BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN
(For the State of Goa and Union Territories)
Under Section 42 (6) of the Electricity Act, 2003

3rd Floor, Plot No. 55-56, Udyog Vihar - Phase IV, Sector 18
Gurugram (Haryana) 122015,
Email ID: ombudsman.jercuts@gov.in
Phone No.:0124-4684708

Appeal No-270 of 2026

Date of Hearing: 17.08.2026
Mode: Videoconferencing
Date of Order: 24.08.2026

In the matter of
Mr. Mukundraj Mudras,
FF3, H.No. 296,
Mudras Mansion, Corte Real,
St. Cruz, Goa403005 ...Appellant

Versus

Executive Engineer,
Electricity Department, Division-1,
Panaji, Goa.

Assistant Engineer,
Electricity Department,
Sub Division-III, Division-1,
Bambolim Goa. ...Respondent(s)

In the matter of Mr. Mukundraj Mudras Versus Electricity Department, Goa.

Present:

Appellant

1. Mr. Mukundraj Mudras

Respondent(s)

1. Mrs. Anita Executive Engineer Div-I,
   Electricity Department, Goa.

ORDER

The present representation was filed on 06.07.2026 under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 35 and 36 of the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2024, (hereinafter referred to as the "JERC CGRF & Ombudsman Regulations, 2024"), challenging the order dated 18.06.2026 passed by the Learned Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Goa (hereinafter referred to as the "CGRF") in Case No. Goa/C.G. No. 04/2026/38.

Upon scrutiny, and being satisfied that the representation fulfilled the requirements prescribed under the Regulations, the same was admitted and notice was issued on 09.07.2026. A copy of the representation was forwarded to the Respondent–Executive Engineer, Division-I, Electricity Department Goa calling upon them to submit their reply/comments.

The Executive Engineer, Division-I, Electricity Department Goa vide his email dated 21st July, 2026 has informed that the SDO in charge Sub Division-III is engaged O&M and Breakdown works due to the onset of Monsoon season in the state of Goa and requested for Two weeks' time extension to file the reply to the complaint filed by the Appellant. The request was allowed. The Executive Engineer, Division-I, Electricity Department Goa vide his email dated 11th August, 2026 has filed the comments/ reply to the petition filed by the Appellant which is taken on record along with other supporting documents.

I. Submissions on behalf of the Appellant

The Appellant submitted that he is the owner and occupier of the premises in question and had applied through the online portal of the Goa Electricity Department on 18.04.2026 for a separate electricity connection for the purpose of charging his Electric Vehicle (EV). He submitted that the application was made along with the documents prescribed on the portal and that the requisite processing fee was duly paid. According to the Appellant, the application was successfully submitted and accepted through the online system of the Respondents.

The Appellant submitted that the application was made in reliance upon Rule 4(15) of the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, as amended vide Notification No. G.S.R. 125(E) dated 22.02.2024 issued by the Ministry of Power, Government of India, which, according to him, specifically contemplates provision of a separate electricity connection for supply of electricity for EV charging at the request of an association, owner of a flat or house in an association, or any other consumer.

The Appellant submitted that, despite submission of the application and payment of the requisite processing fee, the application was not finally processed within the prescribed period. According to him, instead of either releasing the connection or communicating a specific deficiency capable of being rectified, the Respondents issued a Shortcoming Notice dated 15.05.2026 stating that the purpose of the LTDS-II connection requested was EV charging and that the same could be availed by applying for enhancement of load on the existing connection.

The Appellant contended that the aforesaid communication did not disclose the statutory or regulatory basis for refusing the separate connection sought by him. It was further submitted that the communication did not identify any specific deficiency in the application or indicate how the alleged shortcoming could be rectified, nor did it specify under which tariff category the Appellant was required to apply if a separate connection for EV charging was not permissible under LTDS-II.

The Appellant submitted that the application was made under the LTDS-II category only because that was the category available on the online portal which appeared relevant to the proposed use. He clarified that he has never insisted upon any particular tariff category and has always remained willing to pay the tariff lawfully determined by the competent regulatory authority or otherwise applicable to the connection.

The Appellant further submitted that he does not dispute the statutory powers or regulatory jurisdiction of the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (JERC), nor has he challenged the Tariff Order issued by the Commission. According to him, his grievance is confined to the release of a separate electricity connection for EV charging, with the applicable consumption being billed under the tariff lawfully determined by the competent authority.

The Appellant specifically disputed the Respondents' reliance upon the Tariff Order dated 30.09.2025 as a ground for denying the separate connection. He referred to Clause 6.0 of Section 10.2 of the said Tariff Order, which provides that where a consumer uses electricity supply for charging his own electric vehicle at his premises, the tariff applicable shall be as per the category of such premises.

According to the Appellant, the aforesaid provision determines the tariff applicable to EV charging consumption but does not expressly prohibit a consumer from obtaining a separate electricity meter or connection for such purpose. He therefore contended that the absence of a separately designated EV charging tariff cannot, by itself, be construed as a prohibition against release of a separate connection.

The Appellant further relied upon the EV charging guidelines relied upon by the Respondents and submitted that, even assuming that the subsequent Guidelines govern the matter, the entitlement claimed by him continues to be recognised. He referred to Clause 15(1) of the 2024 Guidelines under the provisions relating to charging at residence and submitted that the Guidelines themselves contemplate a separate metered connection from the Distribution Licensee for EV charging, with the applicable tariff being governed by the prescribed framework.

The Appellant accordingly contended that neither the statutory provision relied upon by him nor the subsequent Guidelines, according to his interpretation, extinguish the consumer's ability to seek a separate metered connection for EV charging.

The Appellant further submitted that no subsequent notification, amendment or other legally operative instrument expressly repealing the provision relied upon by him had been brought to his notice. He referred to the replies obtained under the Right to Information Act from the Goa Electricity Department and the Ministry of Power and submitted that no document repealing or withdrawing the provision relied upon by him had been identified.

The Appellant also referred to the divergent views expressed by the Members of the Learned Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Goa (hereinafter referred to as the "CGRF"). According to the Appellant, the Learned Independent Member, after considering the material placed before the Forum, accepted his contention and directed release of the service connection, whereas the Learned Licensee Member took a contrary view and the complaint came to be dismissed by majority.

The Appellant contended that the majority order did not identify any specific statutory, regulatory or technical provision which prohibited release of the separate connection sought by him. It was submitted that the mere availability of the alternative of enhancement of sanctioned load on the existing connection could not, by itself, establish that a separate connection sought under the applicable legal framework was impermissible.

The Appellant further submitted that the Respondents' apprehension regarding bifurcation of consumption and possible application of lower tariff slabs could not constitute a sufficient ground for denial of the connection in the absence of a specific statutory or regulatory provision prohibiting such separate connection. He submitted that any question relating to tariff consequences arising from separate connections falls within the regulatory domain of JERC and cannot be unilaterally determined by the Distribution Licensee.

The Appellant stated that, in his particular case, the apprehension regarding artificial bifurcation of consumption was misplaced, as he already has solar generation installations at his premises and proposes to install another rooftop solar system in connection with the proposed EV charging arrangement.

The Appellant further submitted that the absence of a separately identified EV charging tariff, if established, could not be attributed to the consumer. According to him, if a separate tariff framework was considered necessary for implementation of separate EV charging connections, the Respondents ought to have approached the competent regulatory authority rather than deny the consumer's application on that account.

The Appellant also referred to the broader policy objective of the Government of India and the Government of Goa to promote electric mobility and submitted that availability of adequate charging infrastructure is an important component of such policy. He submitted that public charging infrastructure is still developing and that consumers without convenient access to charging facilities through their existing domestic connections may require alternative charging arrangements.

With regard to the Respondents' suggestion that the Appellant could increase the capacity of his existing solar installation, the Appellant submitted that such a course was not technically feasible in his particular circumstances. He stated that his existing rooftop solar installation was commissioned approximately four years ago and comprises polycrystalline panels, whereas the presently available panels are of a different technology. He further stated that the inverter installed with the existing system is rated at 5 kW and cannot simply be enhanced to meet the additional requirement in the manner suggested.

The Appellant further submitted that the existing solar installation had been established with financial assistance/subsidy and that any alteration to the sanctioned installation would consequently have to comply with the applicable conditions governing the installation and subsidy. He therefore contended that enhancement of the existing solar installation could not be treated as an equivalent or readily available alternative to the separate electricity connection sought by him.

The Appellant submitted that he has never sought to prescribe, modify or challenge any tariff determined by JERC. His request, according to him, is limited to the physical and metered supply arrangement, with the applicable tariff being determined in accordance with the prevailing regulatory framework.

On the aforesaid grounds, the Appellant prayed that the impugned majority order passed by the Learned CGRF be set aside and that the Respondents be directed to process and release the separate electricity connection/meter for EV charging sought by him, subject to compliance with all applicable technical requirements and payment of lawful charges and tariff as may be determined by the competent authority.

II. Submissions on behalf of the Respondents

The Respondents submitted that, except for the representation/Appeal and the orders dated 18.06.2026 and 23.06.2026 passed by the Learned CGRF, the annexures relied upon by the Appellant had not been furnished to the Respondents for their perusal and comments. The Respondents accordingly reserved their right to respond to any document or contention not forming part of the record before the Learned CGRF.

The Respondents submitted that a detailed reply/say had already been filed before the Learned CGRF and requested that the same be taken into consideration in the present proceedings. According to the Respondents, the grievance of the Appellant essentially relates to the alleged non-consideration of his application for a separate electricity connection for EV charging and his contention that the notifications and guidelines relied upon by him confer an entitlement to such separate connection.

The Respondents denied the Appellant's contention that acceptance of the processing fee established that his application was complete and compliant with all applicable requirements. It was submitted that the processing fee is a stipulated charge payable at the stage of submission of an online application and that acceptance thereof does not amount to approval of the application or establish technical feasibility of the proposed connection.

The Respondents submitted that every application remains subject to scrutiny, technical feasibility and compliance with applicable statutory, regulatory and tariff requirements. It was further submitted that, subject to feasibility and completion of all requisite formalities, applicants are required to bear the prescribed service connection charges for release of the connection.

The Respondents submitted that the electricity tariff applicable to consumers is regulated by JERC, which exercises statutory powers under the Electricity Act, 2003, including Sections 62 and 86 thereof. It was contended that, notwithstanding the notifications, guidelines or policy documents relied upon by the Appellant, the Distribution Licensee is bound by the tariff orders issued by JERC and cannot independently create, prescribe or apply a tariff arrangement not approved by the Commission.

The Respondents submitted that JERC had undertaken the process of rationalisation of the retail supply tariff structure, including publication of a draft consultation paper, followed by issuance of the JERC (Retail Supply Tariff Structure) Guidelines, 2024 dated 20.12.2024 and thereafter the Tariff Order dated 30.09.2025. According to the Respondents, the prevailing tariff framework was thus framed and notified by the competent regulatory authority in exercise of its statutory powers and is binding upon all concerned.

The Respondents specifically relied upon Clause 6.0 of Section 10.2 of the Tariff Order dated 30.09.2025, which provides that where a consumer uses electricity supply for charging his own electric vehicle at his premises, the applicable tariff shall be as per the category of such premises. The Respondents submitted that the said provision is to be understood in the context of the existing electricity connection serving the premises. According to them, the provision contemplates that consumption attributable to EV charging forms part of the consumption recorded through the energy meter installed for the premises and is billed under the tariff applicable to that connection.

The Respondents contended that the provisions of the various notifications and guidelines relied upon by the Appellant cannot be read in isolation and have to be harmoniously construed with the Electricity Act, applicable Supply Code, prevailing Tariff Order and technical requirements governing release of electricity connections.

The Respondents submitted that the Learned CGRF had correctly appreciated the legal and regulatory framework and had rightly concluded that the provisions of different notifications and guidelines could not be interpreted selectively so as to create an entitlement inconsistent with the prevailing tariff structure.

The Respondents further submitted that the prevailing Tariff Order does not deprive the Appellant of the right to own or use an electric vehicle or to charge the same at his premises. According to the Respondents, the Appellant has not been denied electricity supply for EV charging and may avail such facility through his existing electricity connection after enhancement of sanctioned load, wherever required.

The Respondents further submitted that the Appellant is also at liberty to increase the capacity of his solar installation, as may be permissible, to offset the additional consumption arising from EV charging.

The Respondents raised a further concern regarding the absence of a dedicated EV charging tariff for the specific arrangement sought by the Appellant. It was submitted that if a separate connection were to be released without a corresponding dedicated tariff framework, the consumption of a single consumer at the same premises could effectively be bifurcated between two connections. According to the Respondents, such bifurcation could result in the consumer falling within lower tariff slabs and consequently cause revenue implications for the Distribution Licensee.

The Respondents submitted that the issue was therefore not one of denying the Appellant access to electricity for EV charging, but of ensuring that such consumption is billed in accordance with the tariff framework approved by the Commission. It was contended that the Distribution Licensee could not, in the absence of an appropriate tariff provision, independently create a separate billing arrangement for the Appellant.

The Respondents accordingly supported the majority order passed by the Learned CGRF and submitted that the findings recorded therein were reasonable and consistent with the prevailing statutory, regulatory and tariff framework.

The Respondents contended that the Appellant had failed to establish any legal infirmity, jurisdictional error or other ground warranting interference with the impugned order in the present proceedings.

On the aforesaid grounds, the Respondents submitted that the Appeal was not maintainable on merits and prayed that the same be dismissed.

III. Further Submissions/Rejoinder on behalf of the Appellant

In response to the submissions made by the Respondents, the Appellant reiterated that the application had been submitted through the online portal of the Goa Electricity Department, along with the documents prescribed by the Respondents, and that the requisite processing fee had been paid. The Appellant clarified that he does not rely upon payment of the processing fee as conclusive proof of final sanction or technical feasibility of the connection. Rather, his contention is that the application, having been accepted for processing, was required to be duly scrutinised and either processed further or rejected by a reasoned communication identifying the legal, regulatory or technical impediment.

The Appellant submitted that no further charges were demanded from him and that he has never disputed his liability to pay any service connection charges or other lawful charges applicable to release of the connection.

The Appellant specifically relied upon the Shortcoming Notice and submitted that it did not identify any specific deficiency capable of being rectified. According to the Appellant, the communication merely advised him to obtain enhancement of load on his existing connection and did not explain why the separate connection sought by him was impermissible or under which tariff category he should apply.

The Appellant reiterated that he has never questioned the jurisdiction or powers of JERC and has never refused to comply with the Tariff Order issued by the Commission. He submitted that the LTDS-II category was selected only because it was the category available on the Respondents' online portal for the proposed use. He further submitted that he remains willing to be billed under any tariff category lawfully determined by the competent authority.

The Appellant contended that the Respondents had not identified any specific provision of the prevailing Tariff Order which would be violated merely by release of a separate EV charging meter or connection. According to him, his request does not involve creation or modification of any tariff and does not seek any concessional rate.

The Appellant reiterated that Clause 6.0 of section 10.2 of the Tariff Order dated 30.09.2025 merely provides that the applicable tariff for electricity used for charging the consumer's own EV at the premises shall be as per the category of such premises. According to the Appellant, the clause does not expressly state that EV charging must necessarily be undertaken through the existing meter of the premises or that a separate connection for EV charging is prohibited.

The Appellant therefore disputed the Respondents' interpretation that the said provision necessarily requires EV charging consumption to form part of the consumption recorded by the existing meter. He submitted that such an interpretation, in his view, introduces a restriction which is not expressly contained in the tariff provision.

The Appellant further submitted that the question of tariff determination and the question of release of a separate connection are distinct. He reiterated that he seeks neither a new tariff nor a variation of the tariff determined by JERC, but only a separate metered supply arrangement, with the applicable tariff being determined in accordance with the prevailing regulatory framework.

The Appellant further submitted that even on the Respondents' own reliance upon the subsequent EV charging Guidelines, the consumer's ability to seek a separate metered connection for EV charging remains contemplated. He relied upon Clause 15(1) of the 2024 Guidelines and submitted that the Guidelines refer to a separate metered connection for EV charging at residences.

The Appellant also relied upon the replies obtained under the Right to Information Act and submitted that no document repealing the provision relied upon by him had been identified by the concerned authorities. According to the Appellant, therefore, the Respondents could not proceed on the premise that the statutory provision relied upon by him had ceased to have effect without identifying the legal instrument by which the same had been superseded or repealed.

The Appellant further disputed the Respondents' contention that enhancement of the sanctioned load of the existing connection constituted an adequate substitute for the separate connection sought by him. According to the Appellant, the relevant statutory framework provides for the consumer's ability to seek a separate connection and the Distribution Licensee could not substitute a different arrangement merely on the ground that EV charging could also be accommodated through the existing connection.

The Appellant further submitted that the Respondents' apprehension regarding bifurcation of consumption and consequent application of lower tariff slabs was not, by itself, a legal ground for denying the connection. According to the Appellant, if separate connections have tariff consequences, the appropriate mechanism for addressing such consequences lies within the regulatory jurisdiction of JERC and not through unilateral denial of the consumer's application.

The Appellant also submitted that, in his particular case, the apprehension regarding bifurcation of consumption was misplaced because of the solar generation installations already existing at his premises and his proposal to install another rooftop solar system in connection with the proposed EV charging arrangement.

The Appellant further submitted that the absence of a dedicated EV charging tariff, if established, cannot be attributed to the consumer. According to him, a consumer cannot be deprived of a connection otherwise permissible under the applicable legal framework merely because the Distribution Licensee has not obtained or secured a tariff arrangement specifically styled as an EV charging tariff.

The Appellant submitted that any such tariff-related issue should be placed before the competent regulatory authority for appropriate determination and should not, in his submission, be converted into a ground for rejection of his application.

The Appellant also referred to the broader policy objective of promoting electric mobility and submitted that the availability of charging infrastructure is an important component of such policy. He contended that consumers who do not have convenient or feasible access to EV charging through their existing domestic connection may require separate charging arrangements.

The Appellant disputed the Respondents' suggestion that the capacity of his existing solar installation could simply be increased. He submitted that his existing rooftop solar installation was commissioned approximately four years ago and comprises polycrystalline panels, whereas presently available panels are of a different technology. He further submitted that the existing inverter is rated at 5 kW and cannot simply be enhanced in the manner suggested.

The Appellant also submitted that the existing solar installation was established with financial assistance/subsidy and that any alteration to the existing sanctioned installation would be subject to the applicable conditions governing such installation and subsidy. He therefore contended that the suggestion to increase the solar capacity could not be regarded as an equivalent or readily feasible alternative to the separate connection sought.

The Appellant finally submitted that he is willing to comply with all lawful technical requirements, service connection charges and applicable tariff conditions associated with the proposed separate connection. His grievance, according to him, is that the application has not been determined on the basis of a specific legal or technical impediment but has instead been directed towards an alternative arrangement which he has not sought.

The Appellant accordingly submitted that the impugned majority order of the Learned CGRF did not adequately address the distinction between the consumer's request for a separate electricity connection and the determination of the tariff applicable to the electricity supplied through such connection.

On these grounds, the Appellant prayed that the impugned order passed by the Learned CGRF be set aside and that the Respondents be directed to process and release the separate electricity connection/meter for EV charging sought by him, subject to compliance with applicable technical requirements and payment of lawful charges and tariff as may be determined by the competent authority.

IV. PROCEEDINGS

The matter was taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing on 17.08.2026.

During the course of hearing, the Appellant reiterated his claim for release of a separate electricity connection for the purpose of charging Electric Vehicles (EVs). The Appellant submitted that his existing electricity connection bearing Connection No. **60006725380**, having Meter No. **22060786-E**, carries a sanctioned load of **4.34 kW** and is having a **net metering connection** in respect of which he has availed the benefit of Government subsidy. He submitted that he does not seek to alter or disturb the existing net-metering arrangement and instead intends to obtain a separate electricity connection with a proposed sanctioned load of approximately **4 kW**, exclusively for EV charging.

The Appellant further submitted that he proposes to install another rooftop solar system along with the proposed EV charging connection. He stated that the proposed location for installation of the new meter is adjacent to the location of his existing meter and, therefore, there would be no practical difficulty in providing a separate metered connection at the premises, subject to compliance with the applicable technical requirements.

The Appellant submitted that his claim for a separate connection is founded, inter alia, upon **Rule 4(15) of the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, as amended vide Notification No. G.S.R. 125(E) dated 22.02.2024**, which, according to him, contemplates provision of a separate electricity connection for EV charging. He reiterated that the Regulatory and Tariff framework should not be construed as extinguishing the right claimed by him.

The Appellant further submitted that he presently owns a **two-wheeler EV**. He clarified that no separate EV charger has yet been installed for the said vehicle. He submitted, however, that he intends to purchase an electric four-wheeler and, thereafter, proposes to install an EV charger supplied by the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM). According to the Appellant, the proposed separate connection is therefore intended to cater exclusively to EV charging requirements and is not sought for any other domestic purpose.

The Appellant also reiterated that his existing rooftop solar installation was established approximately four years ago with the benefit of subsidy and that the existing system comprises polycrystalline panels and an inverter of approximately 5 kW capacity. He submitted that increasing the capacity of the existing solar installation was not a readily feasible alternative in his circumstances. He therefore maintained that the proposed separate connection should not be rejected merely on the ground that additional load could technically be accommodated through the existing connection.

On the other hand, the Respondents reiterated the submissions already placed on record. The Respondents maintained that the Appellant is not being denied electricity for EV charging and that the requirement, if any, can be accommodated through the existing electricity connection by enhancement of sanctioned load, subject to technical feasibility and payment of applicable charges.

The Respondents further relied upon the prevailing tariff framework and submitted that the tariff applicable to charging of an EV at the consumer's premises is governed by the tariff applicable to the category of the premises. They maintained that the release of a second connection at the same premises, in the absence of a separately prescribed tariff arrangement, could result in bifurcation of the consumption of the same consumer and consequential tariff implications. The Respondents accordingly submitted that the Appellant cannot claim an unconditional right to a separate connection merely by relying upon the provision relating to EV charging without satisfying the applicable tariff, technical and regulatory requirements.

During the hearing, the Respondents also drew attention to the fact that the Appellant has not presently installed an EV charger, particularly in view of his statement that he presently possesses only a two-wheeler EV and proposes to acquire a four-wheeler EV in future. The Respondents questioned the immediate requirement of a 4-kW separate connection when the corresponding charging load has not yet been installed or demonstrated at the premises.

The issue of the wiring certificate furnished by the Appellant was also raised during the hearing. The Respondents questioned the validity/reliability of the certificate insofar as it purports to certify the proposed installation without the corresponding EV charging equipment/load presently being installed. The Appellant, however, maintained his claim for the separate connection and expressed his willingness to comply with all lawful technical requirements that may be prescribed by the Distribution Licensee.

The parties were heard at length. The submissions, documents and material available on record, including the pleadings filed before the Learned CGRF, the impugned order, the reply filed by the Respondents and the submissions made during the hearing dated 17.08.2026, have been duly considered.

V. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

1. **Scope of controversy**

   The principal question arising for consideration in the present Appeal is whether the Appellant is entitled to a separate electricity connection/meter at his existing premises exclusively for EV charging, notwithstanding the fact that he already has an electricity connection at the same premises, and whether the Respondents were justified in directing him to seek enhancement of the sanctioned load of the existing connection instead of processing the application for a separate connection.

At the outset, it is necessary to distinguish between two separate aspects of the matter. The first is the legal permissibility of a separate connection for EV charging. The second is whether, on the facts and material presently available, the Appellant has satisfied the technical and procedural requirements for release of such connection.

The Appellant's case before the Learned CGRF and in the present Appeal has essentially proceeded on the premise that the first question must necessarily be answered in his favour and that, consequently, the Distribution Licensee is bound to release the separate connection. The Respondents, on the other hand, have contended that the provisions relating to EV charging cannot be read in isolation from the prevailing tariff framework, the Supply Code and the technical requirements applicable to release of a new connection.

2. Consideration of Rule 4(15) of the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020

The Appellant has placed substantial reliance upon Rule 4(15) of the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, as amended vide Notification dated 22.02.2024. He has contended that the provision specifically contemplates a separate electricity connection for EV charging and, therefore, confers upon him an enforceable right to obtain such connection.

The Appellant's reliance on the said provision cannot be said to be wholly without substance. The material placed on record shows that the Appellant has invoked the provision specifically in the context of seeking a separate metered supply for EV charging. His contention is that the right to seek such connection should not be defeated merely because an existing electricity connection is already available at the premises. The Appellant has also relied upon the subsequent EV charging guidelines dated 17.09.2024.

However, the existence of a statutory or regulatory provision contemplating a separate connection for EV charging cannot be construed as dispensing with the other conditions applicable to the actual release of an electricity connection. A consumer's right to seek a connection and the Distribution Licensee's obligation to release the connection are necessarily subject to the applicable technical feasibility, safety requirements, sanctioned load, wiring requirements, service connection charges and the prevailing tariff and regulatory framework.

Thus, Rule 4(15), even if found applicable to the Appellant's case, cannot reasonably be construed to mean that every application for a separate EV connection must be sanctioned irrespective of whether the proposed electrical installation, connected load and charging equipment actually exist or whether the application otherwise satisfies the technical requirements prescribed by the competent authority.

3. Whether the Tariff Order prohibits a separate EV connection

A. The Respondents have relied upon Clause 6.0 of Section 10.2 of the Tariff Order dated 30.09.2025, according to which where a consumer uses electricity supply for charging his own electric vehicle at his premises, the applicable tariff is to be determined with reference to the category of the premises. The Respondents have interpreted the provision to mean that EV charging consumption forms part of the consumption of the existing connection serving the premises.

The Appellant, on the other hand, has contended that the said tariff provision determines the tariff applicable to EV charging consumption but does not expressly prohibit the release of a separate connection or meter for that purpose. He has therefore submitted that the question of tariff and the question of the physical/metering arrangement are distinct.

On consideration, the contention of the Appellant that tariff determination and release of a connection are conceptually distinct cannot be rejected outright. A tariff provision ordinarily determines the charges applicable to electricity consumption; it does not necessarily, by implication alone, constitute a prohibition upon a particular metering arrangement unless such prohibition follows from the language of the tariff order read with the applicable regulatory framework.

At the same time, the absence of an express prohibition in the tariff order cannot, by itself, be treated as establishing an unconditional entitlement to a second connection. The proposed arrangement must still be examined in the context of the applicable regulatory and technical framework, particularly because two connections at the same premises may have consequences for billing, sanctioned load and tariff slabs.

Accordingly, the Respondents' concern regarding tariff consequences is a relevant regulatory consideration, but such concern, standing alone and without identification of a specific prohibitory provision, cannot conclusively establish that a separate EV connection is legally impermissible.

B. Separate connection under the Ministry of Power's 2024 Guidelines and the applicable tariff under the JERC Tariff Order

The Authority has also examined the specific provisions of the **Ministry of Power's Guidelines for Installation and Operation of Electric Vehicle Charging**

Infrastructure-2024, issued vide Letter No. **12/2/2018-EV (Comp. No. 241852) dated 17.09.2024**.

Section 15 of the said Guidelines specifically deals with **"Charging at Residence"**. Clause 15(1), under the heading **"New Connection"**, provides that the owner can request a separate metered connection from the Distribution Licensee with a dedicated EV charging tariff and that such connection is to be granted within the timelines specified in the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, as amended from time to time.

Clause 15(2), dealing with **"Existing Connection"**, further provides that owners can use their existing electricity connection to charge their EVs at home.

A conjoint reading of Clauses 15(1) and 15(2) is significant. The Guidelines do not confine EV charging at a residence to the existing electricity connection alone. They expressly contemplate two distinct arrangements, namely,

(i) **obtaining a separate metered connection for EV charging; and**

(ii) **using the existing electricity connection for charging the EV**.

Thus, the availability of an existing electricity connection cannot, by itself, be construed as excluding the possibility of a separate metered connection where the applicable requirements are otherwise satisfied.

The Authority, however, also finds that Clause 15(1) refers to a **"dedicated EV charging tariff"**. This aspect has to be considered in conjunction with the prevailing JERC Tariff Order dated **30.09.2025**. The said Tariff Order does not prescribe a separate or dedicated tariff category specifically styled as an EV charging tariff for a consumer charging his own EV at his residential premises.

At the same time, the Tariff Order has specifically addressed the issue of tariff applicable to charging of an electric vehicle by its owner at the premises. **Clause 6.0(ii)** of Section 10.2 **relating to Electric Vehicle Charging Stations** provides:

"In case the consumer uses the electricity supply for charging his own electric vehicle at his premises the tariff applicable shall be as per the category of premises."

The above provision is material to the controversy. It demonstrates that, although the prevailing JERC Tariff Order does not prescribe a separately identified **dedicated EV charging tariff**, it does prescribe a mechanism for determining the tariff where a consumer uses electricity at his premises for charging his own electric vehicle. The applicable tariff is linked to the **category of the premises**.

Therefore, the absence of a separately designated EV charging tariff in the prevailing JERC Tariff Order cannot, by itself, be equated with a prohibition upon a separate metered connection. The Ministry of Power's 2024 Guidelines expressly contemplate a separate metered connection for EV charging, whereas the prevailing JERC Tariff Order provides the tariff treatment for electricity used by a consumer for charging his own EV at his premises.

There is, thus, a distinction between **the permissibility of a separate metered connection** and **the determination of the tariff applicable to electricity supplied through such connection**. The former has been expressly contemplated under Clause 15(1) of the 2024 Guidelines, while the latter is governed by the tariff framework approved by the Commission.

It follows that the Distribution Licensee cannot decline to consider the Appellant's request for a separate connection merely on the ground that a dedicated EV charging tariff has not separately been created under the prevailing JERC Tariff Order. The tariff applicable to the connection, if released, has necessarily to be determined in accordance with the prevailing JERC Tariff Order and any subsequent tariff or regulatory directions issued by the Commission.

At the same time, Clause 15(1) of the 2024 Guidelines does not dispense with the requirement of compliance with the applicable technical, safety, metering, wiring and other prescribed conditions for release and energisation of a new electricity connection. The entitlement to seek a separate connection must therefore be distinguished from the question of whether the proposed connection is presently ready for energisation.

Accordingly, this Authority finds that **the Ministry of Power's 2024 Guidelines expressly recognise the permissibility of a separate metered electricity connection for charging an owner's EV at his residence. The absence of a separately designated EV charging tariff in the JERC Tariff Order dated 30.09.2025 does not, by itself, constitute a legal prohibition against such separate connection. However, the tariff applicable to any such connection shall remain subject to the tariff framework approved by JERC, including Clause 6.0(ii) of section 10.2 of the Tariff Order, and the connection shall be released only upon satisfaction of all applicable technical and statutory requirements.**

4. **Existing connection and proposed separate connection**

An important factual circumstance which has emerged during the hearing is that the Appellant already has an electricity connection bearing No. **60006725380**, with Meter No. **22060786-**

E, having sanctioned load of **4.34 kW**, and that the said connection is a net-metering connection in respect of which the Appellant has availed Government subsidy.

The Appellant has now proposed another connection with a sanctioned load of **4 kW**, exclusively for EV charging, at a location adjacent to the existing meter. He has also proposed to install another rooftop solar system in connection with the proposed arrangement for EV charging.

The existence of the existing connection does not, by itself, establish that a second connection is prohibited. Nevertheless, the fact that the proposed connection is at the same premises and is sought by the same consumer makes it necessary to examine whether the proposed arrangement is supported by an identifiable and presently existing electrical load and whether the separation is technically justified and capable of being independently metered and regulated.

The Respondents' contention that enhancement of the existing connection is an available alternative is therefore relevant to the question of technical and regulatory necessity, although it cannot automatically substitute for a separate connection if the latter is otherwise permissible under the applicable legal framework. The Appellant has specifically disputed the feasibility of enhancing the existing solar arrangement and has explained the constraints arising from the existing solar panels, inverter capacity and subsidy-linked installation.

5. Present existence of EV charging load

The facts placed before this Authority during the hearing dated 17.08.2026 require particular consideration.

The Appellant has stated that he presently possesses only a **two-wheeler EV**, for which **no separate charger has yet been installed**. He has further stated that he proposes to purchase an **electric four-wheeler in future**, after which he proposes to install a charger supplied by the OEM.

Thus, as on the date of hearing, the proposed **4 kW EV charging load is not supported by an existing installed EV charger at the premises**. The proposed four-wheeler and its OEM charger are also prospective and not presently available for inspection or verification.

This factual position is material because the Appellant is not merely seeking a small additional supply for an already installed appliance or equipment. He seeks a separate connection with a substantial sanctioned load of **4 kW**, specifically represented as being required for EV charging. The Distribution Licensee is entitled, while processing a new connection, to ascertain the nature of the proposed load and the technical requirements associated with it.

The fact that the Appellant intends to acquire an EV and install a charger in future may constitute a legitimate future requirement; however, a prospective intention cannot automatically be equated with a presently established connected load or an immediately verifiable technical requirement for the proposed sanctioned load.

This distinction is particularly relevant in the present case because the Appellant himself has stated that the proposed four-wheeler has not yet been purchased and that the corresponding charger would be installed subsequently.

6. **Wiring certificate and technical readiness**

   The question relating to the wiring certificate also assumes significance.

   A wiring certificate furnished in support of an application for a new electricity connection is intended to demonstrate compliance of the electrical installation with the applicable safety and technical requirements. If the certificate purports to cover a proposed EV charging installation, while the corresponding charger/load has not actually been installed, the Distribution Licensee is entitled to verify whether the certificate accurately represents the physical condition and electrical configuration existing at the premises.

   This Authority is not inclined, on the material presently available, to make an adverse finding of deliberate falsification merely on the basis of the competing submissions. However, the discrepancy between the proposed **4 kW EV charging load** and the admitted absence of an installed EV charger is a matter which requires technical verification before a connection carrying such sanctioned load can be released.

   The appropriate course is therefore not to treat the wiring certificate as conclusively establishing technical readiness, but to require the Distribution Licensee to verify the actual electrical installation and connected load in accordance with the applicable procedure.

7. **Whether the Appellant has an absolute right to immediate release of the connection**

   The Appellant has relied upon the principle of consumer rights and has submitted that the Distribution Licensee cannot substitute enhancement of the existing connection for the separate connection sought by him. He has also submitted that he is willing to pay all lawful charges and comply with all applicable technical requirements.

   This Authority finds that the Appellant's claim cannot be rejected solely on the ground that he already has an existing electricity connection. Nor can the application be treated as legally impermissible merely because the proposed connection is intended for EV charging.

   However, the converse proposition—that the existence of a provision contemplating separate EV connections necessarily entitles the Appellant to immediate release of a 4kW connection without demonstration of the corresponding installed load and compliance with technical requirements—would also be too broad.

The statutory and regulatory right to electricity supply has to operate within the framework governing release of a connection. The Distribution Licensee must be satisfied regarding technical feasibility, safety, wiring, connected load and other prescribed requirements. The consumer, correspondingly, cannot insist upon energisation of a proposed load merely on the basis of an intended future installation.

8. Shortcoming notice and duty to give a reasoned decision

The record indicates that the Respondents had issued a Shortcoming Notice dated 15.05.2026 advising the Appellant that the EV charging requirement could be met through enhancement of the existing connection. The Appellant has consistently contended that the communication did not identify a specific statutory or technical prohibition against a separate connection.

The Respondents, in turn, have maintained that the application remained subject to scrutiny, technical feasibility and compliance with the prevailing tariff and regulatory framework and that payment of processing fee did not amount to approval of the application.

In the opinion of this Authority, a consumer application for a new connection ought to culminate either in release of the connection upon satisfaction of the prescribed conditions or in a reasoned communication clearly identifying the legal, technical or procedural deficiency which prevents such release. A general direction to seek enhancement of an existing connection, without clearly stating the regulatory or technical basis on which the separate connection is being declined, does not adequately resolve the consumer's specific request.

This is particularly so where the consumer has expressly invoked a provision which, according to him, contemplates a separate EV charging connection. The Distribution Licensee is required to address that contention with reference to the applicable legal and regulatory framework rather than merely advise the consumer to adopt an alternative arrangement.

9. Tariff bifurcation concern

The Respondents have expressed apprehension that allowing a second connection at the same premises could result in bifurcation of consumption and consequential tariff benefits to the consumer. Such concern is not wholly irrelevant. The tariff structure is within the regulatory jurisdiction of JERC and the Distribution Licensee cannot independently devise a tariff methodology contrary to the tariff approved by the Commission.

At the same time, the concern regarding possible tariff consequences cannot, without more, be elevated into an absolute prohibition against a separate connection if the applicable legal framework otherwise permits such arrangement.

Any billing consequence arising from the existence of multiple connections at the same premises has to be dealt with in accordance with the applicable tariff order, Supply Code and other regulatory directions. If a particular situation requires clarification regarding treatment of consumption, the same may appropriately be placed before the competent regulatory authority. The Distribution Licensee cannot, merely on the apprehension of possible tariff impact, create a prohibition which is not otherwise traceable to the applicable regulatory framework.

Additional Findings and Analysis

10. Effect of the 2024 EV Charging Guidelines vis-à-vis Rule 4(15)

A further contention requiring consideration is the Respondents' submission that the provision contained in Rule 4(15) of the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, as amended on 22.02.2024, stood superseded by the subsequent **"Guidelines for Installation and Operation of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure-2024" dated 17.09.2024**.

The Respondents have not disputed the existence or text of Rule 4(15). Their contention, as emerging from the record, is essentially that the subsequent 2024 Guidelines govern the subject and that the Appellant cannot rely upon the earlier provision independently of the subsequent framework.

This contention requires careful examination because the Appellant's claim cannot be determined merely by assuming that the earlier provision has either been repealed or rendered inoperative. If the Respondents seek to contend that Rule 4(15) has been superseded, the legal instrument and the precise provision by which such supersession has occurred must be identified. A subsequent guideline dealing with the same subject does not, by itself and without examination of its legal character and operative provisions, establish repeal or extinguishment of an earlier statutory rule.

At the same time, the 2024 Guidelines cannot be ignored merely because the Appellant's original claim was founded upon Rule 4(15). The subsequent Guidelines form part of the regulatory material placed before this Authority and are relevant for determining the manner in which EV charging is to be accommodated, including the options available to a consumer and the tariff applicable to charging at a residence.

The question, therefore, is not merely whether Rule 4(15) survived in isolation, but whether the right claimed by the Appellant is recognised, continued, modified or conditioned by the subsequent framework. The provisions should accordingly be read harmoniously, to the extent legally permissible, rather than proceeding on an assumption of supersession unsupported by an identified legal instrument.

11. The alternatives available for EV charging

The material relied upon by the parties indicates that the regulatory framework contemplates more than one mechanism by which a consumer may cater to EV charging requirements, including utilisation of the existing electricity connection, enhancement of the sanctioned load, and a separately metered connection where permissible under the applicable framework. This aspect is significant because the availability of enhancement of sanctioned load cannot, by itself, conclusively establish that a consumer has no right even to seek a separate connection. If the regulatory framework itself recognises separate metered supply as one of the available arrangements, the Distribution Licensee must examine the consumer's application in accordance with the conditions governing such arrangement.

At the same time, recognition of a separate connection as an available option does not dispense with the requirement that the particular application satisfy the applicable technical and safety conditions. The right to apply for or seek a particular supply arrangement and the right to immediate energisation without technical verification remain distinct.

12. Tariff issue: distinction between absence of dedicated EV tariff and absence of an applicable tariff

The tariff issue also requires more precise consideration.

The Respondents have raised the concern that the prevailing JERC Tariff Order does not prescribe a separate tariff category specifically styled as an EV charging tariff for the arrangement sought by the Appellant. The Appellant, however, has submitted that the absence of a separately denominated EV tariff does not mean that no tariff can be applied to electricity consumed for EV charging.

This distinction is material. The absence of a separately designated EV tariff category does not necessarily result in absence of a tariff applicable to the electricity consumed for EV charging at a residence. The 2024 Guidelines relied upon in the proceedings specifically contemplate the application of **domestic electricity rates to charging of EVs at home**. Similarly, Note (ii) to Category 6.0 of the prevailing JERC Tariff Order provides that where a consumer uses electricity supply for charging his own electric vehicle at his premises, the applicable tariff shall be as per the category of such premises.

Accordingly, the issue of tariff cannot be treated as an unresolved vacuum merely because the tariff order does not contain a separate tariff category described as "EV Charging".

For a residential consumer, the applicable tariff has to be determined in accordance with the prevailing tariff order and the applicable regulatory framework. This finding, however, must not be understood as creation of a new tariff category by this Authority. The Ombudsman is not exercising the tariff-determination powers vested in JERC. The task is only to ascertain and apply the tariff framework already approved by the competent regulatory authority.

13. Separate connection and tariff determination are distinct questions

The above position also reinforces the distinction between **entitlement to a supply connection** and **determination of tariff applicable to the consumption through that connection**.

The Learned Licensee Member proceeded on the basis that because the existing domestic connection is already billed under LTDS-II, the Appellant should necessarily accommodate the EV charging load through that connection by seeking enhancement. This reasoning effectively treats the tariff applicable to EV charging as determinative of the permissible metering arrangement.

In the opinion of this Authority, the two questions require separate examination.

The fact that a particular tariff is applicable to electricity used for charging a personal EV at a residential premises does not, by itself, answer the separate question as to whether the consumer may have that EV charging load supplied through a separately metered connection, if such separate connection is otherwise permissible under the governing framework.

Conversely, the recognition of a separate connection does not authorise the consumer or the Ombudsman to create a new or concessional tariff. The tariff applicable to the connection must remain strictly within the tariff framework approved by JERC.

14. Fifteen-day timeline and the question of deficiency in service

Another aspect which requires specific consideration is the statutory timeline for release of a new electricity connection.

The record indicates that the Appellant's application was submitted on 18.04.2026 and that the Respondents subsequently issued a Shortcoming Notice directing him to seek enhancement of the existing connection. The Appellant has contended that the connection was not released within the prescribed period applicable to the area and that no legally sustainable ground for refusal was communicated to him.

The significance of the prescribed timeline is that an application for a new connection cannot be kept pending indefinitely merely because the Distribution Licensee considers another arrangement more convenient or administratively preferable. Once an application is made, the Licensee is required either to process and release the connection in accordance with the prescribed procedure or to communicate a lawful and specific deficiency or impediment within the applicable framework.

Therefore, if, upon examination of the application, the Respondents were of the view that the separate connection was not permissible, they were required to identify the precise statutory, regulatory or technical basis for such conclusion. A mere recommendation that the consumer should enhance the load of his existing connection does not, without more, establish a lawful rejection of an application for a separate connection.

The question whether the prescribed timeline was attracted in the facts of the present case, and whether the application was complete in all respects so as to trigger the said timeline, shall therefore be determined with reference to the application, the documents submitted, the Shortcoming Notice and the applicable provisions governing release of connections.

If the application was complete and no lawful technical or regulatory impediment existed, failure to process the application within the prescribed period would constitute a deficiency in service. Conversely, if a specific and legally sustainable deficiency remained outstanding, the timeline would necessarily operate subject to rectification/compliance by the consumer.

15. Whether the Respondents denied electricity supply to the Appellant

The Respondents have specifically contended that the Appellant was not denied electricity supply because he already enjoys a valid domestic connection and was merely advised to obtain enhancement of sanctioned load for accommodating the additional EV charging requirement.

This submission has some relevance but does not, by itself, dispose of the grievance.

The Appellant's grievance is not that he has been completely deprived of electricity supply. His grievance is that he sought a **particular supply arrangement**, namely a separately metered connection for EV charging, and that the Distribution Licensee declined that arrangement and required him to use the existing connection.

Therefore, the fact that electricity is otherwise available at the premises does not necessarily answer the question whether the Appellant's specific application for a separate connection was lawfully rejected. The relevant enquiry is whether the Distribution Licensee had a lawful basis under the applicable framework to refuse the particular connection sought.

16. Revenue implications and bifurcation of consumption

The Respondents have also relied upon the possibility that two connections at the same premises could enable bifurcation of the consumer's consumption and thereby produce tariff consequences which may adversely affect the Licensee's revenue.

This concern cannot be entirely disregarded from the regulatory perspective. However, revenue implications arising from the structure of the tariff are matters which fall within the regulatory domain of the Commission.

If the regulatory framework permits separate connections, the possibility that a consumer may obtain a tariff consequence by legitimately exercising an available regulatory option cannot, by itself, be converted into a ground for refusal of that option. Any perceived anomaly in tariff slabs, revenue neutrality or treatment of multiple connections is appropriately addressed through the tariff-making and regulatory process.

The Distribution Licensee, however, remains entitled to ensure that the two connections are genuinely separately metered, technically compliant and used only for the purposes for which they are sanctioned. The Licensee may also apply the applicable provisions relating to metering, inspection, sanctioned load and misuse of supply, if any.

17. Effect of the casting vote of the Learned CGRF

It is also necessary to bear in mind that the impugned order of the Learned CGRF did not represent a unanimous determination on the legal issue.

The record demonstrates a clear difference of opinion between the Learned Independent Member and the Learned Licensee Member. The Learned Independent Member considered that the Appellant had a right to a separate EV charging connection and that the tariff issue could be resolved under the existing tariff framework. The Learned Licensee Member took the contrary view that Rule 4(15) did not create an unconditional right and that the Appellant should utilise the existing domestic connection after enhancement of sanctioned load.

The equality of votes resulted in exercise of the casting vote by the Presiding Officer, following which the complaint was dismissed.

Consequently, the mere fact that the impugned order represents the final decision of the Learned CGRF does not mean that the underlying legal issue was free from controversy. In the present Appeal, the question is required to be independently examined on the basis of the applicable statutory, regulatory and tariff framework and the material available on record.

18. Limited scope of tariff jurisdiction of the Ombudsman

The Respondents are correct to the extent that the Electricity Ombudsman cannot create, amend or prescribe a tariff category which has not been approved by JERC. The tariff-making power is vested in the competent regulatory authority and cannot be assumed by the Ombudsman.

However, this limitation does not prevent the Ombudsman from determining the consumer grievance by applying the tariff framework already approved by the Commission. There is a material distinction between **creating a tariff** and **identifying the tariff applicable under an existing tariff order**.

Accordingly, any direction ultimately issued in the present matter must not purport to create a new "EV charging tariff". It should instead require application of the tariff already prescribed under the prevailing JERC Tariff Order and applicable regulatory framework.

19. Consolidated finding on the additional issues

Upon consideration of the above aspects, this Authority finds that the Respondents' reliance upon the absence of a dedicated EV tariff cannot, by itself, constitute a complete answer to the Appellant's claim for a separate connection. The applicable regulatory framework contains provisions capable of determining the tariff for EV charging at residential premises, and the absence of a separately named EV tariff does not necessarily render such consumption unbillable or the proposed connection incapable of being processed.

At the same time, this Authority does not accept the proposition that the existence of Rule 4(15), by itself, dispenses with all technical, safety, metering and procedural requirements for release of a new connection.

The prescribed timeline for release of a connection must also be considered in conjunction with the completeness of the application and compliance with the requirements prescribed by the Distribution Licensee. If the Appellant had complied with all prescribed requirements and no specific lawful deficiency remained, failure to release or determine the application within the prescribed period would require appropriate consideration as deficiency in service.

Finally, any concern regarding tariff bifurcation or possible revenue impact cannot substitute for a specific statutory or regulatory prohibition. Such matters fall within the regulatory domain of JERC and may be addressed through appropriate tariff or regulatory measures, while the Distribution Licensee remains entitled to enforce the applicable metering, technical and safety requirements.

These findings shall be read together with the findings recorded above regarding the presently non-installed EV charger, the proposed future acquisition of the four-wheeler EV, the proposed 4 kW load and the requirement of verification of the wiring/installation before actual energisation of the proposed connection.

20. Overall conclusion

Upon an overall consideration of the material, this Authority is of the view that the Appellant's case involves **two distinct questions** which ought not to be conflated.

First, the Appellant's reliance upon the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, as amended, raises a legally arguable basis for seeking a separate EV charging connection. The existence of an existing electricity connection at the premises does not, by itself, establish that a separate EV connection is prohibited. Similarly, the prevailing tariff provision relating to EV charging does not, on the material presently placed before this Authority, by itself establish an express prohibition against a separate metered connection. The Appellant has also consistently stated that he does not seek any special or concessional tariff and is willing to accept the tariff lawfully applicable to the premises/connection.

Second, however, the Appellant has not demonstrated, as on the date of hearing, the existence of the proposed **4 kW EV charging installation**. He admittedly does not presently have an EV charger installed, owns only a two-wheeler EV at present, and proposes to purchase a four-wheeler and install an OEM charger at a future date. Consequently, the immediate technical requirement for a separate 4 kW connection has not yet been established through an installed and verifiable EV charging load.

In these circumstances, the appropriate relief would not be to direct the Respondents to **straightaway energise** a 4 kW separate connection irrespective of the technical status of the premises. At the same time, it would also not be appropriate to uphold the rejection merely on the broad proposition that EV charging must necessarily be undertaken through the existing connection or that a separate EV connection is legally prohibited.

The more appropriate course would be to direct the Respondents to **reconsider and process the Appellant's application afresh**, specifically examining the request for a separate EV charging connection under the applicable provisions of the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020, the prevailing JERC tariff framework, the Supply Code and the applicable technical/safety requirements.

Such reconsideration shall include verification of the actual electrical installation, the proposed connected load, the wiring and safety compliance, the location of the proposed meter, and the technical feasibility of providing a separate connection. The Respondents shall also clearly communicate to the Appellant the tariff category and billing methodology applicable to the proposed connection, as determined under the prevailing regulatory framework.

If the Appellant is required to first install the EV charger or otherwise establish the proposed load for the purpose of technical verification, the Respondents may communicate such specific requirement to him. Conversely, if the applicable rules permit processing of the application on the basis of the proposed EV charging load subject to subsequent compliance, the Respondents shall process the application accordingly.

The Appellant shall also be required to furnish a valid and technically accurate wiring/installation certificate corresponding to the electrical installation actually existing at the premises. No connection shall be energised unless the applicable technical, safety and statutory requirements are duly satisfied.

Accordingly, the dispute is not required to be determined on the simplistic basis that the Appellant either has an unconditional right to a second connection or has no right whatsoever to seek one. The legal permissibility of a separate EV connection and the technical readiness for energisation are separate matters, and the latter has not yet been satisfactorily demonstrated on the present record.

The above approach would also preserve the Appellant's substantive right to have his application considered under the applicable legal framework while simultaneously safeguarding the Distribution Licensee against release of an unverified 4 kW load and ensuring that the connection, if found permissible and technically feasible, is released only in accordance with the tariff, metering, safety and technical requirements prescribed by the competent authorities.

VI. DECISION

Having considered the pleadings and documents available on record, the order dated 18.06.2026 passed by the Learned Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Goa in Case No. Goa/C.G. No. 04/2026/38, the rival submissions of the parties, the statutory and regulatory provisions relied upon by them, and the submissions made during the hearing dated 17.08.2026, the following conclusions are arrived at.

The Appellant is already having an existing electricity connection bearing Connection No. **60006725380**, Meter No. **22060786-E**, with a sanctioned load of **4.34 kW**, which is a net-metering connection. The Appellant seeks a separate electricity connection having a proposed sanctioned load of **4 kW**, to be used exclusively for charging his Electric Vehicle(s). The proposed connection is sought at the same premises and the proposed meter location is stated to be adjacent to the existing meter.

The first question for determination is whether the applicable framework permits a consumer to seek a separate metered connection for charging his own EV at his residential premises.

On examination of Section 15 of the **Ministry of Power's Guidelines for Installation and Operation of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure-2024 dated 17.09.2024**, this Authority finds that Clause 15(1), dealing with "New Connection", expressly contemplates that an owner may request a **separate metered connection** from the Distribution Licensee for EV charging. Clause 15(2), dealing with "Existing Connection", separately recognises the option of using the existing electricity connection for charging an EV at home.

Thus, the regulatory framework recognises both arrangements. The existence of an existing domestic electricity connection cannot, by itself, be treated as a prohibition against the consumer seeking a separate metered connection for EV charging.

The Respondents' contention that the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Amendment Rules, 2024 stood superseded by the 2024 Guidelines does not materially alter the position, since the subsequent 2024 Guidelines themselves recognise the facility of a separate metered connection for EV charging. The controversy, therefore, cannot be resolved merely by holding that the Appellant has an existing connection and must necessarily use that connection for EV charging.

The second question concerns the applicable tariff.

It is not in dispute that the prevailing JERC Tariff Order dated 30.09.2025 does not prescribe a separately designated tariff category specifically styled as a dedicated EV charging tariff for a consumer charging his own EV at his residential premises. However, Clause 6.0(ii) of the said Tariff Order specifically provides that where a consumer uses electricity supply for charging his own electric vehicle at his premises, the applicable tariff shall be as per the category of the premises.

Consequently, the absence of a separately designated EV charging tariff cannot, by itself, be treated as a legal prohibition against consideration of a separate metered connection. At the same time, this Authority cannot create, modify or prescribe a tariff category. Any electricity supplied through a connection released pursuant to the present proceedings shall necessarily be billed in accordance with the tariff lawfully applicable under the prevailing JERC Tariff Order and any subsequent order or direction of the Commission.

The Respondents' apprehension that separate connections may result in bifurcation of the consumer's load and consequential reduction in tariff slabs may be a matter requiring consideration from the standpoint of tariff design and revenue protection. However, such apprehension, in the absence of an express prohibition under the applicable statutory or regulatory framework, cannot by itself constitute a valid ground for refusing to process a connection which is otherwise permissible. Any issue concerning the tariff consequences of multiple connections is within the regulatory jurisdiction of JERC.

The third and equally important question is whether the Appellant is presently entitled to **immediate energisation** of the proposed 4 kW connection.

On this aspect, the factual position emerging during the hearing dated 17.08.2026 is material. The Appellant stated that he presently possesses only a two-wheeler EV and that no separate EV charger has yet been installed. He further stated that he proposes to purchase an electric four-wheeler in future and would thereafter install an OEM-provided charger. Thus, the proposed 4 kW EV charging load has not, as on the date of hearing, been demonstrated by an installed and verifiable EV charging installation.

The Appellant's intention to acquire an electric vehicle and establish charging infrastructure in future may constitute a genuine prospective requirement. Nevertheless, a prospective requirement cannot, by itself, dispense with the technical and safety requirements applicable to the release and energisation of a new electricity connection. The Distribution Licensee is entitled to verify the proposed connected load, wiring, safety arrangements, meter location and technical feasibility before energisation.

The issue concerning the wiring certificate furnished by the Appellant also requires appropriate technical verification. This Authority does not consider it appropriate, on the material presently available, to record a finding of deliberate falsification merely because the EV charger has not yet been installed. However, a wiring/installation certificate must accurately correspond to the electrical installation actually existing at the premises and cannot be treated as conclusive proof of technical readiness where the proposed charging equipment has not yet been installed.

Accordingly, while the Appellant has established that his request for a separate EV charging connection is **legally entertainable and cannot be rejected merely because an existing domestic connection is available**, he has not established an unconditional right to immediate energisation of the proposed 4 kW load without compliance with the applicable technical and safety requirements.

The fourth issue concerns the manner in which the Respondents dealt with the Appellant's original application.

The Appellant had specifically sought a separate connection and had relied upon the applicable EV charging framework. The communication issued by the Respondents advising him to obtain enhancement of the existing connection did not, on the material placed before this Authority, adequately distinguish between the availability of enhancement as an alternative arrangement and the legal permissibility of a separate EV connection. Nor has the Respondent demonstrated a specific provision which categorically prohibits a separate connection for charging the owner's EV at his residential premises.

Further, if the statutory timeline prescribed under the Electricity (Rights of Consumers) Rules, 2020 was applicable to the Appellant's application, the Distribution Licensee was required either to release the connection upon fulfilment of the prescribed requirements or to communicate a lawful and specific impediment within the prescribed framework. A general direction to avail enhancement of the existing connection cannot, by itself, constitute a reasoned determination of an application specifically made for a separate connection.

The Authority therefore finds that the Appellant's grievance has substance to the limited extent that his request for a separate EV charging connection was not required to be rejected merely on the grounds relied upon by the Respondents, namely the existence of an existing connection, absence of a separately designated EV tariff, or apprehension of tariff bifurcation. However, considering the admitted factual position that the proposed EV charger is not presently installed and the proposed four-wheeler is yet to be acquired, this Authority does not consider it appropriate to direct immediate energisation of the proposed 4 kW connection without technical verification and compliance with the applicable requirements.

The impugned order of the Learned CGRF, insofar as it proceeds on the broad proposition that the Appellant has no entitlement to seek a separate EV connection and that enhancement of the existing connection is necessarily the only permissible arrangement, therefore cannot be sustained in its entirety.

The Appeal accordingly deserves to be **allowed in part**, with a direction for fresh consideration and processing of the Appellant's application for a separate EV charging connection in accordance with the applicable statutory, regulatory, tariff and technical framework.

VII. ORDER

In view of the foregoing findings and analysis, and in exercise of the powers conferred upon the Electricity Ombudsman under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with the applicable provisions of the JERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2024, the Appeal is disposed of with the following directions:

1. The Appeal filed by the Appellant against the order dated **18.06.2026** passed by the Learned Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Goa in Case No. **Goa/C.G. No. 04/2026/38** is **allowed in part**.
2. The finding of the Learned CGRF that the Appellant is required, as a matter of course, to avail EV charging only through his existing domestic connection by enhancement of sanctioned load, and that a separate EV charging connection is impermissible, is **set aside** to that extent.
3. The Respondent–Electricity Department, Goa shall **reconsider and process afresh** the Appellant's application for a separate metered electricity connection for charging his own Electric Vehicle at the subject residential premises, having regard to Clause 15(1) of the Ministry of Power's Guidelines for Installation and Operation of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure-2024 dated 17.09.2024 and all other applicable statutory and regulatory provisions.
4. While processing the application, the Respondent shall verify the **technical feasibility, wiring and safety compliance, proposed sanctioned/connected load, meter location, service connection requirements and other applicable technical conditions** prescribed for release of a new electricity connection.
5. The Appellant shall furnish such documents, valid wiring/installation certificate and other technical particulars as may lawfully be required by the Respondent for processing the proposed connection. The wiring/installation certificate furnished by the Appellant shall

correspond to the electrical installation actually existing at the premises and shall comply with the applicable technical and safety requirements.

6. The Respondent shall not reject the Appellant's application merely on the grounds that:
   (i) the Appellant already has an existing domestic electricity connection at the premises;
   (ii) a separately designated EV charging tariff has not been prescribed under the prevailing JERC Tariff Order; or
   (iii) a separate connection may have consequential tariff implications or may result in bifurcation of consumption.

   Any such issue shall be dealt with strictly in accordance with the applicable tariff and regulatory framework of JERC.
7. As a condition precedent to release of the proposed separate electricity connection, the Appellant/consumer shall furnish an **affidavit-cum-undertaking** to the Respondent that the said connection shall be used **exclusively for charging of his Electric Vehicle(s)** and shall not be utilised for any residential, domestic or other electrical load whatsoever.
8. The Appellant/consumer shall, at his own cost and in accordance with the applicable technical and safety standards, provide and maintain a **separate electrical arrangement** for the proposed EV charging connection, including a separate **main switch/isolator, dedicated distribution board (DB) and independent earthing arrangement**, and the EV charging load shall remain electrically segregated from the electrical installation connected to the existing residential connection.
9. The Respondent shall be entitled to inspect and verify the electrical installation connected with the proposed EV connection, in accordance with the applicable rules and procedures, to ensure that the connection is being utilised exclusively for the purpose for which it has been sanctioned.
10. In the event it is established, upon inspection or otherwise in accordance with due process, that any **residential/domestic or other non-EV load has been intermixed with, connected to or supplied through the separate EV charging connection**, the Respondent shall be entitled to take appropriate action in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions. In such event, the two connections may be **amalgamated into a single connection**, subject to the applicable procedure, and the tariff category and billing arrangement shall thereafter be determined in accordance with the **prevailing JERC Tariff Order and other applicable regulations**.
11. The Appellant/consumer shall remain responsible for maintaining the electrical segregation between the existing residential connection and the proposed EV charging connection throughout the period during which both connections remain in operation. Any subsequent

alteration, extension or modification of the electrical installation shall also be carried out only in accordance with the applicable technical and safety requirements.

12. The Respondent shall determine and communicate to the Appellant the tariff applicable to the proposed connection strictly in accordance with the prevailing JERC Tariff Order and subsequent tariff/regulatory directions, if any, issued by the Commission. Nothing contained in this order shall be construed as creation or prescription of a new tariff category by the Electricity Ombudsman.
13. The Respondent shall complete the aforesaid scrutiny and communicate a **reasoned decision** to the Appellant within **15 days** from the date on which the Appellant furnishes the requisite documents and satisfies the applicable preliminary requirements for processing the application.
14. In the event the application is found technically feasible and the Appellant has complied with all applicable statutory, safety, wiring and other prescribed requirements and paid the lawful charges, the Respondent shall proceed with release and energisation of the separate connection in accordance with the applicable rules, regulations and prescribed timelines.
15. In the event the Respondent finds any specific technical, statutory or regulatory impediment to release of the connection, the same shall be communicated to the Appellant by a **speaking and reasoned order**, clearly identifying the provision or technical requirement on the basis of which the connection cannot be released, instead of merely advising the Appellant to enhance the load of his existing connection.
16. It is clarified that this order does not prevent the Appellant from availing the alternative arrangement of enhancement of sanctioned load on his existing connection, if he so chooses. Likewise, the present order does not compel the Respondent to energise a proposed 4 kW load unless the applicable technical and safety requirements have been duly satisfied.
17. The Respondent shall submit a **compliance report** before the Registry of the Electricity Ombudsman within **30 days** from the date of this order, indicating the action taken pursuant to the above directions.
18. The Appeal is accordingly **disposed of in the above terms**.
19. There shall be **no order as to costs**.

Chandersllot 24/8/26

(C M Sharma)

Dated: 24.08.2026

Ombudsman (JERC)