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-300 of 2026

Date of Hearing: 22.10.2026,
Mode: Videoconferencing
Date of Order: 02.11.2026

In the matter of
Sh. Amit Julka
Near Bhag Dairy, Kaimbwala Road,
Village Kaimbwala,
Chandigarh ...Appellant

Versus

Chandigarh Power Distribution Limited,
Through the Executive Engineer (Nodal Officer),
Electricity 'OP" Division No. 1, Chandigarh. ...Respondent(s)

In the matter of Sh. Amit Julka Versus Executive Engineer, 'OP' Div-1, CPDL, Chandigarh

Present:

Appellant

1. Sh. Amit Julka — Appellant in person

Respondent(s)

1. Mr. Sukhwinder Singh, Commercial manger-1, CPDL
2. Mr. Dhruv Shakuntlam, Sr. Executive Legal, CPDL, Chandigarh

ORDER

The present appeal has been filed by Shri Amit Julka on 21.09.2026 under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003, read with Regulations 35 and 36 of the JERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2024, challenging the order dated 13.08.2026 passed by the LD. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF), Chandigarh, in Complaint No. H-86/2026.

The grievance relates to the assessment and billing of electricity consumption at the premises of the Appellant, where the connection stands registered in the name of Shri Tilak Raj under old connection No. 102KB52/000318W and Consumer Account No. 3000179490. The connection is a domestic connection with a sanctioned load of 10 kW. The meter particulars relevant to the dispute are Meter No. SS22035552 and the earlier burnt meter No. CHEP71593.

The earlier meter reportedly became burnt, and the Appellant submitted an application/intimation in this regard on 20.06.2025. The burnt meter was replaced on 14.10.2025. The final reading of the removed meter was not available in the record placed before this Authority. Consequently, the billing for the period covering the burnt meter and the subsequent replacement-meter period requires to be considered separately, with due regard to the applicable regulatory provisions and the readings available for each period.

The Respondent raised a bill amounting to Rs. 1,18,634/- in May 2026 for consumption of 20,553 units. The order of the Ld. CGRF, however, contains a reference to 15,837 units, which is an inadvertent error and does not reflect the actual consumption reconciliation underlying the bill.

The Appellant has also raised concerns regarding the adjustment of payments made by him and the manner in which the amounts paid have been reflected in his consumer account. The present adjudication is, therefore, directed towards ensuring period-wise billing clarity, proper assessment for the burnt-meter period, and due credit of payments already made.

A. Proceedings

Notice of the appeal was issued to the Respondent on 21.09.2026. The Respondent submitted its reply through its Senior Executive (Legal), CPDL, by email dated 15.10.2026, which was taken on record.

During the proceedings, the Appellant reiterated his grievance regarding the correction of the bill, the accounting of payments and the need for a transparent statement showing the consumption assessed, amounts billed and payments credited to the consumer account.

The Appellant had also represented to the Respondent through his letter dated 31.08.2026, raising concerns regarding the correction in the electricity bill. No compliance report demonstrating compliance with the directions contained in the order of the Ld. CGRF has been placed on record by the Respondent.

The submissions of the parties and the material available on record have been considered for adjudication of the present appeal.

B. Condonation of delay

The Respondent has raised an objection concerning the delay in filing the appeal. In considering this objection, it is relevant that the Appellant had represented to the Respondent by letter dated 31.08.2026 regarding his concerns over the correction in the bill. Further, no compliance report demonstrating implementation of the directions of the Ld. CGRF has been placed on record.

Having considered the circumstances of the case, including the Appellant's aforesaid representation and the absence of the compliance report, the delay in filing the appeal is condoned. The appeal is accordingly taken up for consideration on merits.

C. Submissions of the Appellant

1. The Appellant has submitted that the impugned billing position has not been correctly reconciled despite substantial payments made by him towards the electricity charges of the connection. According to the Appellant, the bill raised for the period from 12.04.2026 to 07.05.2026, amounting to Rs. 1,18,634/-, was based on an assessment of 20,533 units after adjustment of units previously billed provisionally. However, the underlying consumption assessment and the adjustment of the amounts already deposited have not been satisfactorily explained.

2. The Appellant has contended that the Respondent failed to record actual meter readings for a prolonged period following the replacement of the burnt meter. He has submitted that the absence of regular readings and the subsequent raising of a substantial demand cannot, by themselves, establish the correctness of the assessment. According to him, the Respondent was required to reconcile the consumption with the available meter-reading records and apply the prescribed billing methodology under the applicable Supply Code Regulations.

3. The Appellant has further submitted that he made several payments towards the electricity bills, including the following:

Date of payment	Amount
05.08.2025	Rs. 26,608/-
28.09.2025	Rs. 17,045/-
21.01.2026	Rs. 17,720/-
07.04.2026	Rs. 4,403/-
13.05.2026	Rs. 9,538/-
24.06.2026	Rs. 60,000/-
Total	Rs. 1,35,314/-

4. The Appellant has also referred to a payment of Rs. 618/- (Rs 600/- + Rs 18/- LPSC) against Bill No. 6153, which is to be verified from the Respondent's payment records.

5. The Appellant has specifically objected to the adjustment of only Rs. 27,265/- towards previously deposited amounts in the bill dated 07.06.2026. He has contended that the five payments made between August 2025 and May 2026, aggregating Rs. 75,314/-, have not been satisfactorily reconciled with the said adjustment, leaving a difference of Rs. 48,049/- unexplained. He has also sought confirmation that the subsequent payment of Rs. 60,000/- made on 24.06.2026 has been duly accounted for.

6. The Appellant has further relied upon the findings recorded by the Learned CGRF regarding consumption of approximately 15,837 units over a period of about nine months, averaging approximately 1,760 units per month. He has submitted that the Respondent's demand should be recalculated in accordance with the findings and directions contained in the order of the Learned CGRF, rather than being maintained without a transparent reconciliation of the consumption and payments.

7. The Appellant has, accordingly, requested that the Respondent be directed to verify the complete payment ledger, give credit for all amounts actually received, prepare an itemised statement of account, issue a fresh or revised bill after applying the appropriate consumption assessment and adjustments, and keep recovery of the disputed or unreconciled demand in abeyance until the exercise is completed.

D. **Submissions by the Respondent**

1. The Respondent has opposed the appeal and submitted that the order dated 13.08.2026 passed by the Learned CGRF is based on the material placed on record, including the billing particulars, historical consumption data, meter replacement records and meter-testing report. According to the Respondent, the Appellant has not established any manifest error, illegality or procedural irregularity warranting interference by this Authority.

2. As a preliminary objection, the Respondent has raised the issue of limitation, contending that Regulation 36(f) of the JERC CGRF and Ombudsman Regulations, 2024, prescribes a period of thirty days for filing a representation against the decision of the Learned CGRF, subject to the provisions concerning condonation of delay. Since the impugned order is dated 13.08.2026 and the present representation was filed on 21.09.2026, the Respondent has submitted that the Appellant should establish the date of receipt of the order and, if the representation is found to be delayed, demonstrate sufficient cause for condonation.

3. On the merits, the Respondent has submitted that the connection bearing Account No. 102KB52/00318W and Consumer Account No. 3000179490 is a domestic connection with a sanctioned load of 10 kW. The earlier meter became burnt and was replaced vide Meter Change Order No. 28/744 dated 14.10.2025. The removed meter was subsequently forwarded for examination and testing in accordance with the prescribed procedure.

4. The Respondent has stated that, during the period when actual meter readings were unavailable or had not been incorporated into the billing system, provisional or average bills were raised. Subsequently, upon availability of the recorded consumption particulars, the billing records were reconciled by adjusting the units already billed provisionally. The Respondent has contended that such reconciliation is an essential part of the billing process and that a higher bill arising from the subsequent adjustment of actual consumption does not, by itself, establish an arbitrary or unlawful demand.

5. The Respondent has relied upon the bill dated 07.06.2026, which reflects consumption of 20,533 units after adjustment of 4,696 units previously billed provisionally against the recorded consumption of 25,249 units. It has submitted that the exact figure of consumption and the adjustments incorporated in the bill should be read with the original meter-consumption data and the relevant billing records.

6. The Respondent has further submitted that the meter installed at the premises was tested on 05.08.2026 through YMPL Mobile Laboratory, an NABL-accredited laboratory, in the presence of the consumer or his representative. The testing report records a running-load error of 1.31%, a maximum-load error of 1.91% and no abnormality. The meter was, accordingly, reported to be functioning within permissible accuracy limits. On this basis, the Respondent has contended that the Appellant has not established that the disputed consumption was attributable to a defective or inaccurate meter.

7. The Respondent has also relied upon the historical consumption particulars and MRI data placed before the Learned CGRF. It has submitted that historical consumption provides

relevant context for examining the disputed bill and that the assessment should be considered along with the recorded meter data, the provisional billing and the subsequent adjustments, rather than by considering the disputed bill in isolation.

8. The Respondent has, therefore, prayed that the appeal be dismissed and the order of the Learned CGRF be upheld. It has also opposed the Appellant's request for replacement of the existing meter on the ground that the available meter-testing report does not establish any defect or abnormality warranting such replacement.

E. Submissions by the Appellant in Rejoinder

1. In his rejoinder, the Appellant has disputed the Respondent's justification of the billing and payment adjustments, contending that the Respondent has not produced a complete and verifiable reconciliation of the amounts received from him and the amounts adjusted in the disputed bill.

2. The Appellant has reiterated that he deposited Rs. 75,314/- through five payments made between 05.08.2025 and 13.05.2026. However, the bill dated 07.06.2026 reflected an adjustment of only Rs. 27,265/-. He has, therefore, sought an explanation for the difference of Rs. 48,049/- and has submitted that the Respondent must disclose the manner in which the said amount has been accounted for.

3. The Appellant has further submitted that he deposited an additional amount of Rs. 60,000/- on 24.06.2026 to avoid disconnection and that this payment must also be duly accounted for while determining the final liability. He has accordingly referred to aggregate payments of Rs. 1,35,314/- and sought credit for the said amount, subject to verification and reconciliation with the Respondent's records.

4. The Appellant has relied upon the Respondent's own reply, particularly its reference to the findings of the Learned CGRF concerning consumption of approximately 15,837 units over about nine months, averaging approximately 1,760 units per month. According to the Appellant, the Respondent cannot continue to maintain the disputed demand without explaining how the assessment is consistent with the findings recorded by the Learned CGRF.

5. The Appellant has further contended that the absence of regular billing and the delay in incorporating meter-related data into the billing system were not attributable to him. He has submitted that the Respondent must prepare a fresh and transparent calculation in accordance with the applicable tariff and the consumption assessment properly established from the record, and thereafter reconcile all payments, provisional billing adjustments and credits.

6. The Appellant has, accordingly, prayed that the Respondent's justification of the disputed demand be rejected to the extent that it is inconsistent with the findings of the Learned CGRF;

    1. that a complete, itemised statement of account be furnished;
    2. that the payments already made be duly credited;
    3. that a revised bill be issued after reconciliation; and
    4. that coercive recovery or disconnection on the basis of the disputed demand be kept in abeyance until the exercise is completed.

F. Issues for determination

The following issues arise for determination:

i. Whether the consumption and billing for the period from 12.12.2024 to 12.06.2025, during which the recorded readings are available, require any further assessment.
ii. How the consumption for the period from 12.06.2025 to 14.10.2025, during which the earlier meter was burnt and its final reading was unavailable, is to be assessed.
iii. Whether the consumption reconciliation for the replacement-meter period from 14.10.2025 to 07.05.2026 is correct and requires any further recalculation.
iv. Whether all payments made by the Appellant have been duly credited and adjusted in the consumer account.

G. Findings and analysis

Period from 12.12.2024 to 12.06.2025

The available meter readings for this period are as follows:

- Reading as on 12.12.2024: 52,873 units.
- Reading as on 12.06.2025: 62,272 units.
- Recorded consumption: 9,399 units.

The consumption for this period is ascertainable from the recorded readings and works out to 9,399 units. Accordingly, the consumption for this period shall be taken as 9,399 units, subject to the applicable tariff and billing provisions.

The Respondent shall verify the bills raised and payments received for this period and ensure that all payments made by the Appellant and attributable to this period are duly credited to the consumer account. No payment already received shall be omitted or counted more than once.

H. Period from 12.06.2025 to 14.10.2025: Burnt-meter period

The earlier meter (CHEP71593) was reported burnt, and the Appellant's application/intimation in this regard is dated 20.06.2025. The meter was replaced on 14.10.2025. The final reading of the removed meter is not available in the record before this Authority.

In the absence of a reliable final reading, the consumption for this period cannot be established merely by assuming a closing reading or by treating the absence of a reading as proof of any particular level of consumption. The consumption and charges for this period must be determined in accordance with Regulation 7.12 of the JERC Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2018, applying the assessment methodology applicable to the facts of the case and the records available with the Respondent.

The Respondent shall accordingly undertake the assessment for the period from 12.06.2025 to 14.10.2025 under the aforesaid provision. The assessment shall clearly disclose the methodology adopted, the relevant data relied upon, the period assessed, the units determined and the charges calculated. All payments already made by the Appellant and attributable to this period shall be duly credited to the consumer account.

I. Period from 14.10.2025 to 07.05.2026: Replacement-meter period

The replacement meter was installed on 14.10.2025, with an initial reading of 1 unit. The reading recorded on 07.05.2026 was 25,250 units. Accordingly, the consumption recorded during this period is:

25,250 − 1 = **25,249 units**.

During this period, 4,696 units had already been provisionally billed, comprising 3,131 units for the period from 12.10.2025 to 12.12.2025, nil units for the period from 12.12.2025 to 12.03.2026, and 1,565 units for the period from 12.03.2026 to 12.04.2026.

After deducting the 4,696 units already provisionally billed from the total recorded consumption of 25,249 units, the net consumption works out to:

25,249 – 4,696 = **20,553 units**.

The consumption reconciliation for this period has been verified and found to be correct. The bill for Rs. 1,18,634/- raised in May 2026 was in fact raised for 20,553 units.

The reference to 15,837 units in the order dated 13.08.2026 of the Ld. CGRF, Chandigarh, is an inadvertent error. It does not represent the verified consumption reconciliation and shall not be relied upon as the basis for any fresh assessment or recalculation. To the extent that the figure of 20,533 units appears in the relevant billing particulars, it is also inconsistent with the verified reconciliation and the correct figure shall be recorded as 20,553 units.

Accordingly, no fresh consumption assessment or recalculation is warranted for this period merely on account of the aforesaid recording errors. The Respondent shall, however, ensure that all payments made by the Appellant and attributable to this period are duly credited to the consumer account.

J. Verification and credit of payments

The Appellant has stated that the total amount paid by him is Rs. 1,35,314/-. This amount includes the payment of Rs. 618/- made in January 2026, comprising Rs. 600/- towards arrears relating to the bill for November 2025 and Rs. 18/- towards late payment surcharge (LPSC), paid along with the current demand.

The amount of Rs. 618/- is thus included in the aggregate amount of Rs. 1,35,314/- and shall not be added again as a separate payment. The Respondent shall verify the payment receipts and the corresponding entries in its billing ledger and ensure that the aggregate payments actually received are duly reflected in the consumer account.

The verification shall be undertaken with reference to the relevant billing periods and shall identify the amount billed, amount paid, payment date, credit/adjustment made and balance, if any, for each period. Any payment already credited to the account shall not be credited a second time, and any payment received but not duly accounted for shall be appropriately adjusted.

The exercise shall result in a clear and intelligible consumer ledger showing the final position after the assessment for the burnt-meter period and the adjustment of all payments.

K. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing analysis, the consumption of 9,399 units for the period from 12.12.2024 to 12.06.2025 is ascertainable from the available readings. The consumption for the burnt-meter period from 12.06.2025 to 14.10.2025 is required to be assessed in accordance with Regulation 7.12 of the JERC Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2018, on the basis of the applicable methodology and available records. For the replacement-meter period from 14.10.2025 to 07.05.2026, the verified net consumption is 20,553 units, and the bill for Rs. 1,18,634/- raised in May 2026 pertains to period 12.04.2026 to 07.05.2026 (0.82 months) requires reassessment from 14.10.2025 to 07.05.2026 by applying the applicable tariff for that period.

The reference to 15,837 units in the order of the Ld. CGRF is an inadvertent error and must be corrected in the record. The consumption reconciliation for the replacement-meter period does not require reopening however, the applicable tariff shall be applied occordingly. The Respondent is, however, required to ensure proper accounting and period-wise adjustment of all payments made by the Appellant.

The appeal is, therefore, **partly allowed**, and the order dated 13.08.2026 passed by the Ld. CGRF, Chandigarh, is modified to the extent indicated in this order.

L. ORDER

In view of the findings recorded above, the following directions are issued:

Condonation of delay: The delay in filing the present appeal is condoned for the reasons recorded in paragraph 3 above.

Period-wise assessment and billing: The Respondent shall verify and reconcile the consumer account by adopting the following period-wise treatment:

(a) Period from 12.12.2024 to 12.06.2025

- Opening reading: 52,873 units.
- Closing reading: 62,272 units.
- Consumption: 9,399 units.

The Respondent shall retain the consumption of 9,399 units for this period and credit all payments received from the Appellant and attributable to this period to the consumer account.

(b) Period from 12.06.2025 to 14.10.2025

The Respondent shall assess the consumption and charges for the period from **12.06.2025 to 14.10.2025**, taking into account that, as intimated by the Appellant, the meter was burnt on **20.06.2025**. Accordingly, the assessment shall cover both the period from **12.06.2025 to 20.06.2025**, for which the meter reading up to the date of burning is required to be determined, and the period from **20.06.2025 to 14.10.2025**, during which the meter remained burnt and the final reading of the removed meter was unavailable. The consumption and charges for the aforesaid periods shall be assessed in accordance with Regulation 7.12 of the JERC Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2018, and the applicable assessment methodology. The Respondent shall clearly specify the basis of assessment, the consumption assessed and the calculation of charges for each period separately in the revised statement of account. All payments already made by the Appellant and attributable to these periods shall be duly credited to the consumer account.

(c) Period from 14.10.2025 to 07.05.2026

- Initial reading: 1 unit.
- Closing reading: 25,250 units.
- Total recorded consumption: 25,249 units.
- Less units already provisionally billed: 4,696 units.
- Net consumption: 20,553 units.

The verified net consumption of 20,553 units shall be retained. The bill for Rs. 1,18,634/- raised in May 2026 is noted to have been raised for these 20,553 units however, the bill raised in May 2026 pertains to period 12.04.2026 to 07.05.2026 (0.82 months) requires reassessment for the period 14.10.2025 to 07.05.2026 by applying the applicable tariff for that period. All payments received from the Appellant and attributable to this period shall be duly credited to the consumer

account. No fresh consumption reconciliation for this period shall be undertaken merely on account of the erroneous reference to 15,837 units in the CGRF order.

Correction of CGRF order: The reference to 15,837 units in the order dated 13.08.2026 passed by the Ld. CGRF, Chandigarh, is declared to be an inadvertent error and shall not be used as the basis of any assessment or recalculation. The correct net consumption for the replacement-meter period, as verified above, is 20,553 units. The Respondent shall ensure that the corresponding billing particulars and consumer ledger reflect the correct figure wherever necessary.

Credit of payments: The Respondent shall verify and account for the total payments of Rs. 1,35,314/- stated to have been made by the Appellant, including the payment of Rs. 618/- made in January 2026 towards arrears of Rs. 600/- and LPSC of Rs. 18/-. The said Rs. 618/- is already included in the aggregate amount of Rs. 1,35,314/- and shall not be counted separately. The credit of payments shall be based on the payment records and shall avoid both omission and duplication.

Revised statement of account: Upon completion of the above exercise, the Respondent shall furnish the Appellant with a revised, itemised statement of account clearly showing, for each of the three periods:

(i) the relevant readings and consumption, wherever ascertainable;

(ii) the assessment methodology and calculation of charges for the burnt-meter period;

(iii) the units already provisionally billed and the adjustments made;

(iv) the bills raised and amounts payable;

(v) all payments received, with payment dates and corresponding credits; and

(vi) the final balance payable by the Appellant, if any, or credit due to the Appellant.

The statement shall clearly distinguish the correction of the erroneous reference in the CGRF order from the substantive assessment for the burnt-meter period.

The Respondent shall complete the above exercise and submit a compliance report to this Authority within **30 days from the date of receipt of this order** by email, enclosing a copy of the revised statement of account furnished to the Appellant.

The order dated 13.08.2026 passed by the Ld. CGRF, Chandigarh, stands modified to the limited extent set out in this order. The verified consumption reconciliation for the replacement-meter period shall not be reopened, while the burnt-meter period shall be assessed in accordance with the applicable regulatory provisions and the payments shall be duly reconciled.

The appeal is **partly allowed** in the above terms. There shall be no order as to costs.

Pronounced on this 2nd day of November, 2026

Ordered accordingly.

2/XI/26

(C. M. Sharma)
Electricity Ombudsman
For the State of Goa and Union Territories.