



BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

First Floor 33/11 kV Substation, Beside Hyderabad Boat Club
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

**PRESENT : MARINGANTI SRINIVASA CHARY
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

THURSDAY THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

Appeal No. 23 of 2026-27

Between

Mr. Abdul Aleem Habeeb Salmani, s/o. Late Abdul Sattar Salman, H.No.1-9-395/1,
Gandhi Nagar, Opp: Walamtari, Rajendra Nagar, Hyderabad - 500 030. Cell:
9391731113, 9573877952.

..... Appellant

AND

1. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Rajendra Nagar/TGSPDCL/Rajendranagar Circle.
2. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Rajendra Nagar/TGSPDCL /Rajendranagar Circle.
3. The Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Gaganpahad/TGSPDCL/Rajendra Nagar Circle.
4. The Divisional Engineer/Operation /Rajendra Nagar Circle/TGSPDCL/Rajendra Nagar Circle.
5. The Superintending Engineer/Operation /Rajendra Nagar/TGSPDCL/Rajendra Nagar Circle.

..... Respondents

This appeal is coming on before me for final hearing on 15.09.2026 in the presence of the appellant and Sri M. Durga Prasad - AE/OP/Rajendra Nagar, Sri G. Satyanarayana - ADE/OP/Rajendra Nagar and Smt. G. Nagamani - AAO/ERO/Gagan Pahad for the respondents and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following Award:

ORDER

This Representation/Appeal is preferred by the complainant feeling aggrieved by the Award passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum - II

(Greater Hyderabad Area), (in short 'the Forum') of Telangana State Southern Power Distribution Company Limited (in short 'TGSPDCL') in C.G.No. No.292/2025-26/Rajendra Nagar Circle dt.30.05.2026, rejecting his grievance.

CASE OF THE APPELLANT BEFORE THE FORUM

2. He is a consumer of the Respondents with meter No.HP240418858651, Service Connection No.5203 03874, USC No.114077262 under Domestic Category, 3 phase. He received the abnormal electricity bill of Rs.1,90,426/- for the month of November 2025, despite there being no such increase in electricity consumption and that he has not consumed such large number of units during the said period. He has used only one deep freezer, 2 LED lights of 15 watts each and one fan. His average monthly electricity bill from August 2025, has been ranged between Rs.90 to Rs.5018/- and for the month of December 2025, he received the bill for Rs.6,876/-. His electricity meter was sent to the Gagan Pahad electricity office for testing and certificate of testing dt.16.12.2025 has been received. As per it, for the last 6 months, the readings as on 21.06.2025 was 1718, on 30.07.2025 - 18696, on 02.08.2025 -19961, on 03.09.2025 - 21118, on 04.10.2025 - 22203, on 20.11.2025 - 23265. Again the meter was sent for re-testing and after testing a certificate dt.27.02.2026 has been issued for the last 6 months there from and readings is 19961 on 02.08.2025, 21118 on 03.09.2025, 22203 on 04.10.2025 and 23265 on 20.11.2025, 24151 on 10.12.2025 and 24945 on 01.01.2026. Thus his total consumption for the last 8 months (prior to the date of complaint) according to the first and second certificate data, is 7763 units and the electricity bill should be revised accordingly as per his average consumption.

He has three electricity connections with service Nos. 5203 03874, 5203 03429 and 5203 03427 and all of them have been fixed on the same wall outside the premises, which is always accessible being on the side of the road. For two meters service Nos. 5203 03429 and 5203 03427, the meter Reader has been taking the reading in IR status and for one meter vide Service Connection No.5203 03874, he has been taking reading in 01, 03, 04 and 05 status for last twelve months. Although three meters are fixed on the same wall, for the month of February 2025 he has given "05" status (door lock) for the Service Connection No.5203 03874 but for the other two service meters Nos. 5203 03429 and 5203 03427 the meter Reader has given 'IR' status. His actual consumption of units for 8 months as per the data shown in Gaganpahad electricity office in two test certificates is very much low but due to the intentional false and in correct recording under 01,03,04 and 05 status given by meter Reader, he has received the abnormal electricity bill for Rs.1,90,426/-. After changing the meter in December 2024, if the meter Reader has taken the actual readings under IR status, the correct starting reading would have been recorded; but for the reasons best known to him, the meter Reader has given the reading under false status. When he has taken the reading under IR status for said two meters in February 2025, how could he give the reading under '05' (Door lock status) for this meter with abnormal electricity bill, when all the three meters are fixed on the same wall. Against the abnormal electricity bill, he has given complaint dt.07.01.2026 to AE/TGSPDCL/Rajendra Nagar, Gandhi Nagar section, Budvel, Hyderabad, but only a meagre amount of Rs.11,686/- has been reduced. He has filed as many as 8 enclosures along with his complaint. Thus, his grievance to issue correct bill as per his actual average consumption and adjust his previous payments.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS BEFORE THE FORUM

3. Respondent No.2, submitted that on verification of billing history of Service Connection No.5203 03874, it was found that billing was not done properly every month by the meter reader/OM staff, but the consumption billed during December 2025 was actual recorded consumption only. The service energy meter was tested in MRT lab, Rajendra Nagar Circle twice on 16.12.2025 and 27.02.2026 respectively, as per the **consumer changed the performance of the meter** and found an error within the permissible limit with percentage of error 0.34 and 0.02 respectively. Accordingly, meter performance certificate has been issued by the concerned stating that “the meter functioning is normal”. On the request of consumer CC bill for December 2024 to 2025 has been revised and a sum of Rs.11,686/- was credited to the consumer. It is also his further submission that a joint inspection was conducted on 29.03.2026 at the premises in respect of Service Connection No.5203 03874 and it was conclusively established that it has been sanctioned under Domestic Category (LT-I) which is being used for commercial/ware house activity and the connected load was physically verified at the site and it was 53.00 kW and a table has been given showing the total connected load of 52.83 kW.

4. The premises is having another two Nos. 1-phase Category-II Service Connection Nos. 5203 03427 and 5203 03429 in the name of Abdul Aleem Habeem Salmani (Appellant) with a contracted load of 1 kW each which are being used for Commercial outlets. Furthermore, as per EBS billing record the maximum demand recorded against SC Nos.5203 03874 is 14 kW, 5203 03429 is 11 kW and 5203 03427 is 6 kW respectively and that no residential activity was noticed at the premises

during the inspection.

5. Respondent No.2 has further submitted that a joint inspection was conducted on 29.03.2026 in the presence of the Appellant and noted the load found against Service Connection No.5203 03874 and the total load is 52.536 and a table is shown recording the load description, load of each item, quantity and total load. The service connection Nos. 5203 03427 and 5203 03429 of 1kW each that were being used for commercial outlets (juice centre) are kept idle at the time of inspection and no load on the said two Service Connections are found. As per EBS billing record, the maximum demand recorded against Service No.5203 03874 is 14.04 kW for the month of June 2024, Service Connection No.5203 03427 is 5.84 for the month of July 2024 and whereas Service Connection No.5203 03429 is 10.48 kW for the month of May 2025.

6. Respondent No.3 has submitted that on verification of history vide proposal for billing revision submitted by R2, the service was released on 22.02.2023. Upto November 2024, bills were issued under IR mode. Only in December 2024, meter was burnt and in January 2025 meter was replaced as per the AEs request the bill was revised from December 2024 to December 2025 by taking average consumption of 1810 units per month (new meter total 23525 units/13 months) and JE credited Rs.11,686/- vide JE No. 23053 dt.31.01.2026. According to him, the meter functioning is normal, readings are correct, bill revised for December 2024 to December 2025 during the period non IR bills were issued under different status. From January 2026 till to date bills again were issued in IR mode, hence further bill revision is not possible.

7. The Appellant has filed rejoinder on 15.09.2026. The sum and substance of it is to the effect that at the time of joint inspection i.e., on 29.03.2026, his juice centre was not functioning and it was closed on account of repairs and renovation to be attended and its tarpaulin roof was removed. So he brought and kept 11 deep freezers in his house for safety purpose which were not connected to the power line and all the deep freezers lids were open and there was nothing inside. The officials of electricity department started blaming that he has been using his residence for commercial purpose, which fact reported to CGRF on 01.04.2026. Later, they booked irregularity case for Rs.9,032/- on his residential meter with U.SC.No.112219489 and he was compelled to pay the same. Further they have changed the Category from residential to commercial and ever since sending the electricity bills under commercial Category. He received the order of CGRF dt.30.05.2026 and came to know that the electricity officials misrepresented the facts regarding his connections and the connected load. Similarly they are misrepresenting before this Authority. They failed to answer why manual reading was taken continuously for 11 months for the subject meter, whereas IR reading taken for the other two meters fixed on the same wall which indicates that some mischief has been committed. Similarly they failed to answer why status '05"(Door locked) was given to the subject meter in February 2025 although IR reading was given to the other two meters. After replacement of the subject meter, the department has not issued him the meter change slip which is also a mischief. While issuing the manual bills, the meter Reader has to capture the image of reading, but the department has not produced the pictures under the SASA application, instead mislead this Authority that the bill was as per actual consumption. No explanation is offered why irregularity case for Rs.9,032/- on U.SC.No.112219489

and changed its Category into commercial, when they are alleging that all the deep freezers were connected to the subject meter No.520303874, but they have not changed its Category from residential to commercial. Indeed he has paid Rs.1,70,011/- from December 2024 to November 2025 for the meter U.SC.No.112219489 for the consumption of electricity for the deep freezers, fans and lights connected to it. He has paid Rs.43,279/- for the subject meter from December 2024 to November 2025 in respect of Service No.520303874, the officials have issued the bill for Rs.1,69,410/- after revising the bill without taking into consideration of the amount he paid already to the tune of Rs.43,279/- for the months December 2024 to November 2025 and requested to adjust the said amount.

AWARD OF THE FORUM

8. After considering the material on record and hearing both sides, the learned Forum has passed the following Award:-

"In the result, the grievance complaint filed on 07.03.2026 by the Complainant/Consumer is hereby rejected with the above observations.

The Complaint is "Disposed Off" accordingly. The Complainant if aggrieved by the above order may approach the "VIDYUTH OMBUDSMAN" situated at First Floor, 33/11 KV Sub Station, Hyderabad Boats Club Lane, Lumbini Park, Hyderabad-500063, within 45 days from the date of receipt of this order as per clause 3.19(a) of Regulation No. 3 of 2015 of TGERC."

ARGUMENTS

9. a) During the hearing on virtual mode, the Appellant reiterated his submissions with reference to grounds of Appeal, rejoinder and the substance of the complaint he laid with CGRF to resolve his grievance. In a nutshell, the sum and substance of his grievance is to the effect that the electricity department officials misrepresented the facts before the learned Forum, as a result thereof his grievance

has been rejected and the learned Forum ought not to have acted upon the representation of the Respondents. Indeed, the meter Reader committed mistake in not correctly recording the consumption. His endeavour is that no explanation was offered why manual reading was taken continuously for eleven months in respect of the subject meter even though IR reading was taken for the rest of the two meters, when three meters are readily available that are fixed to a wall. No explanation offered why status "05" Door locked was given to the subject meter for February 2025. It has been vehemently argued by him that eleven deep freezers of juice centre that were shifted to his house on account of renovation to be attended to his juice centre, although they were not connected to power supply, the officials of the department having blamed him booked an irregularity case and made him scapegoat to pay Rs.9,032/-. His further submission is that although he paid Rs.43,279/- same has not been given credit to his account and they did not deduct the same from the consumption charges.

b) In addition to the above, the following are the grounds of Appeal:-

The learned Forum failed to consider that the consumption jump is technically impossible under normal domestic load conditions; the meter appears to be defective erratic or suffered a voltage surge jumping the reading; Failed to consider all the previous bills, meter reading the average units the appellant consumed; Failed to ask the concerned officers to bring the official data for the subject meter No.HP240418858651 and it was recorded auto-reading mode for January 2025, March 2025 to August 2025 upto 06.08.2025, it was 3834; there was no record of meter after 06.08.2025 and as on 08.11.2025, the reading was 4425 and mode of reading is not mentioned, suddenly on 08.12.2025, the reading was jumped from

4425 to 23535; failed to ask for meter change slip after replacement; failed to consider the discrepancy after replacement of the meter. While concluding he urged to set aside the impugned Award and resolve his grievance by allowing the Appeal.

10. *Per contra* the Respondents resisted the submissions of the Appellant and thereby supported the impugned Award. Their endeavour is that they did not commit any mischief as alleged by the Appellant and their action in all respects is lawful. According to them the learned Forum has dealt with the matter in accordance with law and the Award is lawfully tenable and no grounds are there to disturb the Award. While concluding they urged to dismiss the Representation/Appeal.

POINTS

11. On the strength of the rival submissions on either side and material on record, the following points that arise for consideration:-

- i) Whether the Appellant is entitled to revision of the bill of Rs.1,90,426/- in November 2025 against SC.No.5203 03874 of Category-I, as prayed for?
- ii) Whether the impugned Award of the learned Forum is factually tenable and legally sustainable? OR liable to be set aside?
- iii) To what relief?

12. In-as-much as Clause 3.25 of Regulation 6 of 2026 of Hon'ble TGERC, contemplates the effort for promotion of settlement of conciliation, this Authority made efforts to promote a settlement of dispute by mutual agreement between the Appellant and Respondents but no fruitful purpose that served and matter could not be settled by mutual agreement. Therefore heard on both sides and perused the record.

POINT Nos. (i) and (ii)

13. Prima facie the bill generated by the Licensee dated 16.12.2025 on the Service Connection No. 5203 03874 for an amount of Rs.1,90,426/- against 19,011

units seems to be abnormal, compared with the previous consumption of the said Service Connection. The prime reasons for such abnormality would be defect in the energy meter or taking of the wrong reading by the meter.

As it may be, It is relevant to reproduce GTCS Clause 7.3.3 here under:-

7.3.3 The consumer shall be entitled on submission of application along with required fees to the Company's Designated Officer to have a special test of the meter carried out at any time. If the meter is found defective the Company shall bear the cost of testing and if the meter is found to be correct the expenses of such test shall be borne by the consumer. Such meter shall be deemed to be correct if the limits of error do not exceed those laid down as per Rule 57 of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1956.

In the present case, the healthiness of the meter was verified by way of special testing in the meters testing lab on two occasions dated 16.12.2025 and 27.02.2026. The percentage errors arrived on the special test of the meter were 0.34% and 0.02% respectively. It is not out of place to mention that as per the rule 57 of Indian Electricity Rule 1956, the permissible limits of an electricity meter is considered correct if its percentage error does not exceed **3% above or below absolute accuracy**, the above two tests results show that errors were well below the limit of 3%. Hence, the error in the recording of consumption of energy in the energy meter is ruled out.

14. Now the question to be answered is why such abnormal consumption was recorded in a single month of November 2025. The scrutiny of the periodical readings of the subject Service Connection goes to show that meter was burnt out during the month of December 2024, healthy meter was replaced in the month of January 2025,

and in the next month February 2025 the bill was issued under door lock status which is absurd since other two meters i.e SC. Nos. 5203 03427 & 5203 03429 are at the same place in the premises billed under normal status which shows that subject Service connection was billed with wrong status of door lock in spite of clear access to the meter. In the subsequent months the bills were issued with consumed units, such as 128, 78,633, 166, 1366, 615, 381, 210 & 0 units which go to show that consumption pattern recorded is erratic.

It is relevant to know about IR energy meter.

INFRA RED ENERGY METER:- Infrared (IR) energy meters in the electricity sector Use official infrared communication parts to transit and receive data without physical contact. Eliminates the need for manual data entry

Respondents submitted during the course of hearing that due to non functioning of IR (Infra Red) mode in the energy meter, readings were not reflected in the SBM (Spot Billing Machine) alternatively manual reading were taken, while doing so mistake was done by the meter reader. This is the prime cause for arriving total units of 19,110 in a single month of November 2025. Evidently, the whole consumption for the period from the month of December 2024 to December 2025, consumption was billed at lump sum in the month of December 2025 for an amount of Rs.1,91,096/- . During the course of hearing before the learned Forum, the respondents revised the bills for the above period by distributing the recorded consumption of 19011 units taking average units of 1810 units per month and credited an amount of Rs.11,686/- vide JE No.23053.

15. The argument of the appellant is that he has received abnormally high electricity bill for the month of November 2025, despite there being no such increase in electricity consumption, not utilised large no of units, but used only one deep freezer, two LED lights of 15w each and one fan, the load would be around 1200W (1.2KW). On the contrary respondents held that they conducted the inspection of premises on 29.03.2026, **in the presence of appellant** and noted the following load details:-

Sl.No	Load description	Load of each Item	Quality	Total Load
I	Room - 1			
1	Triple Door Chest Freezers	4000W	7 Nos.	28.00 KW
2	Double Door Chest freezers	2800W	7 Nos.	19.60KW
3	Tube lights	16W	13 Nos.	0.208KW
4	LED lights	40W	8 Nos.	0.320KW
5	Fans	40W	2 Nos.	0.080KW
II	Containers Room			
1	Tube lights	16W	8 Nos.	0.128KW
2	Fans	40W	2 Nos.	0.080KW
3	Bulbs	60W	2 Nos.	0.120KW
4	LED Lights	20W	1 Nos.	0.020KW
III	Bore Well Motor	5HP	1 Nos.	3.73KW
IV	CCTC UPS	250W	1 Nos.	0.250KW
Total				52.536KW

Here it is pertinent to note that there's a huge gap of estimation of connected load between both the parties which is 1.2KW made by the appellant against 52.5KW of

Respondents claim, The connected load of 52.5Kw was detected in the presence of appellant during the inspection of connected load on 29.03.2026.

16. In order to verify the actual load for arriving at the correct consumption, the M.D's recorded in the meter during testing has more relevance. The following are the last 6 month meter data retrieved during the meter tests conducted twice in the presence of the appellant.

METER TESTED ON 16.12.2025				METER TESTED ON 27.02.2026			
Sl.No	KWH	KW/MD	DATE	Sl.No	KWH	KW/MD	DATE
1	23265	6.11	20/11/2025	1	24945	4.44	01/01/2026
2	22203	5.77	04/10/2025	2	24151	5.70	10/12/2025
3	21118	6.47	03/09/2025	3	23265	6.11	20/11/2025
4	19961	2.41	02/08/2025	4	22203	5.77	04/10/2025
5	18696	9.75	30/07/2025	5	21118	6.47	03/09/2025
6	17182	8.42	21/06/2025	6	19961	2.41	02/08/2025

The above recorded MDs(Maximum demand) in the meter at column 3 of both the tables shows that usage was around 6 kW to 10 kW, which reflects that the load declared by the appellant is not correct, further the above M.D's recorded is commensurating with the number of units recorded in the meter for the period from December 2024 to December 2025.

17. The contention of the appellant that the meter is defective, erratic or suffered a voltage surge resulting in jumping of the meter is not tenable in the absence of proof. Further the appellant relied on the procedural lapses and comparison of

average historical consumptions, that do not help to the cause of reduction of disputed bill. Whatever the units consumed, recorded in the meter has to be paid, since the subject meter is in healthy condition, errors being within permissible limits. In view of the circumstances stated above, it is concluded that though cumulatively the total number of units 19011 was billed at once during the consumption month of November 2025, it is actual consumption availed by the appellant for the period from December 2024 to December 2025. Accordingly, I conclude under this point that the Appellant is not entitled for revision of the bill as prayed for.

Point No.(ii)

18. My findings on point No.(i) would follow this point. As this Authority does not find any irregularity or infirmity in the impugned Award warranting interference, the same is to be confirmed dismissing this Representation/Appeal by rejecting the grievance of the Appellant. Thus I conclude this point.

Point No.(iii)

To what relief

19. In the result,

i) Representation/ Appeal is dismissed as devoid of the merits. Consequently the Award of CGRF -II TGSPDCL dated 30.05.2026 is confirmed.

ii) In the circumstances of the case, parties shall bear their own costs.

A copy of this Award is made available at <https://vidyutombudsman-tserc.gov.in>.

Typed to my dictation by Office Executive cum Computer Operator, corrected and pronounced by me on this 24th day of September 2026.

Sd/-

Vidyut Ombudsman

1. Mr. Abdul Aleem Habeeb Salmani, s/o. Late Abdul Sattar Salman, H.No.1-9-395/1, Gandhi Nagar, Opp: Walamtari, Rajendra Nagar, Hyderabad - 500 030. Cell: 9391731113, 9573877952.
2. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Rajendra Nagar/TGSPDCL/Rajendranagar Circle.
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Rajendra Nagar/TGSPDCL /Rajendranagar Circle.
4. The Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Gaganpahad/TGSPDCL/Rajendra Nagar Circle.
5. The Divisional Engineer/Operation /Rajendra Nagar Circle/TGSPDCL/ Rajendra Nagar Circle.
6. The Superintending Engineer/Operation /Rajendra Nagar/TGSPDCL/Rajendra Nagar Circle.

Copy to

7. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum of TSSPDCL- Greater Hyderabad Area, Door No.8-3-167/E/1, Central Power Training Institute (CPTI) Premises, TSSPDCL, GTS Colony, Vengal Rao Nagar, Erragadda, Hyderabad - 45.

