

PUNJAB STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
SITE NO. 3, BLOCK B, SECTOR 18-A MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH

Petition No. 23 of 2020
Date of hearing: 09.09.2020
Date of Order: 11.09.2020

Clarification with regard to implementation/interpretation of regulations with regard to payment of interest on meter and ACD security (consumption) i.e 17.1 to 17.4 of Supply Code, 2007 and Regulations 17.1, 17.3 of Supply Code

In the matter of: Rajeev Sood, C-3, Industrial Area-A, Extension, Ludhiana-141003
...Petitioner
Versus
Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. Through, Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission, Chandigarh.
...Respondent

Present: Ms. Kusumjit Sidhu, Chairperson
Sh. S.S. Sarna, Member
Ms. Anjuli Chandra, Member

For Petitioner: Sh. Rajesh Jain
Sh. Subhash Chandar

For PSPCL: Sh. Bhupinder Sharma, CE/ARR/TR
Sh. Bhuvnesh Nahuria, SE/TR-2
Sh. Mukesh Kumar, ASE/TR-5
Sh. Lovleen Gupta, AEE-TR-5
Sh. Sukhbir Singh, Sr. XEN

ORDER

The petitioner is a consumer of PSPCL and has submitted that ever since the release of his Electricity Connection he has not received any interest on meter securities as stipulated in the Electricity Act, 2003 and Supply Code 2007 and Supply Code 2014, despite repeated requests except for the year 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 & 2019-20. The petitioner requested Sr. Executive Engineer, C.M.C Division, Ludhiana for the release of interest accrued on his meter security and ACD from 01.01.2008 onwards which was declined. The petitioner raised his grievance before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) Ludhiana and the CGRF held that the claim of the petitioner is not maintainable under Regulations 17.4 of Supply Code 2007 and Regulation 17.3 of Supply Code 2014. The petitioner, not satisfied with the decision of the

CGRF filed an Appeal before the Ombudsman, Electricity Punjab, S.A.S Nagar, Mohali wherein the decision of the CGRF was upheld. The petitioner has submitted that the CGRF, Ludhiana as well as Ombudsman has misinterpreted 2007 & 2014 Supply Code Regulations and has wrongly denied the interest. The petitioner has requested to review the Order passed by CGRF as well as the Order passed by the Ombudsman and to allow the claim of interest as per Regulations 17.4 of Supply Code 2007 and Regulation 17.3 of Supply Code 2014.

The representative appearing on behalf of the petitioner has been heard. The petitioner has disputed the Order passed by CGRF, Ludhiana and the Order passed by the Ombudsman upholding the decision of CGRF in Appeal. The jurisdiction of the Commission is not attracted to challenge the Order passed by the Ombudsman. The petition does not merit to be admitted and is dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-
(Anjuli Chandra)
Member

Chandigarh
Dated: **11.09.2020**

Sd/-
(S.S. Sarna)
Member

Sd/-
(Kusumjit Sidhu)
Chairperson