

## **THE STATE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

D.H. Road & Foreshore Road Junction, Near Gandhi Square,  
Ernakulam, Kerala-682 016

Ph: 0484 2346488, Mob: 8714356488

Email: [ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com](mailto:ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com)

---

### **Appeal Petition No. P/037/2025 (Present A. Chandrakumaran Nair) Dated: 23-07-2025**

Appellant : Sri. T.Surendran  
Keezhathil Veedu,  
Ulloor Medical College P.O  
Thiruvananthapuram - 695011

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer  
Electrical Sub Division,  
KSE Board Ltd.,  
Kesavadasapuram,  
Thiruvananthapuram (Dt).

### **ORDER**

#### **Background of the case**

The appellant T.Surendran is the owner of M/s.Sreekrishna Oil Mills situated at Ulloor - Akkalam road at Trivandrum. He has availed a 3 phase power connection from the Licensee for operating this oil mill. The consumer number is 1145170002261 with connected load 48.642 KW and contract demand 40 KVA under LT 4 A tariff. The connection was effected on 31/08/1970. The APTs and Section Squad had conducted an inspection on 25/11/2024 and two anomalies were detected at the premises. 1. The voltage terminals of R phase was connected to the Y phase. 2. The current terminals of CT of Y phase is connected to B phase and that of B phase is connected to the Y phase. Due to the wrong connection the meter was reading less than the actual power consumed. The Licensee has connected a test meter parallelly and found that meter is reading 76.32 % less than the actual power consumption. The consumer requested for a load enhancement for 13 KW to 48.642 KW which necessitated the meter change with CT and the same was effected on 01/08/2022. The short assessment bill have been

served to the appellant amounting to Rs. 5,25,356/- for a period with effect from 08/2022. The appellant challenged the demand and filed the petition to CGRF. CGRF on completing the procedures, issued order on 28/03/2025. This petition is filed to this authority as an appeal to the CGRF Order.

## **Arguments of the Appellant**

I am the proprietor of Sree Krishna Oil Mill (Coconut Oil Mill) having consumer No. 1145170002261 in industrial Tariff (LT 4A) under the jurisdiction of Electrical Section Ulloor. On 25th November 2024 the APTS team of Electricity Board inspected the electric connection in my premises and subsequently issued a bill amounting to Rs.525326/- as short assessment. This is a small firm and I can't possibly pay this much amount and could potentially lead to its permanent closure. In this circumstance after getting the final bill from KSEB, Ulloor Electrical Section, I approached the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Vidyuthi Bhavanam, Kottarakkara and the Forum ordered to revise the bill for 24 months prior to the date of inspection, 12 interest free installments. Based on the Order I approached the section officials to receive the final bill and they issued me a revised bill of Rs 469319/- without signing the document. However, I am constrained to file this appeal before the Honorable Ombudsman due to the following unresolved grievance

A person not below the rank of Sub Engineer is visiting the premises every month for taking meter reading. I understand that taking meter reading is also an inspection. So that if any defect exists in this connection, that vest in the concerned officials of the Licensee who made the connection wrong. My firm's final product is coconut oil and I fix the rate of the oil after considering all income and expenses. In the site Mahasser there is no statement about testing was done for how much load and for how much duration with the standard reference meter. The testing teams were not produced or viewed generated result of printout. The 'START' and 'STOP' buttons in the standard reference meter were seen controlled by the inspection team manually and hence they can fix the error 'more' if required. As per the site Mahaseer the loads in all the three phases are balanced. In the site Mahasser the team reported that all the three voltage connections to the meter terminals were reversed (changing of phase association). While discussing with the Electrical Engineers they informed that, even if the phase association of all the phase were changed the maximum possible error for the balanced load is only up to -50%. But the team recorded the error as -76.32% for generating more income and hence this is not justifiable. In the Mahasser there is no writing about the calibration details of Zera make reference meter and consumer Grievence Redreseel Forum not checked the validity of calibration certificate of that reference meter.

Even though the request was made to check the installation with a parallel meter, the inspection team and section officials proceeded to alter the

existing connection there by denying a fair assessment. The accuracy class of meter installed in my premises is 0.5s. But in the site Mahasser it is stated as 0.05s and even though after changing the connection, the reference meter error is stated as 2.72%, that is not within the limit of error class stated. In the site Mahasser second page it is stated as current/voltage ratio as 100/5 instead of recording CT ratio as 100/5. Actually 100/5 is the CT ratio (Current Ratio). Hence there were several errors in the site Mahasser like class of meter, etc. Also Testing team made repeated phone calls during the procedure, suggesting the lack of technical preparedness. The meter data is not seen downloaded to establish the anomalies recorded in the Mahasser. As per the order of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, *The Forum in its 'Analysis and Findings' Clearly stated as below "The Forum viewed that an official not below the rank of sub Engineer used to take reading at the premises of consumer, it is a part of inspection also. So wrong CT connection in the metering panel is a technical competency of the concerned official which should not be burdened upon the Petitioner. This is serious lapse from the part of the licensee".* Despite such clear observation, the final order of the Forum did not adequately resolve the issue in a manner that relieves me of the undue burden caused by the licensee's error.

## **Arguments of the Respondent**

The appellant, T. Surendran is the proprietor of Sree Krishna Oil Mills located at Ulloor-Akkulam road, Ulloor, Trivandrum. The oil mill is provided with a three phase electric connection with consumer number 1145170002261. The connection has a registered load of 48642 Watts and Contract Demand of 40000 VA under LT 4A tariff. Original date of connection is 31.08.1970.

As part of a special drive, a joint inspection by Section Squad and Anti-Power Theft Squad was conducted on 25.11.2024. An anomaly was detected during the inspection of CT Connection and metering units, and a site mahazar was prepared by Sub Engineer, Electrical Section, Ulloor. During inspection following irregularities were found.

1. Current terminals S1 and S2 of the R phase CT were connected correctly to the meter's terminal but R phase voltage lead of CT was connected Y phase of meter terminal. Voltage lead of Y phase CT was wrongly connected to the R phase meter terminal.
2. Current terminals S1S2 of Y phase of CT were wrongly connected to B phase meter terminals and B phase current terminals S1S2 of CT were wrongly connected to Y phase meter terminals. B phase voltage terminal was correctly connected to B phase terminal.

As a result R and Y phase voltage terminal of CT were incorrectly connected to each other and Y and B current terminals also incorrectly connected to each other and leading to under recording of the actual consumption by the CT meter. To assess the difference between actual and recorded consumption a standard reference meter (Make - ZERA, Model MT 310, Serial No. 500433259) connected in parallel to the premises meter provided by KSEBL and readings were noted. It was found that while the premises meter recorded a consumption of 1 kWh, the reference meter recorded 4.222165 kWh, indicating a percentage error of 76.32%.

The inspection was witnessed by the appellant's son, Sri. Riju, Kizhakkathil Veedu, Ullor-Akkulam road, Thiruvananthapuram 695011. The inspection team explained the issue to the witness, and site mahazar was duly signed by the witness. The connections of the metering equipment's were corrected and sealed by the joint inspection team on the same day. The consumer enhanced the load from 13 kW to 48.642 kW on 01.08.2022 and meter changed with CT meter on 01.08.2022. At this time that the wrong meter connection was made.

A short assessment bill amounting to Rs. 5,25,356/- was prepared for the entire period (27 months) by the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Ulloor on 25.11.2024. Appellant has approached CGRF Kottarakkara and passed an order against OP No. 70/2024 on 28.03.2025. As per the order Assessment bill quashed and directed to revise the bill for 24 months prior to the date of inspection and shall be allow to pay 12 interest free installments.

Based on the above said facts, the consumer is liable to remit the re-assessed bill for the energy actually used by him.

## **Analysis and findings**

The hearing of the case was conducted on 20/06/2025 at 11:30 a.m. in the KSEB IB, Paruthippara, Thiruvananthapuram(Dist.). The hearing was attended by the appellant Sri. T.Surendran and the respondent Sri. M.Asnan, Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Kesavadasapuram, Thiruvananthapuram (DT).

Here in this case the appellant is an industrial consumer availed power supply for operating his Oil Mill named as M/s. Sreekrishna Oil Mills. The connection was originally connected on 08/1970. This connection is under Ulloor Electrical Section of Licensee. The appellant has requested for load enhancement from 13 KW to 48.64 KW. The enhancement of load resulted to change of meter with CT. As such the meter and CT was changed on 08/2022. The Anti Power Theft Squad along with the Section officials conducted an inspection on 11/2024. During the inspection they have noticed that the voltage terminals of R and Y phase CTs were interchanged in connection to the meter terminal. Then the current terminals of B and Y

phase CTs were also connected to the meter terminal in interchange position. This results the meter reading very much less than the actual consumption. A zero make, calibrated meter was connected parallelly to the consumer meter for a short duration and found that meter is having a percentage error of 76.32%. The Licensee has issued a short assessment bill for Rs. 5,25,56/- for 27 months with effect from 08/2022. Then the bill has been revised for Rs. 4,69,319 for the duration of 24 months as per the order of CGRF. There seems serious lapses from the Licensee. (1) The meter and CT were connected wrongly. (2) The Licensee has not noticed this 76% reduction in meter reading while raising the monthly bills and no action has been taken to correct the meter connections. It is the responsibility of the Licensee to connect the correct meter to record the energy supplied. Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 regulation 104 & 109 stipulated about this

#### **104. Requirement of meters.-**

*(1) The licensee shall not supply electricity except through a correct meter installed in accordance with the provisions of the Central Electricity Authority (Installation and Operation of Meters) Regulations, 2006, as amended from time to time.*

*(2) The meter shall be tested and installed by the licensee and it shall conform to the requirements as specified in the Central Electricity Authority (Installation and Operation of Meters) Regulations, 2006, as amended from time to time.*

#### **109. Supply and installation of meters and circuit breakers.-**

*(10) Initial installation as well as replacement of the meter shall be done by a qualified employee of the licensee duly authorised for this purpose, in the presence of the consumer or his representative.*

*(11) The licensee shall adopt a format of meter particulars sheet for recording the particulars of the meter at the time of initial installation or replacement.*

*(12) The licensee shall retain one copy of the meter particulars sheet and its second copy, duly signed by the authorised representative of the licensee, shall be given to the consumer under proper acknowledgment.*

The Licensee has not abide by the regulation and seriously violated the Supply Code 2014 regulation and the Electricity Act 2003. Then the meter reading would have been taken by a qualified official of the Licensee. Then why the errors are not noticed?

#### **110. Reading of meters.-**

*(1) The meter shall regularly be read once in every billing cycle and on special reading occasions.*

*(3) The meter shall be read only by an employee of the licensee or by the person duly authorised by the licensee for this purpose.*

*(4) The licensee shall issue proper photo identity cards to the employee or the person duly authorised by the licensee for reading the meter and he shall carry the photo identity card during the course of meter reading.*

*(5) The employee of the licensee or the person duly authorised by the licensee for reading the meter, may use hand held instruments, meter reading instrument (MRI) or wireless equipment for recording meter readings and for generation of bills on the spot.*

*(6) If bills are prepared on the basis of MRI downloads or if meter reading is taken on the basis of remote meter reading and the consumer wishes to have a record of the reading taken, he shall be given such details by the licensee.*

It is also noticed that the Licensee had issued a circular that if the meter reader notice substantial variation in the consumption, then this has to be informed to the section Incharge. The officials of section has to examine the reason of reduction in reading and to be get convinced about the chances of errors. This direction were also have been violated the officials of the Section. This required serious action against the erred official.

The sustainability of the short assessment bill is to be examined. This issue is regarding the inaccuracies of metering. Due to the wrong connection of CT Terminals, the meter was recording the reading wrongly or inaccurately. The regulation 152 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 is the relevant regulation in the case. The meter was tested and was found correct, but due to the improper connections, the meter reading was not accurate.

***152. Anomalies attributable to the licensee which are detected at the premises of the consumer.-***

*(1) Anomalies attributable to the licensee which are detected on inspection at the premises of the consumer, such as wrong application of multiplication factor, incorrect application of tariff by the licensee even while there is no change in the purpose of use of electricity by the consumer and inaccuracies in metering shall not attract provisions of Section 126 of the Act or of Section 135 of the Act.*

*(2) In such cases, the amount of electricity charges short collected by the licensee, if any, shall only be realised from the consumer under normal tariff applicable to the period during which such anomalies persisted.*

*(3) The amount of electricity charges short collected for the entire period during which such anomalies persisted, may be realised by the licensee without any interest: Provided that, if the period of such short collection due to the anomalies is not known or cannot be reliably assessed, the period of assessment of such short collection of electricity charges shall be limited to twelve months:*

*Provided further that while assessing the period of such short collection the factors as specified in sub regulation (8) of regulation 155 shall be considered: Provided also that realisation of electricity charges short collected shall be limited for a maximum period of twenty four months, even if the period during which such anomaly persisted is found to be more than twenty four months.*

The error was detected by connecting a parallel meter for a small duration which shows the error is 76.32% . The error also varies with connected load and also from time to time. It seems there is so many mistakes in the Mahazar prepared such as the accuracy class of CT was wrongly mentioned as 0.05S instead of 0.5S. Instead of CT ratio 100/5, it is mentioned as Current/Voltage ratio as 100/5. These mistakes are seen to be serious and it is clear that the mahazar is prepared very casually without any seriousness. Then the method adopted by the Licensee to arrive the percentage error is not seen to be reliable. It is more reliable to compare with the consumption pattern for a long duration to arrive the error. As such it has been instructed the responded to submit the average of reading before detecting the error and also after rectifying the defect. The readings before the inspection since the change of meter as below.

Month	11/24	10/24	09/24	08/24	07/24	06/24	05/24	04/24	03/24	02/24	01/24
Reading	480	678	596	786	710	580	595	599	574	586	626

Month	12/23	11/23	10/23	09/23	08/23	07/23	06/23	05/23	04/23	03/23	02/23	01/23
Reading	1036	378	576	760	824	830	830	860	900	1200	962	1030

Month	12/22	11/22	10/22	09/20
Reading	1550	1736	1118	1424

The average of 27 months consumption is **845 units**.

After the rectification of the defects, the readings are as tabulated below.

Month	12/24	01/25	02/25	03/25	04/25	05/25
Reading	2720	2920	2640	2600	2840	2600

The average of six months reading is **2730 units**.

On comparing the average of consumption before and after the rectification of the defects the recorded the reading is only  **$845/2730 \times 100 = \underline{\underline{30.95\%}}$**

of the actual reading. Then the percentage error is  **$100 - 30.95 = \underline{\underline{69.05\%}}$**

Then reliable percentage error could be 69.05% and short assessment should be reworked considering the percentage error as 69.05%

As per the regulation 152(3), the short collection amount is limited only for a period 24 months even if the period during which the anomaly persisted more than 24 months.

Further 152(4) states that consumer may be given instalment facility by the Licensee for a maximum period of 12 months.

## **Decision**

On verifying the documents submitted and hearing both the petitioner and respondent and also from the analysis as mentioned above, the following decision are hereby taken.

1. The Short assessment bill issued by the Licensee for Rs. 5,25,356/- is quashed herewith.
2. The Licensee has to change the short assessment only for a period of 24 months considering the percentage error as 69.05
3. The appellant is liable to pay the amount as per the revised demand raised by Licensee as per decision (2) above.
4. No interest is to be charged for this short assessment amount
5. Licensee may grant 12 monthly installments amount to clear the payment.
6. Licensee shall enquire and find out the officials who is responsible for this wrong connection and take appropriate disciplinary action against the concerned official.
7. No Other Costs ordered.

**ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**



No. P/037/2025/\_\_\_\_\_ dated: 23/07/2025.

**Delivered to:**

1. Shri.T.Surendran, Keezhil Veedu, Ulloor, Medical College P.O, Uarra-60, Thiruvananthapuram - 695011
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd., Kesavadasapuram, Thiruvananthapuram - 695004

**Copy to:**

1. The Secretary, Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission, KPFC Bhavanam, Vellayambalam, Thiruvananthapuram-10.
2. The Secretary, KSE Board Limited, Vydhyuthi bhavanam, Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram-4.
3. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Vydhyuthi Bhavanam, KSE Board, Kottarakkara - 691506.