



large number of affected consumers on the generic issue of non-refund of RLC charges.

- b. In case of consumers who have shifted from LT to HT, MSEDCL disconnects their LT connection permanently and new HT connection is taken on record. In the IT system, there is no cross-referencing of such cases. Records for the purpose of arrears/ credits, etc. are not automatically carried forward in the Ledger of the new HT connection. In case of other permanently disconnected (PD) consumers, the Commission has already provided a methodology for refund of the RLC charges.
  - c. MSEDCL in its additional Reply has admitted that it has still not refunded RLC to most of the PD consumers despite of the Commission's directives in its Order dated 16 August, 2012 in Case No. 19 of 2012.
  - d. MSEDCL has also submitted that it modified its IT system in 2017 so that no consumer is left out for RLC refund. While the IT system upgradation/modification was being made, MSEDCL had shown the amount of RLC refund in the Consumer Personal Ledger (CPL). However, the money is not actually refunded and is hence being shown as negative arrears in the CPL. MSEDCL has only passed the credit in the CPL but final settlement will happen only when the negative arrears shown in the CPL will be made zero after payment to the PD consumers. Hence, MSEDCL has still not complied with the directives of the Commission in Case No. 19 of 2012 with regard to RLC refund.
  - e. MSEDCL has not taken adequate measures for timely refund of RLC to PD consumers. In view of this, the Commission may ask MSEDCL to provide the list of credit balance consumers to all the Industrial Associations of the concerned District so that they can also intimate consumers to claim the RLC refund due to them.
5. To a query of the Commission as to whether making such list available will absolve MSEDCL from its responsibility vis-à-vis any consumers left out, the representative of the Petitioner replied that it would be one of the efforts and MSEDCL can also publish the list of such consumers in the newspapers. He further stated that, apart from consumers having negative arrears in their CPLs, MSEDCL still has to refund 176 crores on account of the RLC.
  6. Representative of MSEDCL stated it has already taken various steps and are still taking steps to refund RLC and has followed the Commission's directives in true spirit. However, due to issues in its IT system some of the consumers remained left out. MSEDCL had no intention of withholding such RLC refund. To a query of the Commission, MSEDCL representative stated that the issue will be discussed with its IT team for suitable modification to take care of integration of data for LT to HT converted consumers.

7. The Commission observed that this is a case of RLC refund .It is likely that many such issues may arise by way of legal dispensations or otherwise. It is, therefore, necessary to take care of all such eventualities in a transparent manner through a robust IT system.
8. Representative of the Petitioner stated that MSEDCL should also pay interest on the amount of RLC refund.
9. The Petitioner may submit its Rejoinder, if any, within a week.

**The Case is reserved for Order.**

**Sd/-  
(Deepak Lad)  
Member**

**Sd/-  
(Azeez M. Khan)  
Member**