



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 : SRI MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

WEDNESDAY THE ELEVENTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

Appeal No. 51 of 2025-26

Between

M/s. Indian Oil Corporation, P.No.5/Part, 44/A Part and 43/A Part, Mamathanagar, Nagole,
Hyderabad - 500 059, represented by Smt. B. Pushpalatha, w/o. Sri B. Venkateswar Rao,
Managing Partner. Cell:9849313999.

..... Appellant

AND

1. The Assistant Engineer /Operation/Ramakrishnapuram/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
2. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Saroor Nagar/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
3. The Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Saroor Nagar/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
4. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Saroor Nagar/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
5. The Superintending Engineer/Operation/Saroor Nagar/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
6. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/DPE/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
7. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/MRT/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.

..... Respondents

This appeal is coming on before me for final hearing on 07.03.2026 in the presence of the authorised representative of the appellant and Sri Ravi Chandra- AE/OP/Ramakrishnapuram, Sri M.Vijay Bhaskar- ADE/OP/Saroor nagar, Smt. G.Pavani - AAO/ERO/ Saroor Nagar, Sri J.Chandra Shekar - AE/CT Meter-I /Saroor Nagar, Sri L.Uday Bhaskar- AE/DPE/Saroor Nagar and Sri Mohd. Farahath Ali - DE/OP/Saroor nagar, for the respondents and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following Award:-

AWARD

This appeal is preferred aggrieved by the Award passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum - (Greater Hyderabad Area), (in short 'the Forum') of Telangana State Southern Power Distribution Company Limited (in short 'TGSPDCL') in C.G.No. 159/2025-26/ Saroor Nagar Circle dt.05.02.2026, rejecting the complaint.

CASE OF THE APPELLANT BEFORE THE FORUM

2. The case of the appellant is that the respondents have released the Service Connection No. 580703391 (in short 'the subject Service Connection') under Category-II to the appellant. Respondent No.2 has issued a notice on 30.06.2025 to the appellant demanding to pay Rs.81,889/- (Rupees eighty one thousand eight hundred eighty nine only) towards the short billing amount of the subject Service Connection. Then the said amount was not correctly assessed as per the consumption of units. Therefore it was prayed to waive the said amount.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS BEFORE THE FORUM

3. In the written reply filed by respondent No.2 before the learned Forum, it is, inter-alia, submitted that basing on Y-ph current missing complaint, AE/DPE/Saroor Nagar inspected the subject Service Connection and observed that 3-ph currents are as IR-13.3A, IY-0A, IB- 6.9A. Whereas, the currents recorded in the tong tester are IR-13.3A, IY-4A, IB-6.4A and CMRI dump was also taken. The AE/DPE concluded as Y-ph missing and reported to AE/CT meter for rectification or replacement of the defective meter in coordination with MRT wing in the presence of the consumer. The meter was tested with an ERS kit with consumer / 2KW heater load and found an

error of -32%. On inspection it was observed that the Y-ph terminal screw found loose connection and the same was rectified and then voltages and currents were found normal. After rectification error was found 0.11%. Therefore the short billing demand was raised.

4. In the written reply filed by respondent No.3, she has also reiterated the contents of the written reply filed by respondent No.2 before the learned Forum.

5. In the written reply filed by AAE/CT Meters/I.MRT/Saroor Nagar, it is inter-alia, submitted that the periodical testing was conducted on 30.05.2025 and observed that Y-phase current was missing. Accordingly he informed AE/DPE/Saroor Nagar and also respondent No.1.

AWARD OF THE FORUM

6. After considering the material on record and after hearing both sides, the learned Forum has rejected the complaint.

7. Aggrieved by the said Award of the learned Forum, the present appeal is preferred reiterating the contents of its complaint filed before the learned Forum. It is accordingly prayed to waive the entire demanded short billing amount.

WRITTEN SUBMISSION OF RESPONDENTS

8. In the written reply filed by respondent No.2, before this Authority, he has reiterated the written reply filed by him before the learned Forum.

9. In the written reply filed by respondent No.4, it is submitted that in the present case Y-ph was missing and error was identified. According to him the root

cause of the issue is due to loose connection at the Y-ph terminal screw.

ARGUMENTS

10. In the written arguments filed by the appellant it is, inter-alia, submitted that without MRT lab testing for 7 months 23 days is violation of Clause 7.5.1.2 of General Terms and Conditions of Supply (in short 'GTCS'); that the recording of consumption was less during the defective period; that the recording of Kilo Watt Hour (KWH) and Kilo Watt Ampere Hour (KVAH) was almost same and accordingly the PF was maintained between 0.96 to 0.97 and as such the less consumption of 7398 units cannot be ascertained during the relevant period; that during the disputed period the bills were shown as '1' as regards the status which means that there is no defect in the meter; that the inspecting officer has not served a copy of inspection report and thus violated Clause 7.5.1.1 of GTCS; that during the post period of inspection and during the prior period of inspection, the observation of loose Y-ph screw only cannot ascertain that Y-ph was missing and that the Designated Officer must issue notice in the Appendix-VII within 2 days from the date of receipt of MRT lab testing report, which was not done. Hence, it is prayed to set aside the claim of Rs.81,889/- towards short billing.

11. On the other hand, the respondents have supported the impugned Award and prayed to reject the appeal.

POINTS

12. The points that arise for consideration are:-

- i) Whether the appellant is entitled for setting aside the short billing amount of Rs.81,889/-?

ii) Whether the impugned Award of the learned Forum is liable to be set aside?
and

iii) To what relief?

POINT Nos. (i) and (ii)

ADMITTED FACTS

13. The admitted facts are as under:-

i) The respondents have released the subject Service Connection under Category-II.

ii) The appellant has not paid the demanded amount of Rs.88,891/-.

SETTLEMENT BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT

14. Both the parties have appeared before this Authority virtually and physically. Efforts were made to reach a settlement between the parties through the process of conciliation and mediation. However, no settlement could be reached. The hearing, therefore, continued to provide reasonable opportunity to both the parties to put-forth their case and they were heard.

REASONS FOR DELAY IN DISPOSING OF THE APPEAL

15. The present appeal was filed on 16.02.2026. This appeal is being disposed of within the period of (60) days as required.

CRUX OF THE MATTER

PHASE MISSING

16. In the present case it is necessary to know the relevant technical aspects of phase missing. They are as under:-

I) LOW TENSION CURRENT TRANSFORMER METERS (LTCT METERS)

An LTCT (Low Tension Current Transformer) meter arrangement refers to the way energy meters are connected in systems where loads draw high current at low

voltage (typically below 1000V), such as in commercial and industrial settings. These meters measure energy consumption by working with current transformers (CTs), which reduce high current to a safer, smaller value that the meter can easily and accurately register.

PRINCIPLE OF OPERATION

- The main line current passes through the primary winding of the CT.
- The CT produces a much smaller, but proportional, secondary current.
- This secondary current is routed to the energy meter's measured terminals.
- The meter is calibrated to take into account the CT's ratio and accurately record the real energy consumption of the load.
- The terminals of the LTCT meter are connected to the secondary outputs of the CTs (usually marked as S1 and S2 for each phase).

II) METER TERMINAL ARRANGEMENT

- For a three-phase LTCT meter, there are usually 11 or 12 terminals:
- Terminals are connected to phase inputs (R, Y, B) and to the neutral.
- Separate terminals are provided for incoming and outgoing connections from CT secondaries to ensure proper polarity and accuracy.

III) DOCTRINE OF CT METER

- CTs allow safe measurement of high currents without exposing the meter to dangerous voltage or current levels.
- The arrangement is ideal for industrial, commercial, and large residential complexes.
- The meter reads a scaled-down current and voltage. The actual consumption = Meter Reading × CT Ratio.

17. The appellant is having above said LTCT meter arrangement for his Service Connection No. 5807 0339. In this metering setup, the Y-Ph current was missing. It is

necessary to know as to what makes a difference in billing of energy consumption if one phase current is missing. For all metering currents circuits, which is generally existing, the power consumption in hours KVAH is:

$$\text{Energy (KVAH)} = \frac{P(W) \times T \text{ (hours)}}{10000}$$

$$\text{Where } P(W) = V \times I \text{ (V= Voltages, I = Currents)}$$

When any phase current drops from its actual value in the metering circuit, the energy consumption recorded shall be less to the extent of the portion in the percentage drop. In the present case, the consumer has a healthy 3-phase power supply as the currents pass through the primary winding of the CT, but Y-Ph current recording is not reflected precisely in the energy meter resulting in recording of less consumption of energy to the extent of the portion percentage drop. Some of the reasons for having irregularities are formation of loose contacts, carbon, rust etc., at the terminals.

18. The respondents have submitted the detailed dump records of the energy meter which unfolds the actual recording of the various parameters, such as voltages, currents etc., consistent with the time. What are 'Dumps' of energy meters?

A "Dump" of an energy meter refers to the extraction or output of stored data or readings from the meter, usually for analysis, billing or troubleshooting purposes. In technical contexts, this means accessing historical consumption logs, events, registers, error codes or other internal measurements that the meter records over time.

The procured dump of the subject energy meter reveals that there is Y-Ph current missing.

The data reveals the following:-

1. The Y-Ph current is missing
2. Y-Ph current was missing from dt.21.04.2024 to 30.05.2025.

3. The percentage error arrived with ERS testing kit is -32%

Y-ph CURRENT MISSING

19. It is apparent from the MRI dump record submitted by the respondents that there is zero current recorded in the Y-Ph of the CT meter. The Provisional Assessment Notice reveals that the meter has recorded zero currents in the Y-ph, whereas the corresponding value of currents is 4 AMPS when measured through tong tester. This goes to show that the consumer is availing 4 AMPS of load under Y-Ph but it is being not recorded in the meter due to loose contact in the terminal screw. It is pertinent to note that in the inspection report (test report for LT CT meters) dt.30.05.2025, the current particulars were wrongly noted as “Four AMPS through meter and Zero AMPS” through tong tester which has to be vice versa as per the prevailing condition.

PERIOD OF ASSESSMENT

20. The period of assessment was taken from 08.10.2024 to 30.05.2025. Whereas, the MRI dumps record shows that the current missing is from 21.04.2024. Though there is current missing from 21.04.2024, in view of intermittent pattern of current missing prior to October 2024, hence ample relief was given to the appellant in assessing the revenue loss. The period of assessment taken by the inspecting officer can be admitted as correct and reasonable.

PERCENTAGE ERROR IN THE METER

21. It is relevant to reproduce the following Clause of GTCS here-under:-

**Annexure XII (VII) (C)
Guidelines for Assessment of Short-billing cases**

(I) Short-billing arising out of Defective Meter

Meter is to be tested with Accucheck / Electronic Reference Standard (ERS) Meter at site and % Error is to be arrived at and billed for the period when the meter was defective. If the period of the defect can be established with the aid of production figures of consumer and MRI dumps (Meter Reading Instrument), the assessment is to be undertaken for the period when the meter was defective as per the formula.

	Unit of measurement	Formula
Number of units recorded by the defective meter from to	Units	A
Number of units that would have been recorded if the meter had been working normally	Units	$B = A * 100 / (100\% + \% \text{ error})$ Where the % error is a negative value
Energy lost during the period	Units	$B - A = C$
Cost of energy	Rs per unit	D
Value of energy lost	Rs	$C * D = E$
Total Electricity charges payable	Rs	E

ASSESSMENT CALCULATION

Contracted load	25000 W	Connected load	25000W
Assessment from period	08-Oct-2024	Assessment to period	30-May-2025
Units assessed	23117 Units	Units recorded	15719 units
Units lost	7398 units		
Amount	Rs.81445.00		
Electricity duty charges	Rs.444		
Total amount	Rs.81,889/-		

The above given assessment calculation is in line with the guidelines for assessment of short billing cases reckoned with GTCS as stated supra.

22. The above given revised short billed units of 7398 units was corroborated with the percentage error of the metering circuit on account of current missing arrived by testing with electronic reference standard test kit. **The Electronic Standard Test kit (ERS kit)** is a portable, highly accurate device used to verify the accuracy of electricity meters by comparing its readings to the reference standards “Meter means including accessories like CT and PT used in consumption with such meter.” The Meter was tested on 30.05.2025 and the error found in the CT meter is -32%. Hence it is reasonable to confirm that the percentage error is -32% which is admissible as per the above given GTCS Clause.

TEST REPORT FOR LTCT METER

23. The appellant contended that the claim of the respondents stating that the meter was recording less energy consumption is illegal and that the test was not conducted in the MRT lab testing, which is violation of Clause 7.5.1.2 of GTCS. As per the records available the meter was tested with ERS kit on 30.05.2025 at the premises and submitted the test report for LTCT meter with the following test results. The defect in the meter was loose contact in the Y-Ph terminal.

BEFORE RECTIFICATION

Voltages particulars			Current particulars			
Voltages	ERS meter	Meter	Currents	ERS Meter	Meter	Tong Tester
VRN	246	246.2	IR		13.36	13.0
VYN	246	246.8	IY		4.0	0.0
VBN	245	245.2	IB		6.96	6.4

Percentage error : -32%

AFTER RECTIFICATION

Voltages Particulars			Currents Particulars			
Voltages	ERS meter	Meter	Currents	ERS Meter	Meter	Tong Tester
VRN	244	244.4	IR	12.99	13.00	12.4
VYN	246	246.6	IY	4.98	5.02	4.7
VBN	244	244.4	IB	4.68	4.96	4.6

Percentage error : 0.11%

24. The respondents have submitted the meter testing report dt.30.05.2025, before and after rectification of the defect in the meter. The defect noticed was in the terminal test block, Y-ph screw was loose and the same was rectified. This was the reason claimed by the respondents for the less recording of consumption under Y-ph. The Clause 7.5.1.2 of GTCS is reproduced here-under:-

“The associated circuitry including CT/PT shall be tested at the premises of the consumer. In addition wherever the consumer disputes or otherwise considered necessary, the Inspecting Officer shall also ensure that the meter, which is found to be defective at the time of inspection, is sent to the MRT laboratory for testing after replacement with a correct meter. The testing at MRT shall be conducted by an officer notified by the company as per Designated Officers’ Notification in the presence of the consumer (or his authorised representative) who should be given at least two weeks advance notice by the company. He shall send the Meter Test Report to the Officer authorised as per Designated Officers’ Notification to issue assessment notice, within 3 days from date of testing with copy to consumer and all other concerned.”

The appellant has mis-interpreted the above said Clause, it is clearly mentioned that the associated circuitry including CT and PT are to be tested at the premises of the consumer and the need for MRT lab testing is not necessary. Hence, the claim

of the appellant of not testing the meter in MRT lab is violation of Clause 7.5.1.2 of GTCS is not tenable.

25. The main argument of the appellant is that when comparing the monthly consumptions there is no difference in the consumption of energy even after the rectification of the defect in the meter and hence contended that the claim of the respondents towards less recording of energy consumption is due to meter defect is not correct. The premises consists of a petrol pump with a connected load of 18.7 KW. The major contributor of the load are air compressor (10HP), pump motors (3HP), submersible motor(1.5HP) and other miscellaneous gadgets. The usage of electricity supply to petrol pump cannot be ascertained as constant every month in view of the normal pattern of usage and hence there is no significance in the comparison of monthly consumption. The GTCS reiterates under Annexure XII (VII) (C) that records of MRI dumps are allowed to establish the defect and assess the loss/shortfall sustained due to such defect or current missing. In the present case, it is clearly established through the available MRI Dump data that Y-Ph current is missing, so as the energy consumption is not recorded in the meter in concurrence with the healthy supply availed by the appellant. Thus the averments of the appellant to drop the assessment totally cannot be considered. In view of the discussion supra, I hold that the appellant is not entitled for setting aside the short billing amount of Rs.81,889/- and the impugned Award of the learned Forum is not liable to be set aside. These points are accordingly decided against the appellant and in favour of the respondents.

POINT No. (iii)

26. In view of the findings on point Nos. (i) and (ii), the appeal is liable to be rejected. However, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the appellant is entitled for grant of instalments to pay the demanded amount.

RESULT

27. In the result, the appeal is rejected confirming the Award passed by the learned Forum. The appellant is granted (10) monthly equal instalments to pay the amount of Rs.81,889/-. The first of such instalments shall be paid on or before 31.03.2026. In default of payment of any of the instalments, the respondents are at liberty to realise the entire balance amount due in lumpsum.

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 the 11th day of March 2026.

**Sd/-
Vidyut Ombudsman**

1. M/s. Indian Oil Corporation, P.No.5/Part, 44/A Part and 43/A Part, Mamathanagar, Nagole, Hyderabad - 500 059, represented by Smt. B. Pushpalatha, w/o. Sri B. Venkateswar Rao, Managing Partner. Cell:9849313999.
2. The Assistant Engineer /Operation/Ramakrishnapuram/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Saroor Nagar/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
4. The Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Saroor Nagar/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
5. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Saroor Nagar/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.

6. The Superintending Engineer/Operation/Saroor Nagar/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
7. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/DPE/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar.
8. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/MRT/TGSPDCL/Saroor Nagar

Copy to

9. 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.

