Respondent to renew them and install a syntax box. The Respondent provided an estimate of Rs.1,46,705/- for the work. The Appellant disputed the cost, arguing that the Respondent should bear the expense as part of their responsibility for maintaining the distribution system.</p> <p>A joint inspection was conducted to assess the safety of the services. The report indicated that 9 services required immediate renewal, while 52 services were deemed safe. The respondent committed to renewing the 9 services within 15 days and to periodically inspect the remaining 52 services.</p> <p>The Appellant's concern about the safety of the services, particularly in light of a fire incident in a known building, was acknowledged. The Respondent was directed to prioritize the safety of all services and to take immediate action to address any identified hazards.</p>	As per letter no. 472 dated. 26.04.2024, The Respondent has implemented the order of the ombudsman.
4	5/ 2024	Shri Ashokbhai Kanubhai Patel	MGVCL, Vadodara	Solar Related	<p>The Appellant, Shri Ashokbhai Kanubhai Patel, a participant in the "Suryashakti Kisan Yojana" (SKY Yojana), filed a complaint against Madhya Gujarat Viji Company Limited, Vadodara, alleging various issues with the scheme's implementation. These issues included non-payment of subsidies, incorrect calculation of power generation rates, non-functional solar systems, and unclear billing practices. The Appellant sought redressal of these grievances through the Electricity Ombudsman.</p> <p>The Respondent, Madhya Gujarat Viji Company Limited, defended their actions, stating that the scheme's implementation adheres to government regulations and that factors like solar panel performance and billing are influenced by various external factors. They provided</p>	As per letter no. 283 dated. 11.07.2024, The Respondent has implemented the order of the ombudsman.

					<p>documentary evidence and explanations to support their position.</p> <p>After considering the written and oral submissions of both parties, along with the documentary evidence presented, the Electricity Ombudsman issued an order addressing the Appellant's concerns. The order directed the Respondent to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clear and detailed explanations of electricity bills to consumers, ensuring easy understanding of calculations and charges.</li> <li>• Ensure timely maintenance of solar systems, including regular cleaning and repair of faulty components.</li> <li>• Take appropriate action regarding non-functional solar systems, such as facilitating repairs or replacements, as per the terms of the bilateral agreement.</li> <li>• Clarify the process for consumers to withdraw from the SKY Yojana, outlining the necessary steps and conditions.</li> </ul> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman also emphasized the importance of adhering to government regulations and bilateral agreements between the parties involved. They emphasise the need for transparency, accountability, and timely resolution of consumer grievances.</p>	
5	7/2024	M/s. Sanidhya Corporation One Partnership Firm	TPL, Surat	New Connection	<p>The Appellant has withdrawn the representation stating that a mutual settlement was made with the Respondent and Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.</p>	
6	8/2024	M/s. Shivani Poly Pack	MGVCL, Godhara	Estimate Related	<p>The Appellant, M/s. Shivani Polypack is a customer of the Respondent having a contracted load is 100KW under LTMD Tariff with Consumer No.17101/52073/1. The Appellant, M/s. Shivani Polypack has challenged the Suo-Moto estimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand. The Respondent argued they had previously notified The Appellant, M/s. Shivani</p>	Status of order of Ombudsman is asked from the Respondent.

					<p>Polypack about exceeding their contracted usage and offered them opportunities to adjust their consumption or upgrade their connection. Evidence showed usage exceeding the contracted limit in both 2022-23 and 2023-24.</p> <p>Acknowledging similar past decisions by the Electricity Ombudsman allowing consumers to maintain their connection level with additional charges, the final decision suggests a compromise. The Appellant, M/s. Shivani Polypack can stay on the LT connection level if The Appellant, M/s. Shivani Polypack restrict their demand and also undertake that they will not use the excess demand beyond their contract demand. The Appellant, M/s. Shivani Polypack must pay the minimum charges proposed by the Respondent for the past two years of exceeding their contracted demand. This charge, likely calculated based on the difference between their contracted demand and actual Demand, acknowledges the past violation and serves as a penalty to stop future overconsumption. The Respondent shall monitor the maximum demand utilized by The Appellant, M/s. Shivani Polypack 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 Regulation-2015.</p>	
7	9/2024	Smt. Veenaben Jayeshbhai Patel	MGVCL, Godhara	Estimate Related	<p>The Appellant, Smt. Veenaben Jayeshbhai Patel is a customer of the Respondent having a contracted load is 75KW under LTMD Tariff with Consumer No.17106/00062/0. The Appellant, Smt. Veenaben Jayeshbhai Patel has challenged the Suo-Moto estimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand.</p> <p>The Respondent argued they had previously notified The Appellant, Smt. Veenaben Jayeshbhai Patel about exceeding their contracted usage and offered them opportunities to adjust their consumption or upgrade their connection. Evidence showed usage exceeding the contracted limit in both 2022-23 and 2023-24.</p> <p>Acknowledging similar past decisions by the Electricity</p>	Status of order of Ombudsman is asked from the Respondent.



					<p>Ombudsman allowing consumers to maintain their connection level with additional charges, the final decision suggests a compromise. The Appellant, Smt. Veenaben Jayeshbhai Patel can stay on the LT connection level if The Appellant, Smt. Veenaben Jayeshbhai Patel restrict their demand and also undertake that The Appellant, Smt. Veenaben Jayeshbhai Patel will not use the excess demand beyond their contract demand. The Appellant, Smt. Veenaben Jayeshbhai Patel must pay the minimum charges proposed by the Respondent for the past two years of exceeding their contracted demand. This charge, likely calculated based on the difference between their contracted demand and actual Demand, acknowledges the past violation and serves as a penalty to stop future overconsumption. The Respondent shall monitor the maximum demand utilized by The Appellant, Smt. Veenaben Jayeshbhai Patel 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 Regulation-2015.</p>	
8	10/2024	M/s. Gujarat Metro Rail Corporation Ltd.	TPL, Ahmedabad	Estimate Related	<p>The Appellant, M/s. Gujarat Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. applied for a new EHV connection with the Respondent on 08.08.2022, with an initial contract demand of 1 MW and a total demand load of 28.74MVA. The Respondent offered two options to execute the job, and the Appellant selected Option-1. The Respondent provided a single cost estimate of Rs. 5635.09 Lakh, which included material and labor costs for providing electric connection from two different substations. The Appellant objected to the cost estimate, claiming it was not in line with GERC regulations. They argued that the cost estimate should only be calculated based on the substation from which the cable/line is proposed for providing supply. The Appellant calculated their estimate charges as per their understanding and submitted a summary of excess charges recovered from the Respondent. The Respondent argued that the charges mentioned in the estimate were legitimate and as</p>	



					<p>per prevailing regulations. They stated that the Appellant had paid the estimate without any protest except for the 15% supervision charges on material. The Respondent requested the Electricity Ombudsman not to accept the present complaint on the grounds of clause no. 4.104 of the GERC Electricity Supply Code.</p> <p>The Appellant responded that they had already made the payment of the demand note of the cost estimate and the Respondent had accepted the payment without any dispute. They argued that there was no limitation/bar to raising a dispute pertaining to the cost estimate.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman heard the complaint and granted the Appellant's prayer to allow the present application. However, the Electricity Ombudsman dismissed the Appellant's prayers to pass an order directing the cancellation of network enhancement charges, refund of excess charges, and payment of suitable cost.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman found that the estimate issued by the Respondent for the recovery of 100% cost for exclusive used items and enhancement/pro-rata cost for shared items considering the present load demand of the Appellant was appropriate. The prayer of the Respondent to allow them to revise and recover the pro-rata charges towards the cost of building and structures of the 220 KV Gandhinagar supply point SS was not supported by the prevailing regulations of the GERC and was therefore rejected.</p>	
9	11/2024	M/s. S.K.Engineering C/o. Shri Kanaiyalal Rupchand Soni	MGVCL, Godhara	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant disputes the electricity bill issued by the Respondent, claiming excessive consumption due to a faulty capacitor. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum found the bill to be accurate, attributing the excess consumption to the faulty capacitor in the Appellant's installation. The Appellant appealed to the Electricity Ombudsman, arguing that the Respondent should be responsible for the faulty capacitor and subsequent excess consumption.</p>	

					However, the Respondent maintains that the Appellant is responsible for maintaining their installation, including capacitors, and is liable for the consumption recorded by the meter, regardless of the cause. The Electricity Ombudsman agrees with the Respondent, citing relevant regulations that place the responsibility for maintaining the installation on the consumer. Therefore, the Appellant is obligated to pay the disputed electricity bill.	
10	12/2024	M/s. Siddhi Industries	MGVCL, Godhara	Estimate Related	<p>The Appellant, M/s. Siddhi Industries is a customer of the Respondent having a contracted load is 99KW under LTMD Tariff with Consumer No.17103/00667/9. The Appellant, M/s. Siddhi Industries has challenged the Suo-Moto estimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand.</p> <p>The Respondent argued they had previously notified The Appellant, M/s. Siddhi Industries about exceeding their contracted usage and offered them opportunities to adjust their consumption or upgrade their connection. Evidence showed usage exceeding the contracted limit in both 2022-23 and 2023-24. Acknowledging similar past decisions by the Electricity Ombudsman allowing consumers to maintain their connection level with additional charges, the final decision suggests a compromise. The Appellant, M/s. Siddhi Industries can stay on the LT connection level if The Appellant, M/s. Siddhi Industries restrict their demand and also undertake that The Appellant, M/s. Siddhi Industries will not use the excess demand beyond their contract demand. The Appellant, M/s. Siddhi Industries must pay the minimum charges proposed by the Respondent for the past two years of exceeding their contracted demand. This charge, likely calculated based on the difference between their contracted demand and actual Demand, acknowledges the past violation and serves as a penalty to stop future overconsumption. The Respondent shall monitor the maximum demand utilized by The Appellant, M/s. Siddhi Industries regularly and in case</p>	Status of order of Ombudsman is asked from the Respondent.

					of violation, they may take action as per regulation 4.95 of the GERC's Electricity Supply code and related matters Regulation-2015.	
11	13/2024	M/s. S.P. Industries Pro. Swetaben G. Patel	MGVCL, Godhara	Estimate Related	The Appellant has withdrawn the representation stating that a mutual settlement was made with the Respondent and Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.	
12	14/2024	Shri Anilbhai Gupta, Partner on behalf of M/s. Bluetron	TPL, Ahmedabad	Finalisation of HT Bill	<p>The Appellant, M/s. Bluetron, sought a HT connection from the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited, with a contracted load of 200KW. An estimate of Rs.2,231,741/- was given to the Appellant by the Respondent for the amount payable for the electricity connection. The Appellant paid the estimate and the Respondent completed the line work. After completing the connection, the Appellant sought clarification for the matters related to the budget. The Respondent replied to the Appellant's query. The connection with 200KW load was released as per the Appellant's demand.</p> <p>The Appellant complained to Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum about discrepancies in the various charges collected in the estimate given by the Respondent. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum passed an order in favour of the Respondent.</p> <p>Aggrieved by the order, the Appellant appealed to the Electricity Ombudsman. The key points of the Appellant's representation before the Electricity Ombudsman were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Network enhancement charges Rs.1700/-KW collected by the Respondent, totaling Rs.3,20,000/- have not been clarified to the Appellant.</li> <li>2. The RMU Installation and Cabal Laying charges should be recovered pro-rata by the Respondent.</li> <li>3. RO charges should be levied accordingly by the Respondent.</li> <li>4. The labor charges collected by the Respondent are shown as Rs.22,469/-. As per norms the details of labor charges are not shown on hourly basis.</li> </ol> <p>The Respondent clarified that network enhancement charges were taken as per the GERC Notification No.9 of 2005. RMU</p>	

					<p>is an essential unit for effective operation of ring main system and also for safety of customer installation. Charges required by the Respondent have been collected as per provision Clause No.5(i), 5(ii), 4.2(i) and 3(iii) of GERC Recovery Regulation.</p> <p>The Respondent also clarified that the excavation done for the RO charges was correct. The road opening charge has been increased from Rs.660.00 to Rs.1185.00 per meter by the Competent Authority (GIDC, Vatva) and the actual work has been done for 20 meters.</p> <p>The Appellant's main point of complaint was the cost of network enhancement charges, cable termination cost, RMU Make, RMU Cost, RMU Installation Cost, RO charges, Earthing Plate, Swgr Erection Channel and Miscellaneous charges mentioned in the Final Bill as mentioned in the estimate given by the Respondent and which is an insufficient specification of those charges.</p> <p>The Respondent clarified that all matters have been explained to the Appellant from time to time in person and in letters and network enhancement charges collected by them are 11kV as per Clause No.4.2(i) and 5(ii) of Expenditure Regulation-2005 of GERC. Rs.3,40,000/- (200*1700) has been recovered from the cost of 33KV network/sub-stations for power connection as per pro rata calculation of Rs.1700/- KW.</p> <p>The Respondent also clarified that RMU is a mandatory device for the ring main system and its installation is required for both the distribution licensee and the customer. RMU Charges are recoverable from the applicant in case of individual applicant and pro rata in case of group applicants.</p> <p>Cable termination charges capacity wise or giving details of miscellaneous charges etc. seems to have been clarified here, however the Appellant can get more information by contacting the office of the Respondent if required.</p> <p>The clarification made by the Respondent regarding the RO Charges seems to be correct. It is essential that the material used in electrical work is selected carefully, considering</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>quality and suitability. It is not advisable to select these items solely based on commercial rate comparisons and use them in power lines. The Appellant's complaint regarding the selection of earthing plate, Swgr erection channel, etc. is not justified.</p> <p>The selection of power equipment used in power lines involves careful consideration of various technical factors such as standard specifications, location of use, type of use, and the potential for lightning accidents. Commercial rate comparisons should only be made after these technical matters are addressed. It is not appropriate to assume that using a particular device can reduce costs without considering these factors.</p> <p>The Appellant's contention that RMU Make, type of earthing plate, etc. should be compared solely based on commercial rates is not acceptable.</p>	
13	15/2024	M/s. Shana Texo Fab	DGVCL, Surat	Estimate Related	The Appellant has withdrawn the representation stating that a mutual settlement was made with the Respondent and Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.	
14	16/2024	M/s. JB Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	DGVCL, Surat	Interest on refund of amount paid	<p>The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. filed a representation against the order of Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, DGVCL, Surat passed in case No.70/2023-24. The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. had two separate electricity connections for its manufacturing units, which were merged by the Respondent in year 2018. The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. challenged this merger before Hon'ble Gujarat High Court and paid supplementary bills. The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. then filed a grievance with CGRF, seeking to set aside the supplementary bills and recover excess amounts paid. CGRF granted The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd.'s prayers except for payment of interest. The Respondent challenged CGRF's order before Hon'ble Gujarat High Court, which directed the Respondent to conduct a factual inquiry into</p>	The Respondent has filed SCA No. 17365 of 2024 before Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, Ahmedabad aggrieved by the order passed by Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited, Surat.

					<p>the matter. The Respondent conducted the factual inquiry, personal hearing and passed a reasoned order, which was affirmed by CGRF.</p> <p>The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. challenged a refund of excess amount already paid and interest on the refund amount. CGRF partially sided with The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd., after that The Respondent submitted that as per the approval of competent authority, the Respondent have filed the SCA No. 17365 of 2024 before the Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat against the order of CGRF in case no. 70/2023-24 dated 24.04.2024.</p> <p>Based on the fact that the Respondent had appealed to a higher court, the appeal cannot be decided at this current level because it involves a matter of precedent. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed of the The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. without deciding by the Electricity Ombudsman.</p>	
15	17/2024	M/s. JB Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	DGVCL, Surat	Interest on refund of amount paid	<p>The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. filed a representation against the order of Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, DGVCL, Surat passed in case No.71/2023-24. The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. had three separate electricity connections for its manufacturing units, which were merged by the Respondent in year 2017. The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. challenged before CGRF and after CGRF directed the Respondent to set aside the supplementary bill after raising another supplementary bill, the Respondent filed petition before Hon'ble Gujarat High Court and paid supplementary bills. The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. then filed a grievance with CGRF, seeking to set aside the supplementary bills and recover excess amounts paid. CGRF granted The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd.'s prayers except for payment of interest. The Respondent challenged CGRF's order before Hon'ble Gujarat High Court, which directed the Respondent to conduct a factual inquiry into</p>	<p>The Respondent has filed SCA No. 17329 of 2024 before Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, Ahmedabad aggrieved by the order passed by Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited, Surat.</p>

					<p>the matter. The Respondent conducted the factual inquiry, personal hearing and passed a reasoned order, which was affirmed by CGRF.</p> <p>The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. challenged a refund of excess amount already paid and interest on the refund amount. CGRF partially sided with The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd., after that The Respondent submitted that as per the approval of competent authority, the Respondent have filed the SCA No. 17329 of 2024 before the Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat against the order of CGRF in case no. 71/2023-24 dated 24.04.2024.</p> <p>Based on the fact that the Respondent had appealed to a higher court, the appeal cannot be decided at this current level because it involves a matter of precedent. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed of the The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. without deciding by the Electricity Ombudsman.</p>	
16	18/2024	Shri Ashokbhai Jayantibhai Jariwala	DGVCL, Surat	New Connection	<p>The Appellant, Shri Ashokbhai Jayantibhai Jariwala, applied for a new electricity connection for Plot No. 5, Block No. 112, Village: Mota Borsara, Dist. Surat. However, the Respondent, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited, denied the application, citing outstanding dues on other plots owned by the Appellant. The Appellant contends that these dues belong to previous owners, as the plots were acquired by the Gujarat State Finance Corporation in 1998. The Appellant has provided evidence supporting this claim, including a judgement from the Gujarat High Court.</p> <p>The Respondent argues that they are entitled to recover the outstanding dues from the Appellant under the Supply Code Notification No. 4 of 2015. They have also cited a Supreme Court judgement in support of their position.</p> <p>After considering the submissions of both parties, it appears that the Respondent may have overlooked existing power connections in the Appellant's name with no outstanding dues. Additionally, the Respondent's actions in providing new connections without addressing previous</p>	As per letter no. DGVCLD OKI/0787 /10/2024 dated. 30.10.2024, The Respondent has implemented the order of the ombudsman.



					<p>dues raise questions about their diligence in recovering outstanding amounts.</p> <p>In light of these factors, it is recommended that the Respondent re-evaluate the Appellant's application and consider waiving the outstanding dues, especially given the significant time lapse and the potential impact on the Appellant's business.</p>	
17	19/2024	M/s. Kushal Ayurvedic Pharmacy	MGVCL, Vadodara	Refund of Security Deposit	<p>The Appellant, M/s Kushal Ayurvedic Pharmacy, applied to change the name of their 27.5KW LTMD connection with the Respondent. The Respondent issued an estimate and the Appellant paid the security deposit and an agreement fee. The Appellant then applied for a 10KW temporary connection for construction purposes and the existing LTMD connection was made permanently disconnected. The Appellant claims that they did not receive any supplementary or arrears bills before the disconnection. The Appellant applied for a refund of the security deposit, but the Respondent deducted Rs.50,750/- for minimum charges for two years and refunded only Rs. 3,498/- instead of Rs.54,248/-. The Appellant registered a grievance with consumer grievance redressal forum, MGVCL, Vadodara, but it was rejected. The Appellant argued that the minimum charges should not be deducted as this was not a new connection. The Respondent justified the deduction based on clause no. 4.102 of Hon'ble GERC regulations. The Appellant also submitted that the Respondent had issued a Technical circular No. 57 for change of name cases, but it was rendered obsolete and ceasing the acceptance of any annexures by the Government of Gujarat in 2017.</p> <p>The Respondent stated that they processed the change of name application without any annexures as required by the circular. The Respondent further explained that they recovered the minimum charges as per clause no. 4.102 of the GERC regulations. The Appellant argued that the existing connection was more than 10 years old and there were no outstanding dues or charges. The Respondent</p>	<p>As per letter no. 2834 dated. 11.09.2024, The Respondent has implemented the order of the ombudsm an.</p>



					<p>admitted that the connection was old but stated that they did not incur any expenditure for the name change application. The Appellant referred to clause no. 8.7, 8.8, and 8.9 of Hon'ble GERC regulations for permanent disconnection of supply. The Respondent countered by citing clause no. 4.102 for minimum charges. Both parties agreed that the existing connection was more than 10 years old and the Respondent had not issued any supplementary bills. The Appellant argued that the name change application was merely for name transfer and did not involve any new load or installation work. The Respondent stated that the agreement executed after the name change remained unchanged except for the consumer's name. The Appellant requested a refund of the security deposit as the original connection was released by the Respondent before 10 years and the application was not for a new or additional supply. The Respondent is directed to refund the security deposit paid by the Appellant.</p>	
18	20/2024	M/s. Users Welfare Association	TPL, Ahmedabad	Sub Station Related Dispute	<p>The Appellant filed a complaint against The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman regarding disputes related to the installation and leasing of a substation. The primary issue revolves around whether the Appellant can be compelled to enter into a lease agreement with the Respondent for the substation site. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum ordered a remand hearing to address specific issues raised by the Appellant. Key points of contentions included as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether a whole-time director can be joined as a party to the complaint?</li> <li>• Whether the customer can be forced to implement provisions not explicitly mentioned in the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission regulations?</li> <li>• The necessity of a lease agreement for</li> </ul>	

					<p>permanent power connection, the implications of refusing to lease, and the validity of a notarized undertaking as an alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The justification for a nominal lease fee, the legality of the lease terms, and the potential for future disputes.</li> <li>• The role of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission in resolving disputes related to lease agreements and supply code provisions.</li> <li>• The status of compliance with previous orders issued by Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum.</li> </ul> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman, after considering the submissions of both parties and the findings of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, concluded that while the Supply Code allows for free-of-charge provision of substation space, it does not explicitly prohibit lease agreements. However, the Electricity Ombudsman emphasized that compelling a customer to lease is not advisable, particularly in cases of temporary power connections.</p> <p>The final decision on the matter rests with the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission, which will determine the appropriate course of action based on the applicable regulations and the specific circumstances of the case.</p>	
19	21/2024	M/s. Vidhi Enterprise	MGVCL, Godhara	Estimate Related	<p>The Appellant, M/s. Vidhi Enterprise is a customer of the Respondent having a contracted load is 100KW under LTMD Tariff with Consumer No.17101/51501/0. The Appellant, M/s. Vidhi Enterprise has challenged the Suo-Moto estimate issued by the Respondent to regularize the contracted demand.</p> <p>The Respondent argued they had previously notified The Appellant, M/s. Vidhi Enterprise about exceeding their contracted usage and offered them opportunities to adjust their consumption or upgrade their connection. Evidence showed usage</p>	Status of order of Ombudsman is asked from the Respondent.

					<p>exceeding the contracted limit in both 2022-23 and 2023-24. Acknowledging similar past decisions by the Electricity Ombudsman allowing consumers to maintain their connection level with additional charges, the final decision suggests a compromise. The Appellant, M/s. Vidhi Enterprise can stay on the LT connection level if The Appellant, M/s. Vidhi Enterprise restrict their demand and also undertake that The Appellant, Vidhi Enterprise will not use the excess demand beyond their contract demand. The Appellant, Vidhi Enterprise must pay the minimum charges proposed by the Respondent for the past two years of exceeding their contracted demand. This charge, likely calculated based on the difference between their contracted demand and actual Demand, acknowledges the past violation and serves as a penalty to stop future overconsumption. The Respondent shall monitor the maximum demand utilized by The Appellant, Vidhi Enterprise 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 Regulation-2015.</p>	
20	23/2024	M/s. JB Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	DGVCL, Surat	Non Implementation of CGRF order	<p>The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. filed a grievance before Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, DGVCL, Surat vide case no. 70/2023-24, which was partially allowed by Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, DGVCL, Surat. The Respondent was required to refund Rs. 2,81,51,934.15 by adjustment in the immediate forthcoming bills. However, the Respondent issued a monthly bill dated 03.06.2024 without any adjustments or credit, which is in violation of Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, DGVCL, Surat's order. The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. filed a grievance before the Electricity Ombudsman against the Respondent's noncompliance with Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, DGVCL, Surat's order. The Respondent submitted that as per the approval of competent authority, the</p>	<p>The Respondent has filed SCA No. 17365 of 2024 before Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, Ahmedabad aggrieved by the order passed by Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited, Surat.</p>

					<p>Respondent have filed the SCA No. 17365 of 2024 before the Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat against the order of CGRF in case no. 70/2023-24 dated 24.04.2024.</p> <p>Based on the fact that the Respondent had appealed to a higher court, the appeal cannot be decided at this current level because it involves a matter of precedent. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed of the The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. without deciding by the Electricity Ombudsman.</p>	
21	24/2024	M/s. JB Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	DGVCL, Surat	Non Implementation of CGRF order	<p>The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. filed a grievance before Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, DGVCL, Surat vide case no. 71/2023-24, which was partially allowed by Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, DGVCL, Surat. The Respondent was required to refund Rs. 82,50,821.22 by adjustment in the immediate forthcoming bills. However, the Respondent issued a monthly bill dated 17.05.2024 without any adjustments or credit, which is in violation of Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, DGVCL, Surat's order. The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. filed a grievance before the Electricity Ombudsman against the Respondent's noncompliance with Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, DGVCL, Surat's order.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that as per the approval of competent authority, the Respondent have filed the SCA No. 17329 of 2024 before the Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat against the order of CGRF in case no. 71/2023-24 dated 24.04.2024.</p> <p>Based on the fact that the Respondent had appealed to a higher court, the appeal cannot be decided at this current level because it involves a matter of precedent. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed of the The Appellant, M/s. JB Chemicals &amp; Pharmaceuticals Ltd. without deciding by the Electricity Ombudsman.</p>	The Respondent has filed SCA No. 17329 of 2024 before Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, Ahmedabad aggrieved by the order passed by Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited, Surat.
22	25/2024	Shri Rajnikant B. Shah	TPL, Ahmedabad	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant, Shri Rajnikant B. Shah, having service no. 3129250 and he has been experiencing high electricity bills for his residential connection at B/102, Rahul</p>	

					<p>tower, 100ft Anand nagar road, satellite, Ahmedabad. Despite registering complaints, his issues remain unresolved for over three years. The Respondent has conducted load testing and checked for unauthorized use but found no discrepancies. The Appellant has raised concerns about the high bills, lack of analysis, and non-provision of MRI data.</p> <p>The Respondent has provided meter consumption data and bill amounts, and has explained the meter reading and billing process to the Appellant. The Respondent has also submitted that the allegations against CGRF, TPL, Ahmedabad are unjustified as CGRF, TPL, Ahmedabad heard both parties and provided ample opportunities for submission. Upon further investigation, the Respondent conducted a site visit and found that the connected load had increased from 9.31KW to 15.810KW. Several electrical appliances were found to be non-functional or not in use. The Respondent submitted that only one person was staying at home and using the AC for approximately 22 hours. The Respondent has submitted the MRI data and site report to the Appellant and the Electricity Ombudsman.</p> <p>The analysis of the energy consumption data indicates that the consumption recorded by the meter is found increasing in the year 2023 compared to the previous year but decreased after the meter replacement. The Respondent's meter accuracy was found within permissible limits during testing, and the MRI data does not indicate discrepancies. The installation wiring is also found accurate as per the site verification report. The Respondent is required to adhere to the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 for handling consumer complaints. The consumption recorded by the meter is found to be consistent with the usage pattern and connected load of the installation. The current consumption is considered adequate, and the Appellant may need to be vigilant about electricity usage and consider</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					testing or replacing old electrical appliances. The complaint is not supported by meter testing results, MRI data, and installation wiring reports, and therefore, the request of the Appellant for compensation or refund cannot be accepted. The Respondent is urged to adopt a more consumer-centric approach and ensure that consumer complaints are registered, acknowledged, and resolved in accordance with Hon'ble GERC guidelines to avoid inconvenience to consumers.	
23	26/ 2024	Shri Pankajbhai Gopalbhai Vastarpara	DGVCL, Surat	Refund of Security Deposit	<p>The Appellant, Shri Pankajbhai Gopalbhai Vastarpara, had taken temporary LT connections at different times from time to time. After the Respondent failed to return the security deposit amount on time, the Appellant filed a complaint at Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum. An amount of Rs.87,375/- was returned by the Respondent after the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum. However, the Appellant claimed that a total amount of Rs.1,94,427/- was paid by him, and thus, Rs.1,07,052/- was still owed to him.</p> <p>The Respondent argued that the security deposit amount was refunded to the Appellant as per Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum's order and bank details were provided. Additionally, the Respondent stated that three different temporary connections were taken by the Appellant, each with its own deduction amounts. The total amount paid by the Appellant was Rs.1,94,427.00, out of which Rs.1,07,050.62 was deducted for outstanding bills, line depreciation charges, and labor charges. The remaining amount, Rs.87,375.00, was refunded to the Appellant.</p> <p>The Respondent further stated that the refund amount was given through a Bank of India cheque no.235409 on 30.04.2024. The Appellant, however, claimed that the account details were not provided despite repeated requests. After being informed about the deduction amounts during the hearing, the Appellant was satisfied with the account and the Respondent was ordered to provide the said account to the Appellant in</p>	

					writing. Additionally, the Respondent was instructed to be more alert and customer-oriented in the future, and also instructed to provide all information in a simple and understandable manner to future customers.	
24	27/ 2024	Shri Shaileshbhai Shivrambhai Patel	UGVCL, Mahesana	Disconnec- tion	<p>The Appellant, Shri Shaileshbhai Shivrambhai Patel, has appealed to the Electricity Ombudsman regarding the electricity connections provided to Shri Ashokkumar Madhavalal Patel and Shri Dashrathbhai Madhavalal Patel in his co-partnership property. He claims that he is the direct co-sharer and owner of the property, yet he has not been deliberately and knowingly supplied with the documents related to the electricity connections.</p> <p>The Respondent, however, claims that the Appellant has received all the necessary information through RTI and that the electricity connections were provided in accordance with the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations, 2015.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman finds that the Respondent has provided the necessary documents to the Appellant and that the electricity connections were provided in accordance with the regulations. Therefore, the Appellant's claim for disconnection of the current electricity connection cannot be accepted and The Electricity Ombudsman agreed with finding of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Mehsana in this matter.</p>	
25	28/ 2024	Shri Rameshbhai Ambalal Patel	TPL, Ahmedabad	Solar Related	<p>The Appellant, Shri Rameshbhai Ambalal Patel, applied for a solar power system installation, which was denied due to pending legal proceedings under Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003. Despite paying the penalty imposed, the Respondent continued to withhold the application. The Appellant believes this action violates his fundamental right to justice and hinders the nation's development.</p> <p>The Appellant argues that Clause No.4.30 of Supply Code 2015 allows the Respondent to stop the application only if</p>	

					<p>there are outstanding dues, which is not the case. The Respondent contends that Clause No.7(5)(f) of Net Metering Rooftop PV Grid Interactive System Regulations 2016 requires a "No legal dispute pending certificate" for solar installation approval. Due to the ongoing legal case, the Respondent cannot proceed with the solar connection.</p> <p>Both parties disagree on the interpretation of "No legal dispute pending." The Appellant believes it only refers to disputes related to solar installation, while the Respondent argues it applies to all legal disputes between the parties. The Respondent suggests that the Appellant should seek clarification from the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman concludes that the dispute is not related to billing or energy injection and therefore lacks jurisdiction to hear the matter. The dispute falls under the purview of the Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission, which can provide clarification on the interpretation of the regulations.</p>	
26	29/ 2024	M/s. Shiv Stone Industries	DGVCL, Surat	Load Extension	<p>The Appellant, M/s. Shiv Stone Industries, has been facing issues with their power connection since 2022. Despite repeated requests, the Respondent has not been able to switch the Appellant's power supply to a proper feeder, causing frequent interruptions and financial losses. The Appellant has filed multiple complaints with the relevant authorities but has not received a satisfactory resolution.</p> <p>The Respondent has stated that the load increase requested by the Appellant is not technically feasible from the existing feeder and has proposed a new feeder. However, the Respondent has been unable to proceed with this plan due to opposition from villagers. As a temporary measure, the Respondent has increased the Appellant's load from the existing feeder, but this has not resolved the power interruption issues.</p> <p>The Respondent has also carried out maintenance work on the existing feeder to improve power quality, but this has not been sufficient to address the Appellant's</p>	



					complaints. The Respondent is advised to complete the remaining maintenance work and take action to resolve the power interruption issues.	
27	30/2024	M/s. Sekhani Industries Pvt. Ltd.	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant, M/s. Sekhani Industries Private Limited a registered MSME, has installed a solar plant and is being charged excessive banking charges by the Respondent. Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Uttar Gujarat Vij Company Limited, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad ordered the Respondent to rectify the agreement and charge the MSME rate. However, The Appellant, M/s. Sekhani Industries Private's request for a refund of excess charges is not considered. The Respondent claims that the Appellant registered as a Non-MSME unit and has now executed a new agreement under MSME.</p> <p>Upon reviewing the submitted documents, it is noted that the Appellant, M/s. Sekhani Industries Private initially registered as a Non-MSME unit on the GEDA portal. The Respondent's concern department needs to verify the submitted documents and proceed accordingly. The Interconnection agreement was executed on 13.06.2024, and the Appellant opted for the MSME option in the agreement. However, the Appellant initially marked the "Other than MSME" option in the previous agreement dated 08.06.2021. The Respondent executed a fresh agreement on 13.06.2024 after verifying the MSME certificate and started applying the MSME banking charges from June 2024. As per the Interconnection agreement, the Appellant is required to submit documentary proof of MSME registration, which was verified during the agreement execution. Given the circumstances, the Appellant, M/s. Sekhani Industries Private's request for a refund of banking charges prior to June 2024 is not accepted. The Respondent's effect of charging of MSME banking charges from June 2024 from the Appellant, M/s. Sekhani Industries Private is found to be appropriate, and there is no error in the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Uttar Gujarat Vij Company</p>	

					Limited, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad's order.	
28	36/ 2024	M/s. Mahavir Glass Enterprise	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Billing Related	The Appellant has withdrawn the representation stating that a mutual settlement was made with the Respondent and Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, no order issued.	

S/d.  
Electricity Ombudsman, 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.2024 to Sept.2024) of the year 2024-25.**

Sr. No.	CGRF	Representations			Representations disposed of				Representations pending at the end of 30.09.2024	Disposed of within 45 days.	Disposed of after 45 days.	No. of seatings
		Pending as on 01.04.'24	Received during Apr.'24 to Sept.'24	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
1	MGVCL- Vadodara	2	1	3	3	0	0	3	0	1	2	3
2	MGVCL- Godhara	2	4	6	4	1	1	6	0	6	0	6
3	DGVCL- Surat	2	9	11	1	3	5	9	2	7	2	7
4	DGVCL- Valsad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	UGVCL- Sabarmati	0	4	4	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	4
6	UGVCL- Mahesana	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
7	TPL- Ahmedabad	1	8	9	1	2	3	6	3	1	5	9
8	TPL- Surat	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
9	TPL- Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>31</b>

S/d.  
Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad

**REPORT FOR THE**  
**SECOND HALF OF THE YEAR 2024-25**  
**(October, 2024 TO March, 2025)**

**(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 2024-2025 (October, 2024 to March, 2025) 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 2024-25, 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.	39/2024 (10/2024)	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
2.	6/2025 (47/2024)	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
3.	11/2025 (50/2024)	Review Pending.
4.	13/2025 (5/2024)	Review Withdrawn-Original order stands.
5.	19/2025 (34/2024)	Review Pending.
6.	21/2025 (35/2024)	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.

**(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.

**REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, AHMEDABAD FOR THE SECOND HALF OF YEAR 2024-2025 (OCTOBER, 2024 TO MARCH, 2025) 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	22/2024	M/s. NCR Buildtech	TPL, Ahmedabad	New Connection	<p>The Appellant applied for a permanent 26HP, 2KW connection for the scheme's construction. However, the Respondent did not accept the application form. Instead, they returned it to the Appellant with the remark:</p> <p>"Without lease deed, this permanent connection cannot be registered." The CGRF didn't consider the request of the Appellant and hence aggrieved by the order of the CGRF, the present appeal was filed before the Electricity Ombudsman.</p> <p>Based on the submissions from both parties, the issue has arisen regarding the necessity of executing a lease deed for the sub-station land; however, there is no mention or clarification of such a requirement in the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations, 2015, Notification No. 4/2015. Since this provision is not included in the said notification, executing such a document requires prior approval from the Hon'ble Commission. Moreover, if the Appellant is unwilling to execute a lease deed with the Respondent, the Electricity Ombudsman does not have the authority to compel the Appellant to do so. Therefore, when the Appellant applies for a temporary electricity connection for construction purposes, insisting on a lease deed is inappropriate, and as per the regulations, providing a temporary connection is mandatory.</p>	The Respondent has filed SCA No. 15617 of 2024 before Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, Ahmedabad aggrieved by the order passed by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad.
2	31/2024	Shree Gayaprasad Jain Charitable Trust	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Representation Admission stage Hearing	The Appellant, Shri Gyaprasad Jain Charitable Trust, originally held a 45 kW LT (GLP category) electricity connection and later applied for an upgrade to a 150 kW HT connection. Despite paying	Status of order implemented asked by the Electricity

					<p>the required estimate and receiving a Two Month Notice (TMN), the Respondent issued a supplementary bill of ₹11,01,366.86 for excess demand usage prior to activation of the HT connection. The Appellant argues that since the HT connection process was already completed and billing had started under HT, the issuance of a supplementary bill for LT to HT conversion is unjustified. The Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum upheld the bill but directed recalculation based on distribution losses, resulting in a revised bill of ₹7,07,464.33. However, the Appellant states that the revised bill is also baseless and seeks its cancellation.</p> <p>Based on the written and oral submissions by the Respondent, it is found reasonable that for the period from 28.12.2022 to 06.09.2023, in months where the Appellant's demand exceeded 100 kW, the electricity bill may include tariff difference charges for that specific month only, as per the applicable tariff under Clause 3.2 of the GERC Supply Code, 2015.</p> <p>However, for the period before 28.12.2022, since the Appellant had a non-demand-based GLP category connection and had already applied for conversion under Clause 4.95 of the GERC Supply Code, 2015, Notification No. 4/2015, but the Respondent had not yet completed the process, any tariff difference billed by the Respondent during this time is not consistent with the provisions of the said regulations. The Respondent is directed to recalculate the supplementary bill in accordance with para 4.22 and 4.23 of the Order, and issue a revised bill to the Appellant. Upon receipt, the Appellant is instructed to make the payment accordingly.</p>	Ombudsman. Not reported by DISCOM.
3	32/2024	Smt. Nitaben Pareshbhai Bharodiya	DGVCL, Surat	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant challenged a supplementary bill issued by the Respondent, which was dismissed by the CGRF, DGVCL, Surat. The Appellant then approached the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad claiming the bill resulted from the Respondent's error and should be cancelled. The Respondent clarified that the bill was raised due to reverse polarity in the Y-phase CT of a solar meter, which was detected during the third inspection. The meter was replaced and sealed for</p>	As per letter no. DGVCLSD GT/0061 /12/2024 dated. 24.12.'24, The Respondent has implemented the order of the

					<p>lab testing, and the bill was based on unbilled units—not under any penal provision. No objection was raised by the Appellant during the lab inspection.</p> <p>It was found that due to a metering error, the energy imported by the Appellant was wrongly recorded as export, resulting in undue benefit. The Respondent's assumption of zero export during the period was incorrect. The export units for 53 months must be recalculated based on post-replacement meter data and adjusted for energy generated during the COVID-19 lockdown using average generation. The revised export must be deducted from the unbilled units, and a revised supplementary bill should be issued within 10 days. The Appellant must pay the final amount in 15 interest-free monthly installments along with regular bills.</p>	ombudsm an.
4	33/2024	Shri Sumeru R. Amin C/o. Shri Gopalji Mandir Trust Dahegam	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Dis-connection	<p>The Appellant, Shri Gopalji Mandir Trust, a registered religious trust in Dahegam, has raised a grievance that unauthorized individuals, i.e., the Respondent-2, Shri Manubhai Govindbhai Patel, and the Respondent-3, Shri Kantibhai Kacharabhai Thakor, have illegally occupied trust land and constructed residential buildings. These individuals allegedly manipulated records and misled the Respondent-1, UGVCL, to obtain electricity connections without the mandatory "No Objection Certificate" (NOC) from the Trust, which is required under Clause 4.16 of the Supply Code, 2015. The trust claims it has not leased or permitted the use of the land to anyone, and no such NOC was issued by the Appellant.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad noted that as per clauses 8.3 to 8.6 of the GERC Supply Code, 2015, the existing electricity connection of the consumer cannot be disconnected at this stage. However, if ownership of the property is disputed and the connection was granted without valid ownership or a "No Objection Certificate" (NOC) from the original owner, the Respondent is instructed to verify ownership documents and NOC. The Respondent is also directed to ensure compliance with Clause 4.16 of the Supply Code while processing documents submitted by the Respondent-2 and the</p>	

					Respondent-3 for the electricity connection.	
5	34/2024	M/s. Gujarat Metro Rail Corporation Ltd.	TPL, Ahmedabad	Estimate Related	<p>The Appellant disputes the revised cost estimate dated 02/10.11.2022, alleging errors in refund calculation, cost estimations for EHT and other connections, and unlawful recovery of pro rata and network enhancement charges.</p> <p>The Appellant's appeal against the revised estimate dated 02/10.11.2022 is dismissed. The revised estimate is justified due to a change in feasibility and aligns with regulations. Charges and cost recovery by the Respondent are found appropriate. Refund of contingency charges has been made correctly, and no interest is payable. The Respondent is directed to ensure proper cost recovery in the final bill.</p>	
6	35/2024	M/s. Gujarat Metro Rail Corporation Ltd.	TPL, Ahmedabad	Estimate Related	<p>In the present appeal filed by the Appellant, the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, identified four key issues for decision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether the cost calculation for GIS bays and CRPs at TPL Thaltej substation has anomalies?</li> <li>2. Whether system enhancement charges were recovered illegally?</li> <li>3. Whether supervision and system guarantee charges were wrongfully levied?</li> <li>4. Whether the Appellant is entitled to interest on refunded contingency charges?</li> </ol> <p>From the submission of both the parties and reviewing the final bill submitted by the Respondent, there is no error found in the calculation of various charges produced by the Respondent before the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad and hence, the appeal of the Appellant regarding excess recovery of charges by the Respondent is not accepted and dismissed.</p>	
7	37/2024	Shri Rajendrakumar Kanaiyalal Prajapati	UGVCL, Mahesana	Transformer Shifting	<p>The Appellant, not being a consumer of the Respondent, raised objections to the relocation of an existing transformer structure near his open plot. The work is part of the RDSS scheme for converting overhead lines to underground. The structure is on municipal land and at a safe distance. Since the Appellant is not directly availing electricity services, his grievance does not qualify as a complaint under GERC regulations.</p> <p>The Appellant and the Respondent initially agreed to the interim directions of the</p>	



					Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, but later disagreement arose when the Appellant demanded relocation of the existing structure. Hence, the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, directed the Respondent to install the distribution structure as per prevailing rules and safety guidelines.	
8	38/2024	The Baroda Rayon Corporation Ltd.	DGVCL, Surat	Refund of Security Deposit	The Appellant challenged the CGRF, DGVCL Surat's order dated 03/06.07.2024. However, since the same matter is already under consideration before the Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, the Electricity Ombudsman held that the representation cannot be decided at this level due to legal precedence and jurisdiction. Therefore, the representation was dismissed without any further order.	The Respondent has filed SCA No. 14201 of 2024 before Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, Ahmedabad aggrieved by the order passed by Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited, Surat.
9	39/2024	M/s. Gujarat Metro Rail Corporation Ltd.	TPL, Ahmedabad	Review Case No.10/2024	The Appellant, aggrieved by an order issued by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, on 29.08.2024 in Case No.10/2024, filed a review application on 19.03.2024. This review application, registered as Case No. 39/2024 (Review of Case No. 10/2024), resulted in hearings on 15.10.2024. Interestingly, the Appellant's review primarily reiterates their original arguments and doesn't raise any new issues with the electricity supply. Section No. 3.47 of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 allows for order reviews within 30 days for reasons like new evidence, errors in the record, or other sufficient reasons. However, the Appellant's application doesn't present new evidence, identify clear errors in the original order, or establish legal grounds for revision. Therefore, due to a lack of a compelling reason for review, the	Review appeal filed by the Appellant against the order passed by the Ombudsman which is rejected on grounds of no new things.

					Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, dismisses the Appellant's application.	
10	40/2024	Shri Ghanshyambhai Bhailalbhai Patel	MGVCL, Vadodara	Representation Admission stage Hearing	<p>The Appellant, Shri Ghanshyambhai Bhailalbhai Patel, owns agricultural land at Survey No. 237 in Mota Fofaliya village, where an electric pole has been erected near the boundary, obstructing the access path to his field. He requested the line to be shifted and compensation for crop damage caused during the work done by the Respondent, MGVCL. The Respondent, however, stated that the poles were installed to provide an agricultural connection at Survey No. 238 and that consent from nearby farmers was taken. They also issued a cost estimate for the line shifting, which the Appellant has not paid to date. Therefore, no further action was taken by the Respondent regarding the line shifting.</p> <p>Because of mutual consent between the Appellant and the Respondent, MGVCL, the Electricity Ombudsman directed the Respondent to relocate the obstructing electric pole without recovering any cost from the Appellant, ensuring safe access to the Appellant's farmland. However, the Appellant's request for compensation due to crop damage was not considered, as it falls outside the jurisdiction of the Electricity Ombudsman.</p>	As per letter no. 4979 dated 27.12.'24, The Respondent has implemented the order of the ombudsman.
11	41/2024	M/s. Ami Life Science Pvt. Ltd.	MGVCL, Vadodara	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant contested the application of excess electricity duty, i.e., 20%/25% on staff quarters in a rural area instead of the applicable 7.5%. The Appellant requested a refund of the excess duty collected and proper billing as per the prescribed rate going forward. The Respondent is directed to verify and adjust power factor rebate/penalty amounts as per GERC tariff orders and recalculate the April 2016 bill to correct tariff-related errors. Disputes related to electricity duty classification must be taken up by the Appellant with the State Government's competent authority under the Gujarat Electricity Duty Act, 1958.</p>	As per letter no. 556 dated 29.01.'25, The Respondent has implemented the order of the ombudsman.
12	42/2024	Shri Vinubhai Kantilal Patel	UGVCL, Mahesana	Dis-connection of Power Supply	<p>The Appellant requested temporary disconnection of his residential electricity connection where his brother stays and sought to deposit the meter with the Respondent.</p> <p>As per the provisions of the Supply Code, the Electricity Act, 2003, and considering various</p>	

					<p>judgments of the Hon'ble High Court and Supreme Court from time to time, as well as principles of natural justice, no person can be deprived of electricity.</p> <p>Because of the above findings, the Appellant's appeal/ submission is not accepted. The order passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Uttar Gujarat Vij Company Ltd., Mehsana, is upheld.</p>	
13	43/2024	M/s. Gujarat Ambuja Exports Ltd.	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Solar Related	<p>The Appellant's dispute was divided into two parts. The first part, regarding an alleged billing error, was reviewed and found accurate as per the Interconnection Agreement. Thus, the CGRF's decision on this issue is upheld. The second part of the dispute related to the applicability of the Gujarat Solar Power Policy and GERC regulations does not concern billing or energy injection, and hence falls outside the jurisdiction of the Electricity Ombudsman. Accordingly, the second part of the appeal is dismissed without examining its merits.</p>	
14	44/2024	Ms. Diptiben Bhavdeepbhai Prajapati	TPL, Ahmedabad	Solar Related	<p>The Appellant's rooftop solar net metering application was rejected due to non-submission of ownership documents, despite the Respondent having approved the regular power connection and name transfers for the same premises. The Respondent's objection based on GERC regulation was found to be partially interpreted, as there is no dispute over the Appellant's possession. The CGRF's dismissal of the complaint on jurisdictional grounds is found incorrect. Hence, the CGRF order dated 27.09.2024 is quashed, and the case is remanded back to CGRF, TPL, Ahmedabad, for a decision on merits.</p>	
15	45/2024	M/s. Subhlaxmi Steel & Alloys Pvt. Ltd.	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Refund of Security Deposit	<p>The Appellant has requested the Hon'ble Ombudsman to set aside the CGRF order dated 30.09.2024 and direct the Respondent to refund ₹49.01 lakhs along with interest or penalty. The Appellant has also sought any other reliefs that may be considered just and fair in the interest of justice. The Respondent withheld ₹49.01 lakhs from the Appellant, citing dues from three separate PDC connections unrelated to the Appellant's premises or entity. As per the Respondent's submission, no arrears exist against the Appellant or the premises in question, and the name transfer was completed without issue. The Respondent has failed to provide</p>	Status of order implemented asked by the Electricity Ombudsman. Not reported by DISCOM.

					any legal basis under the Indian Electricity Act, 2003, or GERC regulations to justify this withholding, making the action unjustified and subject to reversal. However, the Appellant's claim for interest on the withheld amount is not supported by any regulation and is therefore rejected.	
16	46/2024	Shri Rajesh Hariram Maurya C/o. Prajatantra Aadhar Party	TPL, Ahmedabad	Compensation for delay in New Connection	The Appellant's claim of delay in providing a new electricity connection is found unjustified, as the Respondent acted as per the GERC regulations and Standard of Performance Notification No. 2 of 2023. The demand for compensation is not admissible. Additionally, the issue of an audio clip was not presented before the Ombudsman, and the claim for mental harassment lies outside the Ombudsman's jurisdiction.	
17	47/2024	Shri Shirishkumar Mansukhlal Trivedi	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Refund of Electricity Duty	The issue raised by the Appellant regarding an error in electricity duty calculation involves interpretation under Schedule-I, Part-2 of the Gujarat Electricity Duty Act, 1958. As per the Act, such disputes regarding classification under the Schedule fall under the jurisdiction of the competent authority appointed by the State Government. Since the Respondent has already sought clarification from the Commissioner of Electricity Duty, it is not appropriate for this office to pass any order on the matter. The Respondent is advised to proceed as per the guidance received from the Commissioner of Electricity Duty.	Review appeal filed by the Appellant against the order passed by the Ombudsman.
18	48/2024	M/s. Gujarat Ambuja Exports Ltd.	UGVCL, Mahesana	Solar Related	The Appellant, an HT consumer of the Respondent, UGVCL, installed a 899.79 KW DC rooftop solar plant, registered under the Gujarat Solar Power Policy-2015 and commissioned on 10.06.2021. They disputed billing errors, claiming incorrect solar energy setoff calculations due to the retroactive application of the GERC (Net Metering) Third Amendment 2022, seeking correction, refund with interest, and future billing as per GERC Net Metering Regulations, 2016. The CGRF, UGVCL, Mehsana, ruled in favor of the Respondent, UGVCL, on 25.09.2024, finding no billing errors and directing a fresh agreement. The Ombudsman upheld the CGRF's decision on billing, ruling it as per the Provisional Interconnection Agreement. However, the dispute over regulatory applicability falls under GERC's jurisdiction per	

					Clause 14.2(b) of the agreement and was dismissed without merit review. Thus, the appeal was partially dismissed, with the Appellant directed to take regulatory concerns to GERC.	
19	49/2024	Shri Dhavalkumar Kirtikumar Thakkar C/o. Shri Himanshu Ramaniklal Shah	MGVCL, Vadodara	New Connection	The Appellant has withdrawn the representation/application before the Ombudsman, and the Respondent has submitted the same before the Ombudsman. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed, and no order is issued.	
20	50/2024	Dr. Smitesh Bharatbhai Patel	TPL, Ahmedabad	Shifting of Meter	The Appellant, Dr. Smitesh Patel, challenged CGRF, Torrent Power Limited's order No. 4566, dated 05.12.2024, regarding his electricity meter shifting request at Plot No. 81A, Sector-19, Gandhinagar. Initially, he applied for a name change due to ownership transfer, but after demolishing the old house, he requested meter relocation within the same premises. The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited, treated it as a new connection, requiring fresh documents, including a test report and security deposit, which the Appellant opposed as unnecessary and harassing. The CGRF upheld the Respondent's stance, but the Ombudsman ruled in favor of the Appellant, waiving the test report and additional security deposit, since no installation changes occurred. However, the Respondent may recover the security deposit in the future if there is an increase in load demand.	Review appeal filed by the Respondent against the order passed by the Ombudsman.
21	51/2024	M/s. Aghadi Silk Mills	DGVCL, Surat	Supplementary Bill Related	The Appellant, M/s. Aghadi Silk Mills contested a ₹7,39,434.85 supplementary bill issued by the Respondent, DGVCL, for a 53.94% slow meter, alleging wrongful application of Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003. The Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum directed a bill revision based on MRI data, reducing it to ₹12,579, which the Appellant paid. Despite this resolution, the Appellant sought ₹50 lakh compensation for financial loss and distress. The Electricity Ombudsman ruled that the bill was issued correctly under Clause 6.21 of the GERC Supply Code-2015, and the reference to Section 126 was a typographical error. Since the CGRF order was implemented, and no consumer rights were violated, the compensation claim was rejected, and the case was dismissed.	

22	52/ 2024	Shri Upendra H. Shah, Chairman Shri Nirat Sanjay Shah, Secretary C/o. Belleview Association	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Line Shifting Dispute	The Appellant has withdrawn the representation stating that a mutual settlement was made with the Respondent, and the Respondent has submitted the same. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed; no order has been issued.	
23	53/ 2024	Kamarjahan I. Pathan	TPL, Ahmedabad	New Connection	Based on the documentary evidence submitted by both parties—such as the sale deed, electricity checking sheet, FIR copy, and description of the premises for which the new connection was sought—it is evident that the premises where the Appellant requests the new electricity connection is the same as the one where electricity dues are pending. As per Clause 4.30 of the “Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters” Notification No. 4 of 2015 issued by the Hon’ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission, the dues recovery action taken by the Respondent is found to be appropriate. Therefore, the order passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum is upheld.	
24	1/ 2025	Shri Govind Prajapati C/o. Jayveer Denim Private Limited	TPL, Surat	Supple- mentary Bill Related	The Appellant, Shri Govind Prajapati C/o. Jayveer Denim Private Limited contested the accuracy of the electricity meter installed by the Respondent, Torrent Power Limited, alleging that it was manipulated to register higher consumption. To support this claim, the Appellant compared the Respondent's meter readings with those from a privately installed meter, noting discrepancies. The Appellant demanded third-party meter testing, citing the Respondent's lack of transparency in its internal testing procedures. In defense, the Respondent argued that the Appellant lacked documentation proving directorship and authorization to file the appeal. However, they reiterated their willingness to conduct third-party testing at a Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC) approved facility. The Respondent detailed prior internal tests, which found the meter accurate, and provided MRI data to the Appellant. They also clarified that the meter had already been removed and replaced and that the testing was conducted in the presence of the Appellant. The Respondent prayed for dismissal of the appeal. The Electricity Ombudsman examined the case under GERC Electricity Supply Code	As per E-mail dated 29.03.'25, The Respondent has implemented the order of the ombudsman.

					<p>Notification No. 4 of 2015, specifically Clauses 6.30 and 6.37, which allow third-party testing at the consumer's request, with costs borne by the consumer unless the meter is proven defective. Since the Appellant expressed a willingness to resolve the dispute through third-party testing, the Ombudsman directed the Respondent to provide a list of approved third-party testing laboratories and assist in the process.</p> <p>The Appellant's application for third-party meter testing was accepted, and further actions were ordered as per the GERC regulations.</p>	
25	2/ 2025	President, Yash Complex Co. Op. Housing Service Society Ltd.	MGVCL, Vadodara	Representation Admission stage Hearing	<p>The Appellant, Yash Complex Co-operative Housing Service Society Ltd., filed a representation before the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, challenging wrongful tariff application, incorrect credit of payments, and refund claims for charges recovered for two transformers, when only one was installed. The Appellant alleged non-compliance with previous orders from the APTEL and the GERC and submitted new evidence to justify reopening the grievance.</p> <p>The Respondent, MGVCL, contended that the issues had already been adjudicated in multiple cases, including Case No. 9/2020 and Case No. 82/2017, where the claims were rejected. It argued that the Appellant was attempting to re-litigate settled matters.</p> <p>The Ombudsman reviewed the case and applied the principle of res judicata, i.e., Section 11 of CPC, 1908, which bars re-examining issues already decided by competent authorities. Since the disputes had been conclusively addressed in previous proceedings, the case was dismissed at the admission stage without reviewing its merits.</p>	
26	3/ 2025	The Ashoknagar Samudayik Kheti Sahakari Mandali Ltd. Secretary-Shri Ghanshyam Ambalal Upadhyay	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Representation Admission stage Hearing	<p>The Appellant was issued a supplementary electricity bill for an offense under Section 135 of the Electricity Act, 2003, relating to electricity theft, which remains unpaid. As per Regulation 2.33 of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019, the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Sabarmati, held that it lacks jurisdiction due to limitation constraints. The Appellant filed an appeal before the Electricity Ombudsman,</p>	



					where the possibility of compounding the offense was considered. However, the Respondent clarified that it does not have the authority to settle matters under Section 135. Taking this into account, the Ombudsman concurred with the Forum's decision and concluded that the Appellant's complaint is not legally maintainable.	
27	4/2025	M/s. Gaurang Minerals Associates	MGVCL, Vadodara	Compensation against use of transformer	The Appellant, M/s. Gaurang Minerals Associates claimed ownership of a transformer that was part of their HT installation and alleged that the Respondent, MGVCL, failed to replace it when converting their connection from HT to LT. The Appellant sought the return of the transformer and rent reimbursement for its use. The CGRF directed the Appellant to provide ownership proof, but no documents were submitted. During the Ombudsman hearing, the Appellant was granted additional time to furnish proof but failed to do so. In the absence of conclusive ownership evidence, the Ombudsman ruled that the burden of proof lay with the Appellant. If ownership is proven, the Respondent must return the transformer; otherwise, it may be added to the Respondent's inventory and replaced as needed. The claim for rent reimbursement was rejected, and the case was disposed of due to a lack of supporting documentation.	Status of order implemented asked by the Electricity Ombudsman. Not reported by DISCOM.
28	5/2025	Kaushar Ali Khan C/o. Moon Construction	TPL, Surat	New Connection	During the hearing on 28.02.2025, the Electricity Ombudsman suggested a site visit to finalize a suitable location for a substation. Despite multiple attempts by the Respondent to coordinate the visit, the Appellant did not respond. The Appellant had requested a temporary electricity connection for construction, and although the Respondent aimed to plan the substation to avoid future issues, the Appellant was uncooperative. Therefore, the Ombudsman ordered that a temporary connection be provided as per applicable regulations.	As per letter no. TPL/VD PSC/000 15 dated. 07.04.'25, The Respondent has implemented the order of the ombudsman.
29	6/2025	Shri Shirishkumar M. Trivedi	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Review Case No.47/2024	The Appellant filed a review application against the order passed by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, on 26.12.2024. However, as per Regulation 3.47 of the GERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019, the Appellant did not present any new evidence or valid legal grounds. Upon examination, no error or legal flaw	Review appeal filed by the Appellant against the order passed by the Ombudsman which is



					was found in the original order. Therefore, the review application is not maintainable and has been rejected.	rejected on grounds of no new things.
30	7/2025	Mahamad Rafik Yakubbbhai Vahora	MGVCL, Vadodara	Dis-connection	In this case, as per Regulation 3.19 of the GERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019, Notification No. 2/2019, the matter raised by the Appellant is not within the jurisdiction of the Electricity Ombudsman for adjudication. Therefore, it is not appropriate for the Ombudsman to pass any order on the issue, and accordingly, the appeal is disposed of without any order.	
31	8/2025	M/s. Atvantic Finechem Pvt. Ltd.	DGVCL, Surat	Load Reduction	The Appellant, M/s. Atvantic Finechem Pvt. Ltd., sought a reduction in contract demand from 2430 KVA to 2000 KVA after an earlier approved reduction from 2700 KVA. The request was denied by the Respondent, DGVCL, citing Clause 4.102 of the Supply Code, 2015, which mandates a minimum two-year retention of increased demand from the supply commencement dated 31.03.2023. The Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum upheld this decision, ruling that the Appellant was bound by the agreement and regulatory provisions. The Ombudsman, upon reviewing the submissions, found no irregularities in the Respondent's decision and held that the Appellant must adhere to the contractual terms. The request for reduction before the stipulated period was thus rejected, with the Appellant permitted to reapply after completing the required two years.	
32	9/2025	M/s. Aster Motors Ltd.	MGVCL, Vadodara	Refund of amount paid	The Appellant, M/s. Aster Motors Pvt. Ltd. contested the ₹10,80,444/- underground cable charges imposed by the Respondent, MGVCL, without prior consent, arguing that an overhead or ABC network could have reduced costs and seeking a refund. The Ombudsman found that the decision was based on a joint site survey that deemed an underground cable necessary due to dense tree cover and terrain constraints, the Appellant's prior payment without objection, and alignment with GUVNL regulations for UG networks. Since no overhead network existed at the requested connection site, the Ombudsman ordered the Respondent to recover as proposed by them in their additional submission and refund	Vide bill dated 16.04.'25, The Respondent has implemented the order of the ombudsman.

					the amount calculated and proposed by the Respondent.	
33	10/2025	Shri Shantilal Haribhai Patel	MGVCL, Vadodara	New Connection	As per the GERC (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations, 2015 and the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, a new electricity connection cannot be granted at a location where dues from the previous owner are still outstanding. Hence, the request of the Appellant, Shri Shantilal Haribhai Patel, for a new connection cannot be accepted. The Respondent is instructed to initiate necessary legal proceedings to recover the dues from the previous occupant of Survey No. 2422/2, and after recovery, the Appellant's request for a new connection may be considered.	
34	13/2025	Executive Engineer, MGVCL, Division Office, Dabhoi	MGVCL, Vadodara	Review Case No.5/2024 (Admission Stage Hearing)	The Appellant, via email dated 24.02.2025, submitted a representation referring to the order passed in Case No. 5/2024, specifically point 4.17, under Regulation 3.56(2) of Notification No. 2/2019. Since the issue related to the prohibition order mentioned in that regulation has already been resolved, the Appellant respectfully requested the withdrawal of the review application filed earlier on 23.12.2024. Accordingly, the Appellant has withdrawn the review request through letter No. 825 dated 21.02.2025, and therefore, no further hearing is required.	

S/d.  
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.2024 to March.2025) of the year 2024-25.**

Sr. No.	CGRF	Representations			Representations disposed of				Represe- ntations pending at the end of 31.03.2025	Disposed of within 45 days.	Disposed of after 45 days.	No. of seatings.
		Pending as on 01.10.'24	Received during Oct.'24 to March.'25	<b>Total</b>	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	<b>Total</b>				
1	MGVCL- Vadodara	0	9	<b>9</b>	2	1	6	<b>9</b>	0	5	4	12
2	MGVCL- Godhara	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
3	DGVCL- Surat	2	4	<b>6</b>	1	2	1	<b>4</b>	2	2	2	6
4	DGVCL- Valsad	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
5	UGVCL- Sabarmati	2	10	<b>12</b>	2	1	5	<b>8</b>	4	4	4	10
6	UGVCL- Mahesana	1	3	<b>4</b>	0	2	1	<b>3</b>	1	1	2	3
7	TPL- Ahmedabad	3	9	<b>12</b>	1	4	3	<b>8</b>	4	5	3	8
8	TPL- Surat	0	2	<b>2</b>	2	0	0	<b>2</b>	0	2	0	2
9	TPL- Dahej	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>41</b>

S/d.  
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.2024 to March.2025) of the year 2024-25.**

Sr. No.	CGRF	Representations			Representations disposed of				Representations pending at the end of 31.03.2025	Disposed of within 45 days.	Disposed of after 45 days.	No. of seatings.
		Pending as on 01.04.'24	Received during April.'24 to March.'25	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
1	MGVCL- Vadodara	2	10	12	5	1	6	12	0	6	6	15
2	MGVCL- Godhara	2	4	6	4	1	1	6	0	6	0	6
3	DGVCL- Surat	2	13	15	2	5	6	13	2	9	4	13
4	DGVCL- Valsad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	UGVCL- Sabarmati	0	14	14	2	2	6	10	4	5	5	14
6	UGVCL- Mahesana	0	5	5	0	3	1	4	1	2	2	4
7	TPL- Ahmedabad	1	17	18	2	6	6	14	4	6	8	17
8	TPL- Surat	1	2	3	2	0	1	3	0	3	0	3
9	TPL- Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>72</b>

S/d.  
Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad

**REPORT FOR THE**  
**FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 2025-26**  
**(April, 2025 TO September, 2025)**

**(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 First Half of Year 2025-2026 (April, 2025 to September, 2025) 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 FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 2025-26, 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.	11/2025 (50/2024)	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
2.	19/2025 (34/2024)	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
3.	21/2025 (35/2024)	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
4.	23/2025 (9/2025)	Review Rejected-Original order stands.
5.	32/2025 (28/2025)	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 the website of GERC, also intimate through E-mail and/or telephonically.
- 3) Scanning of the old document files.
- 4) Monitoring of implementation of Ombudsman/CGRF orders and related activities.
- 5) Providing general guidelines to applicants who approach before Ombudsman.

- 6) Monitoring of cases challenged before Hon'ble High Court by parties.
- 7) At every Quarter, details of implementation of order of Ombudsman are asked from the Licensees to analyze the implementation of CGRF/ Electricity Ombudsman order.
- 8) Reply provided to RTI applications received by the office of the ombudsman from time to time.
- 9) The process of Scrapping Old Materials from the Old Premises.
- 10) The process of vacating and handing over of the Office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Barrack No. 3, First Floor, Polytechnic Compound, Ambawadi, Ahmedabad-380015, to the R&B Department, Ahmedabad.

**REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, AHMEDABAD FOR THE FIRST HALF OF YEAR 2025-2026 (APRIL, 2025 TO SEPTEMBER, 2025) 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	56/2021	M/s. Agro Pack	DGVCL, Surat	New Connection	<p>On 07.06.2021, the Hon'ble Gujarat High Court issued an oral judgement, based on which Case No. 56/2021 was initiated at the Electricity Ombudsman, and a hearing was scheduled for 15.07.2021. The Appellant, M/s. Agro Pack, requested a new electricity connection for the land previously owned by M/s. Ambeshwar Paper Mills Ltd., i.e., the Respondent-2, which had outstanding dues. The Respondent-1, DGVCL, denied the request and argued that the Appellant, M/s. Agro Pack was liable to clear the outstanding dues. On 09.07.2021, meanwhile, the Respondent-1, DGVCL's appeal SLP(C) 008291/2021 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which was granted and stayed the Hon'ble High Court's judgement. Consequently, the Electricity Ombudsman adjourned the case indefinitely on 17.07.2021 and instructed parties to submit progress reports.</p> <p>After no updates were received, the Electricity Ombudsman found that the Hon'ble Supreme Court had disposed of the appeal on 18.12.2024. The Hon'ble Supreme Court's order clarified that the Electricity Ombudsman lacked the authority to handle cases involving electricity theft and redirected the matter to an Appellate Committee.</p> <p>As the issue was already decided by a superior authority, the Electricity Ombudsman concluded that it could not proceed with the matter. Therefore, on 25.06.2025, the representation filed by the Appellant was dismissed.</p>	

2	11/ 2025	Manager, TPL, Ahmedabad	TPL, Ahmedabad	Review Case No. 50/2024	<p>The Appellant, aggrieved by an order issued by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, on 01.02.2025 in Case No.50/2024, filed a review application on 14.02.2025. This review application, registered as Case No. 11/2025 (Review of Case No. 50/2024), resulted in hearings on 20.03.2025 and 16.04.2025. Interestingly, the Appellant's review primarily reiterates their original arguments and doesn't raise any new issues with the electricity supply.</p> <p>Section No. 3.47 of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 allows for order reviews within 30 days for reasons like new evidence, errors in the record, or other sufficient reasons. However, the Appellant's application doesn't present new evidence, identify clear errors in the original order, or establish legal grounds for revision.</p> <p>Therefore, due to a lack of a compelling reason for review, the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, dismisses the Appellant's application.</p>	Review appeal filed by the Respon- dent against the order passed by the Ombuds man which is rejected on grounds of no new things.
3	12/ 2025	Harihar Mahadev Trust	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Representa- tion Admission stage Hearing	The Appellant has withdrawn the representation, stating that the grievance has been resolved by the Respondent. Withdrawal of the representation is allowed; no order issued.	
4	14/ 2025	Rizvan Mohummad Hussain Pathan	DGVCL, Surat	Supplemen- tary Bill and Meter Testing Related	<p>The Appellant, Rizwan Mohammad Hussain Pathan, registered an appeal against an audit bill for ₹5,64,085.65, which was added as arrears to the Appellant's May-2024 electricity bill. The Appellant claims he never received the original audit bill dated 03.12.2023, and that the bill was incorrectly backdated. The Respondent, DGVCL, stated that the meter was repeatedly inaccessible and then found to have a faulty display, leading to issues with average bills from February-2021 to June 2021. The Appellant contends that his factory's production was shut down during this period, and he provided GST and e-way bill details as proof. The Appellant argues that the Respondent, DGVCL, violated supply codes by not replacing the faulty meter within seven days and by not conducting an accuracy test on either the old or new meters. The Respondent, DGVCL, conducted its lab testing of the meter ex parte without the presence of the</p>	

					<p>Appellant, and the meter's data was not retrieved. The Appellant requested the cancellation of the audit bill and compensation of ₹50,000 for the mental distress caused. The Respondent, DGVCL, maintains that the audit recovery was legitimate and that the Respondent, DGVCL, followed the regulations.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman has found the Respondent, DGVCL's revised supplementary bill, issued for 90 days, to comply with the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations-2015. The Appellant had initially been issued a bill for 162 days, which was later corrected to 90 days following a complaint to Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum. The Appellant is instructed to pay the remaining balance of the bill within 30 days, as 33% of the amount has already been paid. The appeal filed by the Appellant to the Electricity Ombudsman has been rejected. The Respondent, DGVCL, has also been advised to follow proper procedures for meter reading, replacement, laboratory testing, and issuing supplementary bills according to the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's notifications to prevent future consumer complaints.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman found no errors in the order issued by Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, and therefore, the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum's order is upheld.</p>	
5	15/2025	M/s. V. Square Projects Partnership Firm C/o. Ashaben Vishnubhai Patel, Partner	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Interest on refund amount	<p>The Appellant's previous case no. 132/2015 of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad's order went through multiple appeals, up to the Supreme Court. On 14.03.2024, in the appeal no. S.L.P.(C) No.11769/2021, the Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed the Respondent, UGVCL's appeal and upheld the Gujarat High Court's judgment of case no. L.P.A. No.1584/2019, which was in favour of the Appellant. The principle of "Res Judicata" under Section 11 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908, applies in this Case. The Appellant was previously ordered to be paid a refund of ₹36,99,957 by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad. However, the Appellant's demand for interest on this refund amount was not accepted by any</p>	



					<p>authority, including the Hon'ble Supreme Court.</p> <p>Given this, it has been decided that the Appellant is not entitled to receive interest on the refund. Therefore, the Appellant's current appeal, which again demands interest, cannot be accepted. For these reasons, the Appellant's appeal/ representation is rejected.</p>	
6	16/2025	M/s. V. Square Projects, Naroda Partnership Firm C/o. Shri Dineshbhai Kantibhai Patel, Partner	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Interest on refund amount	<p>The Appellant's previous case no. 117/2015 of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad's order went through multiple appeals, up to the Supreme Court. On 14.03.2024, in the appeal no. S.L.P.(C) No.11677/2021, the Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed the Respondent, UGVCL's appeal and upheld the Gujarat High Court's judgment of case no. L.P.A. No.1582/2019, which was in favour of the Appellant. The principle of "Res Judicata" under Section 11 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908, applies in this Case. The Appellant was previously ordered to be paid a refund of ₹11,84,285 by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad. However, the Appellant's demand for interest on this refund amount was not accepted by any authority, including the Hon'ble Supreme Court.</p> <p>Given this, it has been decided that the Appellant is not entitled to receive interest on the refund. Therefore, the Appellant's current appeal, which again demands interest, cannot be accepted. For these reasons, the Appellant's appeal/ representation is rejected.</p>	
7	17/2025	M/s. Ashwamegh Co. Op. Housing Soc. Ltd., Block-5	UGVCL, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad	Interest on refund amount	<p>The Appellant's previous case no. 93/2015 of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad's order went through multiple appeals, up to the Supreme Court. On 14.03.2024, in the appeal no. S.L.P.(C) No.11994/2021, the Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed the Respondent, UGVCL's appeal and upheld the Gujarat High Court's judgment of case no. L.P.A. No.1583/2019, which was in favour of the Appellant. The principle of "Res Judicata" under Section 11 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908, applies in this Case. The Appellant was previously ordered to be paid a refund of ₹16,02,023.01 by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad. However, the Appellant's demand for interest on this refund amount was not accepted by any authority, including the Hon'ble Supreme Court.</p>	

					Given this, it has been decided that the Appellant is not entitled to receive interest on the refund. Therefore, the Appellant's current appeal, which again demands interest, cannot be accepted. For these reasons, the Appellant's appeal/ representation is rejected.	
8	18/2025	Tabrej A. Ansari	TPL, Ahmedabad	Representation Admission stage Hearing	<p>The Appellant had requested a new connection for his shop, but the building owner objected to the meter being installed on the ground floor. The Respondent refused to install it on the first floor, citing Clause No. 6.10 of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations, 2015. The Appellant initially took the matter to Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF), which instructed him to resolve the objection of the building owner first.</p> <p>Later, the Appellant filed a new application, presenting evidence that the Respondent had violated the same regulation for other customers by installing meters on the first floor, thereby alleging discrimination. CGRF dismissed this new application without registering it, stating it was a repeat of the previous case. The Electricity Ombudsman deemed this decision erroneous because the new application presented new evidence and raised the issue of discrimination.</p> <p>Consequently, the Electricity Ombudsman ordered the case to be remanded back to the CGRF, instructing it to register the new application, provide a hearing to both parties, and resolve the matter on its merits.</p>	
9	19/2025	M/s. Gujarat Metro Rail Corporation Ltd.	TPL, Ahmedabad	Review Case No.34/2024	<p>The Appellant, aggrieved by an order issued by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, on 01.02.2025 in Case No.34/2024, filed a review application on 04.03.2025. This review application, registered as Case No. 19/2025 (Review of Case No. 34/2024), resulted in hearings on 16.04.2025 and 06.05.2025. Interestingly, the Appellant's review primarily reiterates their original arguments and doesn't raise any new issues with the electricity supply.</p> <p>Section No. 3.47 of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 allows for order reviews within 30 days for reasons like new evidence, errors in the record, or</p>	Review appeal filed by the Appellant against the order passed by the Ombudsman which is rejected on grounds of no new things.

					<p>other sufficient reasons. However, the Appellant's application doesn't present new evidence, identify clear errors in the original order, or establish legal grounds for revision.</p> <p>Therefore, due to a lack of a compelling reason for review, the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, dismisses the Appellant's application.</p>	
10	20/2025	M/s. Sakar Glazed Tiles Pvt. Ltd.	UGVCL, Mahesana	Refund of Pro-Rata Charges	<p>The Appellant had paid GETCO pro-rata charges previously when their contract load was increased to 4000 KVA. Subsequently, the load was reduced and then increased again, at which point the Respondent, UGVCL, collected the pro-rata charges for a second time, which the Appellant argues is unjust and a duplication of charges.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman, after reviewing the arguments and relevant regulations, found that Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum's order was unacceptable. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum had incorrectly concluded that the matter was outside its jurisdiction and had misinterpreted the relevant circulars by selectively applying them. The Electricity Ombudsman referred to Clause No.5 of Chapter-V of GERC (Recovery of Expenditure by the Licensee) Regulations, 2005, which are silent on the recovery of pro-rata charges in cases where a consumer has already paid them for a particular load and later requests an enhancement to the same or a load reduction. Therefore, in the absence of a specific provision, the Respondent is not empowered to recover these charges a second time. The Electricity Ombudsman also referenced a previous similar Case No. 107/2018, where it was ruled that such a recovery of charges is not legal.</p> <p>Based on these findings, the Electricity Ombudsman allowed the Appellant's appeal, directed the Respondent, UGVCL, to refund the principal amount of the pro-rata charges, but rejected the claim for interest on the refunded amount.</p>	
11	21/2025	M/s. Gujarat Metro Rail Corporation Ltd.	TPL, Ahmedabad	Review Case No.35/2024	<p>The Appellant, aggrieved by an order issued by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, on 01.02.2025 in Case No.35/2024, filed a review application on 15.03.2025. This review application, registered as Case No. 21/2025 (Review of Case No. 35/2024), resulted in hearings on</p>	Review appeal filed by the Appellant against the order passed by the

					<p>16.04.2025 and 06.05.2025. Interestingly, the Appellant's review primarily reiterates their original arguments and doesn't raise any new issues with the electricity supply. Section No. 3.47 of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 allows for order reviews within 30 days for reasons like new evidence, errors in the record, or other sufficient reasons. However, the Appellant's application doesn't present new evidence, identify clear errors in the original order, or establish legal grounds for revision. Therefore, due to a lack of a compelling reason for review, the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, dismisses the Appellant's application.</p>	Ombudsman which is rejected on grounds of no new things.
12	22/2025	Shri Kanubhai Prabhudas Patel	UGVCL, Mahesana	Estimate Related	<p>The Appellant, Shri Kanubhai Prabhudas Patel, requested an electricity connection for a mining lease in Village: Bhatvas, Ta. Satlasana, Dist. Mahesana. The Respondent, UGVCL, charged a "Full Cost" of ₹13,20,435/-, which the Appellant disputed. The Appellant argued that the government land allocated for mining is considered Non-Agriculture by default, and therefore, the Respondent should have provided an estimate based on "Fixed Charges" rather than "Full Cost." Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum dismissed the Appellant's application, leading the Appellant to appeal to the Electricity Ombudsman. The Respondent argued that it acted following its circular and that the Appellant had accepted and paid the amount, so the matter was not subject to reconsideration. However, upon reviewing the documents, it was found that as per the Electricity Act, 2003, the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission has the authority to determine the charges. According to the policies approved by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission, an LT consumer should be charged a KW-based fixed cost for a new connection, not the "Full Cost." In light of this contradiction, the Electricity Ombudsman accepted the Appellant's appeal and set aside the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum. As per this decision, the Respondent must adjust the</p>	

					amount paid by the Appellant against the KW-based fixed cost approved by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission and refund the difference to the Appellant.	
13	23/2025	M/s. Aster Motors Ltd.	MGVCL, Vadodara	Review Case No.9/2025	<p>The Appellant, aggrieved by an order issued by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, on 28.03.2025 in Case No.9/2025, filed a review application on 09.04.2025. This review application, registered as Case No. 23/2025 (Review of Case No. 9/2025), resulted in hearings on 06.05.2025. Interestingly, the Appellant's review primarily reiterates their original arguments and doesn't raise any new issues with the electricity supply.</p> <p>Section No. 3.47 of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 allows for order reviews within 30 days for reasons like new evidence, errors in the record, or other sufficient reasons. However, the Appellant's application doesn't present new evidence, identify clear errors in the original order, or establish legal grounds for revision.</p> <p>Therefore, due to a lack of a compelling reason for review, the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, dismisses the Appellant's application.</p>	Review appeal filed by the Appellant against the order passed by the Ombudsman which is rejected on grounds of no new things.
14	24/2025	M/s. Nagami Nicotine Pvt. Ltd.	MGVCL, Vadodara	New Connection	<p>The Appellant, M/s. Nagami Nicotine Pvt. Ltd. is the original owner of a plot and applied for a new electricity connection, which the Respondent, MGVCL, denied. The denial was based on an existing connection for M/s. Shree Rang Converters is at the same premises. The Appellant alleges that the Respondent, MGVCL's actions, were fraudulent and illegal, asserting that M/s. Shree Rang Converters has no ownership rights, and the Respondent, MGVCL, ignored a pending civil court case. The Respondent, MGVCL, countered that M/s. Shree Rang Converters' connection was based on a valid deed of assignment, and they followed all proper procedures.</p> <p>Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) found that the Respondent, MGVCL, had denied the new connection due to the existing one, and later rejected the Appellant's review application. Critically, the document reveals that there is a pending civil court case between the Appellant, M/s.</p>	

					<p>Nagami Nicotine Pvt. Ltd., and M/s. Shree Rang Converters regarding the ownership of the property where a new electricity connection was requested by the Appellant, M/s. Nagami Nicotine Pvt. Ltd.. Citing Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman Regulations, 2019, the Electricity Ombudsman determined it was inappropriate to decide on the matter. The regulation specifies that an appeal cannot be heard if the same complaint is pending before any court.</p> <p>Therefore, the appeal was disposed of because the core issue of property ownership was under judicial review.</p>	
15	25/2025	Suda Sahakar Residency "Block-K" Co. Op. Housing Service Society Ltd. C/o. Shri Arjun Kumar Singh, President	DGVCL, Surat	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant, Shri Arjun Kumar Singh, representing the SUDA Sahakar Residency, is concerned about unusually high electricity bills. He argued that despite having a 30-kilowatt solar panel system, the society received exorbitant bills from August 2024 to November 2024. The Appellant stated that the society's low-income members found it difficult to pay these bills and had initially complained to the Respondent and then to Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, but received no satisfactory resolution. Subsequently, he paid one-third of the bill amount and filed an appeal with the Electricity Ombudsman.</p> <p>The Respondent clarified that the meter had been tested multiple times via Accu-Chek test, lab test, and even by the manufacturing company, and was found to be operating within permissible limits. The investigation by the Electricity Ombudsman involved a detailed analysis of the meter's MRI data. This analysis revealed that the electricity consumption was consistent with the units recorded by the meter. The Electricity Ombudsman concluded that the increased bills were due to higher consumption during that period, not a faulty meter.</p> <p>Consequently, the Electricity Ombudsman upheld the decision of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and dismissed the Appellant's appeal.</p>	
16	26/2025	Smt. Gitaben Dipakbhai Kakadiya	TPL, Surat (Corporate)	New Connection	<p>On 10.10.2024, the Appellant requested a 5 kW electricity connection, but the Respondent required the provision of land for a new substation. The Appellant claimed that power could be supplied from a nearby</p>	

					<p>substation and accused the Respondent of improperly trying to seize land. In response, the Respondent stated that a new substation was necessary to meet the "Palladium Bungalows" society's total estimated load of 375 kW. The society's developer had initially agreed to provide space for the substation, but the work was halted due to internal disputes among some plot holders.</p> <p>Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum sided with the Respondent, dismissing the applications. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum concluded that it is the moral responsibility of the developer and plot holders to provide space for essential public utilities like a substation, as per the Electricity Act, 2003, and the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations, 2015. Ultimately, during a hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman, the Appellant requested a temporary connection for construction. The Respondent agreed to provide a temporary connection but maintained that a permanent connection could not be granted until the substation issue was resolved.</p> <p>Consequently, the Electricity Ombudsman ordered the Respondent to provide a temporary electricity connection for construction purposes.</p>	
17	27/2025	Shri Kalpeshkumar Devchandbhai Gondaliya	TPL, Surat (Corporate)	New Connection	<p>On 06.01.2025, the Appellant requested a 5 kW electricity connection, but the Respondent required the provision of land for a new substation. The Appellant claimed that power could be supplied from a nearby substation and accused the Respondent of improperly trying to seize land. In response, the Respondent stated that a new substation was necessary to meet the "Palladium Bungalows" society's total estimated load of 375 kW. The society's developer had initially agreed to provide space for the substation, but the work was halted due to internal disputes among some plot holders.</p> <p>Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum sided with the Respondent, dismissing the applications. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum concluded that it is the moral responsibility of the developer and</p>	



					<p>plot holders to provide space for essential public utilities like a substation, as per the Electricity Act, 2003, and the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations, 2015. Ultimately, during a hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman, the Appellant requested a temporary connection for construction. The Respondent agreed to provide a temporary connection but maintained that a permanent connection could not be granted until the substation issue was resolved.</p> <p>Consequently, the Electricity Ombudsman ordered the Respondent to provide a temporary electricity connection for construction purposes.</p>	
18	28/2025	M/s. Deepshikha Exim Pvt. Ltd.	UGVCL, Mahesana (Corporate)	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant argued that the CGRF's order was one-sided, as it did not properly consider their claims that the deemed release notice was invalid. They contended that several key works, including the installation of a VCB panel, DP structures, and an RMU, were incomplete at the time of the notice on 07.06.2024. The Appellant cited an inspection on 25.10.2024, by the Electrical Inspector that noted deficiencies and confirmed the work was not finished. They also highlighted that the Respondent, UGVCL, had admitted to the delay in installing the feeder panel and that a work completion report was required for final approval. The Appellant requested the Electricity Ombudsman to set aside the deemed release notice and order, and to direct a refund of the fixed demand charges totaling Rs. 35,88,838.71.</p> <p>In response, the Respondent argued that they had completed their work by 06.06.2024, with the panel installation being the only exception due to the Appellant's failure to provide an outage confirmation. They stated that the deemed release was issued in compliance with Clause 4.42 of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission's (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations-2015. The Respondent further claimed that the delay in energization was entirely the Appellant's fault due to their non-compliance, including their failure to submit a test report and obtain necessary approvals. They pointed out that the Appellant</p>	



					<p>had paid the bills without objection and that the levied fixed charges were in line with the GERC regulations.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman upheld the CGRF's decision, concluding that the deemed release procedure was correctly executed and that the delay was due to the Appellant's lack of readiness.</p>	
19	29/2025	Shri Sunilkumar Kalekatarsinh Pal C/o. Shri Gopibhai H. Patel	TPL, Ahmedabad (Corporate)	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant, Shri Sunilkumar Kalekatarsinh Pal C/o. Shri Gopibhai H. Patel had complained about an excessively high electricity bill of ₹89,420 for November 2024, despite having their load reduced from 19.650kw to 14.428kw. A subsequent meter inspection revealed the meter was stopped or had no display. The Respondent offered a settlement of ₹35,000 against the bill of ₹90,000, which the Appellant rejected. The Respondent apologized for the inconvenience caused by a mistake in their process, but maintained that the bill for ₹89,419.60 was correct based on new consumption data. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum had previously ruled in the Respondent's favour, leading the Appellant to appeal to the Electricity Ombudsman and request that the current bill be cancelled and that the Respondent be ordered to pay ₹25,000 for mental and physical harassment and legal fees. The Respondent's on-site inspection of the meter concluded that there was no defect. Therefore, the bill was issued based on the recorded electricity consumption. The Appellant was ordered to pay the bill amount, after deducting any amount already paid. The Electricity Ombudsman upheld CGRF's order. Additionally, the Appellant has the option to have the meter tested at a third-party testing laboratory if they deem it necessary.</p>	
20	30/2025	M/s. Shreeji Yarn Spinning Mills Pvt. Ltd.	DGVCL, Surat	Estimate Related	<p>The Appellant was a High-Tension consumer with a contract demand of 1450 KVA. The case involved two main issues: the recovery of fixed charges at Rs. 1800 per KVA for an increase in the demand load from 150 KVA to 1450 KVA, and the recovery of "System Strengthening Charges" for the grid connectivity of a 1000 KW solar panel. The Appellant argued that the fixed charges for the load increase were incorrect because their network was underground. They also contended that the</p>	The Respondent filed for review against the order passed by CGRF before CGRF.

					<p>system strengthening charges for the solar panel were unjustified, as there was no requirement for it. CGRF had previously granted the prayer regarding the fixed charges for the load increase but denied the prayer for a refund of the system strengthening charges.</p> <p>The Respondent, DGVCL, subsequently filed a review of the CGRF's order. Since DGVCL's review application was still pending before the CGRF, the Electricity Ombudsman could not entertain the Appellant's representation.</p> <p>Therefore, the Electricity Ombudsman dismissed the representation without considering the merits of the case. The Appellant was granted the liberty to file a fresh representation after CGRF's pending grievance is resolved.</p>	
21	31/2025	Shri Ramanbhai Sakhidas Patel	MGVCL, Godhara (Circle)	Non Implementation of CGRF Order	<p>The Appellant, Shri Ramanbhai Sakhidas Patel had applied to transfer his electricity connection from an AG feeder to a JGY feeder and to increase his load. When his application was rejected by the Respondent, MGVCL, the Appellant filed a complaint with Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum. CGRF ruled in the Appellant's favor, ordering him to submit a fresh application with the necessary documents for both the feeder transfer and the load increase. However, the Appellant appealed to the Electricity Ombudsman against this order, arguing that it violated the Indian Constitution and electricity regulations.</p> <p>During the Electricity Ombudsman's hearing, the Respondent, MGVCL, stated that it had already complied with CGRF's order. The Respondent explained that it had prepared and sent an estimate for the feeder transfer to the Appellant and verbally assured that once the Appellant pays the amount, the load increase process will also be undertaken according to the rules.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman instructed the Respondent to proceed with the action as per the rules and advised the Appellant to cooperate fully in the process. The Electricity Ombudsman found no error in CGRF's order and, therefore, upheld it.</p>	
22	32/2025	M/s. Deepshikha Exim Pvt. Ltd.	UGVCL, Mahesana (Corporate)	Review Case No.28/2025	<p>The Appellant, aggrieved by an order issued by the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, on 30.06.2025 in Case No.28/2025, filed a review application on</p>	Review appeal filed by the Appellant

					<p>13.08.2025. This review application, registered as Case No. 32/2025 (Review of Case No. 28/2025), resulted in hearings on 29.08.2025. Interestingly, the Appellant's review primarily reiterates their original arguments and doesn't raise any new issues with the electricity supply.</p> <p>Section No. 3.47 of the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 allows for order reviews within 30 days for reasons like new evidence, errors in the record, or other sufficient reasons. However, the Appellant's application doesn't present new evidence, identify clear errors in the original order, or establish legal grounds for revision.</p> <p>Therefore, due to a lack of a compelling reason for review, the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, dismisses the Appellant's application.</p>	<p>against the order passed by the Ombudsman which is rejected on grounds of no new things.</p>
23	33/2025	Shri Bharatbhai Tilakraj Sharma	TPL, Ahmedabad (Corporate)	Refund of amount paid	<p>The Appellant, Shri Bharatbhai Tilakraj Sharma's main argument is that the Respondent has wrongfully collected an outstanding bill amount of ₹98,912/- from him, which was due from the previous owner of the property. The Appellant contends that when he purchased the property, the Respondent changes name of old electricity connection with name of the Appellant, Shri Bharatbhai Tilakraj Sharma. So, it is an "unfair trade practice" to collect the previous customer's bill later. Furthermore, the Appellant argues that according to the Electricity Act, 2003, and the Civil Procedure Code, the Respondent should have filed a civil suit against the previous owner for the outstanding bill within a three-year limitation period.</p> <p>The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited, argues that the Appellant was aware of the three separate electricity connections on the property at the time of purchase. The Respondent states that the Appellant applied for a name change for only one connection and provided only a Index Copy at that time, and after that sales deed of the said property came into knowledge of the Respondent that mentioned all three connections in which the Two Connections has a Dues, but intentionally hid the details by the Appellant. The Respondent had</p>	

					<p>attempted to recover the outstanding amount from the previous owner but was unable to find that person at any other address in the Licensee's area. The Respondent also stated that they had complied with Section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003, as they had attempted to disconnect the power supply eight times due to non-payment of the bill.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman clarifies that it was the Appellant's responsibility to be aware of any outstanding electricity dues related to the property he was purchasing and have to get "No Due Certificate" from the Respondent. The sales deed explicitly states that the seller is responsible for paying all outstanding dues on the property. Furthermore, the Electricity Ombudsman noted that the Appellant was trying to legally evade his responsibility to pay the bill in this case. Therefore, upholding the decision of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Torrent Power Limited, Ahmedabad (Corporate). The Electricity Ombudsman rejected the Appellant's appeal and his plea for a refund of the amount he had paid.</p>	
24	34/ 2025	Shri Lalit Subhashbhai Joshi	TPL, Surat (Corporate)	New Connection	<p>The Appellant, Shri Lalit Subhashbhai Joshi, an existing customer of the Respondent purchased a property at Plot No.153, Gajanand Park Society, Surat, through an "as is where is" auction conducted by Edelweiss ARC. The Respondent demanded Rs.1,00,370/- in arrears from the previous consumer, Shri Nitin Boricha, before granting a new connection, which the Appellant argued was contrary to settled law for a bona fide purchaser. The Appellant contended that the Respondent failed its statutory duty by allowing the previous consumer to continue supply for over a year despite default from January 2019, while the Appellant's own supply was disconnected within 60 days of default. The Appellant further requested that the CGRF order, which dismissed his complaint, be quashed, and that the Respondent be directed to release a new connection without insisting on past arrears, submitting that the ledger entries were inconsistent and lacked supporting bill copies for substantiation.</p> <p>The Respondent, Torrent Power Limited, argued that the Appeal</p>	

					<p>should be dismissed as the Appellant failed to exercise due diligence while purchasing the property on an "as is where is" basis and was trying to shift his own failings onto the utility. The Respondent stated that the previous consumer, Shri Nitin Boricha, stopped paying in January 2019, but partial payments were made, and disconnection was eventually effected on 15.02.2020 after multiple notices were issued. Relying on Supreme Court judgments like Srigdhaa Beverages and KC Ninan and clauses of the Supply Code-4.6, 4.30 and 4.72(4), the Respondent contended that electricity dues are statutory and attach to the premises, making the new owner/occupier liable, and an application for a new connection need not be entertained unless the premises' dues are cleared. The Respondent also noted that while old bill copies are not retained, the ledger and the break-up of dues provided and the total arrears aggregate to Rs.1,01,242.35.</p> <p>The Electricity Ombudsman partly allowed the Appeal. The Electricity Ombudsman found that the Appellant's liability for arrears was affirmed by the Supply Code, Clauses-4.6, 4.30, 4.72(4) and judicial precedents, given the property was purchased "as is where is" and the Appellant failed to obtain a "no-dues certificate". However, the Electricity Ombudsman noted that the Respondent's delay in timely disconnection had resulted in the escalation of arrears. Accordingly, the Electricity Ombudsman directed the Respondent to process and allow the Appellant's application for a new electricity connection upon the recovery of the principal arrears of Rs.64,906.47, but prohibited the Respondent from insisting on the recovery of delayed payment charges from the Appellant. The CGRF order dated 04.09.2025 was modified to this extent, and the Respondent was further directed to initiate appropriate legal remedies against the original consumer, Shri Nitin Boricha, for recovery of the entire outstanding dues.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

S/d.  
Electricity Ombudsman, 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.2025 to Sept.2025) of the year 2025-26.**

Sr. No.	CGRF	Representations			Representations disposed of				Represe- ntations pending at the end of 30.09.2025	Disposed of within 45 days.	Disposed of after 45 days.	No. of seatings
		Pending as on 01.04.'25	Received during Apr.'25 to Sept.'25	Total	In favour of Appellant	In favour of Licensee	Others	Total				
1	MGVCL- Vadodara	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	3
2	MGVCL- Godhara	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	MGVCL- Vadodara (Corporate)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	MGVCL- Baroda (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	MGVCL- Baroda City (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	MGVCL- Anand (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	MGVCL- Nadiad (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	MGVCL- Godhra (Circle)	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
9	DGVCL- Surat	2	2	4	0	2	2	4	0	2	2	4
10	DGVCL- Valsad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	UGVCL- Sabarmati	4	0	4	0	0	4	4	0	3	1	3
12	UGVCL- Mahesana	1	1	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	2
13	UGVCL- Mahesana (Corporate)	0	2	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
14	UGVCL- Mahesana (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	UGVCL- Sabarmati (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	UGVCL- Palanpur (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	UGVCL- Himmatnagar (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	TPL- Ahmedabad	4	0	4	0	2	2	4	0	2	2	6
19	TPL- Ahmedabad (Corporate)	0	2	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
20	TPL- Ahmedabad East (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	TPL- Ahmedabad West (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	TPL- Gandhinagar (Circle)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	TPL- Surat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	TPL- Surat (Corporate)	0	3	3	3	0	0	3	0	3	0	3
25	TPL- Dahej	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	TPL- Dahej (Corporate)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	MUL- Mundra (Corporate)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28	GIFT PCL- GIFT City (Corporate)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
29	AIVPL- Pipaliya (Corporate)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	JIL- Vilayat (Corporate)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>26</b>

S/d.  
**Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad**

**REPORT FOR THE**  
**FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 2024-25**  
**(April- 2024 TO September- 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 First Half of Year 2024-2025 (April-2024 to September-2024) as provided in Regulation 3.51 of GERC Notification No.02 of 2019 and amendments thereof 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 2024-25, 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 and amendments thereof, are stated in table below:

Sr. No.	Case No.	Review Case no.	Decision.
1.	08/2024	21/2024	Original order stands.
2.	11/2024	25/2024	Original order stands.
3.	16/2024	33/2024	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 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 2024-2025 (APRIL-2024 TO SEPTEMBER-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.	04/2024	Shri Makwana Lavjibhai Tapubhai	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Implementation of CGRF Order	<p>The Appellant had represented that, he has applied for a conventional agricultural new connection for 7.5 HP contracted demand at survey No.127 of Adpur village. Afterwards, he had switched over his application and opted for a solar pump set scheme by paying required charges. However, PGVCL rejected the said application stating reason that the land area is less than 1 acre. Therefore, he had filed complaint before CGRF, Bhavnagar. On the basis of that, vide order dated 14.09.2018 CGRF, Bhavnagar had directed PGVCL to provide a solar pump set connection to the Appellant's other survey No. 4/P1 of Adpur village which is more than 1 acre. The Respondent has not implemented the CGRF order. Therefore, he prayed here for the implementation of the CGRF order.</p> <p>Since, the Appellant has represented for implementation of the CGRF Order after more than five years from the date of order instead of within 30 days, his representation was registered on admission stage.</p> <p>The Respondent represented that as the Appellant didn't fulfill the criterion of the scheme, his application was not sanctioned. Later, after order of the CGRF-Bhavnagar the scheme was over and therefore it was not possible to comply the order of the CGRF. The Respondent had informed the Appellant about closure of the scheme. The Respondent has also informed that, the Appellant may participate in PM KUSUM scheme as well as he may opt for conventional connection, which may grant within short period as there was no pending application.</p> <p>The hearing was kept on dated 12.03.2024 and 02.04.2024. It was observed that the Appellant taken more than 5 years of time even after hearing of closure of the scheme from letter of the</p>	



					Respondent dated 07.02.2020 didn't appear before this office or taken any action. Therefore, the representation of the Appellant was rejected at the admission stage due to delay.	
2.	09/20 24	Shri Jayeshbhai Manharlal Rupareliya	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is using 42 Kw contracted demand LTMD tariff electricity connection having no. 87201/56471/4. The Appellant represented that, bill for the month of November 2023 was issued for average consumption mentioning the meter as faulty by the Respondent. In fact, during that time consumption was less as the production unit was closed due to the Diwali festival. Even the next month's bill was also assessed on an average basis after replacement of meter. The Appellant has prayed to grant the relief in assessment of the bill for the above-specified month by considering less consumption during the Diwali festival. The Appellant had prayed for the relief of delay payment charges of the said billing cycle.</p> <p>The Respondent had represented that, the Appellant is using the 42 Kw contracted demand LTMD tariff electricity connection No. 87201/56471/4. At the time of the meter reading of November 2023 on the date 20.11.2023, the display of the Meter of the said connection was found off. Therefore, bill was assessed for 7990 unit on an average basis considering the average of the last three months' consumption. The said meter was replaced on dated 22.11.2023 and tested on date 19.12.2023 at the Respondent's laboratory in presence of the Appellant. At the time of testing meter was found defective and data could not be retrieved by MRI. Therefore, the meter was sent to the manufacturer to obtain data through MRI. But only data retrieved till the date 31.10.2023. After the replacement of the meter next month's bill was assessed on a 7990 unit average basis as per the 'C' status. However, the same was revised to 3934 units.</p> <p>It was observed that the Appellant has not submitted any evidence of working and/or occupancy of the concerned premises during the said period(s). therefore, the revised average bill issued to the Appellant for November 2023 and December 2023 was</p>	The Respondent has implemented the order as informed vide letter dated 13.06.24

					observed in line with regulation No.6.58 of the GERC (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters). The representation of the appellant regarding the refund of DPC is considered and directed the Respondent to refund DPC levied towards the bills of November 2023 and December 2023.	
3.	10/20 24	Shri Kanabhai Valabhai Dangar	PGVCL, Bhuj	Billing related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent having connection No.60549/10497/6. The Appellant had represented that, after a period of two years from date of release of connection, the Respondent has debited Rs.66,389/- towards the revised estimate charges. In fact, he had paid a quotation at the time of application for new connection. The Appellant prayed for relief in payment of the said additional quotation amount. The Appellant had represented during hearing that, said electricity connection was utilized in land which is adjacent to his agricultural land area.</p> <p>The Respondent had represented that, for above mentioned connection, the Appellant had paid Rs. 4343 towards quotation. Later, the Appellant had misguided the staff of the Respondent and obtained new supply in agriculture area outside village whereas application was registered for residential purpose within village area. Therefore, in case of residential connection outside village area, applicant requires to pay actual cost incurred in providing power supply. Accordingly, in case of the Appellant, actual cost incurred in case of the Appellant was debited to his account as per the GERC circular No. 1378 Dt.24.06.2014. The Appellant was informed to submit details of land at where the connection is in use vide daily order dated 05.04.2024. On the basis of the submission of the Appellant and the Respondent, it was observed that, the Appellant has submitted two different documents of the land ownership i.e. with application and in compliance to daily order for same connection. Moreover, land ownership details mentioned in both documents were different though both were issued by Taltati Mantri.</p>	

					It was decided that, the Appellant was failed to prove his claim due to incomplete and ambiguous submission. it was also directed to the Respondent to consider the estimate charge as per prevailing norms of GERC after site verification after submission of the required documents by the Appellant.	
4.	12/20 24	Shri Anjara Danabhai Bijalbhai	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	New Connect ion	<p>The Appellant had represented that, in context to order dated 16.02.2023 of the Hon'ble High Court in SCA No. 17432/2019, the Appellant had applied for a new RL connection at land of survey no. 562 of the Longadi village of Mahuva Taluka of Bhavnagar District. However, the Respondent had rejected the said new connection application. Therefore, the Appellant was deprived of the basic need for electricity. The said connection was demanded on the land of the Railway department. The Appellant had also represented that he will never claim ownership of the said land if the electricity connection is granted and the Appellant will return possession as it is as and when it is required.</p> <p>The Respondent had represented that the Appellant has applied for a residential lighting purpose new connection at Quarter of the Railway department, therefore the Appellant was informed to submit NOC of the concerned department. However, the Appellant had not submitted the required NOC of the Railway department with the new connection application. Therefore, the connection was not granted.</p> <p>It was observed that, the Appellant has filed petition for electricity connection and water supply before Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, in the petition Hon'ble High Court has ordered to consider the application of the Appellant as per the law. Since, the EA 2003 empowers the Commission to decide regulation under section 50 of the EA 2003, new application for power supply is required to be process as per the provisions of the Supply Code-2015 and amendments thereof.</p> <p>The issue between the Appellant and the Respondent was regarding proof of ownership of the land where the connection was requested.</p> <p>Therefore, the Respondent was directed to consider the</p>	

					application of the Appellant on submission of the proof of ownership or occupancy of premises as per regulation no 4.16 of the GERC Electricity supply code and related matters regulations notification no 4 of 2015 and amendment thereof.	
5.	11/20 24	M/s. SAL Steel Limited	PGVCL, Bhuj	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is using power through connection no.31429 having contracted demand 3700 KVA. The Appellant has represented that, due to a phenomenon event their ABT meter has recorded high-value MD of 9.36 MVA, however during that time slot, the Appellant was exported energy to the grid instead of that the Meter has recorded the energy as 'Import' energy. The Respondent considered such high recorded MD and excess charge of Rs.37,20,359.00 recovered in billing of July 2023. In such a case the Respondent should consider the past month's recorded MD i.e. 3.56 MVA instead of the 9.36 MVA. The Appellant has prayed for the refund of the excess MD charge levied by the respondent during the billing of July 2023.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the Appellant had approached the respondent company on 03.07.2023 regarding "Higher MD recorded in ABT meter on dt.02.07.2023 and also collected MRI data of the meter from the Respondent company. The Appellant has informed the Respondent company through e-mail dated 03.07.2023 regarding the same along with the copy of MRI data and DCS trends of the generator data. On analysing the MRI data, it was found that on 02.07.2023, 00:00 to 00:15 hours (15-minute slot) 0.000289- Active energy, 0.029-Calculated Average import power factor and 39.41 VA – Demand was recorded as consumption in ABT meter. Accordingly, the bill was issued for the month of July 2023 considering the BMD recorded in the ABT meter as per the MRI data. The Respondent added that, during synchronization of the turbine, it is required that the power factor is properly maintained and it is the responsibility of the Appellant to maintain the power factor appropriately.</p> <p>It is noted that no abnormality reported after that particular time block till now and the said</p>	

					<p>ABT meter is still in operation. The Appellant stated about the operation of the capacitor bank and power during that time block, however no convincing evidence or record to that effect was submitted to prove their statement even after sufficient opportunities were given for the production of evidence, the Appellant could not submit and therefore in absence of convincing evidence, bare statement of the Appellant appears as an assumption. It is observed that the representation of the appellant didn't suffice to prove the recording of various parameters of the energy during said time block on 02.07.2023 as abnormal and also was not able to clarify how the ABT meter can behave abnormally in only one-time block and normal in all the rest periods. The Appellant has failed to prove their representation and therefore the representation of the Appellant was dismissed.</p>	
6.	08/20 24	M/s. Cruso Granito Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is using power through connection no.33298 having contracted demand 2300 KVA. The Appellant represented that, the Respondent has issued a supplementary bill amounting to Rs.52,01,755.31 towards the slowness of the meter for 200 days. However, the bill was revised to 180 days as per the representation done before CGRF. The Appellant has prayed to consider the last billing date of the said connection for revision of the said supplementary bill and accordingly, prayed to revise the bill for the period of 12 days i.e. from 04.09.2021 to 16.09.2021. The Appellant has also prayed for refund of the additionally recovered PF rebate till the Feb 2019 and also prayed to direct the Respondent to collect Electricity Duty at the rate of 7.5% instead of 15% on residential purpose consumption of the said connection as their said unit was situated in a rural area.</p> <p>The Respondent has represented that, due to a heavy workload, the Respondent was unable to inspect HT category electricity connection every 6 months. As the HT category connection's monthly bill was prepared by retrieving the readings through online, it is not required to visit the electricity connection physically. Due to that reason,</p>	The Respondent has confirmed implementation of order vide letter no.4749 dated 25.09.2024

					<p>the said matter has not been inspected.</p> <p>It is further submitted that, their higher office has updated the HT billing software after March 2019. However, due to a lack of guidance regarding the refund of the PF rebate for the before period of the march 2019, the refund was not processed. The representation of the Appellant regarding the rate of electricity duty falls within the jurisdiction of the office of collector of the electricity duty and the same has been clarified in the order done by the consumer grievance redressal forum.</p> <p>It is observed that the bill issued by the Respondent towards slowness, was as per the provisions of applicable regulations, therefore the pray of the Appellant was rejected. The representation regarding PF rebate, it was directed to the Respondent to process the refund as per the related tariff order.</p> <p>In reference to representation regarding Electricity duty, it was observed that, as per the provisions of the Electricity Duty Act, the representation did not fall within the jurisdiction of this office, therefore no observation was made.</p>	
7.	15/20 24	Shri Keyurbhai Batukbhai Kothiya	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is using residential electricity connection no.32206/04330/0, which exists in the name of his father Shri Kothiya Batukbhai Nanjibhai. The Appellant has represented that, his average bi-monthly consumption is around 400 units. However, during billing of May-June 2023, the meter reader noted consumption of 4289 units, therefore, the Appellant had approached the concerned office of the Respondent. Afterwards the meter was replaced and inspected at the meter testing laboratory in presence of the Appellant and it was observed that the meter was 'ok'. In reference to that, the Respondent has issued a supplementary bill of 4289 units, amounting to Rs.37,926/-. The Appellant has prayed for the cancellation of the said supplementary bill.</p> <p>The Respondent has represented that, the Meter of the said connection was faulty due to display-off faulty, which was replaced on 10.08.2023. Afterwards, it is inspected at the</p>	

					<p>meter testing laboratory, at that time meter was found ok and the final reading noted as 37360 units. Therefore, the differential 3842 units supplementary bill was issued as per the final reading after deducting the consumption billed under the faulty status.</p> <p>It was observed that a supplementary bill was issued based on the lab inspection report, which was prepared in presence of the Appellant and as the meter is inspected as 'ok', the recorded unit can't be ignored. Accordingly, the prayer of the Appellant regarding the cancellation of the said supplementary bill was rejected.</p>	
8.	14/20 24	Shri Jentialil Liladhar Soni	PGVCL, Bhuj	Compen sation towards the damage	<p>The Appellant is using a 3-phase electricity connection for making the gold ornaments. The Appellant has represented that, he had complained several times to the Respondent regarding issues faced due to the high voltage supply. However, the Respondent didn't take any action. On 25.09.2023, his machinery worth Rs.7,64,050/- was completely damaged due to fire which was resulted due to high supply voltage. Therefore, he again complained and informed the respondent to pay the said amount towards the damage due to the high voltage supply. In response to that, the respondent has advised that he didn't provide MCB/RCCB/ or ELCB with his connection to get protection against high voltages and also inspected the voltages and informed that voltages in all three phases were found within the limit. The appellant prayed for compensation of Rs.7,64,050/- for the damage to the machinery due to high voltage.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, in response to the Appellant's complaint dated 02.12.2023 regarding the damage of his machinery due to high voltage, the Respondent has inspected the said connection and found that the ELCB had not been installed with a connection for the protection against high voltage. At the time of inspection, voltages were found within the permissible limit and the Appellant was also advised to install ELCB/MCB. If the said damage occurred due to the high voltages the nearby area also gets affected. However, on the date of fire incidents i.e. 25.09.2023 and</p>	



					<p>also 24.09.2023 no complaint had been lodged from that area. Electricity was supplied to the Appellant through the 11 KV DNC feeder. in fact, on dates 24.09.2023 and 25.09.2023 no tripping or fault has been recorded. The said incident may have happened due to any internal wiring error at the Appellant end. As per clause no 9.2 of the GERC supply code it is the duty of the licensee to maintain a continuous power supply. But, not responsible for the damages due to fluctuation in voltages. As per the Electricity Act 2003 and CEA safety regulation 42. It is compulsory to install ELCB/RCCB with connection for protection purposes.</p> <p>It was observed that the Appellant has not submitted enough proof to prove that the fire incident happened due to fluctuations of voltages and also unable to prove how the fire incident was directly related to the fluctuation of voltages. The Appellant has accepted that ELCB/MCB has not provided at the time of the fire incident as per the rules of CEA. Therefore, the representation of the Appellant was not accepted.</p>	
9.	13/20 24	Shri Valiya Khimjibhai Nanjibhai	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is having LTMD tariff electricity connection of the Respondent bearing connection no.36727/00832/9 and contract demand 90 Kw. The Appellant has set up a 45 Kw rooftop solar plant with the said connection. The Appellant represented that, the Respondent has issued a supplementary bill of 65,50,946.42 due to reversal in CT wiring since the date of installation of the solar Bi-directional meter. The Appellant added that the grievance filed before CGRF, Bhavnagar for the said supplementary bill, which wasn't considered. The Appellant prayed to direct the Respondent to revise the supplementary bill as per clause 6.33 of the GERC supply code 2015 by considering the said meter as faulty as per CEA meter regulation 2006, al and also prayed to revise the supplementary bill for the period from the last date of checking to the date of replacement as per clause 6.33 of the GERC supply code 2015.</p>	



				<p>The Respondent submitted that the existing meter of the Appellant was replaced with a Bi-directional meter on 20.06.2020. the installation of the connection was inspected on 25.09.2020 and dated 09.11.2023, at that time accuracy of the Bi-directional meter was tested and found the same within the permissible limit. It was observed that the export units were captured greater than the generation capability of the solar power plant. Therefore, the generation and bi-directional meter were replaced on 21.11.2023. Both the meters were inspected at the meter testing laboratory of the Respondent in the presence of the Appellant's representative. During inspection, it was noticed that the direction of all three CTs of the Bi-directional meter was P2 to P1 instead of P1 to P2. At the time of installation of the said Bi-directional meter dated 20.06.2020, the connection of all three CTs was reversely connected due to that, from the date of installation of the Bi-directional meter 'export' units were registered as 'import' units and vice versa. Therefore, the respondent company has issued a supplementary bill amounting to Rs.65,50,946.42 by revising 'import' and 'export' units to the appellant. In this case, CTs and meter accuracy are within the permissible limit, therefore, they can't be considered faulty, so provisions of regulation 6.33 of the supply code do not apply to this case.</p> <p>It was noted that the Respondent company inspected the installation of the appellant on 25.09.2020 and 09.11.2023. However, the checking squad didn't verify that 'Export' energy was recorded as 'Import' energy and vice versa. Also, as submitted by the Respondent company, since the installation of the Rooftop Solar Plant i.e. from 20.06.2020, during every billing cycle there was 'Net Export Energy' after settlement and the consumer account of the Appellant, which was credited with Export Energy. Also, the Respondent Company had collected data of generated solar energy during every billing cycle and 'Net Export Energy' every month was more than the generated energy of the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>respective month, even though any billing employees did not notice that. It reflects gross negligence on part of the concerned officers, who installed the said Bi-directional meter and tested later, as well as concerned billing employees who didn't care for the period of 42 consecutive billing cycles. The Respondent has submitted that disciplinary actions are initiated against defaulters. However, the respondent company is directed to take disciplinary actions against defaulter officers, billing employees and other responsible officers/employees in the matter strictly in line with existing norms.</p> <p>It was observed that during the period from dt.20.06.2020 to 21.11.2023, the Bi-directional meter has recorded 'Import' energy as 'Export' energy and vice versa, whereas accuracy of the meter was within permissible limit, therefore the provisions of the regulation 6.33 was not applicable to the case, therefore the Respondent company was directed to carry commercial settlement as per the provisions of the Interconnection agreement considering generated solar energy and actual 'Import' energy &amp; 'Export' energy as per data of Bi-directional meter for the period from date 20.06.2020 to 21.11.2023 and supplementary bill may be issued to the Appellant. The Respondent company was further directed to grant four monthly instalments of equal amount to the Appellant for the payment of the said supplementary bill.</p>	
10.	17/2024	M/s. Everyday Herbal Beauty Care	PGVCL, Bhuj	Non-Implementation of CGRF Order	<p>The Appellant is an industrial consumer of the Respondent having consumer no.83020/02167/7. The Appellant had represented that, the power, supplied to the said connection through the Bharat JGY feeder of the Samakhiali S.S. was frequently interrupted. The Appellant has complained 174 times about frequent interruptions in the last seven years, but the issue was not resolved. Therefore, it was represented before CGRF, Bhuj. CGRF, Bhuj ordered the Respondent to take necessary action to reduce power failure vide order dated 14.09.2023. However, the Respondent didn't take any action to reduce</p>	The Respondent has submitted action taken vide letter dated 12.08.2024

					<p>interruptions as per the CGRF Order.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, the power supply is provided to the said connection by the Bharat JGY feeder of the Samakhiyali S.S. On 16.06.2023 said feeder was heavily damaged due to Biporjoy cyclon. For maintenance of said feeder, it was required to shut down many time for the safety purpose. Due to technical constraints Bharat JGY and Surajbari JGY feeders have been erected on same poles at during initial spans therefore, it was required to shut down the Bharat JGY feeder, even for the maintenance work of the Surajbari JGY feeder. As part of the implementation of the CGRF order the maintenance work carried out on 23.09.2023. Further, under the RDSS scheme of the central Gov. up to 12 Km Conductor will be replaced with MVCC. After the completion of replacement work, the fault will be reduced notably into the said feeder.</p> <p>It was observed that the Respondent has carried out maintenance work as part of implementation of CGRF order. Therefore, the representation of the Appellant regarding the non-implementation of the CGRF order was not be accepted. However, the Respondent was directed to carry out the maintenance work of the Bharat JGY feeder for the reduction of the interruption and also directed to replace conductor with the MVCC as per the approval under the said scheme as soon as possible.</p>	
11.	19/20 24	M/s. Neel wire industries	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent having 100 KW LTMD tariff connection no.82948/00505/1. The Appellant has set up a 99.90 KW Rooftop Solar Plant with the connection. The Appellant represented that, supplementary bill of Rs.24,43,082.96 was received from the Respondent in March 2024. The said supplementary bill was issued based on the revision of the bills of the last two years due to an error in the settlement of energy of the solar plant against consumption recorded in the TOD-2 zone of meter. The Appellant had prayed for relief in the said supplementary bill.</p>	The Respondent has submitted action taken vide letter dated 23.08.2024

					<p>The Respondent has submitted that the Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent company and uses a 100 KW LTMD tariff connection number 82948/00505/1. After releasing said connection under Solar Policy 2021, agreement was executed and the meter was replaced with the Bi-Directional meter on 23.09.2021. As per the Solar Policy 2021, solar generation is to be setoff against the consumption recorded during 7 to 18 Hrs. In case of the Appellant, it was noticed that, Generation of the solar plant was being setoff as per policy and remaining units were billed but consumption recorded during Non-Solar hours was not billed. Therefore, the bi-directional meter was replaced and data was retrieved through MRI. From the MRI data, total 2,65,069 units were left out, so supplementary bill amount of Rs.24,43,082 were issued to the Appellant.</p> <p>It was observed from the MRI data that, Non-Solar hours consumption was not considered by the billing employee of the Respondent. Due to the said mistake, the electricity, which consumed by the Appellant can not be neglected. Therefore, the representation of the Appellant for waiving the bill was not accepted. Also, the Respondent was directed to facilitate the 4 instalments for the payment of the revised bill and also directed to take disciplinary action against the defaulters.</p>	
12.	18/2024	Shri Dobariya Bhanabhai Tapubhai	PGVCL, Junagadh	New Connection	<p>The Appellant has applied for a NRGP category connection at agricultural land having survey no.2008/P1 of Visavada Village, Ta. Porbandar. The purpose of usage was mentioned as 'Transport Office'. The Appellant represented that, as per the present practice, the CPC unit of the Respondent has approved their application and forwarded it for payment of registration charges to the concerned field office. However, the concerned field office has not accepted registration charges, so their application was not registered. The Respondent has conveyed that, as per the norms it is required to change land to 'Non-Agriculture' purpose for getting NRGP tariff connection for the said purpose. The Appellant has</p>	The Respondent has submitted action taken vide letter dated 28.08.2024

					<p>represented to get a connection as per GUVNL Circular No.GUVNL/Tech-2/RNR/2719 dt.30.01.2017 and also prayed for compensation as per the SoP.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, in response to new connection application of the Appellant, the Respondent carried out site survey in the presence of the Appellant. As per GUVNL circular No.GUVNL/Tech-2/1085 dt.01.09.2017 and No.GUVNL/Tech/RNR-2719 Dt.30.01.2017, to promote agro-based industries and agricultural small enterprises the connection may be provided from a 24-hour feeder on agricultural land. However, new connection for commercial use of the transport office can not be granted on agricultural land as per the prevailing norms. For the said purpose connection, it is required to change land to Non-agricultural purpose and need to submit the documents according that. As per GERC regulation 4.31 of notification of 04/2015, the Appellant has not submitted the complete documents along with the application form therefore, the connection was not granted.</p> <p>It was observed that, due to incomplete document submission with the new connection application, the Appellant was not eligible for compensation.</p> <p>In the exercise of the power conferred under section 50 of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission has notified "Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters". The Respondent was directed to process the new connection application as per GERC (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) notification no.4/2015 and amendment thereof.</p>	
13.	20/20 24	Shri Ashok J. Bhatt	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent having a 6.00 Kw RGPU tariff connection No.32105/01669/3. The Appellant has set up a Rooftop Solar plant with the connection. The Appellant has represented that, he has received a display-off, F-Status average bill for July-August 2023 and September-October 2023. He has regularly</p>	The Respondent has confirmed the implementation of the order vide letter no CZ/Rev/Legal/24/374

					<p>received bills with credit amounts due to exported surplus units in the said connection. In fact, the generation of Sept 2023 to Dec 2023 was recorded as 1532 units, which should be equally divided in the billing cycle of Sept-Oct 2023 and Nov-Dec 2023 and the Respondent should consider 766 units as generation during each billing cycle. The Appellant has prayed to provide credit adjustment considering generation of Sept 2023, and Oct 2023 as 766 units for calculating the consumption of the billing period.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, due to the display-off detection of the Bi-directional meter at the time of the meter reading for the billing period of July-August 2023 on 24.08.2023 Import and Export reading was not available, therefore, a 100-unit average bill was assessed, which was revised with a credit of 337 units as per CGRF order. The said faulty meter was replaced on dt.31.08.2023 and inspected in the presence of the Appellant on dt.04.09.2023. Due to the display being off, the meter was declared faulty and also data have not been retrieved through MRI. The Bill of Sep-Oct 2023 was also revised to 214 units from the 100 units as per the CGRF order.</p> <p>It was observed that the Meter was replaced on 31.08.2023. Despite data availability, in the billing period of Sep-Oct, 2023, dt. 24.08.2023 to 10.11.2023, The Respondent has assessed the average bill for the whole period. Therefore, it was directed to assess the average bill from 24.08.2023 to 31.08.2023 and as per MRI data for the period of 01.09.2023 to 10.11.2023 for the billing period of Sep-Oct. 2023.</p>	3 Dt.03.08.20 24
14.	23/20 24	Shri Tushar Dharmshibhai Vansjaliya	PGVCL, Junagadh	Estimate Related	<p>The Appellant is the consumer of the respondent having a 15.00 Kw NRG tariff commercial connection No.85547/02482/1. The Appellant has represented that, instead of charging a fixed cost estimate for the new connection, the Respondent has charged a full cost estimate towards the above-said connection. The CGRF directed the Respondent to refund the differential amount after deducting the fixed cost charge and security deposit against the</p>	-

					<p>paid amount of Rs.2,87,689/- The appellant has paid a total of Rs.3,05,959/- towards the full cost estimated amount of the above-said connection, in which the respondent has charged Rs.2,84,661/- towards the line charge and 21,298/- towards the security deposit. As per the prevailing norms, a fixed cost of Rs.21,000/- and Rs.21,298/- towards the security deposit is recoverable, the remaining amount of Rs.2,63,661 needs to be refunded. But, the Respondent has refunded Rs.2,45,391/-. The Appellant has prayed for the refund of the differential amount of Rs.18,270/-</p> <p>The Appellant has represented vide E-mail dt 11.07.2024 regarding mutual settlement of the above-said representation, the Appellant represented that, the Respondent has processed the refund of the differential amount of 18,270/- same is also confirmed by the Respondent.</p>	
15.	21/20 24	M/s. Cruso Granito Pvt. Ltd.	-	Review applicati on of case no.8 of 2024	<p>The Appellant is using power through connection no.33298 having contracted demand 2300 KVA. The Appellant represented that, the Respondent has issued a supplementary bill amounting to Rs.52,01,755.31 towards the slowness of the meter for 200 days. However, the bill was revised to 180 days as per the representation done before CGRF. The Appellant has prayed to consider the last billing date of the said connection for revision of the said supplementary bill and accordingly, prayed to revise the bill for the period of 12 days i.e. from 04.09.2021 to 16.09.2021. The Appellant has also prayed for refund of the additionally recovered PF rebate till the Feb 2019 and also prayed to direct the Respondent to collect Electricity Duty at the rate of 7.5% instead of 15% on residential purpose consumption of the said connection as their said unit was situated in a rural area.</p> <p>The Respondent has represented that, due to a heavy workload, the Respondent was unable to inspect HT category electricity connection every 6 months. As the HT category connection's monthly bill was prepared by retrieving the readings through online, it is not required to visit the electricity connection physically. Due to that reason,</p>	The Respondent has confirmed implementa tion of order vide letter no.4749 dated 25.09.2024



					<p>the said matter has not been inspected.</p> <p>It is further submitted that, their higher office has updated the HT billing software after March 2019. However, due to a lack of guidance regarding the refund of the PF rebate for the before period of the march 2019, the refund was not processed. The representation of the Appellant regarding the rate of electricity duty falls within the jurisdiction of the office of collector of the electricity duty and the same has been clarified in the order done by the consumer grievance redressal forum.</p> <p>The Appellant's original representation was already noted and decided in order dated 22.05.2024. It was observed that the Appellant has repeated the same representation in review appeal without submitting any new evidence on new ground. Therefore, the order of original case no 08/2024 continued without accepting the review appeal of the Appellant.</p>	
16.	26/20 24	Shri Payak Riyazbhai Ishabhai	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	New Connect ion	<p>The Appellant has applied for a new residential lighting purpose connection. The Appellant has represented that, he had paid the required estimate amount of Rs.4,998.80 on 13.10.2023. The Respondent has cancelled the application with the reason that, as per the certificate issued by Talati Mantri, the residential premises are within Belampur Village and stated that, the premises at where connection was demanded, is situated outside the 'Gamtal' area on government waste land.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, in response to the new connection application, a site survey was carried out, at that time it was noticed that, the tax receipt submitted along with the new connection application as proof of ownership or occupancy of premises was of another house which is situated within the Gamtal area. The actual premises where the new connection was demanded was situated on a government waste land outside the Gamtal area. Also, the house number is not mentioned in the attached proof. Due to this type of inadequacy the demanded connection can not be granted from the JGY feeder. Therefore new connection was not granted.</p> <p>It was observed that the tax receipt attached as the proof of</p>	



					ownership and occupancy of premises has not been stamped by the competent authority and also concerned gram panchayat. The Respondent was directed to, process the new connection application as per the GERC Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters and amendment after receiving the related documents in terms of proof of ownership and occupancy as notified in regulation 4.16 of the GERC Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters and amendment thereof.	
17.	24/20 24	M/s. Madhav Oil Industries	PGVCL, Bhuj	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is the HT consumer of the Respondent having connection no.31664. The Appellant has represented that, it had not opted to bill under seasonal tariff, the Respondent has debited the yearly minimum guarantee charge of Rs.7,60,407 in the bill of Jan 2024 for the year 2023. In fact, in the year 2023 till August month, their industry was not working due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Appellant has prayed for relief in the said yearly minimum guarantee charge.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, the Appellant had opted for seasonal billing vide its application dtd.30.11.2022 and 06.04.2023 from Jan 2023 to Sep 2023. Therefore, 'Seasonal On' period considered from Oct 2023 to December 2023. During that period 197 KVA maximum demand was recorded. As per the tariff order of FY 2023-24, the Appellant has to pay a yearly minimum guarantee as per tariff order. 'Seasonal On' time recorded maximum demand was 197 KVA, which was multiplied by 4550/-, i.e. Rs.8,96,350/- amount, from the amount, Demand charge and Energy Charges paid during 'Seasonal On' time was deducted i.e. Rs.1,35,943/-. Then after the differential amount of Rs.7,60,407/- debited in the bill of Jan 2024.</p> <p>It was observed that the Appellant has opted for seasonal billing vide its application dtd. 30.11.2022 and 06.04.2023 for the period from Jan 2023 to Sep 2023. Accordingly, the procedure followed by the Respondent appears in line with the respective year tariff order for the Respondent. Therefore, the representation of the Appellant was rejected.</p>	

18.	16/20 24	M/s. Varvo Panels LLP	PGVCL, Bhuj	Estimate related	<p>The Appellant is an industrial consumer of the Respondent having 3000 KVA contract load connection no.34235. The Appellant has represented that, in response to its demand for a new connection, the Respondent has surveyed to release supply by erecting a new feeder from 66 KV Shikra S.S. and issued an estimate of Rs.2,94,50,491/- including Rs.54,00,000/- towards fixed cost, Rs.42,60,000/- towards prorata charges, Rs.34,25,701/- towards underground cable and Rs.1,57,88,418 towards security deposit. Later, The Respondent informed that, during the execution of work of underground cable, certain farmers have objected the work. Therefore, it was required to supply power through an alternate route and for that additional estimate was issued of Rs.20,27,103 including Rs.10,21,083 towards line dismantling charge and Rs.10,06,020 towards additional security deposit. A certain work which was included in the original estimate like the underground cable was not executed by the Respondent after re-routing, Therefore, the estimated amount to that extent should be refunded as the original route was decided by the Respondent. Also dismantling charges would not required to be paid by the Appellant. The Appellant prayed for a refundable amount of Rs.50,23,154/- which was paid towards the additional line cost, underground cabling work and dismantling charges.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted, as per the new connection application of 3000 KVA contract load, total estimate charge amounting to Rs.2,94,50,491/- issued which includes Per KVA fixed cost charge Rs.54,00,000/-, Line charges Rs.40,020,71/-, total Estimate charges Rs.94,02,071/-, Security Deposit Rs.1,57,88,418/-, Prorata Charges at 1420/- Per KVA GETCO Charges 42,60,000/-. After payment of the estimate, the work is executed, which includes 2.5 km of underground cable and 5.5 KM of overhead line work. From that, the work of erecting the overhead line was completed. Due to the continuation of the road broadening work from the</p>	<p>The Respondent has confirmed by letter no. BDO/Tech/2024/2672 Dt.20.07.2024 that the refund of Rs.9,12,536.41/- to the Appellant.</p> <p>&amp;</p> <p>BDO/TECH/HT/2024/3456 Dt.12.09.2024 regarding the refund Rs.25,06,311.70 to the Appellant.</p>
-----	-------------	--------------------------	-------------	------------------	---	---

					<p>government department from the starting point of S.S., the respondent decided to lay the underground cable near agricultural land. However, the same is not completed due to the objection raised by the owner of the agricultural land. Due to the incompleteness of the said work, the respondent resurveyed the same and issued a revised estimate of the amount Rs.20,27,103/- including Rs.10,21,083/- towards Dismantling /charge and Rs.10,06,020/- towards the additional security deposit. According to that, the 4.0 Km line was used from the earlier erected overhead line and the 2.477 K.m. and 05. K.m. new overhead line was erected with the new decided route. The said connection's final bill is pending approval. The differential amount will be refunded to the appellant as and when the bill is approved.</p> <p>It was observed that, as per the revised approval a total of 8.477 K.m. overhead line was erected in comparison to 8.5 K.m. of the earlier surveyed. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to refund the differential amount to the appellant as per the regulation-7 of the GERC notification No.09/2005 and amendment thereof.</p>	
19.	25/2024	M/s. SAL Steel Limited	-	Review of case no.11 of 2024	<p>The Appellant is using power through connection no.31429 having contracted demand 3700 KVA. The Appellant has represented that, due to a phenomenon event their ABT meter has recorded high-value MD of 9.36 MVA, however during that time slot, the Appellant was exported energy to the grid instead of that the Meter has recorded the energy as 'Import' energy. The Respondent considered such high recorded MD and excess charge of Rs.37,20,359.00 recovered in billing of July 2023. In such a case the Respondent should consider the past month's recorded MD i.e. 3.56 MVA instead of the 9.36 MVA. The Appellant has prayed for the refund of the excess MD charge levied by the respondent during the billing of July 2023.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the Appellant had approached the respondent company on 03.07.2023 regarding "Higher MD recorded in ABT meter on dt.02.07.2023 and also collected MRI data of the</p>	

					<p>meter from the Respondent company. The Appellant has informed the Respondent company through e-mail dated 03.07.2023 regarding the same along with the copy of MRI data and DCS trends of the generator data. On analysing the MRI data, it was found that on 02.07.2023, 00:00 to 00:15 hours (15-minute slot) 0.000289- Active energy, 0.029-Calculated Average import power factor and 39.41 VA – Demand was recorded as consumption in ABT meter. Accordingly, the bill was issued for the month of July 2023 considering the BMD recorded in the ABT meter as per the MRI data. The Respondent added that, during synchronization of the turbine, it is required that the power factor is properly maintained and it is the responsibility of the Appellant to maintain the power factor appropriately.</p> <p>It was observed that the Appellant has repeated the ground and advanced the same arguments which were already considered and negated. There is no new ground available from the documents presented by the Appellant for the review of the order dated 17.05.2024. Therefore, the review appeal filed by the Appellant does not survive and is dismissed accordingly.</p>	
20.	27/2024	Shri Shiyal Arjanbhai Shambhubhai	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	New Connection	<p>The Appellant has applied for a new 3-phase connection for industrial purposes. The Appellant has represented that, he had submitted an application for new connection along with attachments of the required documents and paid the required estimate. After payment of the required estimated charges for a new connection, the Respondent later on rejected the application with the reason stating that, the premises situated outside the 'Gamtal' area. Despite its location is within the 'Gamtal' area, The Appellant has prayed for a new connection.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted, the Appellant has applied for a new industrial purpose connection on 13.12.2021 and paid the required estimate on 27.12.2021. At the time of the resurvey of the site, the Respondent came to Respondent's knowledge that, the Appellant has actually demanded new connection on agricultural land by submitting</p>	

					<p>the other premises documents which is located within the Gamtal area. Therefore, the Respondent informed the Appellant to submit the actual premises document within the 7-days. Due to non-submission of the proof of documents of ownership or occupancy of actual premises within the stipulated time, the said application stated 'Paid Cancelled' and it is informed to the appellant for the refund procedure.</p> <p>It was observed that the tax receipt attached as the proof of ownership and occupancy of premises has not been stamped by the designated authority and also related gram panchayat name is not mentioned on that. The respondent was directed to, process the new connection application as per the GERC Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters and amendment thereof after receiving the related documents in terms of proof of ownership and occupancy as notified in regulation 4.16 of the GERC Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters and amendment thereof.</p>	
21.	29/20 24	Shri Keshavbhai Chaturbhai Khavadiya	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a residential lighting consumer of the Respondent. The appellant has represented that, as per the bill of Mar-Apr 2023 last reading was 14850 kwh. While meter reading of May-June 2023 was noted as 18528 Kwh, therefore, the meter reader of the Respondent has declared the meter as 'Faulty' and issued a bill of average consumption i.e. 170 units. Later, after inspection of the meter at the laboratory, the respondent issued a bill of differential unit i.e. <math>18528 - 14850 = 3780</math> units amounting Rs.34,104.88, whereas the Appellant's normal average consumption ranges between 170 to 200 units. The Appellant stated that said meter was defective and prayed for relaxation in the said amount of the bill.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, at the time of the meter reading on 26.06.2023, 18528 Kwh reading was noted. Therefore, an average of 170 units bill was assessed by the meter reader and then after said meter was replaced on 21.07.2023 as per the meter reader remark. The said meter</p>	

					<p>was tested in the presence of the Appellant on 10.08.2023. At the time of inspection, the meter was found 'Ok' and the final reading was noted 18630 Kwh. In reference to that, differential units of 3550 bill amount of Rs.34,104.88 were issued to the Appellant, which is payable by them.</p> <p>It was observed that at the time testing of the said Meter it was found 'ok' also as per the MRI report of the Meter, consumption was found recorded. Therefore, the representation of the Appellant can not be accepted by neglecting the consumption recorded in the meter. It was also observed that, the meter reading was not done properly as per the MRI report at the relevant time therefore the Respondent was directed to take disciplinary action against defaulters.</p>	
22.	22/20 24	M/s. AGS Industries Ltd.	PGVCL, Bhuj	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is the consumer of the Respondent having NRGPTariff industrial connection No.88803/10276/0. The Appellant had received a supplementary bill of Rs.2,01,713.33 in Feb 2024 towards the slowness of the meter inspected on 21.12.2022. The Appellant has represented that, the said supplementary bill was issued for the meter change which was already inspected a long period ago i.e. approx. two years ago. The Appellant has rented the said property and the agreement ended in March 2023. Due to the delay and mistake of the Respondent, the Appellant has to bear the past electricity usage of their tenant. It is also added that consumption before meter replacement and after replacement remains the same. The Appellant has prayed for relief in the said supplementary bill.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, from Sept 2022 to Nov 2022, the Appellant's billing was assessed in 'Lock' status with average consumption, which was credited to the consumer account in the billing of December 2022 after the meter was replaced on 17.11.2022. Later, the replaced meter was tested on 21.12.2022 at the Respondent's meter testing laboratory in the presence of the Appellant's representative. As per the meter inspection report, consumption was 'Not readable' therefore the said meter was sent to the meter manufacturing company for a detailed</p>	

					<p>inspection report. The meter data was retrieved on 05.01.2024 through MRI by the meter manufacturing company, which was received on 09.01.2024. As per the data retrieved through the MRI, the CT of Phase 1 and 3 was missing from 25.08.2022, which means the meter was 66% slow therefore, as per the report, the Respondent has issued a supplementary bill towards 66% slowness for 88 days vide letter dated 16.02.2024.</p> <p>It was noted that, the meter of the Appellant was replaced on 17.11.2022 and 'Meter Power Off' event was also occurred on 25.08.2022, therefore, power consumed from 25.08.2022 to 17.11.2022 was not recorded in the meter, whereas as confirmed by the representative of the appellant that power supply was consumed as per their average consumption during that period. Further, there was no test result of slowness, to prove the Meter was actually recording less energy, therefore it was directed to cancel the supplementary bill issued towards slowness and it was appeared appropriate to consider the meter as 'Faulty'. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to assess consumption for the months from Sep 2022 to Nov 2022 considering the meter as 'faulty' as per the provisions of regulation 6.58 of the Supply Code 2015.</p>	
23.	33/20 24	M/s. Varvo Panels LLP	-	Review of Case No. 16 of 2024	<p>The Appellant is an industrial consumer of the respondent having 3000 KVA contract load connection no.34235. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent had surveyed 8.5 Km from Sikra S.S. instead of Chirai S.S. to supply power to its new connection and according they had paid the estimate, after payment, the Respondent had released the connection after 1.5 years.</p> <p>Later, The Respondent informed that, during the execution of work of underground cable, certain farmers have objected the work. Therefore, it was required to supply power through an alternate route and for that additional estimate was issued of Rs.20,27,103 including Rs.10,21,083 towards line dismantling charge and Rs.10,06,020 towards additional security deposit. A certain work which was included in the original estimate like the underground cable was not</p>	



					<p>executed by the Respondent after re-routing,</p> <p>The Respondent has refunded Rs.9,12,536.41 against the charges paid towards the dismantling but clarification regarding the excess paid amount of Rs.40,02,071/-is yet not received.</p> <p>During the hearing, the Respondent has submitted letter dated 12.09.2024 mentioning that Rs.25,063,11.70 is refundable as per final bill approval.</p> <p>The Appellant has also confirmed the receipt of the letter and shown his satisfaction.</p> <p>Moreover, it was observed that the Appellant had repeated the ground and advanced the same arguments which were already considered. There was no new ground available from the documents presented by the Appellant for the review of the order dated 27.06.2024. therefore the review appeal filed by the Appellant does not survive and is dismissed accordingly.</p>	
24.	35/2024	Shri Jagdishbhai Mansukhbhai Joisar	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent having a 1.00 Kw RGPU tariff connection no. 32105/04233/3. The Appellant has set up a rooftop solar power generation plant with the connection. The Appellant has received a display-off, F- Status average bill. The Appellant has represented that, his average energy consumption is less than solar generation. The Respondent has issued a bill of Oct-Nov 2023 considering the meter as faulty and wrongly assessed an average of 400 units. In fact, 3.0 Kw solar generation power plant can generate approximately 15 units per day and accordingly 900 units in 60 days. So, the Respondent should provide the credit in the bill for the said period by considering 400 units of consumption out of 900 solar-generated units.</p> <p>The Respondent has not considered the solar-generated unit for the said billing purpose. The Appellant has prayed to cancel said F-status average bill.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented vide letter received on dated 17.09.2024 regarding mutual settlement of the above-said representation between both the parties. The same was also confirmed by the Respondent vide letter dated 09.09.2024. Therefore, it was not required to</p>	



					observe on merits of the case and accordingly disposed without any order.	
25.	32/2024	Shri Bharatbhai Dhanjibhai Thesia	PGVCL, Junagadh	Estimate Related	<p>The Appellant has represented that, the Govt. of Gujarat has leased land for mining for 10 years at Jalansar village of Kalawad taluka. The Appellant has registered an application for a new connection at the said land through online mode and paid an estimate of Rs.2,63,433.60 on 05.10.2023. Later, the Respondent has informed the Appellant that the land is situated outside the 'Gamtal' area, therefore it is required to pay the actual cost of line charges according to the issued an estimate of Rs.14,09,301/-. According to the Appellant, the provisions of recovery of actual cost is not applicable as it is not an 'Agriculture' purpose land. Therefore, the Respondent should calculate the charges based on fixed cost instead of the actual cost of line. The Appellant has prayed for refund of the estimated amount paid towards the actual cost of the line. The Respondent submitted that they released the new connection after receiving the payment towards the actual line cost from the Appellant. Further, CGRF, Junagadh has observed that, as per GUVNL circular No.GUVNL/Tech-2/RNR/2719 Dt.30.01.2017, the charges levied by the respondent observed in order. It was 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. Therefore, the Respondent should adhere the regulations notified by the GERC. Therefore, it was directed to refund the differential amount to the Appellant after considering the KW-based fixed cost against the amount paid on Dt.05.10.2023 and 12.03.2024 towards the new connection.</p>	
26.	34/2024	Shri Vanjara Ashaji Ranaji	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is using a residential purpose connection. He has represented that the Respondent company had billed 2496 units in July-August 2023, which cannot be possible. Because average consumption during the summer seasons of March to June 2023 was 254 units per month and March to June 2024 was 197 units per month. Therefore, the Appellant</p>	

					<p>has prayed for relief in the above-said 2496-unit bill.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, because of the mistake in meter reading, the units were kept pending from beginning. However, during the meter reading of July-August 2023, the meter reader noticed the pending units and issued a bill for the total consumption of 2496 units. Therefore, the said issued bill was of the actual consumption of the Appellant which is payable by him.</p> <p>It was observed that the meter inspection at Meter Testing Laboratory found no error and data retrieved through MRI matched with readings taken during the billing period of July-August 2023. Therefore, the representation of the Appellant cannot be accepted by ignoring the consumption recorded in the meter. It was also noted that, the Appellant has paid the said bill therefore, it was directed to the Respondent to grant exemption in payment of delay payment charges of said bill.</p>	
27.	30/2024	Shri Mayurbhai Rambhai Rajai C/o. Shri Chiragbhai Rajai.	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a NRG category consumer of the Respondent. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent has issued a bill of 240 units without any usage. The meter was replaced and it was tested at Meter Testing Laboratory and found 'ok'. Because before and after the period of the said 240 units bill, the Appellant was generally billed only for the fixed charges amount because of non-usage. Therefore, the Appellant has prayed for the relief in the said 240 units bill.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, at the time of billing of Feb-March 2023, meter reading was noted as 244 Kwh. Therefore, the differential consumption of 240 units was billed. The meter was replaced as per the Appellant's complaint, but it was found 'OK' during testing. Therefore, the bill issued was as per consumption which is payable.</p> <p>It was observed that at the time of testing, the said meter was found 'ok' and the accuracy of the meter was also found within the permissible limit also the data retrieved through the MRI was observed in line with the billed consumption. It was not possible that the meter recorded energy abnormal for a specific time and normal for the rest of</p>	

					the time. Therefore, the representation of the Appellant was rejected.	
28.	31/20 24	Shri Narendrakumar Kesara Halai	PGVCL, Bhuj	Shifting of line	<p>The Appellant has represented that, without getting his permission the Respondent has erected poles of JGY feeder on his plot area. The Appellant has represented before the Respondent to shift the JGY feeder elsewhere as he wanted to do construction work over the plot area. In response to that, the Respondent has recovered Rs.15,000 towards shifting charges to shift the said line. The Appellant has represented that, poles erected on his plot area should be shifted at cost of the Respondent. The Appellant has prayed for refund of the amount which was paid toward the line-shifting estimate.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, earlier in 1996, the Dhunai feeder was commissioned and its line was passed through the plot area which was purchased by the Appellant in 1999. Because of that reason, the charges of the shifting of the line were recovered from the Appellant, which is also observed in the order by the CGRF.</p> <p>The representation of the Appellant was registered on admission stage to decide as to whether the representation of the appellant falls within the jurisdiction of the Electricity Ombudsman or not. As per representation, it was observed that the Appellant did not fall within the definition of complainant and consumer. Further, as per the Works of Licensees Rules, 2006, the line-shifting-related issue should be adjudicated by the District Magistrate, Police Commissioner or authorized officer. It was observed that the representation did not fall within the jurisdiction of this office. Therefore, it was rejected on the admission stage without going in to the merits.</p>	

S/d.  
Electricity Ombudsman

**REPORT FOR THE**  
**SECOND HALF OF THE YEAR 2024-25**  
**(October- 2024 TO March- 2025)**

**(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 2024-2025 (Oct.-2024 to Mar.-2025) as provided in Regulation 3.51 of GERC Notification No.02 of 2019 and amendments thereof 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 2024-25, 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 and amendments thereof, are stated in table below:

Sr. No.	Case No.	Review Case no.	Decision.
1.	04/2025	37/2024	Original order stands.
2.	05/2025	36/2024	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 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 2024-2025 (OCTOBER-2024 TO MARCH-2025) 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.	28/2024	Shri Juthabhai Naranbhai Karangiya	PGVCL, Junagadh	New Connection	<p>The Appellant has applied for a new agriculture purpose connection for on land which is leased by TDO. The Appellant has represented that, even after the documents were submitted as per clause no.4.16 of the supply code notification no.4 of 2015, the Respondent has denied for granting a new connection stating reason that it as a second connection. The Respondent has informed that the Appellant intends to utilize a power supply from a new connection to transmit water through piping at survey no.450, where an agriculture connection is already exists. The Appellant has represented to treat the same as a distinct legal entity as per clause no.4.27 of notification no. 4 of 2015, as the new connection was sought in a different survey number and prayed for granting a new connection. The Appellant also prayed to consider the order of case no.13/2017 of the Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmedabad, by stating it a similar type of representation.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the Appellant has demanded a new connection in the Kakabhai Sinhan village 1 Gutha land to transmit water to his another survey number 450, as per circular No.GUVNL/T-3/Ag/1021 Dt.18.08.2017 and No.PGVCL/Project/Schem/1998 Dt.17.11.2023, it is amended that the connection could be granted for lifting water for irrigation from the river/creek which is flowing into the sea and is wasted. However, from the area where the connection was sought by the Appellant, no water was being wasted by flowing into the sea. Moreover, the land allotted by the TDO is only for Oriya-Dhoriya purposes. Presently connection no.33083/00786/8 is already exists in his survey number 450 and also the said survey number 450's area is less than 8 acres.</p>	

					<p>Because of the above reasons, the connection could not be granted.</p> <p>It is observed that the Respondent has not denied granting the connection on the grounds of clause no.4.16 and 4.28 of notification no. 4 of 2015. It is also observed that the circulars were amended after the order of case no.13/2017 which is stated by the Appellant, therefore the representation of considering the similar type representation was not accepted. It was also observed that, the land allotted by the TDO under the oriya-dhoriya purpose which is not included into provisions of Energy and Petrochemical Department's circular issued for surface water, also as per the Energy and Petrochemical Department letter dated 28.07.2017, in case of one connection is exist in a land and is less than 8 Acre, applicant is not eligible to get another connection at 2 Ghutha land. Accordingly, the Appellant is not entitled to get second connection, therefore the representation of the Appellant about the new connection was not accepted.</p>	
2.	36/20 24	M/s. Madhu Silica Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is an EHT consumer of the Respondent holding connection no. 23865, having a contracted demand of 9,000 KVA under the HTP-1 tariff. The Appellant had also sourced power from entities other than the Respondent Company. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent had sent a calculation sheet of recovery made against the demand charges for the energy bills for July 2015, August 2015 and May 2016 on 30.09.2023. The Appellant has filed a grievance against this recovery before the CGRF. The Forum directed the Respondent to refund the amount of Rs.9,01,875.00 allowing the application of the Appellant vide order dated 26.04.2024. Later, the Respondent has filed a review application. In the review order, the forum has cancelled the earlier order dated 26.04.2024 and directed the Respondent not to refund Rs.9,01,875.00 vide order dated 20.07.2024. The review application filed by the Respondent was against regulation 2.64 of GERC notification 2 of 2019. The appellant added that, As outlined</p>	The Respondent has conveyed vide letter dated 04.12.2024 about implementation.

				<p>in GERC Open Access Regulation 2011, the difference between the actual energy draw and the scheduled power represents the power supplied by the distribution licensee, the tariff order applies only to the power supplied by the distribution licensee and not to the scheduled open-access power. Therefore, to determine the power drawn from the distribution licensee, the scheduled power must be deducted from the actual energy drawl. The recovery made by the Respondent is against the said regulation. The Appellant had prayed to quash the review order and represented to refund the wrongly recovered amount of Rs.9,01,875.00.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, as part of the implementation of the CGRF, Bhavnagar order dated 06.06.2020, a total difference amount of Rs.28,63,025.00 was refunded to the Appellant in the energy bill of Jun 2021. Later, as per CGRF, Rajkot order dated 29.04.2023 “when the recorded demand more than the contract demand no refund need to be made”, according to that, the refunded demand charge was reviewed and it was found that in three months billing demand recorded was more than the contract demand, which is recoverable from the Appellant. Therefore, the amount of Rs.9,01,875.00 was recovered from the Appellant in the energy bill of Sep 2023. The recovery made is in line with the provision outlined in notification no.03/2011 Terms and Conditions of Intra-State Open Access.</p> <p>As per the provisions outlined in the regulations, CGRF has been vested with the powers to review their order on the received application. According it is noted that, it is the jurisdiction of the CGRF to decide whether the application for the review is to be allowed or not.</p> <p>As per the provisions outlined in regulation 32(3) of notification no.3/2011- Terms and Conditions of Intra-state Open Access, in case the actual drawl of energy is more than the scheduled energy and also more than the contracted demand, for excess drawl of energy more than the contracted demand, the consumer is liable to pay penal rate as per the applicable tariff.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--



					<p>The interpretation by the Appellant as 'actual energy drawl' means differential energy is found illogical and erroneous as difference derived from the quantities itself cannot be made comparable with the same quantities. Instead, it is found appropriate to consider 'actual energy drawl' as energy recorded in the meter installed at consumer end, because comparison of quantum of energy recorded in the meter with scheduled energy and contracted demand make correct interpretation in line with the provisions of above regulations. In fact, for deriving difference, the Appellant and the Respondent is agreed to consider energy recorded in the meter installed at consumer end as 'actual drawl', accordingly 'actual energy drawl' should have same quantum i.e. energy recorded in the meter installed at consumer end.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Respondent is directed to carryout calculations based on data of recorded energy in the Meter installed at consumer end, contracted demand and scheduled energy drawl of the Appellant for the month of July-15, August-15 and May-16 as per the provisions of the regulation 32(3) of the Notification no.03/2011-Terms and Conditions of Intra-state Open Access and amendments thereof notified by the Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission.</p>	
3.	37/20 24	M/s. Shree Ram Oxy Gas Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing related	<p>The Appellant is an EHT consumer of the respondent holding connection no. 23368, having a contracted demand of 7,400 KVA under the HTP-1 tariff. The Appellant had also sourced power from entities other than the Respondent company. The Appellant had represented that, the Respondent had sent a calculation sheet of recovery made against the demand charge for the energy bills for 12 different months starting from April 2013 to December 2021 on 30.09.2023. The Appellant has filed a grievance against this recovery before the CGRF. The Forum directed the Respondent to refund the amount of Rs.36,49,926.25 allowing the application of the Appellant vide order dated 26.04.2024. Later, the Respondent has filed a review application against the order</p>	The Respondent has conveyed vide letter dated 03.12.2024 about implementation.



				<p>believing that the review application was not in line with related regulations. In the review order, the forum cancelled the earlier order dated 26.04.2024 and directed the Respondent not to refund Rs.36,49,926.25 vide order dated 20.07.2024. The review application filed by the Respondent was against regulation 2.64 of GERC notification 2 of 2019. The Appellant had added that, as outlined in GERC Open Access Regulation 2011, the difference between the actual energy drawl and the scheduled power represents the power supplied by the distribution licensee the tariff order applies only to the power supplied by the distribution licensee and not to the scheduled open-access power. Therefore, to determine the power drawn from the distribution licensee, the scheduled power must be deducted from the actual energy drawl. The recovery made by the Respondent is against the said regulation. The Appellant had prayed to quash the review order and represented to refund the wrongly recovered amount of Rs.36,49,926.25.</p> <p>The Respondent had submitted that, as part of the implementation of the CGRF, Bhavnagar order dated 23.12.2021, a total difference amount of Rs.1,23,49,965.00 was refunded to the Appellant in the energy bill of July 2022. Later, as per CGRF, Rajkot order dated 29.04.2023 “when the recorded demand more than the contract demand no refund need to be made”, according to that, the refunded demand charge was reviewed, and it was found that in total twelve months billing demand recorded was more than the contract demand, which is recoverable from the Appellant. Therefore, the amount of Rs.36,49,926.25 was recovered from the Appellant in the energy bill of Sep 2023. The recovery made is in line with the provision outlined in notification no.03/2011 Terms and Conditions of Intra-State Open Access.</p> <p>As per the provisions outlined in the regulations, CGRF has been vested with the powers to review their order on the received application. Accordingly it was noted that, it is the jurisdiction of the CGRF to decide whether the application</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>for the review is to be allowed or not.</p> <p>As per the provisions outlined in regulation 32(3) of notification no.3/2011- Terms and Conditions of Intra-state Open Access, in case the actual drawl of energy is more than the scheduled energy and also more than the contracted demand, for excess drawl of energy more than the contracted demand, the consumer is liable to pay penal rate as per the applicable tariff. The interpretation by the Appellant as 'actual energy drawl' means differential energy is found illogical and erroneous as difference derived from the quantities itself cannot be made comparable with the same quantities. Instead, it is found appropriate to consider 'actual energy drawl' as energy recorded in the meter installed at consumer end, because comparison of quantum of energy recorded in the meter with scheduled energy and contracted demand make correct interpretation in line with the provisions of above regulations. In fact, for deriving difference, the Appellant and the Respondent have agreed to consider energy recorded in the meter installed at consumer end as 'actual drawl', accordingly 'actual energy drawl' should have same quantum i.e. energy recorded in the meter installed at consumer end.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Respondent was directed to carryout calculations based on data of recorded energy in the Meter installed at the consumer end, contracted demand and scheduled energy drawl of the Appellant for the month of Apr.-13, Jun.-13, Dec.-13, Jan.-14, Feb.-14, Mar.-14, Oct.-18, Jan.-19, Feb.-19, Mar.-19, Jan.-20 and Feb.-20 as per the provisions of the regulation 32(3) of the Notification no.03/2011-Terms and Conditions of Intra-state Open Access and amendments thereof notified by the Hon'ble Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission.</p>	
4.	38/2024	Shri Dalsukhbhai Maganbhai Chauhan	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Power supply through separate transformer center	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent having agricultural purpose connection no. 36845/04705/7. The Appellant has represented that, after the load extension, as per the Appellant's demand for power supply through a separate transformer centre, the</p>	

					<p>Respondent has erected a separate transformer centre near the existing transformer centre but did not provide a power supply from it because of an objection raised by the neighbour consumer. The Appellant has claimed that the newly erected transformer centre was erected on his land and prayed for a power supply from it.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the Appellant has applied for the load extension under the VDS scheme. As per the Appellant's demand for the power supply through a separate transformer centre, the new transformer centre was erected near the existing but due to objection raised by the neighbour of the appellant, it was not possible to charge it.</p> <p>Moreover, capacity of existing transformer centre is sufficient to cater power supply to enhanced demand of the Appellant, therefore it was sanctioned from the existing transformer centre from the date of receipt of the test report. The Appellant and one more consumer of the respondent is being supplied from the existing transformer centre. However, due to a dispute between these two consumers the power was not supplied from the newly erected transformer centre and the same was also dismantled as per the CGRF order.</p> <p>It was observed that, the Appellant has accepted that there is no issue of power supply and reliability. Further, the Respondent should maintain the reliability of power and also it is under preview of the Respondent to determine as to whether another transformer centre is required or not.</p> <p>Therefore, the representation of the Appellant is not accepted.</p>	
5.	39/2024	Shri Ved Prasadbhai Shashikantbhai	PGVCL, Rajkot	Load Extension and Billing-related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent using residential connection no. 33101/01536/0. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent has issued a supplementary bill of amount Rs.19,757.90 for the period from April 2017 to April 2023 towards reclassification of tariff from RGPR to RGPU. However, the same is revised to the amount of Rs.8127.44 as per CGRF order. At the time of application for new connection, The Appellant had submitted Sale deed as proof of ownership, which describes that the premises is within Gondal</p>	The Respondent has conveyed vide letter dated 16.12.2024 about implementation.

					<p>Municipality, even though the Respondent had classified the connection under the wrong tariff category. The Appellant has added that their application for the load extension is also pending before the Respondent for which required charges were paid in 2019. The Appellant prayed for relief from the said supplementary bill and for the completion of the load extension process.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, new connection was inadvertently classified under RGPR tariff instead of RGPU tariff at the time of release of the connection. The same was come into the knowledge during the audit period of 2021-22 dated 15.05.2023 to 31.05.2023. As per audit report, the total amount of Rs.19,757.90 bill was issued to the Appellant which was later revised to Rs.8127.44 as per the CGRF order. Because of a delay in effect into the system regarding the reclassification of the relevant tariff, the said bill was again revised to Rs.11,326.45 with an extension of the billing period from April 2017 to Jun 2024. Also, the load extension process is pending at the e-urja system level which is also in progress.</p> <p>As per notification no.4 of the 2015, reclassification of tariff category by the Distribution Licensee shall be allowed after giving notice to the Consumer. Even in case of erroneous classification of tariff category, the Distribution Licensee can reclassify after following provisions of the regulation. Further, there is no provision to reclassify the tariff category with retrospective effect. Therefore, the Responder was directed to issue supplementary bill from the period of detection of the appropriate consumer category i.e. 31.05.2023.</p> <p>It was also observed that the Respondent was failed to release the additional load within the stipulated time limit defined in the above-mentioned regulation. Therefore, as per the provisions of the regulations, after particular time line, the load enhancement shall be considered as deemed release and accordingly load enhancement application of the Appellant has be directed to consider as deemed release.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

6.	40/20 24	Smt. Upadhyay Darshnaben Gautambhai	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing- related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent using residential connection no. 33101/01720/3. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent has issued a supplementary bill of amount Rs.8,492.93 for the period from April 2018 to March 2023 regarding the reclassification of tariff from RGPR to RGPU. However, the same is revised to the amount of Rs.8560.95 as per the CGRF order. At the time of application for new connection, The Appellant had submitted Sale deed as proof of ownership, which describes that the premises is within Gondal Municipality, even though the Respondent had classified the connection under the wrong tariff category.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, new connection was inadvertently classified under RGPR tariff instead of RGPU tariff at the time of release of the connection. The same was come into the knowledge during the audit period of 2021-22, therefore as per audit report, the total amount of Rs.8492.93 bill was issued to the Appellant, which as revised to Rs.8560.95 as per the CGRF order. Because of a delay in effect into the system regarding the reclassification of the relevant tariff, the said bill was again revised to Rs.11,256.40 with an extension of the billing period from April 2018 to May 2024.</p> <p>As per notification no.4 of the 2015, reclassification of tariff category by the Distribution Licensee shall be allowed after giving notice to the Consumer. Even in case of erroneous classification of tariff category, the Distribution Licensee can reclassify after following provisions of the regulation. Further, there is no provision to reclassify the tariff category with retrospective effect. Therefore, the Responder was directed to issue supplementary bill from the period of detection of the appropriate consumer category i.e. 31.05.2023.</p>	The Respondent has conveyed vide letter dated 16.12.2024 about implementation.
7.	42/20 24	Shri Dhanabhai Memabhai Dau	PGVCL, Bhuj	Billing- related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent using NRGPR tariff connection no.38553/10070/7. The Appellant has represented that, from November 2023 to January 2024 bills were issued under 'faulty' status. In fact, during that period, the usage was very low compared to other months.</p>	The Respondent has conveyed vide letter dated 04.02.2025 about implementation.

					<p>The meter was replaced and detected as a display-off in initial testing. Later on, as per the Appellant's retesting application, the meter was retested and data of the meter were retrieved. Accordingly, the Respondent issued a revised bill to the Appellant of month Nov. 2023 to Jan.-2024. The Appellant prayed to consider the average consumption of the succeeding period of the meter replacement for the revision of the above-said bill of the faulty meter.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, as per the Appellant's retesting application, the meter was retested. During the time of retesting, after patting the meter, on providing power supply, display shown consumption and also data retrieved through MRI. As per the retesting result of the meter, the revised bill was issued to the appellant.</p> <p>As per notification no.4 of the 2015 electricity supply code and related matters, a provision outlined to consider average consumption of the succeeding period in case of unavailability of sufficient data of preceding months. However, in this case, sufficient data of last three months average consumption is available. Therefore, the representation regarding the consideration of succeeding period average consumption cannot be accepted.</p> <p>It was observed that, the Respondent recognised the meter as faulty in initial testing and later, it declared the 'ok' meter in the retesting result and revised the bill accordingly as per the retrieved reading. Also, if the meter display was started by patting from outside, it could fall into the definition of the faulty meter. Therefore, it was directed the Respondent to revise the bills, as per clause no.6.58 of notification no.4 of the 2015 electricity supply code and related matters.</p>	
8.	43/20 24	Shri Dulabhai Tapubhai Ladumor	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing- related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent using NRGTP tariff connection no.37626/00025/0. The Appellant has represented that, The Respondent has issued a supplementary bill of amount Rs.59,331.64 towards a differential electricity duty for the period from 2011. The Respondent has proposed recovery at 20% instead of 10% after 14 years. The Appellant has</p>	

					<p>represented that, initially connection was obtained for carpentry work, later in 2016 it was used for ice cream parlour etc. The Appellant has represented to consider ED @20% from that period. The Respondent has accepted the representation and accordingly revised the bill. Accordingly, the issue was mutual settled between both the parties. Therefore, it was no observations made and passed any directions/orders in the matter.</p>	
9.	44/2024	Shri Naranbhai Bhimshibhai Solanki	PGVCL, Junagadh	Reconnection of Supply	<p>The Appellant is the Respondent's consumer using agricultural tariff connection No.80732/00251/6. The Appellant has represented that the Respondent had shifted the transformer centre through which his connection was supplied. After shifting, his supply has yet to be restored. Later, he paid the required charges as informed by the Respondent towards load extension, though his connection has yet to be reconnected. The Appellant has prayed for the restoration of power as soon as possible.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, because of load enhancement applications of the consumers, the existing transformer Centre through which power was supplied to the Appellant and other was converted to HVDS. Therefore, the connection of the Appellant was sanctioned to supply through separate Distribution Transformer Centre and accordingly it was erected at site of the Appellant. However while tapping it to the existing line one of the consumer raised the objection. Therefore, the Respondent has tried to carry out work through another route but same was objected by the Appellant. Therefore, the restoration of the power supply was not completed.</p> <p>As per the cited circumstances, power supply restoration can only be possible with police protection. Therefore, indent for police protection was already raised before the Superintendent of Police and District Magistrate, however it was still awaited. After the availability of police protection, power supply</p>	The Respondent has conveyed vide letter dated 31.12.2024 about implementation.



					<p>restoration work can be carried out.</p> <p>It was noticed that, the Appellant has agreed that he has objected the alternate route as suggested by the Respondent. As per the Electricity Act 2003, the power is vested to the licensee to decide the feasible route for the power supply. Therefore, it was directed the Respondent to restore the power as soon as possible. Also, the Appellant was directed to co-operate during the work execution.</p>	
10.	45/2024	Shri Amulakhbhai Dayabhai Khambhaliya	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing-related	<p>The Appellant is the Respondent's consumer using 90 KW-LTMD tariff connection No.85814/03841/1. The Appellant has represented that, he had opted for a seasonal tariff for the years 2022 and 2023. The Respondent has issued a shortfall amount bill towards the Annual Minimum Guarantee amounting Rs.1,48,763.30 and Rs.53,162.00 for the years 2022 and 2023 respectively as per the audit report. The Respondent has considered 12 months for the calculation of the shortfall amount towards the AMG charge for the year 2023. However, in the case of the year 2022, only 9 months period was considered instead of 12 months. Therefore, the Appellant prayed for the revision of the issued AMG charge bill for the year 2022, with consideration of 12 months.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the Appellant has opted for seasonal tariff vide application dated 14.03.2022 and 28.07.2023 for the year 2022 and 2023 respectively. At the year-end, Annual Minimum Charge is calculated. Accordingly, the shortfall amount of Rs.1,48,763.30 and Rs.53,162.00 respectively for the years 2022 and 2023 debited in the Appellant's consumer account towards the Annual Minimum Charge. The Appellant has opted 1<sup>st</sup> time for a seasonal tariff in 2022. Therefore, the shortfall amount towards the Annual Minimum Charge is calculated on 9 months symmetric basis, which is observed in line by the CGRF.</p> <p>It is observed that, the Respondent has used different method for the calculation of the Annual Minimum Charge for the year 2022, in comparison to the method used for the year 2023. For the year 2022, the</p>	The Respondent has conveyed vide letter dated 16.01.2025 about implementation.



					respondent has considered only 9 months for the AMG charge calculation. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to revise the bill of the year 2022 issued towards the Annual Minimum Charge as per the corresponding provisions of tariff order determined by the Hon'ble GERC.	
11.	46/20 24	M/s. Golden Ice Factory	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing- related	<p>The Appellant is an HT consumer of the respondent using connection no.32753 having contracted demand 275 KVA. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent has issued an estimate of load extension on a suo-moto basis due to the recording of excess demand than contracted demand. The Appellant does not require load enhancement. In fact, due to low voltage supply from the existing feeder, their factory machinery had consume 15 to 20 Amp more current than regular drawl. As a result, the demand was recorded more than the contract demand. In response to the grievance filed by the Appellant, CGRF has ordered to pay minimum charges for two years. The Appellant has prayed for relief from the supplementary bill which the Respondent has issued in terms of the CGRF order.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, as per regulation.4.95 of GERC notification No.04/2015 the Appellant was informed to enhance the load as per the excess load recorded into the meter. However, no action has been initiated by the Appellant. Therefore, on a suo-moto basis, the estimate of Rs.13,36,466.00 was issued to the Appellant. Later on, as per the order of CGRF, bill towards two years minimum charges amounting Rs.1,33,200.00 was issued to the Appellant.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented about the low voltage supply which was the reason of overdrawn appears illogical and therefore rejected.</p> <p>Further, the both the parties may settle their dispute as decided by the CGRF, otherwise the Respondent is free to take action as per the provisions of regulation 4.95 of supply code.</p>	
12.	41/20 24	M/s. MJH Carbons Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Bhuj	New Connect ion	The Appellant has applied for a 90.0 KW capacity new connection on its own non-agricultural land of Sabhrai village of Mandvi Taluka. The Appellant has represented that, even after necessary payment	

				<p>was made towards the new connection, the respondent has not yet granted the new connection. Further added, the cost towards the new connection should be recovered on a fixed cost basis as the new connection was demanded on NA land. The appellant prayed for the grant of a new connection and compensation towards the non-release of a new connection as per the time frame within the SOP.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the Appellant has registered an application for the new connection in Sambhrai village of Mandvi Taluka which is potential area of Great Indian Bustard (GIB) as per the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 19.04.2021 in Civil Writ Petition No.838 of 2019. In the order, it was directed to underground the existing overhead electricity line and also in case of the erection of a new electricity line for a new connection and shifting the electricity line work was directed to be carried out underground in the potential areas of the Great Indian Bustard. Against the direction issued vide order dated 19.04.2021 by the Hon'ble Supreme Court to underground existing electricity lines in a vast rural area another petition is filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court to represent the difficulties faced to underground the existing electricity lines of the vast rural area. Accordingly, the Hon'ble Supreme Court reviewed the order and vide order dated 21.03.2024 constituted the expert committee for the erection of new electricity lines and modification of existing electricity lines in the potential area of GIB. The committee was appointed to determine the scope, feasibility, and extent of overhead and underground electric lines in the area identified as a priority area in the earlier order. The said committee is required to submit the report by 31.07.2024, which is in progress. Therefore, the new connection cannot be granted to the appellant by erecting a new line in the potential area of GIB till the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The respondent has further submitted that, after the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in writ petition No.838 of 2019 dated 21.03.2024, no new connection</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>is granted within the priority and potential area as defined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.</p> <p>It appears that, the Committee constituted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court shall determine the scope, feasibility and extent of overhead and underground electric lines in the area and accordingly the Hon'ble Supreme Court shall take further decision.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Respondent has submitted that, after the order dated 21.03.2024 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in writ petition no. 838 of 2019, no new connection is granted within the priority and potential area as defined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Further as mentioned the writ petition no.838 of 2019 is pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, therefore it is desirable that the new electricity line should be laid and connection should be granted as decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in writ petition no.838 of 2019.</p> <p>Further, the Respondent has not granted the Appellant a new connection considering the above-referred petition, which is pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Therefore, the Appellant is not eligible to receive any compensation for the delay in granting a new connection.</p> <p>Further, the Respondent is directed to take action on an urgent basis for granting a new connection to the Appellant after the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in writ petition no.838 of 2019.</p>	
13.	47/20 24	Shri Yusufbhai Mamadbhai Ghanchi C/o. Mahmadbhai Yusufbhai	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing- related	<p>The Appellant is an LTMD consumer of the Respondent having contracted demand of 60 KW. The Appellant has represented that, by considering the multiplying factor (MF) as 2, the Respondent has issued the differential consumption supplementary bill of Rs.5,58,943.61 to the Appellant for 8 years of consumption. The supplementary bill issued by the Respondent is not in line with clauses no.6.31 to 6.33 and 6.40 of the regulations.</p> <p>In fact, since the meter was replaced, the Respondent didn't care about the MF. The Appellant prayed for revision of the supplementary bill for a maximum period of six months as per clause no.6.33 of the regulation.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, Meter No.PG33575 having</p>	The Respondent has conveyed vide letter dated 04.02.2025 about implementation.

					<p>capacity 100/5 ampere was installed on 19.07.2016 with CT capacity 200/5 ampere. The same was replaced on 06.08.2024 with another one and after meter replacement, the meter No.PG33575 was tested in the presence of the representative of the Appellant and during testing it was came to the attention that the meter was having MF-2. For actual billing, the unit must be multiplied by 2 as per the meter and CTPT ratio. The Respondent has considered MF 1 instead of 2, therefore, the supplementary bill of Rs.5,58,943.61 was issued to the Appellant of the differential unit as per the MF-2 for the period from 19.07.2016 to 06.08.2024. The provisions of the regulation 6.31 to 6.33 is applicable in case of regulation 6.29 and 6.40. In this case, it does not fall within provisions of 6.29 or 6.40. therefore, the prayer of the appellant for the revision of the bill is not accepted. It was noted that, the multiplying factor is applicable in this case therefore it was directed the Respondent to grant 8-monthly instalments for payment of supplementary bill amount.</p>	
14.	48/20 24	Shri Bhil Dhanjibhai Kanabhai	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing- related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent holding 15.0 K.W. contracted demand NRGTP tariff connection no.37101/57198/0 for rope weaving. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent has recovered an amount of Rs.92,658.30 towards the billing shortfall as per the audit report. The Appellant has prayed for relief from the above-mentioned recovery.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that the electricity bill of the month August 2023 was assessed Rs.48,474.50 only under the fuel charge head and other charges like Energy charge, Fix Charge and Electricity Duty was not assessed due to an arithmetic error of the system. The short billing recovery of the billing month of August 2023 of Rs.92,657.50 was proposed in the audit report of FY 2022-23. Accordingly, the proposed recovery amount was debited to the consumer account.</p> <p>The Respondent has confirmed that the issue was mutually settled between both parties and also submitted the Appellant's consent letter dated 03.02.2025 in this regard.</p>	

					<p>In the consent letter of the Appellant, it is stated that, due to the resolution in the subject matter, he has preferred to withdraw the appeal.</p> <p>Therefore, regarding this representation, it was not required to make any observations and pass any directions/orders.</p>	
15.	02/20 25	Shri Ashokbhai Manjibhai Savani	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Shifting of line	<p>The Appellant applied before the Respondent's Ghodidhal Subdivision Office for shifting of the electricity line and pole. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent has erected the poles on the way to his survey No.263 of Vadiya village in an obstructive manner, which could cause any mishap like a short circuit and fire. The Respondent must seek permission from concerned farmers before erecting poles, which was not obtained in their case. The Appellant has raised his objection regarding the erection of poles before the commencement of the work. However, the Respondent did not consider it. During the hearing, the Appellant has clarified that the subjected electricity pole is not erected on his land and he is not holding any electricity connection on his agricultural land. The subjected electricity pole may be obstructed in the future. Also, other farmers of the above village objected too. The Appellant has also suggested an alternate route for the subjected electricity line. The Appellant prayed for the removal of the electricity line with the pole.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, since the subjected poles are erected on the opposite side of the carriage route of the Appellant's land, no question arises of obstruction, also there are no possibilities of mishap like short circuit and fire because the subjected poles were not erected on the Appellant's land. As for granting supply to the new connection application, the only route is technically feasible. The representation made by the Appellant does not fall within the definition of the complainant and the subjected grievance could be adjudicated by District Magistrate, Police Commissioner, or any other officer authorized by the State Government. Accordingly, the Respondent also approached the District Magistrate regarding the subject grievance. However, the proposal</p>	

					<p>was returned due to non-submission of the required land records by objectors.</p> <p>The representation of the Appellant was registered on the admission stage to confirm as to whether the representation of the Appellant falls within the jurisdiction of this office or not. It was observed that, the representation did not fall within the definition of 'complaint' and the Appellant did not fall within definition of 'consumer' as per the regulation outlined in notification no. 2 of 2019 and the amendment thereof.</p> <p>Further, as per the Works of Licensees rules, 2006, the line-shifting-related issue can be adjudicated by District Magistrate, Police Commissioner or any other officer authorized by the State Government on this behalf. As the representation does not fall within the jurisdiction of this office, therefore, it was rejected on admission stage.</p>	
16.	01/20 25	Shri Jashvantray Vashrambhai Baraiya	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Reconnection of Power Supply	<p>The Appellant is the consumer of the Respondent with a commercial use purpose connection No.30403/10245/6. The Appellant represented that, the subjected connection had been in use since 2001 in his cabin. However, the Respondent disconnected the connection during the land encroachment clearance drive of Municipal Corporation. Therefore, he often approached the Respondent's concerned office for restoration of the connection. But the Respondent has asked to submit proof of land ownership or NOC of the concerned department for reconnection. The Appellant represented that his application is for reconnection, therefore, it is not required to submit the NOC of the authority. At the time of taking a new connection, the Appellant paid the required charges for the pole. Therefore, the pole is of ownership of the Appellant. From the said pole, the Respondent could not provide power supply to others. Likewise, The Appellant prayed for the reconnection at the earliest.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, the subjected connection was disconnected by the Respondent's subdivision office as per the telephonic instruction received from the Bhavnagar Municipal Corporation. The process of disconnection was</p>	

					<p>carried out as per clause no.4.20 of the GERC Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters Regulations Notification no.4 of 2015. As per the connection restoration application of the Appellant, the Respondent seek opinion from the Bhavnagar Municipal Corporation. In reply to that, a Negative opinion was received from the Estate officer, Municipal Corporation, Bhavnagar.</p> <p>It was observed that, as per As per chapter No.3 and 4 of the GERC Licensee's Power to Recover Expenditure Incurred in Providing Supply and Other Miscellaneous Charges regulations notification No.9/2005 and amendment thereof, The entire service line, notwithstanding that a portion thereof has been paid for by the consumer, shall be the property of the distribution licensee and by whom it shall be maintained and the distribution licensee have a right to use it for the supply of energy to any other person by tapping the service or otherwise except if such supply is detrimental to the supply to the consumer already connected therewith. Accordingly, the Appellant's representation of owning the above subject pole is observed as invalid. It is also observed that the premises do not own by the Appellant, and if the appellant has submitted the concerned department's NOC at the time of the new connection application, it cannot be considered irrevocable. Therefore, it was observed that it is required to submit a concern department NOC for the restoration of the subject connection. The Appellant is allowed to submit proof of occupancy/ownership within 60 days and till the time the Respondent was directed not to take action for PD and in case of the Appellant is failed to submit required documents, the Respondent may proceed for permanently disconnection of the subject connection.</p>	
17.	03/20 25	Shri Jasmin B. Dattani	PGVCL, Rajkot	Shifting of line	<p>The Appellant has applied before the Respondent's Ronki Subdivision Office for the shifting of the electricity line and pole. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent has erected the poles by trespassing on his own plot No.30 of survey No.80-81 of Virda-Vajdi village without his consent. Due to that, the</p>	



				<p>Appellant was deprived of the utilisation of the plot. The Appellant and also the earlier owner of the plot, applied before the Respondent's sub-division office for the removal of the subject pole. The Appellant added that, since the Respondent erected a pole on his land after the change of purpose to non-agriculture land, he did not need to pay any charges for shifting. Despite that, the Respondent compelled him to pay charges. The Appellant prayed for the refund of the paid estimate charges with interest and also sought compensation for the trespassing and disciplinary action against the defaulter. The Respondent submitted that, since the purpose of the subject plot changed to non-agricultural in 1980, no development/construction has been observed on the plot. There are no provisions for the compensation as sought by the Appellant. The representation made by the appellant did not fall within the definition of the complainant as per clause no.3.19 of the GERC notification 2 of 2019, and the subjected grievance could be only adjudicated by District Magistrate, Police Commissioner, or any other officer authorized by the State Government on this behalf as per the works of licensees rules, 2006. This has been enforced by the Chief Electrical Inspector, Gandhinagar, vide circular dated 20.10.2018.</p> <p>The Representation of the Appellant was registered at the admission stage as to whether the representation of the Appellant falls within the jurisdiction or not. As per representation, it is observed that the Appellant did not fall within the definition of complainant and consumer as per the regulation outlined in notification no. 2 of 2019 and the amendment thereof. As per the Works of Licensees rules, 2006, the line-shifting-related issue can be adjudicated by the District Magistrate, Police Commissioner or any other officer authorized by the State Government on this behalf. It was observed that the representation does not fall within the jurisdiction of this office. Therefore, it is rejected on the admission stage.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--



18.	04/20 25	M/s. Shree Ram Oxy Gas Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Review of Case No. 37 of 2024	<p>The Appellant has filed the review application under regulation 3.47(iii) of the Hon'ble GERC Notification No. 2 of 2019. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent did not deny the directive of the order but suitably twisted the same to deprive the Appellant of the effect of the order under the guise of clear wording. Accordingly, the Appellant has prayed to review the petition with the limited purpose of rewriting the clear directives to the Respondent. Also further represented that the review application is not filed to seek a review of the order but either to request to limited change restricted only to rewriting the directives for the sake of justice, and to clarify the matter to the Respondent.</p> <p>It was further represented by the Appellant that the Respondent did not follow the directives in the Order dated 08.11.2024 and merely reproduced the previously submitted data. Therefore, the Appellant has represented to review the Order for a limited change in directives to clarify the matter to the Respondent.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, the Appellant has nothing new things or important matters or evidence found which was not discussed or any mistake or error apparent on the face of the record. There is no sufficient reason represented by the Appellant to review the Order, therefore, the application of the Appellant to review the Order should be rejected. It is further submitted by the Respondent that all relevant billing data are shared to the Appellant as per the Order of this office in case no. 37/2024. And added that the Respondent has obeyed the order in the right sense and has informed the appellant regarding the implementation of the order. It was noted that, the Appellant has pressed on the implementation of the Order announced in case no.37/2024 and simultaneously also filed a review application mentioning different reasons as discussed above. While disposing the case no.37/2024, clear directives were issued in the order to the Respondent and the Appellant with elaborate explanations of the related provisions of the regulation and need no further change. The appropriate action in case of non-compliance of the</p>
-----	-------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--	---

					order is not within the jurisdiction of this office. The Appellant has represented to review the Order under provisions of the regulation 3.47(iii), which means the Order can be reviewed on grounds of any other sufficient reason, however, no sufficient ground is represented by the Appellant to review the Order. Therefore, in the absence of sufficient reasons review application is observed as unmaintainable and is dismissed accordingly.	
19.	05/20 25	M/s. Madhu Silica Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Review of Case No. 36 of 2024	<p>The Appellant has filed the review application under regulation 3.47(iii) of the Hon'ble GERC Notification No. 2 of 2019. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent did not deny the directive of the order but suitably twisted the same to deprive the Appellant of the effect of the order under the guise of clear wording. Accordingly, the Appellant has prayed to review the petition with the limited purpose of rewriting the clear directives to the Respondent. Also further represented that the review application is not filed to seek a review of the order but either to request to limited change restricted only to rewriting the directives for the sake of justice, and to clarify the matter to the Respondent.</p> <p>It was further represented by the Appellant that the Respondent did not follow the directives in the Order dated 04.11.2024 and merely reproduced the previously submitted data. Therefore, the Appellant has represented to review the Order for a limited change in directives to clarify the matter to the Respondent.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, the Appellant has nothing new things or important matters or evidence found which was not discussed or any mistake or error apparent on the face of the record. There is no sufficient reason represented by the Appellant to review the Order, therefore, the application of the Appellant to review the Order should be rejected. It is further submitted by the Respondent that all relevant billing data are shared to the Appellant as per the Order of this office in case no. 36/2024. And added that the Respondent has obeyed the order in the right sense and has informed the appellant regarding the implementation of the order.</p>	

					<p>It was noted that, the Appellant has pressed on the implementation of the Order announced in case no.36/2024 and simultaneously also filed a review application mentioning different reasons as discussed above. While disposing the case no.36/2024, clear directives were issued in the order to the Respondent and the Appellant with elaborate explanations of the related provisions of the regulation and need no further change. The appropriate action in case of non-compliance of the order is not within the jurisdiction of this office. The Appellant has represented to review the Order under provisions of the regulation 3.47(iii), which means the Order can be reviewed on grounds of any other sufficient reason, however, no sufficient ground is represented by the Appellant to review the Order. Therefore, in the absence of sufficient reasons review application is observed as unmaintainable and is dismissed accordingly.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

S/d.  
Electricity Ombudsman

**REPORT FOR THE**  
**FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 2025-26**  
**(Apr.- 2025 TO Sept.- 2025)**

**(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 2025-2026 (Apr.-2025 to Sept.-2025) as provided in Regulation 3.51 of GERC Notification No.02 of 2019 and amendments thereof 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 2025-26, 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 2025-2026 (APRIL-2025 TO SEP.-2025) 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.	07/2025	Shri Rameshbhai Chhaganbhai Dhavaniya	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is an NRG consumer of the Respondent, having a contract load of 39.0 kw. The Appellant has represented that, the Respondent has debited a total of 48870 units in the consumer account during the billing of October 2024 for the billing period of April, May and November 2023, considering the monthly average consumption of 16290 units towards the defective meter average bill. In fact, except March to May period, average consumption is around 5000 to 6000 units. Therefore, the Appellant is agreed for April and May-23 average consumption however, average consumption billed for Nov.-23 is quite higher. Therefore, the Appellant prayed for relief for the average assessed bill of November 2023.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the subject connection is used in salt production. During the monsoon period, the meter of the subject connection is not accessible. Therefore, the provisional bill was issued to the Appellant for the period from April 2023 to September 2023. The meter of subject connection was replaced on 19.11.2023 and tested on 12.01.2024. As per the meter testing result, the meter was found defective. Therefore, from the above-mentioned period, the bill for April, May and November 2023, assessed on the average consumption basis as per the defective meter lab report. It was not able to retrieve data through MRI and as meter was out of guarantee period, therefore, not possible to retrieved through manufacturing company, Therefore, the Meter was declared scrap.</p> <p>The Appellant has objected the average bill issued for November 2023. As per clause no.6.58 of the GERC Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters Regulations Notification No. 4 of</p>	The Respondent has implemented the order as conveyed vide letter no, 668/19.06.25

					<p>2015 and amendment thereof, in case of defective/stuck/stopped meter, the consumer shall be billed based on the average consumption of the past three billing cycles. And these charges shall be leviable for a maximum period of three billing cycles only. It is observed that, instead, considering the three consecutive billing cycles for the assessment of the average consumption billing for the defective meter bill, the Respondent has assessed the bill for months, April, May and November 2023. It is observed that, for month of June, the consumption recorded in the years 2022 and 2024, respectively, was 8510 and 17696 units. Therefore, the Respondent has been directed to revise the bill as per the average consumption by considering three consecutive billing cycles from April 2023. It was also directed to cancel average consumption bill of Nov.-23 and issue it as per actual consumption and also directed to grant two interest free instalment, if paid within due date of the bill.</p>	
2.	08/20 25	Shri Anilbhai Hirjibhai Makadiya	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is an RGPU consumer of the Respondent, using connection no.30608/48214/5, having a contract load of 3.0 kw. The Appellant represented that, he was billed 3 to 4 times the units than his actual consumption for an unknown reason. The Respondent has replaced the meter on 04.12.2024 as per his application. After replacement of the meter, the recorded consumption is convincing and quite lower than the corresponding period of earlier years. Accordingly, the Appellant prayed to revise the bills of earlier period.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, as per the Appellant's application regarding the fast meter, the meter was replaced on 04.12.2024 and was tested in the presence of the Appellant on 16.12.2024. As per the test results the meter was found 'ok', the accuracy of the meter was observed within the permissible</p>	

					<p>limit. Also, a report was generated through MRI. As per the MRI report, no abnormality was observed. The meter reading taken by the meter reader was also in consistent with the consumer personal ledger.</p> <p>It is observed that the doubt shown by the Appellant regarding working of the meter was tested and found 'ok'. Also, the accuracy of the meter was observed within the permissible limit. The meter reading retrieved through MRI was also in consistent with the consumer personal ledger. Therefore, in case of the 'ok' meter, recorded consumption can't be avoided, so the pray of the Appellant was rejected.</p>	
3.	09/20 25	Shri Mustak A. S. Ansari C/o. Nisar Mahmadhusain Munsi	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is an RGPU consumer of the Respondent, using connection no.30908/02254/9, having a contract load of 3.0 kW. The Appellant has represented that the bill of January-February 2021 was issued as per the meter reading of 4053 kWh. After that, no actual reading was taken for a long time, and the Respondent has directly issued a bill of Rs.33,993/- on 30.10.2024, mentioning consumption of 4227 units. As the Appellant was mostly roaming out of the station, the subjected connection was very rarely used. The Appellant has prayed for relief in the subjected bill.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, the bill of September-October 2024 was issued of 4227 units, amounting to Rs.33,966.08. After that, the subject meter was replaced on 24.12.2024 and tested on 16.01.2025. The report was also generated through MRI. As per the meter testing results, no defects were observed. Therefore, the issued bill was payable by the Appellant.</p> <p>The Appellant has conveyed vide email dated 12.05.2025 that the subjected matter was mutually conciliated between both the parties and further added that the Appellant has no complaint regarding the subjected matter. Due to the satisfactory resolution in the subjected matter, the Appellant preferred to withdraw the representation made before this office. The Respondent confirmed the mutual settlement between both parties by</p>	

					submitting the Appellant's consent letter vide letter dated 06.05.2025. Therefore, regarding this representation, it did not require any observation and directions/orders to be passed.	
4.	06/2025	M/s. R plus Cera	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is an LTMD consumer of the Respondent, having a contract load of 100.0 kW. With the connection, the rooftop grid-interactive PV solar plant was commissioned on 05.05.2022. The Appellant represented that the Respondent had issued random bills after the commissioning of the rooftop solar plant. The bills issued by the respondent have many disparities, as the meter reading series of export and import units was not in a consecutive manner. Consequently, the Respondent has issued a significant recovery assessment. The Respondent has also violated the GERC net metering regulations 2016 by recovering banking charges. The Appellant has prayed to direct the Respondent to prepare the revised ledger for final payment or refund, with the issuance of a set of fresh bills for every month as per actual readings. Also prayed to direct the respondent to refund the recovered banking charge.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, there was an error in reading the 'Import' and 'Export' series of the meter due to the identical reading series of both parameters. However, as per the application of the Appellant, the meter was replaced and inspected. At the time of the inspection, the meter was found okay, and meter data was also collected through M.R.I. Accordingly, the revised bill was issued to the Appellant as per the meter data collected through M.R.I. The agreement for the Rooftop Solar Power plant was executed on 09.03.2022 with the Appellant as per the applicable Solar Power Policy 2021. As per clauses no.10.8 and 10.12 of the said policy, the banking charge is recoverable from the MSME (Manufacturing) consumer, which is mentioned in clause No.9 of the agreement executed between both parties.</p> <p>The meter was inspected at the laboratory and found ok. The revised bills issued by the Respondent were observed to be</p>	The Respondent has implemented the order as conveyed vide letter no, 1248/08.07.25



					<p>consistent with the data retrieved through M.R.I. it is observed that the Respondent was failed to bill as per the actual consumption recorded in the meter. In this particular case, no one right from the meter reader to concerned staff, has taken care to verify the billing series of the 'Import' and 'Export' energy, which is randomly changed from one number to another. Even after realizing errors, no disciplinary action was initiated against the defaulters. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to take disciplinary action against all the defaulters. The Appellant is obligated to pay for the energy actually consumed. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to re-verify the calculation as per the applicable tariff to consumption of the relevant period and convey the Appellant about the amount payable/refundable, if any. In case of a payable amount, the Respondent company was directed to grant four equal monthly instalments to the Appellant for the payment of the supplementary bill. The banking charge-related issue raised by the Appellant in the representation was not raised before the CGRF. Also, the issue is not about the arithmetical error in recovery of banking charges, but about the applicability of banking charges 'In-principally' to their solar plant. Therefore, the issue of recovery of banking charges cannot be termed as 'dispute in billing' pertaining to energy injection and billing amount, but about the applicability and interpretation of the regulations, which is not within the jurisdiction of this office.</p>	
5.	10/20 25	Shri Vipulbhai Gobarbhai Tanti	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	New Connect ion	<p>The Appellant has applied for a new agricultural electricity connection at the Respondent's subdivision office. The Appellant has represented that, the CGRF, Bhavnagar, has not observed in their order about financial loss, time wastage, mental agony and harassment caused to the Appellant due to the deprivation of the agricultural new connection. CGRF, Bhavnagar has not observed that the Respondent denied granting a new agricultural electricity connection on survey no. 85 P4, considering the whole survey</p>	<p>The Respondent has implemented the order as conveyed vide letter no, 1951/07.07 .25</p>

					<p>number 85 as disputed. However, the Respondent has granted the agricultural new connection in the other part of the survey no.85. The Appellant prayed for compensation of a minimum amount of ₹ 10 lakh per annum for incurred financial loss.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, after receiving payment of the estimated charge of the new connection on 18.11.2017, the Respondent has erected the line and transformer to release the connection. However, the brother of the Appellant raised the dispute over the subjected land. Based on the land ownership proof submitted along with the new connection application by the Appellant, demarcation could not be clarified. Therefore, the Appellant was informed to submit the survey sheet of the competent authority. The Appellant did not submit the same. Therefore, the subjected connection was not granted. The subject connection was granted on 18.04.2025 as per the CGRF, Bhavnagar Order.</p> <p>It is noted that the Appellant has not prayed for compensation before the CGRF. The espondent has informed the appellant to submit the land survey document of the competent authority vide letter dated 26.06.2018, 06.11.2018, 17.12.2020 and 24.01.2025. However, the Appellant did not reply in this regard. The Respondent also communicated to the district magistrate, Amreli, Surveyer, Amreli and Mamalatadar, Dhari, for clarification of the land ownership.</p> <p>It was observed that the Respondent has not utilised vested power to it for releasing the connection to fulfil its universal obligation of providing a new electricity connection. The lack of clarification/ submission regarding proof of ownership is also observed from the Appellant's side. Therefore, it is observed that the Respondent is not solely responsible for the delay in granting a new connection. However, being a distribution licensee, it is obligated to provide supply using its inherent power. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to pay an amount of Rs.5000/- to the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					Appellant in terms of the cost incurred to represent before this office.	
6.	11/20 25	M/s. Itacon Granito Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is an HT consumer of the Respondent, having a contract load of 2350 KVA under the HTP-1 tariff and getting the power supply from the 11 KV Itacon feeder. The Appellant has represented that the Respondent assessed the average bill for 23 days from September 3, 2024, to September 25, 2024, due to the failure of the CTPT unit of the electricity meter. Actually, due to war, their manufacturing unit was shut down from August 16, 2024, to September 21, 2024. Therefore, the bill should be assessed on an average basis for only 3 days, considering the working conditions of the factory. For the assessment of the above-mentioned faulty meter period bill, the Respondent should consider the energy consumed by the other consumers supplied through the same feeder. The Appellant has prayed to revise the bill, which was assessed based on average consumption, considering the working conditions of the factory during the above-mentioned period, as per Clause No.6.58 of Notification No. 4 of 2015 of the GERC Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters regulations. The Respondent has submitted that, as the meter display was off, the connection was checked on 25.09.2024 and found the L.V. side of the C.T.P.T. unit was fail, however power was is being used by the Appellant. As per the M.R.I. report of the subjected meter 'Power Off event' was registered for period from 03.09.2024 to 25.09.2024. Therefore, for 23 days average consumption was assessed as per the previous consumption of last three months as per the provisions of regulation 6.58 of the GERC Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters Regulations notification no.04/2015.</p> <p>It was observed that, the Appellant has not provided convincing evidence about the conditions of working and/or occupancy of the concerned premises of the said periods, which can be considered for energy consumption.</p>	

					Therefore, the prayer for the revision of the average consumption bill was not accepted. The prayer of the Appellant regarding considering the other consumers' consumption of the same feeder is observed to be inappropriate. The bill issued by the Respondent was observed appropriate as per the applicable regulations.	
7.	12/20 25	M/s. Shreeji Agri Impex	PGVCL, Rajkot	Refund of Security Deposit	<p>The Appellant had applied on 08.01.2021 for a refund of the security deposit to the Respondent forgetting refund of security deposit paid towards temporary connection. After finalization of the bill of temporary connection, the Respondent has issued a recovery of Rs.3,10,558/- after adjusting the security deposit amount of 1,50,000/-.</p> <p>The Appellant has represented that, since the application for refund of security deposit, it has been approximately 4.5 years, the Respondent has not refunded the amount of the security deposit. As per section 56 of the Act, other than the charges for electricity supplied, no dues are recoverable after two years also as per Regulation No.6.84 of the GERC Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters Regulations Notification No.4 of 2015. Further, the Respondent has not taken any consent for additional work and material used to carry out the line work for providing a temporary electricity connection. Also, the amount debited into the existing connection in the electricity bill by the Respondent is unconstitutional. The Appellant has prayed to refund the security deposit amount with interest paid for the temporary connection and prayed to direct the Respondent to stop the recovery of the charges of additional work carried out for providing a temporary electricity connection.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, to provide temporary connection no.33800/00100/4, the actual infrastructural cost Rs.9,84,449.49 was incurred. Considering depreciation monthly 1% of the actual cost of Rs.9,844.49, total of deprecation was Rs.1,08,289.00 for 11 months. Also, Rs.1,77,915.00 was for labour charge and Rs.</p>	The Respondent has implemented the order as conveyed vide letter no, 3505/04.09.25

					<p>1,74,354/- was considered towards supervision charges. Accordingly, the final bill prepared was of Rs.4,60,558/- and after adjustment of Security Deposit i.e. Rs.1,50,000/-, remaining amount i.e. Rs.3,10,558/- is payable by the Appellant. The Appellant didn't pay the due amount, therefore same was debited to their present 100 kW LTMD tariff connection no.33827/01153/1, which exists on the same premises.</p> <p>As the Respondent has informed the Appellant vide letter dated 17.04.2025 about outstanding amount of temporary connection. The first due of the bill is to be considered from that date. Therefore, the subject amount can't be considered as time barred as per the provision of Section 56 of the EA Act-03.</p> <p>As per the submission of the actual cost of material incurred by the Respondent, amount of Rs.2,74,828/- is payable instead of Rs 3,10,558/-.</p> <p>Therefore, the Respondent was directed to revise the bill accordingly.</p>	
8.	13/20 25	M/s. Soriso Ceramic Pvt. Ltd.	PGVCL, Rajkot	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the respondent using a 1500 kVA demand through connection no.26306. It has executed a wheeling agreement with the Respondent to wheel power from the solar power plant under a third-party sale arrangement. The Appellant has represented that, due to display off of the Meter, the Appellant has informed the Respondent vide application dated 11.09.2023, the Respondent has replaced the ABT meter on 12.09.2023 and provided a meter having 30 min. integration period. After the replacement of the ABT meter, the Respondent has not provided an energy set-off till providing a new ABT meter. i.e. up to January 2024. The Appellant has prayed to provide an energy set-off of energy procured from the Solar Power Generator for the period from 12.09.2023 to January 2024, with the benefit of the interest.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, as the contract demand of the said connection is less than 01 Mega Watt and as per clause no.9 of the tripartite wheeling agreement executed between the Appellant, the Respondent and the Solar Power Generator,</p>	

					<p>A.B.T. Compliant meter with having 15-minute integration period should be installed at the site of the Solar Power Generation Plant and the Appellant's electricity connection. Due to the replacement of the meter, the A.B.T. meter having 15-minute integration was not available for the said period. Therefore, the set-off cannot be given for the said period. Also, as per clause no.14.4 of the tripartite agreement, the subject dispute shall be adjudicated by an appropriate commission.</p> <p>As per the representation of the Appellant and the Respondent, the subject dispute arose regarding the terms and conditions outlined in the tripartite wheeling agreement executed between the Appellant, the Respondent and the Solar Power Generator. As per clause no.14.4 of the agreement, it is observed that the electricity ombudsman is not having jurisdiction to resolve the dispute in this regard. Therefore, the representation of the appellant was dismissed without any observation</p>	
9.	14/20 25	M/s. Shreeji Mines C/o. Dinesh Vitthalbhai Patel	PGVCL, Junagadh	Estimate Charge Refund Related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent using a 100.0 kW contract demand through industrial connection no.61166/00263/2 on land survey no.65 of Virpur. The said survey number was allotted on lease by the District Magistrate, Jamnagar. The Appellant has represented that, instead of providing the subject connection on a kw-based fixed cost basis, the Respondent has recovered the full infrastructural cost to provide a new connection. Later, in case of load extension, a demand note was issued and recovered on an actual cost basis. The land allotted on lease cannot be considered as agricultural land. In this regard, it has filed the grievance before the CGRF for the refund of the excess recovered amount. CGRF has considered their grievance and directed the Respondent to consider the demand note on a fixed cost basis and further directed to adjust the excess amount in their electricity bill. The Appellant has prayed to provide a refundable amount into the bank account instead of providing the adjustment to the</p>	

					<p>consumer's personal ledger, as otherwise it could take up to two years to adjust in electricity bill considering the present consumption.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, as per the GUVNL circular No.GUVNL/Tec-2/RNR/2719 dt.30.01.2017, No.GUV/2016/3885/k1 dt.24.01.2017 and GUVNL/Tec-2/1085 dt.01.09.2017, outside the gaamtal area and other than non-agricultural land, the industrial use connection could be granted by recovering the actual infrastructure cost. The land allotted by the DM could not be considered non-agricultural. Therefore, the new connection as well as load extension was released by recovering the full infrastructural cost. The Respondent has filed review application before the CGRF in this regard, which is yet to be decided. However, in between, the Appellant has represented before this office.</p> <p>It is noted that, the review application filed by the Respondent in this case is yet to be decided. Accordingly, it is observed that the representation of the Appellant does not fulfil the regulations outlined in clause No.3.19 of the notification no.02/2019 and the amendment thereof. Therefore, the representation was dismissed without any observation. The Appellant has been advised to represent before this office after the decision of the review appeal, if required, as per the applicable regulations.</p>	
10.	16/20 25	Shri Sachinkumar Vitthaldas Dattani C/o. Hotel Kalyan	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent using the LTMD tariff connection No.32001/50019/0. The Appellant opted to be billed as a seasonal consumer. The Appellant received a supplementary bill of the amount Rs.52,826.24 from the Respondent against the shortfall amount recovery as per the seasonal consumer of the years 2016 and 2017. The Appellant represented that the supplementary bill issued by the respondent is not recoverable as per clause no.56 (2) of the Electricity Act 2003 and clause no.6.84 of the Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters Regulations Notification no. 4 of</p>	

					<p>2015 as no sum due is recoverable after a period of two years. Therefore, the Appellant has prayed to cancel the above-mentioned recovery of the amount of Rs.52,826.24.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, as per the recovery proposed vide audit report No.PGCOJ/0069/04/2025 dt.04.04.2025, the total recovery of the amount of Rs.52,826.24 is proposed against the shortfall amount of the total minimum charge payable by the Appellant as per the seasonal consumer. In the years 2016 and 2017, 111.0 kW and 123.0 kW were the maximum demands recorded, respectively. Accordingly, the amount of Rs. 26760.85 and Rs. 26065.39 was proposed to be recovered against the shortfall amounts of the years 2016 and 2017, respectively. The Appellant was conveyed vide letter No.KTSD/Rev/1102 dt.27.05.2025. Further, as per Section 56 of the Act, the limitation of the recovery starts from the date of issuance of the bill. The Respondent has issued the supplementary bill to the Appellant on 27.05.2025. Therefore, the recovery of the amount could not be barred, and it is payable by the Appellant.</p> <p>In context to the observation and order of Hon'ble Supreme Court, in light of Sec.56 of EA 2003, the limitation period for recovery of an amount within 2 years starts from the date of issuance of the bill. In this case, the Respondent has issued a supplementary bill on 27.05.2025. Therefore, the recovery of the said amount is not observed contrary to Section 56 of the Act. Therefore, the prayer of the Appellant was rejected.</p>	
11.	17/20 25	Shri Kishorkumar Ramjibhai Davda C/o. Gujarat Oil Mill	PGVCL, Junagadh	Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent using the LTMD tariff connection No.32001/50012/2. The Appellant opted to be billed as a seasonal consumer. The Appellant received a supplementary bill of the amount Rs.50,674.00 from the respondent against the shortfall amount recovery as per the seasonal consumer of the years 2017, 2020 and 2021. The Appellant represented that, the supplementary bill issued by the Respondent is not recoverable as per the section no.56 (2) of the</p>	



					<p>Electricity Act 2003 and clause no.6.84 of the Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters Regulations Notification no. 4 of 2015, as no sum due is recoverable after a period of two years. Therefore, the Appellant prayed to cancel the above-mentioned recovery of the amount of Rs.50,674.00.</p> <p>The Respondent submitted that, as per the recovery proposed vide audit report No.PGCOJ/0069/04/2025 dt.04.04.2025, the total recovery of the amount of Rs.50,674.00 is proposed against the shortfall amount of the total minimum charge payable by the Appellant as per the seasonal consumer. In the years 2017, 2020 and 2021, 69.0 kW, 77.5 kW and 77.5 kW were the maximum demands recorded, respectively. Accordingly, the amount of Rs. 21,205.80, Rs. 19,677.10 and Rs. 9,791.10 was proposed to be recovered against the shortfall amounts of the years 2017, 2020 and 2021, respectively. Which is informed to the Appellant vide letter No.KTSD/Rev/1103 dt.27.05.2025. As per Section 56 of the Act, the limitation of the recovery starts from the date of issuance of the bill. The Respondent has issued the supplementary bill to the Appellant on 27.05.2025. Therefore, the recovery of the amount could not be barred, and it is payable by the Appellant.</p> <p>In context to the observation and order of Hon'ble Supreme Court, in light of Sec.56 of EA 2003, the limitation period for recovery of an amount within 2 years starts from the date of issuance of the bill. In this case, the Respondent has issued a supplementary bill on 27.05.2025. Therefore, the recovery of the said amount is not observed contrary to Section 56 of the Act. Therefore, the prayer of the Appellant was rejected.</p>	
12.	18/2025	Shri Solanki Parshottambhai Popatbhai	PGVCL, Bhavnagar	New Connection	<p>The Appellant has registered an application for a new connection on 29 September 2012 before the Respondent subdivision office. The Respondent had filed a theft arrears recovery-related Civil Suit no. 217/2008 before the Principal Civil Judge, Ghogha, against the Appellant. The Appellant has represented that, despite the said Civil Suit being decided in favour of the Appellant on 7 December 2024, the</p>	

					<p>Respondent yet not granted a new connection to the Appellant. The Appellant has prayed for a new connection.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, against the judgement in civil suit no.217/2008, an appeal is filed before the Principal District Judge, Bhavnagar vide no.71/2025 on 25.06.2025, which is pending. Therefore, the connection could not be granted.</p> <p>It is noted that the Appellant has represented to grant a new connection based on the decision of the theft arrears recovery-related civil suit no.217/2008. However, the Respondent has filed an appeal before the Principal District Judge, Bhavnagar vide no.71/2025 on 25.06.2025, which is pending. Therefore, the representation made by the Appellant does not fulfil the criteria of admitting the case outlined under regulation no.3.19 of notification no.2 of 2019. Therefore, the representation was dismissed at the admission stage.</p>	
13.	15/2025	Shri Naranbhai Dayabhai Gavadiya	PGVCL, Junagadh	Disconnection of Supply	<p>The Appellant is a consumer of the Respondent using agricultural connections No.81304/00162/8 and 81304/00178/4. The Appellant applied before the Respondent to permanently disconnect its agricultural connections. The Appellant represented that, even after the submission of the required documents along with the PDC application at the Respondent's concern office, the Respondent did not disconnect the above-mentioned two agricultural electricity connections due to the objection raised by a few other persons. The Appellant has prayed to permanently disconnect the above-mentioned two agricultural connections as he no longer requires them.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, during the disconnection of the above-mentioned two connections, the user of the connections other than the Appellant has objected the disconnection work. Therefore, the subjected connections could not be disconnected. However, the Respondent has no issues regarding the disconnections of the subjected connections. The two subjected connections are in</p>	

					<p>use by other co-owner of water sources. However, since electricity is the primary need, the user could not be deprived of electricity by disconnecting the subject connections. On instruction from this office, The Respondent has tried to mutually settle the issue between the Appellant and the objectors on 13.08.2025 and 18.09.2025. However, no amicable solution has been achieved.</p> <p>Before deciding the case, it is important to protect the right of the user of the connection who objected to the disconnection. Therefore, during the second hearing of this case, this office has given them opportunity to be heard. During the hearing of this case, the Respondent who have objected the disconnection has represented that the subjected connection's water sources have been co-owned by the Appellant and others. On of the objector has filed civil suit number 50/2023 before the Principal Civil Judge, Sutrapada. IN the pending case, the court has granted interim injection to maintain status quo by all parties in all survey numbers including in which above connections are falls.</p> <p>It is noted that, the Principal Civil Judge, Sutrapada, has issued interim injunction order vide dated 30.08.2025, which includes the survey numbers 284/1 and 119/4 of the co-owned water source of the subject connections and as order to maintain status quo, if the representation of the Appellant is accepted, it may be contrary to the interim injunction order. Therefore, no order could be passed until the final order of the Regular Civil Appeal Number 50/2023.</p>	
14.	19/20 25	Shri Prabhubhai Premjibhai Patel	PGVCL, Botad	Voltage Fluctuat ion and Billing Related	<p>The Appellant is a residential tariff consumer of the Respondent. He has set up a 3.25 kW Solar Power Generation Power Plant with the connection. The Appellant has represented that, he is suffering from voltage fluctuation and due to that, the ELCB frequently trips. Therefore, he frequently registered complaints before the Respondent for resolution and also requested an MRI report for proof. He also captured certain events of voltage fluctuation using a mobile phone, which</p>	

				<p>were not considered by the Respondent. In contrast, the Respondent measured the voltage of other adjacent connections, which are supplied through a different phase. The Appellant has prayed for an MRI Report, suitable action for voltage stability and a refund of the electricity bill paid for December-January 2025.</p> <p>The Respondent has submitted that, as per the Appellant's complaint regarding high voltage, the Appellant's connection was inspected. During the inspection, no defect was observed related to the power supply, it was measured as 241, 243 and 238 on three phases respectively. The adjacent consumers who have also set up a solar power generation plant were inspected. In this regard, no abnormality related to the power supply was observed. Also, no complaints have been registered from anyone in that particular power supply area. Further, the bill was issued to the Appellant as per the recorded consumption.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not liable to cancellation. As per the MRI of the subjected connection, dated from 04.12.2024 to 02.02.2025, no electricity unit was exported. On 16.05.2025, the transformer was replaced with an off-load tap changing functionality. Also, on 11.09.2025 and 15.09.2025, the tap of the transformer was changed. As per the CGRF order, the load balancing work was carried out on 04.09.2025.</p> <p>It is noted that in December-January 2025, only 119 units were generated through the solar power generation plant which was observed to be less compared to corresponding months of past period. It is also observed that, due to any reason from 04.12.2024 to 02.02.2025, no energy unit was exported. It is noted that the Appellant frequently complained before the Respondent. However, no immediate action was taken by the Respondent. Therefore, the Respondent was directed to take disciplinary action against the defaulter staff/officer. The Respondent was also directed to convey the MRI report to the Appellant within 10 days. Further, the Appellant representation regarding non-generation due to tripping of</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					ELCB for the reason of continuous higher voltage was not accepted in absence of logical acceptable evidence. The recorded consumption cannot be neglected. Therefore, the representation of the Appellant regarding the cancellation of the above-mentioned bill was not accepted.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

S/d.  
Electricity Ombudsman