

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

No.16 C-1, Miller Tank Bed Area (Behind Jain Hospital)
Vasanthanagar, Bengaluru-560052.

Present: **R. Sharada,**
District Judge (Retd)
Electricity Ombudsman,

Case No. OMB/H/G-490/2022
Dated: 23/09/2022

In the matter of

Sri Gaurav B Shah,
R/o “Seven Beans” Restaurant,
Nehru Nagar,
Belgavi.

Represented by:

Sri Tushar Baddi,
Arihant Park,
Keshwapur,
Hubballi.

-

Appellant

Vs

1) The Assistant Executive Engineer (Elec.),
O & M City Sub-division-3, HESCOM,
Nehru Nagar,
Belgavi - 590010.
(In person)

2) The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum/(CGRF),
O & M Circle, HESCOM,
Neharu Nagar,
Belagavi – 590010.

-

Respondents

This Appeal is filed by the Complainant/Appellant under Regulation 21.2 of KERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2004, against the orders passed by the 1st Respondent, with a prayer to quash the final bill dated 22.07.2021 bearing No. ಬೆ/ನಉವಿ-3/ಸಕಾನಿ(ಇಂ)/ಸಲೆ/ಹಿಸ/21-22/916-23 (Annexure-A) and quash the orders passed by the 2nd Respondent in Case No. 24/2021, dated 05.03.2022 bearing No. BGM/CGRF/SEE/DCA/AAO/SA-2/2021-22/7075-77 (Annexure-B) and such other reliefs in the interest of justice and equity.

- 1) It is the case of the Complainant/Appellant that, the Appellant is a registered Consumer who has availed power in the month of February 2016. He has obtained electricity installation from HESCOM with LT installation bearing RR No. CCL-25860 with a sanctioned load of 20KW under commercial tariff LT-3. The Appellant was using electricity supplied to the installation and regularly paying the electricity bills without any default.
- 2) Such being the state of affairs the 1st Respondent on 17.02.2021 issued an impugned communication stating that the meter reading was quantified as '01' instead of '10' for the period from February 2016 to February 2021 by applying correct multiplying

factor as alleged, the difference of amount worked out to the tune of Rs. 8,74,276/-. Being aggrieved by the impugned communication, the Appellant has objected and filed the present appeal on the following grounds: -

GROUND

- a) The Assessing Authority/Respondent No. 1 before passing the final order on disputed demand should have referred the matter to the Chief electrical Inspectorate who is the competent Authority to look into the defects in the disputed meter and so also to assess the quantum of energy as per notification No. KERC/COS/D/07/10 dated 01.07.2010 published in Karnataka Gazzatte dated 22.07.2010 and also as per the Regulation 27.00 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity in Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka.
- b) The disputed meter was tested/checked only on 15.02.2021, by the HESCOM, AEE (Ele), LT Meter Rating Sub division since February 2016 (date of service) and it was alleged to be noted by the Meter Reader on 10.02.2021 that there was an error in entering the Multiplying Constant (MC) where the MC was entered as '01' instead of '10'. The Licensee

ought to have conducted a pre-commissioning test and the report bearing No. 49044 dated 25.02.2016 ought to have been cross checked by the Accounts staff of the 1st Respondent office as well as the same was audited by the internal audit wing at statutory intervals.

- c) That the LT Meter Rating Sub-division conducted a test of the disputed meter in the month of January 2021 and accordingly without application of mind the Accounts staff have wrongly entered the multiplying constant as K-01 which is forthcoming from the meter reading as referred in provisional bill, this act of the Licensee clearly shows that the Respondent No. 1 & 2 are passing on the liability, on the Appellant/Consumer by covering up their negligence and so also mistake on their part and their officials for having not got rectified the same for over a period of 2 years which is wholly perverse and abuse of process.
- d) The 1st Respondent who sat as an Assessing Officer should have taken the said facts into consideration and not by simply terming it as short claim charges which ought to have covered up the negligence acts of the Revenue staff of the 1st Respondent by shifting burden on the Appellant which is

wholly illegal and unsustainable, therefore, the impugned demand made by the Respondent No. 1 as per Annexure-A is liable to be quashed.

- e) From reading Regulation 26.02 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity in Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka it emerges that the schedule of checking which is given in supply conditions of the Licensee every LT installation below 40 HP is required to be checked once in 2 years. The installation of 20KW was never checked during all these disputed periods.
- f) It is settled law that “no wrong doer should be enabled by law to take advantage of his own wrong doings”. The Respondent No. 1 representing HESCOM is a party to the agreement between himself and the Consumer. He cannot by violating the KERC regulations put the Consumer into financial inconvenience taking advantage of his superior position. In the present case the wrong doings on the part of the officer of the HESCOM has caused serious financial inconveniences which are actual loss, physical, mental, emotional suffering, insults of injury or loss which have to be compensated by the erring official.

- g) The right of the HESCOM to recover any amount from the Consumer exists only when the Respondent herein have acted in accordance with regulations issued by the Commission and not otherwise. Thereby, the HESCOM has no right to recover any amount arising out of his own commissions and omissions.
- h) As per Clause 4.9 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity in Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka, the Licensee shall provide and maintain with the Consumer a meter card for recording the meter reading. But the Licensee herein has failed to produce such meter card as contemplated in the said clause.
- i) It is further stated that since the matter relates to the correctness of the meter it has been held by Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in various judgements that any unilateral decision about the correctness or otherwise of the meter should be referred to an Authority called Electrical Inspector.
- j) Further the back billing was raised after a period of 2 years is patently illegal in the eyes of law and also having regard to the fact that recovery proceedings were initiated during

the year 2021 after a lapse of nearly 2 years, the claim itself is barred by limitation.

- k) Even assuming that there exists a liability to pay back billing charges the liability could not have been more than 6 months prior to the deductions of incorrect reading in terms of Regulation 28.02 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity in Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka.
- l) The Appellant submits that the entire responsibility is to be fixed on the Respondent individual and not on the Consumer, since the mistake is admitted by the Licensee. Even if it is presumed that the alleged bill of impugned demand raised is based on facts the same is not binding on the Consumer as the same is caused on the mistakes and defaults committed by the concerned Respondent individual.
- m) The Appellant is aggrieved with the attitude of the Licensee which has caused mental harassment as well as financial burden for no fault of his own. Thereby, the entire demand as well as the impugned order of the Respondent No. 1 is liable to be set aside and quashed by this Authority.
- n) If at all, the meter recording shows that the meter constant was changed or there was a sudden change in the

consumption pattern the Respondent should have intimated to the Appellant. But the Respondent has not placed any evidence before the Authority.

- o) The Licensee is to conduct a business under Section 61 of Electricity Act and it should be done on commercial principles, now if the Respondent claims illegal additions and dis-allowances arbitrarily and vexatiously from the Appellant to the tune of Rs. 8,74,276/- which is an imaginary until proven. The Respondent assumed the figure without any basis or valid reasons justifiable under law.
- p) The entire actions and order of the Respondent No. 1 & 2 above is being malafide and motivated by extraneous reasons not authorized by law and without being guided by any of the correct legal positions and the facts and materials on record, the entire demand as well as the impugned order of the 1st Respondent is liable to be set aside and quashed.
- q) In terms of sub clause (vi) of Clause 4.08 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity in Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka, the account section may be directed to place on record the service certificate issued at the time of service

duly mentioning all the parameters as prescribed under the regulation.

- r) There is no such multiplying constant mentioned and there is no such definition under law to prove as to whether the meter reading (KWH) reflected in the meter is to be multiplied by the CT ratio. Raising the bill for the service connection on the basis of KWH by the concerned Meter Reader who was entrusted with the responsibility of reading the meter for raising the bills, the initial response of the Respondent as due to “technical reasons” is found to be rework of the Meter Reader. The concerned meter reader and the account section from whom an explanation should be called so as to ascertain the facts of the case.
- s) The Respondent individual officer of the Licensee has not come with candid facts and clean hands, he cannot claim the short claim amount with soiled hand.
- t) The Appellant herein is running a Commercial unit Restaurant and the prices of the product supplied to the customer has a direct relation to the input cost and any additional input cost cannot be recovered from the customers retrospectively.

- u) Having regard to the facts the back billing was raised beyond a period of 2 years is patently illegal in the eyes of law, also having regard to the fact that recovery proceedings were initiated after a lapse of nearly 2 years, the claim itself is barred by limitation. Hence, the Appellant prays allow the appeal by quashing the final bill dated 22.07.2021 vide Annexure-A and also quash the order dated 05.03.2022 Annexure-B in the interest of justice.
- 3) This Authority has issued notice to the Respondents. The 1st Respondent has appeared before this Authority in person and filed written reply.
- 4) In the reply the 1st Respondent has stated that, it is fact that the installation bearing RR No. CCL-25860 with a sanctioned load of 20KWs belonging to the Appellant was serviced on 25.02.2016 under LT-3 tariff and the Appellant has been paying the electricity bills regularly.
- 5) The meter available in the market are having maximum current drawing capacity of 30 AMP which restricts only upto 18KWs. No meters are designed to draw current capacity of more than 30AMP as such the CTs of 50/5 ratio was fixed duly providing 3Ph. 5AMPs meters to this installation by assigning the Meter

Constant K-10 as per technical criterion. As per this provision the staff of Respondent was expected to record the meter readings of monthly electricity consumption and bill the installation multiplying the readings by meter constant K-10 with an appropriate tariff.

- 6) During the time of taking meter reading of the installation of the Appellant on 10.02.2021 it was found that the above installation has been billed without taking into consideration of meter constant K-10 that means the above installation has been under charged to the extent of 90% right from February 2016 to February 2021. Even though the Appellant utilized electricity commodity at 100% during the above period as per the consumption recorded in the meter, the 1st Respondent was left with no alternative except to demand the supplemental claims for the electricity consumed by the Appellant which was not measured in accordance with meter constant K-10 during the said previous period, hence, the Respondent No. 1 served a notice dated 17.02.2021 to the Appellant with a demand to pay the supplemental claim of Rs. 8,74,276/- pertaining to the installation bearing RR No. CCL-25860 within 30 days and also an opportunity was afforded to file objections if any within 15 days

as per Clause 29.03 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka.

- 7) The contention of the Appellant that the Respondent No. 1 should have referred the matter to the Chief Electrical Inspectorate who is the competent Authority to look into the defects in the disputed meter before passing the final order dated 22.07.2021 is not acceptable. Since, there is no dispute on the accuracy of the meter either by the 1st Respondent or by the Appellant. In the event of consumer disputes, the accuracy of the meter he shall give notice to the Licensee as per Clause 27.01 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka, then the Licensee shall refer the matter for inspection/testing of the meter to a 3rd party agency approved by the KERC. The supplemental claim made by the 1st Respondent exclusively relates to the under charged the installation right from February 2016 upto February 2021 due to non-applying of meter constant K-10 while preparing the bill and serving to the Appellant every month.
- 8) Before servicing the installation bearing RR No. CCL-25860 of the Appellant, a pre-commission test was conducted on 22.05.2016 vide report No. 49044 wherein it was clearly

indicated meter constant as K-10 for which the signature of the Appellant was also obtained, but while billing the installation right from date of service the meter constant K-10 was not taken into consideration on the contrary it was billed considering MC K-01 by oversight and thus 90% of the electricity consumed by the Appellant was left out from the billing. This was discovered on 10.02.2021 while taking monthly reading as such omission of MC K-10 from billing of monthly energy bills has been got it confirmed from AEE (Ele), LT Rating Sub-division, HESCOM, Belagavi who conducted rating of this installation on 15.01.2021. Based on the pre-commissioning test and rating report the meter constant K-10 has been entered into the ledger accounts which do not require any cross check. Right from the date of service of the installation the electricity consumption recorded in the meter has been read every month but while billing the installation on the spot the meter constant K-10 has not been taken into consideration by oversight. Hence, the installation has been under charged from February 2016 to February 2021. Even though the Appellant utilized the electricity at 100% which could be ascertained from the consumption recorded in every month during the said period. Hence, the question of passing the liability

of having erred in the matter of under charged the energy bills on to the Appellant do not at all arises. The supplemental claim is demanded only for the electricity consumed by the Appellant which was not billed as per MC K-10.

- 9) The plea of the Appellant is admitted that as per the clause 26.02 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka, all the installations having sanctioned load of 40HP and below shall be checked once in 2 years by the LT Rating Sub-division, HESCOM, Belagavi. That the installation of the Appellant in question has been under charged right from February 2016 to February 2021 due to non-applying of meter constant K-10 at the time of issuing the energy bills to the Appellant. Even if the LT Rating Sub-division test checked the installation as per Clause 26.02 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka, the fact of meter constant K-10 left out from the billing from the date of service would have been the same position as it has been detected during January 2021 and this omission could not be erased from the records.
- 10) The Appellant alleges that the HESCOM has no right to recover any amount from the consumer since this supplemental claim has

cropped up by his own omissions and commissions and Respondent No. 1 has not acted in accordance with the regulations issued by the KERC. The supplemental claim has been demanded by the Respondent No. 1 as per Clause 4.22(d) and 29.03 of KERC, Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka.

- 11) The Appellant contended that the Licensee has failed to provide and maintain with the consumer by a meter card which is violation of Clause 9 of the KERC, Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka. Further he pleaded that in the absence of meter card there has not been any evidence of meter being read and reading recorded as on the prescribed date. At the same time, it may be noted that the meter readings taken on the prescribed date and are being indicated in the bills served to the consumer every month. Hence non providing of meter card did not preclude the Appellant for utilizing the electricity.
- 12) The installation of the Appellant was serviced on 25.02.2016 before servicing the installation pre-commission test and rating was conducted duly obtaining the signature of the Appellant on the rating report and the copy of the same handed over to him on

the spot itself. All the details as specified under Clause 4.08 of KERC, Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka, were incorporated in the said rating report that the meter reading taken on the prescribed date are indicated in the bills served to the Appellant every month. Non-delivery of service certificate and meter card did not preclude the Complainant for utilizing the electricity. Hence, the reasons put forth by the Appellant are not maintainable.

- 13) The disciplinary actions against the erring officials who committed the mistake of non-applying the meter constant K-10 in the bills served to the Appellant every month is under process which is internal affair of the Department. This does not preclude the Appellant to pay the supplemental claim. The Appellant has utterly failed to understand that the supplemental claim demanded by the 1st Respondent has no relation about the accuracy of the meter and metering equipment including the CT. The supplemental claim is relating with regard to undercharged the installation and it has not concern about the handling of metering equipment by whomsoever. The judgements relied by the Appellant are not applicable to the case on hand. Hence the

Respondent prays to dismiss the appeal and to order for supplementary claims in the interest of justice and equity.

14) The case is posted for arguments on merits, despite providing sufficient opportunities the Appellant Representative has not appeared before this Authority to submit his arguments, thereby, the arguments on behalf of the Appellant's side is taken as nil. Heard the arguments by the 1st Respondent, and perused the records.

15) At this stage the below mentioned points arose for my consideration.

a) **Point No. 1:** - Whether the Appellant proves that the order passed by the 2nd Respondent/ CGRF in Case No. 24/2021, order No. BGM/ CGRF/SEE/DCA/AAO/SA-2/2021-22/7075-77 dated 05.03.2022 is arbitrary, and not sustainable under law, thereby the interference of this Authority is needed.

b) **Point No. 2:** - What Order?

16) My answers to the points as stated below: -

Point No. 1: - See the final order.

Point No. 2: - As per final order, for the reasons made herein below: -

REASONS

- 17) **Point No. 1:** - As per the contents of the appeal it is noted that this appeal filed by the Appellant through his representative, aggrieved by the orders passed by the 2nd Respondent/CGRF dated 05.03.2022. He has stated in the appeal that, he is the registered consumer of the LT installation bearing RR No. CCL-25860 with a sanctioned load of 20KW under commercial tariff LT-3. The Appellant has been utilizing the electricity sanctioned and remitting the electricity bills amount promptly without any default. Such being the state of affairs the 1st Respondent issued an impugned communication dated 03.03.2021 stating that as the meter reading was quantified as 01 instead of 10 for a period from February 2016 to February 2021 by applying correct multiplying factor, the difference of amount worked out to the tune of Rs. 8,74,276/- (Annexure-A). Aggrieved by this order the Appellant had approached CGRF, Belagavi in case No. 24/2021 in which the 2nd Respondent also upheld the orders passed by the 1st Respondent without looking into facts and circumstances as well as position of law in this case. Further he submitted that the 2nd

Respondent ought to have observed that the Assessing Authority before passing final demand order, would have referred the meter to the Chief Electrical Inspectorate as per Regulation 27 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity in Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka, but he failed to do so. Further he submitted the LT Meter Rating Sub-division conducted a test of the disputed meter on 15.02.2021 and accordingly, without application of mind the Accounts staff have wrongly entered the multiplying constant as K-01 as per report dated 25.02.2016 bearing No. 49044 which clearly shows that the Respondent No. 1 inclined to shift liability on the innocent Appellant in order to cover up their negligence. It is settled position of law that “no wrong doer should be enabled by law to take advantage of his own wrong doings”, but the 1st Respondent in order to cover up his negligence has passed final assessment order despite the 2nd Respondent also without applying his judicial mind has passed impugned order. Hence the appeal is filed.

- 18) It is stated in the appeal that, as per Clause 26.02 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity in Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka, the 1st Respondent is bound to conduct periodical inspection i.e., once in a year, but the 1st Respondent has not

followed the Regulations in 26.02 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity in Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka. Again, it is stated that the claim of the 1st Respondent is barred by limitation because as per rating report dated 25.02.2016 the staff of the 1st Respondent have noticed that the multiplying constant to the Appellant's installation should have been taken as K-10 instead of K-01. Even though the 1st Respondent has noticed this defect on 25.02.2016 itself he has kept silent for all the years without taking any action. After lapse of nearly 5 years preliminary notice is issued to the Appellant on 17.02.2021 which is barred by limitation. After receiving preliminary notice the Appellant Representative has appeared before 1st Respondent, filed objections, thereafter, final order passed by the 1st Respondent on 22.07.2021. Aggrieved by this order the Appellant had approached 2nd Respondent with a complaint, but the 2nd Respondent without judicial approach has passed impugned order dated 05.03.2021. After impugned order passed by the 2nd Respondent, the 1st Respondent has threatened the Appellant that, if the Appellant had not remitted the short claim amount the electricity connection given to his installation will be disconnected. Hence the present appeal is filed.

- 19) Further it is stated in the appeal that in terms of Clause 4.08(vi) of Conditions of Supply of Electricity in Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka, it is mandatory on the part of the Licensee to issue service certificate in the name of the Consumer at the time of service, but no such service certificate is issued. There is no such multiplying constant mentioned, there is no evidence to prove as to whether the meter reading reflected in the meter is to be multiplied by the CT ratio. The Licensee has also not issued meter card which is mandatory under Clause 4.9 of KERC (Electricity Supply) Code, 2004 and its amendments. The Licensee shall record the meter reading and date of reading in the meter card provided to the consumer. In the case on hand, the Licensee has failed to produce such meter card as contemplated in Clause 4.9 of KERC (Electricity Supply) Code, 2004. Looking at all these facts, the Licensee with deliberate intention suppressed the facts, hence he cannot claim the short claim amount as per impugned order.
- 20) Along with appeal, the representative of the Appellant has furnished copies of 2 documents i.e., final order dated 22.07.2021 (Annexure-A) and order passed by 2nd Respondent/CGRF

Belagavi (Annexure-B) in Case No. 24/2021. With all this he prays to allow the appeal in the interest of justice and equity.

- 21) During the course of arguments, the 1st Respondent has submitted that it is a fact that the installation bearing RR No. CCL-25860 with a sanctioned load of 20KWs belonging to the Appellant which was serviced on 25.02.2016 under LT-3 tariff. It is also fact that the Appellant has been paying electricity bills regularly as per the bills issued.
- 22) During the time of taking meter reading of the installation of the Appellant by the meter reader dated 10.02.2021, it was found that the above said installation has been billed without taking into consideration of meter constant K-10 i.e., from February 2016 to February 2021. The Appellant had been using electricity commodity at 100% during the said period as per the consumption recorded in the meter. Therefore, the Licensee was left no choice except to demand the supplemental claims for the electricity consumed by the Appellant which was not measured in accordance with meter constant K-10 during the said period.
- 23) The meters available in the market are having maximum current drawing capacity of 30AMP which restricts only upto 18KWs, no meters are designed to draw current capacity of more than

30AMP. As such the CTs of 50/5 ratio was fixed duly providing 3PH. 5AMPS meters to the installation by assigning the meter constant K-10 as per technical criterion. Therefore, the staff of the Respondent/Licensee was expected to record the meter reading of monthly electricity consumption and bill the installation multiplying the readings by meter constant K-10 with an appropriate tariff i.e., electricity consumption as per meter reading X 10.

- 24) The Respondent No. 1 served a notice to the Appellant dated 17.02.2021 with a demand to pay the supplemental claim of Rs. 8,74,276/- within 30 days as required Clause 29.03 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity in Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka. After serving the supplemental claim notice, the objections of the Appellant was heard on 20.03.2021 and 24.06.2021. Thereafter, the Respondent No. 1 has passed a final order dated 22.07.2021 directing the Appellant to pay the supplemental claim.
- 25) There is no dispute between the Appellant and the Respondent No. 1 regarding accuracy of the meter. The supplemental claim exclusively relates to the under charged the installation right from February 2016 to February 2021 due to non-applying of meter

constant K-10 while preparing the bill and serving to the Appellant every month. Before issuing final bill, the Licensee has provided complete opportunity to the Appellant to place his defense. After hearing from the both the sides final order was passed.

- 26) Further, he argued that before servicing of the installation of the Appellant bearing RR No. CCL-25860 a pre-commission test was conducted on 25.02.2016 and clearly indicated meter constant as K-10. It is in the knowledge of the Appellant and he had put his signature on the report. But while billing the installation right from the date of service the meter constant K-10 was not taken on the contrary it was billed considering MC K-01 by oversight and thus 90% of the electricity consumed by the Appellant was left out from billing. This fact came to the knowledge of Licensee only on 10.02.2021 while taking monthly reading. Hence, the Appellant is liable to pay back billing charges of Rs. 8,74,276/-. The other allegations like non-issuance of meter card, service certificate etc., do not come to the aid of the Appellant for non-payment of back billing charges because pre-commission test report reveals all the details, the copy of which was handed over to the Appellant. The Appellant had utterly failed to understand

the supplemental claim demanded by the Licensee has no relation about accuracy of the meter and metering equipment including the CT. The supplemental claim is relating to undercharged the installation hence, it has no concern about the handling of metering equipment by whomsoever.

- 27) The 1st Respondent has argued further that, the Appellant cited a judgement of Hon'ble Bombay High Court in Writ Petition 10764/2011 wherein it is held that "the recovery proceedings may be initiated seeking to recover amounts beyond the period of 2 years, but the section itself imposing a condition that the amount sought to be recovered as arrears must, in fact, be reflected and shown in the bill continuously as recoverable as arrears, the claim cannot succeed". Under the shelter of the said judgement the Appellant contended that the back billing beyond the period of 2 years is illegal in the eyes of law, but the Appellant failed to understand the judgement and to interpret the word when such sum became "first due and payable". Hence, the appeal is not maintainable liable to be rejected.
- 28) The 1st Respondent has produced the copies of the following document in support of his arguments: -
- a) copy of final order dated 22.07.2021.
 - b) copy of the demand letter dated 17.02.2021.

- c) the copy of the statement showing the details of meter constant omitted, revised bill from May 2016 to February 2021 as well difference amount to be paid.
 - d) The copy of the rating report dated 22.05.2016.
 - e) The copy of the test certificate dated 13.01.2016.
 - f) The copy of the rating report dated 15.01.2021.
 - g) The copy of the order passed by the 2nd Respondent dated 05.03.2022.
- 29) He also relied upon the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Assistant Engineer (Ele), Ajmer Vidyuth Vitarana Nigama Limited Vs Rahamatulla Khan in Civil Appeal No. 1672/2020. And submitted in the above judgement the Hon'ble Supreme Court has defined on the terms of Section 56(1) and 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003 as well as Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka. As per the findings given by Hon'ble Supreme Court that in these types of cases the Limitation Act does not apply and the Consumer is liable to pay supplemental charges raised by the Licensee. With this, he prays to dismiss the appeal in the interest of justice and equity.
- 30) Once again, I have perused the documents and judgements referred by both the parties in this case. At the first instance, I would like to take up admitted facts in the present appeal. It is not

in dispute that the Appellant is the consumer of the installation bearing RR No. CCL-25860 with sanctioned load of 20KWs under LT-3 tariff which was serviced on 25.02.2016 and on the same date the meter was tested and rating report is also issued. It is not in dispute that, the Appellant has not raised any objections against the recording of consumption of electricity in the meter installed by the 1st Respondent from 25.02.2016 till dispute arose i.e., 10.02.2021, except short claim as alleged in this case and the Consumer has been making payment of bills regularly as and when they will be issued to him by the 1st Respondent.

- 31) The first ground urged by the Appellant is that the AEE (Ele.), LT Meter Rating Sub-division had noted the error only on 15.02.2021 in entering the multiplying constant where the MC was entered as '01' instead of '10', such was the situation the Assessing Authority before passing final order on disputed demand should have referred the matter to the Chief Electrical Inspectorate who is the Competent Authority to look into the defects in the disputed meter. In this regard, he relied upon the provisions laid down under Clause 27.00 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka.

- 32) The contention of the Respondent No. 1 is that the present case relates to non-applying of MC K-10 while issuing bills for the electricity consumption by the Consumer. This issue has no relevancy with accuracy of the meter and metering equipment including CT. Hence, referring the meter to the 3rd Party inspection do not arise at all.
- 33) I have perused the Clause 27.01 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka, which reads as follows: -

27.00 CORRECTNESS OF METER

27.01 In the event the Consumer disputes the accuracy of the meter, he shall give notice to the Licensee. The Licensee shall refer the matter for inspection / testing of the meter to a "Third party Agency" approved by the Commission under information to the Consumer. The Consumer shall pay the specified testing fee directly to such Agency. The Agency shall test the accuracy of the meter using an electronic type testing equipment with facility of a printer attached to it which shall provide an automatic printout of test reading, percentage error with date / time / R.R. No., etc. The Agency shall provide printout of test readings, percentage error with date / time / R.R. No., etc. to the Consumer under a copy to the Licensee.

In the event of the meter being incorrect beyond the limits of accuracy prescribed under relevant Regulations framed by the Central Electricity Authority / relevant I. S., the amount of the bill shall be adjusted by the Licensee in accordance

with the result of test with respect to the meter readings of the 6 billing months prior to the month in which the Consumer has disputed the accuracy of the Meter and upto the date of testing, due regard being paid to the conditions of working, occupancy, etc., during the said 6 months. In such cases, the prescribed fee paid for testing the meter shall be refunded to the Consumer.

According to this provision, in the event the Consumer of electricity disputes the accuracy of the meter installed by the Licensee, then he shall give notice to the Licensee thereafter, the Licensee shall refer the same for testing of the meter to a 3rd Party Agency approved by the Commission under information to the Consumer. But in the present case on hand the Appellant never disputed the accuracy of the meter installed by the 1st Respondent from the date of its installation till date. The test certificate furnished by the 1st Respondent dated 13.01.2016 shows that it has been issued by Test Engineer, MT lab, HESCOM certifying the meter bearing serial No. 15485019, HESCOM seal No. B367529 was tested found good and it is sealed in the MT laboratory. The copy of the rating report dated 25.02.2016 shows that the installation was assigned with the Meter Constant K-10. These two documents are not disputed by the Appellant. Hence, the ground urged by the Appellant that the

disputed meter would have been referred to Chief Electrical Inspectorate for testing purpose, do not arise at all. Hence, this ground is rejected.

34) Another ground urged by the Appellant in the appeal memo is that as per facts of the case, the then meter reader was allegedly applying incorrect multiplier i.e., K-01 instead of K-10 while issuing bills from the very 1st date of service i.e., from 25.02.2016 and subsequently a back billing was raised after a period of 5 years is patently illegal in the eyes of law and the recovery proceedings were initiated during the year 2021 after a lapse of 2 years, thereby, the claim itself is barred by limitation.

35) He relied upon the below judgements: -

- (i) Lucknow Development Authority Vs M.K Gupta AIR 1994 SC 787
- (ii) Rathi Memon Vs Union of India (2001) 3 SCC 714
- (iii) In WP No. 10764/2011 held between Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited Vs the Electricity Ombudsman & Another (Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay)

and submitted that as per Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act the Distribution Licensee cannot demand charge for

consumption of electricity for a period of more than 2 years preceding the date of the first demand of such charges. In the present case on hand, on 22.07.2021 the 1st Respondent has passed orders rejecting the prayer of the Appellant which is illegal and improper.

- 36) By way of defense, the Respondent No. 1 has submitted that under the shelter of the judgements referred by the Appellant in the appeal, the Appellant contended that the back billing beyond a period of 2 years is illegal in the eyes of law. The Appellant failed to understand that the said judgements referred by him and to interpret the word “when such sum became first due and payable”.
- 37) In support of his defense, the 1st Respondent relied upon judgement passed by the (i) Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Assistant Engineer (Ele), Ajmir Vidyuth Vitharana Nigama Limited Vs Rehamthulla Khan Alias Rahamjulla in Civil Appeal No. 1672/2020 dated 18.02.2020, (ii) judgement passed in WP No. 45450/2014 (GM-KEB) dated 18.09.2017 by the Hon’ble High Court of Karnataka, Bengaluru in the case of M/s Anriya Dwellington Apartment, Bengaluru Vs CGRF, BESCO, Bengaluru and Electricity Ombudsman, GOK Bengaluru, and

submitted that as per the findings given by the Hon'ble Higher Courts in the above judgements, the contention taken by the Appellant cannot be accepted. Further, the Hon'ble High Court has held in WP No. 45450/2014 (GM-KEB) that "it is well settled that mistake can always be corrected and a mistake in calculation no doubt, can be rectified at a subsequent stage". Under these circumstances, the 1st Respondent submitted the appeal is not maintainable liable to be rejected. Further submitted the Hon'ble High Court was pleased to refer the case which relied by the Appellant in WP No. 10764/2021, thereafter, passed final orders in WP No. 45450/2014 (GM-KEB), holding that the findings given by the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay in the said judgement is not applicable.

38) I have perused the decisions referred by the Appellant in the appeal (i) Lucknow Development Authority Vs M.K Gupta AIR 1994 SC 787 (ii) Rathi Memon Vs Union of India (2001) 3 SCC 714, in my humble opinion they are not helpful to the case on hand, as because in the first decision the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has discussed the issues of "determining right and power of the commission to award exemplary damages and accountability of the statutory Authorities". In second judgement

the Hon'ble Apex Court has dealt with the "scheme of the provision under W.C. Act is materially different from the scheme indicated in Chapter 13 of the Railways Act" and also "payment of compensation". In the present case, these are not the issues to be decided by this Authority, hence, there is no necessity to hold detailed discussion to this extent.

39) In third judgement the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay in WP No. 10764/2011 held between Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited Vs the Electricity Ombudsman & Another has held as: -

"78. Unless and until the preconditions set out in subsection (2) of Section 56 are satisfied, there is no question of the electricity supply being cutoff. Further, the recovery proceedings may be initiated seeking to recover amounts beyond a period of two years, but the section itself imposing a condition that the amount sought to be recovered as arrears must, in fact, be reflected and shown in the bill continuously as recoverable as arrears, the claim cannot succeed. Even if supplementary bills are raised to correct the amount by applying accurate multiplying factor, still no recovery beyond two years is permissible unless that sum has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrears of charges for the electricity supplied from the date when such sum became first due and payable."

40) I have gone through the judgements referred by the Respondent No. 1, which are: -

(i) Assistant Engineer (Ele), Ajmir Vidyuth Vitharana Nigama Limited Vs Rehamthulla Khan Alias Rahamjulla in Civil Appeal No. 1672/2020 dated 18.02.2020.

(ii) the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in WP No. 45450/2014 (GM-KEB).

41) In the case of Assistant Engineer (Ele), Ajmir Vidyuth Vitharana Nigama Limited Vs Rehamthulla Khan Alias Rahamjulla in Civil Appeal No. 1672/2020 dated 18.02.2020, the Hon'ble Court has given findings as: -

“7.4. The period of limitation of two years would commence from the date on which the electricity charges became “first due” under sub-section (2) of Section 56. This provision restricts the right of the licensee company to disconnect electricity supply due to non-payment of dues by the consumer, unless such sum has been shown continuously to be recoverable as arrears of electricity supplied, in the bills raised for the past period.

8. Section 56(2) however, does not preclude the licensee company from raising a supplementary demand after the expiry of the limitation period of two years. It only restricts the right of the licensee to disconnect electricity supply due to non-payment of dues after the period of limitation of two years has expired, nor does it restrict other modes of recovery which may be initiated by the licensee company for recovery of a supplementary demand.

9. Applying the aforesaid ratio to the facts of the present case, the licensee company raised an

additional demand on 18.03.2014 for the period July, 2009 to September, 2011.

The licensee company discovered the mistake of billing under the wrong Tariff Code on 18.03.2014. The limitation period of two years under Section 56(2) had by then already expired.

Section 56(2) did not preclude the licensee company from raising an additional or supplementary demand after the expiry of the limitation period under Section 56(2) in the case of a mistake or bona fide error. It did not however, empower the licensee company to take recourse to the coercive measure of disconnection of electricity supply, for recovery of the additional demand.

As per Section 17(1)(c) of the Limitation Act, 1963, in case of a mistake, the limitation period begins to run from the date when the mistake is discovered for the first time.”

The Hon'ble Apex Court was pleased to held that the Section 56(2) of Electricity Act does not preclude the Licensee Company from raising a supplementary demand after the expiry of the limitation period of 2 years, it only restricts the right of the Licensee to disconnect electricity supply due to non-payment of dues after the period of limitation of 2 years has expired nor does it restrict other modes of recovery which may be initiated by the Licensee Company for recovery of a supplementary demand. Further the Hon'ble Apex Court was pleased to held that the said provision did not preclude the Licensee Company from raising an

additional or supplemental demand after the expiry of limitation period under Section 56(2) of the Act in the case of a mistake or bonafide error.

- 42) I have perused the judgement passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in WP No. 45450/2014 (GM-KEB) in this judgement the Hon'ble High Court has observed some portion of orders passed by the Ombudsman in case No. OMB/B/G-182/2014/407 which reads as follows: -

13. The Counsel for the 1st Respondent added that installation bearing RR No. MSC-6EH4852 was serviced on 20.11.2004 with a sanctioned load of 22 KW and meter was also fixed for recording the consumption at that time. As this meter burnt out, it was replaced on 04.06.2005 and the new meter had a multiplying constant of 50/5 AMPS ratio which is equaled to 10 and the meter reader while reading the meter was supposed to multiply the consumed unit by a multiplying constant of 10. In the instant case the meter reader failed to apply multiplying constant of 10. Thus, only 1/10 the consumption was billed. On 06.04.2013 the MT Rating Division during their routine rating, observed non-application of multiplying constant of 10 and having issued erroneous bill previously and, therefore, suggested to the concerned to make fresh assessment for the period from 04.06.2005 to 06.04.2013."

19. It appears from the Mahazar that the Executive Engineer, M.T. Rating Division, after inspecting the meter, took a decision to verify R.R. Docket and R.R. Register of the Consumer to check whether the Meter Reader had applied multiplying constant 10 correctly or not and the

cross checking revealed that meter reader had not applied the multiplying Constant-10 in respect of the subject meter and, hence, advised the 1st Respondent to make short claims from the date of fixing the new meter i.e. 04.06.2005. Mahazar establishes that the Executive Engineer, M.T. Division not only has inspected the installation but also verified the dossier of the Consumer and, on verification, he found the multiplying constant 10 is left out in the bill from 04.06.2005 and, therefore, advised the 1st Respondent to make short claims. Mahazar settles that the case on hand does not come under Clause 27.03 of the Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka as it does not pertain to meter dispute and, it does not pertain to meter dispute and, hence, does not require the 1st Respondent to make short claims for a period of 6 months preceding inspection. Mahazar confirms that during verification Consumer dossier i.e., RR Register, the Executive Engineer (EI), M.T. Rating Division noticed the erroneous billing from 04.06.2005 i.e., from the date of fixing of new CTs on account of non-application of multiplying constant 10 and, thus, the 1st Respondent is found to have not committed any irregularity as the short claims are found to have been made based on verification of RR Registrar and M.T. Rating Division's report. Therefore, invoking Clause 29.03 of the Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka by the 1st Respondent is found to be in order. Therefore, contention of the appellant that the issue should have been dealt under Clause 27.03 of the Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distribution of Licensees in the State of Karnataka is without any basis and, hence rejected.

After hearing both sides the Hon'ble High Court has given findings stating that it is a simple case of mistake in computing

the units of consumption which was occurred in the present case by oversight or a clerical mistake. It is equally the fault of the Consumers who enjoyed paying only 1/10th of the usual consumption charges for all these periods of 9 years. Further, observed that the Respondent/BESCOM Authorities have also been negligent in not making the timely inspection and bringing this fact to the knowledge of the consumers within a reasonable time, while leaving it free for the concerned higher Authorities to take disciplinary action against the erring officials, further held in this regard this court does not find it a fit case to absolve the consumers of their liability to pay for what they have consumed. The Hon'ble High Court has also referred the case WP No. 10764/2011, which was referred by Appellant representative narrated supra, is not helpful to the present case. Finally, the Hon'ble High Court held that Section 56(2) refers to only such amount which was within the knowledge of the Consumer or within the knowledge of the Electricity Board/Nigam. Moreover, it is well settled that a mistake can always be corrected and a mistake in calculation no doubt, can be rectified at a subsequent stage.

43) In the present case on hand, in my humble opinion, as per the findings given by the Hon'ble Apex Court & Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the cases referred supra by the 1st Respondent are aptly applicable. Because, the staff of the 1st Respondent while preparing electricity bills have calculated Multiple Constant as K-01 instead of K-10. It is a simple case of mistake in computing the units of consumption by oversight or a clerical mistake of the staff concerned. It is also noted that the Consumer never brought this fact to the notice of the 1st Respondent while making payment of bills. The Appellant is running a hotel in the name and style as "Seven Beans Restaurant", hence it cannot be presumed that he is an illiterate or innocent. When the 1st Respondent noticed the error committed by the Accounts staff, he has issued preliminary notice to the Appellant dated 17.02.2021, thereafter, after providing sufficient opportunities to the Appellant to submit his objections, passed final order on 22.07.2021 as required under Clause 29.03 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka. Hence, the demand made by the 1st Respondent is in accordance with law. The Appellant is under liability to pay for what he has consumed.

- 44) Another contention taken by the Appellant in the appeal that in the terms of Clause 4.08(vi) of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka, the 1st Respondent/Licensee has to issue service certificate at the time of service duly mentioning all the parameters as prescribed under the regulation. But, in the present case no such service certificate is issued to the Appellant. Likewise, in the terms of Clause 4.9 of KERC (Electricity Supply) Code, 2004, and its Amendments, the Licensee shall provide and maintain with the Consumer a meter card for recording the meter reading. The Licensee shall record the meter reading and date of reading in the meter card provided to the Consumer. The Licensee has failed to produce such meter card as contemplated under the code.
- 45) I have perused Clause 4.9 of KERC (Electricity Supply) Code, 2004, as per this provision the Licensee shall provide and maintain with the consumer a meter card for recording the meter reading, further, the Licensee shall record the meter reading and date of reading in the meter card provided to the consumer.
- 46) Clause 4.08(vi) of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka provides the Engineer of the Licensee servicing the installation shall give a

service certificate to the consumer for having serviced the installation specifying the following: -

- (a) Name & address of the Consumer
- (b) R.R. No.
- (c) Date of service
- (d) Sanctioned load/contract Demand
- (e) Connected load
- (f) Meter details such as C.T./P.T. ration (multiplying constant), meter reading at the time of service, etc.
- (g) Condition of seals/seal number, if any
- (h) Size of service main cable
- (i) Fuse rating
- (j) I.S.D. and M.S.D. collected with details of receipt nos.
- (k) Name and address of the L.E.C & Valid License number.

A copy of the Agreement shall also be given to the Consumer and necessary acknowledgement from the Consumer shall be obtained and the test report.

47) It is a fact that the service certificate and meter card are not issued by the 1st Respondent Company to the Appellant. But it has to be noted in the present case that the meter readings taken on the prescribed date are being indicated in the bills served to the consumer every month and all the parameters as prescribed under Clause 4.08(vi) regulations are entered in rating reports. Hence, non-providing of meter card or service certificate did not preclude the Appellant for utilizing the electricity as well making payments of the bills.

- 48) However, it cannot be ruled out that the 1st Respondent is negligent in following the mandatory provisions 4.08(vi) of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka as well as 4.9 of KERC (Electricity Supply) Code, 2004.
- 49) It is the contention of the Appellant, that the 1st Respondent has not conducted periodical test of the meter as required under Clause 26.02 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka, this provisions reads as follows: -

26.02 Periodicity of testing of meters by the Licensee: -

Periodicity of testing of meters shall be as follows: -

<i>SL. No.</i>	<i>Nature of installation</i>	<i>Periodicity of testing</i>
<i>i</i>	<i>HT installations</i>	<i>Every six months</i>
<i>ii</i>	<i>LT Power installations</i>	
	<i>a) More than 40 HP</i>	<i>Once in a year</i>
	<i>b) 40 HP and below</i>	<i>Once in 2 years.</i>
<i>iii</i>	<i>Other Installations</i>	<i>Once in 5 years.</i>

Note: All installations whose average consumption is less than 20 units per KW per month or more than 300 units per KW per month shall be mandatorily tested every year.

As per Clause 26.02 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka, there is a mandate on the Licensee to conduct testing of meters

periodically. In the case on hand the installation of the Appellant was sanctioned with a load of 20KW. 1KW is equal to 1.34102HP (1KW = 1.34102HP), if it is multiplied with 20KW, then it comes to 26.8204HP (1.34102 X 20 = 26.8204HP) units per month. As per 'Note' to the Clause 26.02 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka, the installations whose average consumption is less than 20 units per KW per month or more than 300 units per KW per month shall be mandatorily tested every year. Therefore, the Licensee was duty bound to conduct periodical test of Appellant's installation bearing RR No. CCL-25860 every year.

- 50) No records/documents are produced by the 1st Respondent to show that he had followed the provisions laid down in Clause 26.02 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka. This attitude of the 1st Respondent/Licensee company shows that he is not diligent in discharging of his duties, thereby, caused huge loss to the company as well as inconvenience to the Consumer. Hence, I would like to refer this matter to the Managing Director, HESCOM to take up proper steps and to find out who are the officers or officials are responsible in causing loss to the

company, and to take up required action in accordance with law or rules and if necessary to recover the loss caused to the company from those responsible officers or officials.

- 51) Coming to the next point i.e., the short claim demanded by the 1st Respondent as per final order dated 22.07.2021 for Rs. 8,74,276/- for a period from May 2016 to February 2021, the Respondent No. 1 in order to prove the amount demanded by him from the Appellant has produced copy of the statement of calculation i.e., the copy of the statement showing the details of meter constant omitted and revised bill from May 2016 to February 2021 and difference amount to be payable pertaining to the Appellant's installation. On perusal of this document, it appears in the first half left portion (already billed) the 1st Respondent has noted the consumption of electricity for all the months from May 2016 to February 2021 and prepared bills by taking constant K-01. Further, in revised (to be billed) portion of this document (right side second portion) he has mentioned total amount consumption of electricity by the consumer by applying constant K-10 for the same months, finally he has shown the difference amount payable by the Appellant i.e., Rs. 8,74,276/-. Of course, this document is not contested by the Appellant, but it is the duty of this Authority

to see the correctness and genuinity of the documents produced before it. In that context, on perusal, in the top column 'to be billed' portion the 1st Respondent has shown meter constant twice and the entries made in serial No. 50 to 58 are not tally with each other. Because in the left portion in some of the columns total consumption is shown in figures (non-zero) and in second portion in all the columns in serial No. 50 to 57 is shown as zero. No explanation is given by the Licensee in this regard, hence, this statement appears that it is not properly prepared. Therefore, in order to reach final conclusion, it is necessary the 1st Respondent has to re-prepare the statement and to produce. Likewise, on perusal of the copies of the rating reports dated 25.02.2016 & 15.01.2021 (as per serial No. 15) the 'Remarks' of the signatory are absent and these columns are kept blank. In rating report dated 15.01.2021 it is mentioned that the rating carried out as per request letter dated 15.01.2021, but no such request letter is produced before this Authority to know what request has been made. The 2nd Respondent while passing impugned order it appears that he has not observed all these facts which are very much necessary for final adjudication. Therefore, it is a fit case to remand back to the 2nd Respondent/CGRF only to this extent by

allowing the appeal with a direction to collect proper statement and any other documents if required from the 1st Respondent and to pass orders in accordance with law.

52) Hence, acting under the provisions Clause 22.5 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distributions Licensees in the State of Karnataka, prefer to remit back the case to the CGRF/2nd Respondent to look into the matter as per observations made by this Authority in the above paragraphs and to pass final order in accordance with law. With this Point No. 1 is answered accordingly.

53) **Point No. 2:** - As per the discussions made herein above in Point No. 1, I proceed to pass the following order: -

O R D E R

No. OMB/H/G-490/2022/D-126

Dated: 23-09-2022

The appeal filed by the Appellant/ Complainant under Regulation 21.2 of KERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2004 is hereby allowed only to the extent as discussed in above paragraphs 51 & 52.

The order passed by the 2nd Respondent/ CGRF, Belagavi dated 05.03.2022 in Case No. 24/2021, order No. BGM/CGRF/SEE/DCA/AAO/SA-2/2021-22/7075-77 is hereby set aside, and the appeal is remanded back to the CGRF/2nd Respondent to take up the complaint/case as per the observations made in above paragraphs of the order and to provide necessary opportunity to both

the parties to place their evidence or arguments and thereafter to dispose off the case in accordance with law.

The office is directed to comply the provisions laid down in Regulation 22.7 of KERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman), Regulations 2004.

Further the office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the Managing Director, HESCOM to take up necessary action as per observations made in Para 50 of the order and report the same.

Sd/-
(R. Sharada)
Electricity Ombudsman.

- 1) Sri Gaurav B Shah,
R/o "Seven Beans" Restaurant,
Nehru Nagar,
Belgavi.
- 2) Sri Tushar Baddi,
Arihant Park, Keshwapur,
Hubballi.
- 3) The Assistant Executive Engineer (Ele),
O & M City Sub-division-3, HESCOM,
Nehru Nagar,
Belgavi - 590010.
- 4) The Chairperson,
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum/(CGRF),
O & M Circle, HESCOM,
Neharu Nagar,
Belagavi – 590010.
- 5) PS to Hon'ble Chairman, KERC
- 6) PS to Hon'ble Member (M), KERC
- 7) PS to Hon'ble Member (R), KERC
- 8) PA to Secretary, KERC.