

**COURT OF THE LOK PAL (OMBUDSMAN),
ELECTRICITY, PUNJAB,
PLOT NO. A-2, INDUSTRIAL AREA, PHASE-1,
S.A.S. NAGAR (MOHALI).**

**(Constituted under Sub Section (6) of Section 42 of
Electricity Act, 2003)**

APPEAL No. 27/2024

Date of Registration : 05.12.2024

**Date of Hearing : 18.12.2024, 03.01.2025 &
10.01.2025.**

Date of Order : 24.01.2024

Before:

**Er. Anjali Chandra,
Lokpal (Ombudsman), Electricity, Punjab.**

In the Matter of:

Smt. Punam,
Ward No. 2, Near Bhangu Telecom,
Badesha Road, Khamano.

Contract Account Number: 3007383935 (DS)

...Appellant

Versus

Additional Superintending Engineer,
DS Division, PSPCL,
Samrala.

...Respondent

Present For:

Appellant: Smt. Punam,
Appellant.

Respondent : 1. Er. Kanwal Preet Singh Sidhu,
Additional Superintending Engineer,
DS Division, PSPCL,
Samrala.
2. Er. Amarjit Singh, AAE.
3. Sh. Nitish, RA.

Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Appellant against the decision dated 27.09.2024 of the Corporate Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Ludhiana (Corporate Forum) in Case No. CF-153/2024, deciding that:

“The decision dated 28.5.2024 of Zonal CGRF, South Zone, PSPCL, Patiala, is set aside. Bills issued for the period from 22.05.2020 to 26.04.2021 i.e. date of replacement of meter are quashed along with LPS/LPI till date. The account of the petitioner for the period from 22.05.2020 to 26.04.2021 be overhauled as per Reg. 21.5.2(d) of Supply Code-2014. Further all the bills after change of meter are to be revised on the basis of actual readings/consumption.”

2. Registration of the Appeal

A scrutiny of the Appeal and related documents revealed that the Appeal was received in this Court on 05.12.2024 i.e. beyond the period of thirty days of receipt of the decision dated 27.09.2024 of the CCGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CF-153/2024. The Appellant has deposited the requisite 40% of the disputed amount. Therefore, the Appeal was registered on 05.12.2024 and copy of the same was sent to the Addl. SE/ DS Division, PSPCL, Samrala for sending written reply/ parawise comments with a copy to the office of the CCGRF, Ludhiana under intimation to the Appellant vide letter nos. 698-700/OEP/A-27/2024 dated 05.12.2024.

3. Proceedings

With a view to adjudicate the dispute, a hearing was fixed in this Court on 18.12.2024 and intimation to this effect was sent to both the parties vide letter nos. 719-20/OEP/A-27/2024 dated 11.12.2024. As scheduled, the hearing was held in this Court on 18.12.2024 and arguments of both the parties were heard. The next date of hearing was fixed for 03.01.2025. An intimation to this effect alongwith the copies of the proceedings dated 18.12.2024 was sent to both the parties vide letter nos. 736-37/OEP/A-27/2024 dated 18.12.2024. As scheduled, the hearing was held in this Court on 03.01.2025 and arguments of both the parties were heard. The next date of hearing was fixed for 10.01.2025. An intimation to this effect alongwith the copies of the proceedings dated 03.01.2025 was sent to both the parties vide letter nos. 14-15/OEP/A-27/2024 dated 03.01.2025. As scheduled, the hearing was held in this Court on 10.01.2025 and arguments of both the parties were heard. The case was closed for the pronouncement of the speaking orders.

4. Condonation of Delay

At the start of hearing on 18.12.2024, the issue of condoning of delay in filing the Appeal beyond the stipulated period was taken up. The Appellant submitted that the Respondent's office issued

Revised Demand Notice vide Memo No. 717 dated 08.11.2024, received by the Appellant on 13.11.2024 through Whatsapp. As such, there was delay in filing the Appeal. The reason for delay in filing the Appeal was due to delay in implementation of decision of the Corporate Forum, Ludhiana by the Respondent. The Appellant requested for the condonation of delay in filing the Appeal & prayed that Appeal be heard on merits. I find that the Respondent did not object to the condoning of the delay in filing the Appeal in this Court either in its written reply or during hearing in this Court.

In this connection, I have gone through Regulation 3.18 of PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2016 which reads as under: -

“No representation to the Ombudsman shall lie unless:

- (ii) *The representation is made within 30 days from the date of receipt of the order of the Forum.*

Provided that the Ombudsman may entertain a representation beyond 30 days on sufficient cause being shown by the complainant that he/she had reasons for not filing the representation within the aforesaid period of 30 days.”

It was observed that refusal to condone the delay in filing the Appeal would deprive the Appellant of the opportunity required to be afforded to defend the case on merits. Therefore, with a view to meet the ends of ultimate justice, the delay in filing the Appeal in this Court beyond the stipulated period was condoned and the Appellant was allowed to present the case.

5. Submissions made by the Appellant and the Respondent

Before undertaking analysis of the case, it is necessary to go through written submissions made by the Appellant and reply of the Respondent as well as oral deliberations made by the Appellant's Representative and the Respondent along with material brought on record by both the parties.

(A) Submissions of the Appellant

(a) Submissions made in the Appeal

The Appellant made the following submissions in its Appeal for consideration of this Court:-

- (i) The Appellant was having a DS Category Connection bearing Account No. 3007383935 with Sanctioned Load as 2.700 kW under DS Division, PSPCL, Samrala.
- (ii) The Appellant submitted that she received an inflated bill in year 2024 of ₹ 2,59,767/-.

- (iii) The Appellant did not agree to this bill and filed a case in the Corporate CGRF on 16.09.2024.
- (iv) The Forum gave its decision on 27.09.2024 and the Appellant received this decision along with the revised Demand Notice issued by the Respondent's office on 13.11.2024 after implementation of this order.
- (v) The Appellant submitted that she resides alone in this house and for most of the time she lives outside.
- (vi) The Appellant was not satisfied with the decision of the Forum and filed this Appeal before the Hon'ble Court of Ombudsman. The Appellant prayed for the justice.

(b) Submission during hearing

During hearings on 18.12.2024, 03.01.2025 & 10.01.2025, the Appellant reiterated the submissions made in the Appeal and prayed to allow the same.

(B) Submissions of the Respondent

(a) Submissions in written reply

The Respondent submitted the following written reply for consideration of this Court:-

- (i) The Appellant had issued bill for the month of 07/2020 of 3309 units on 'O' code basis and for the month of 09/2020 of 2804

units on 'O' code basis. The Appellant had challenged the working of the meter by depositing challenge fee vide B.A. 16 No. 342/53305 dated 23.03.2021. The meter of the Appellant was changed on 26.04.2021 vide MCO No. 43/2015 dated 23.03.2021 with last reading as 14753 kWh and the challenged meter was submitted in the ME Lab vide Challan No. 14/2606. As per the ME Lab report during testing the meter was found Ok.

- (ii) After the replacement of meter the Appellant had issued bill of ₹ 2,51,060/- for the cycle-2 (from 06.02.2021 to 21.07.2021) of 6064 units on 'F' code basis and for the cycle-3 (from 21.07.2021 to 19.09.2021) of 2132 units on 'F' code basis.
- (iii) The Appellant had challenged the bills and filed the case in Zonal Level Dispute Settlement Committee. The Zonal Level Dispute Settlement Committee had decided the case vide Memo No. 4397 dated 18.06.2024 which is reproduced as under:-

“ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਸਮੂਹ ਤੱਥਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਵਿਚਾਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਫੋਰਮ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਖਪਤਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਮਹੀਨਾ 07/2020 ਅਤੇ 09/2020 ਦੌਰਾਨ ਜਾਰੀ ਹੋਏ ਬਿਲ ਡੀ.ਡੀ.ਐਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਦਰਜ ਹੋਈ ਅਸਲ ਖਪਤ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਅਤੇ ਮਿਤੀ 03.10.2020 ਤੋਂ ਮੀਟਰ ਬਦਲਣ ਦੀ ਮਿਤੀ 26.04.2021 ਤੱਕ ਦੀ ਖਪਤ ਮਹੀਨਾ 10/2021 ਤੋਂ 04/2022 ਦਰਮਿਆਨ ਦਰਜ ਹੋਈ ਖਪਤਕਾਰ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਸੋਧ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ। ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਇਲਾਵਾ ਖਪਤਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਮਹੀਨਾ

07/2021 ਅਤੇ ਮਹੀਨਾ 09/2021 ਦੌਰਾਨ F-Code ਉੱਪਰ ਕ੍ਰਮਵਾਰ 6064 kwh ਯੂਨਿਟ ਅਤੇ 2132 kwh ਯੂਨਿਟ ਦੇ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਬਿਲ ਵੀ ਅਸਲ ਖਪਤ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਸੋਧ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਜਾਣ।”

- (iv) As per decision of the ZDSC, the DS Sub Division, PSPCL, Khamano had overhauled the account of the Appellant and refund of ₹ 75,860/- had been credited in the account of the Appellant vide SCA No. 08/120, R-224. After the adjustment of refunded amount in the account of the Appellant, the demand of amount of ₹ 2,55,150/- was raised (for the month 08/2024), which was not deposited by the Appellant.
- (v) The Appellant did not deposit the amount and filed its case in the Corporate Forum, Ludhiana. The Corporate Forum, Ludhiana decided the case on 27.09.2024.
- (vi) As per decision of the Corporate Forum, Ludhiana, the DS Sub Division, PSPCL, Khamano again overhauled the account of the Appellant and refund of ₹ 1,28,110/- had been credited in the account of the Appellant vide SCA No. 01/132, R-224.
- (vii) After the adjustment of refunded amount in the account of the Appellant, the amount of ₹ 1,32,050/- was payable by the Appellant which was informed to her by the DS Sub Division, PSPCL, Khamano vide Notice No. 717 dated 08.11.2024.

(viii) The Appellant did not deposit the amount and challenged the decision of the Corporate Forum, Ludhiana by filing Appeal in the Court of Ombudsman, Electricity, Punjab. The Appellant had deposited the requisite 40% of the disputed amount i.e. ₹ 53,000/- on 04.12.2024.

(ix) The bill of ₹ 1,32,050/- for the month of 12/2024 is recoverable from the Appellant. Therefore, the Appeal of the Appellant be dismissed.

(b) Additional Submissions

The Respondent submitted the following additional submissions for consideration of this Court:-

- (i) The Appellant had issued a bill dated 01.02.2020 for the reading from 440 kWh to 6604 kWh (for the period 04.12.2019 to 01.02.2020) of total consumption of 51 units (Average I Code basis) for ₹ 2,770/-. The Appellant did not deposit this bill.
- (ii) The Appellant had issued a bill dated 11.04.2020 for the reading from 440 kWh to 0 kWh (for the period 04.12.2019 to 27.03.2020) of total consumption of 39 units (Average N Code basis) for ₹ 3,400/- (including previous bill arrear). The Appellant did not deposit this bill.

- (iii) The Appellant had issued a bill dated 22.05.2020 for the reading from 440 kWh to 8248 kWh (for the period 04.12.2019 to 22.05.2020) of total consumption of 7808 units (Ok Code) for ₹ 71,969/- (including previous bill arrear). The detail of which is as under:-

New Reading	Old Reading	Units	
8248	440	7808	
	ARREAR	Current Bill as on 22.05.2020	
SOP	3059	55319	
FIXED CHARGES		542	
ED	265	7526	
IDF	103	2895	
MUNICIPAL TAX	41	1158	
METER RENTAL		62	
SURCHARGE	53		
FCA		1970	
ADJUSTMENT		2.7	
TOTAL	3521	69474	72995
N CODE ADJUSTMENT			(-) 1026
TOTAL AFTER ADJUSTMENT			71969/-

- (iv) The Assistant Engineer, DS Sub division, PSPCL, Khamano had informed that the Appellant had deposited amount of ₹ 12,350/- only from January, 2018 to 10.11.2021 i.e. ₹ 2,500/- was deposited on 23.02.2018 & ₹ 9,850/- was deposited on 07.02.2019. Beside this, the Appellant did not deposit any amount. The Appellant had challenged the working of meter in this office and the same was checked in ME Lab. After the ME Lab report, the Appellant had filed her petition in Zonal Level Dispute Settlement Committee.
- (v) The Appellant's sanctioned load was 2.7 kW but with the LCR No. 34/502 dated 13.12.2024 the connected load was found as 4.686 kW. The Appellant's Meter No. 8998717 was installed vide MCO No. 82/547 in the month of 01/2019. It was informed that due to more connected load than sanctioned load, the 485 days consumption was found from the replacement of the meter. In the year 2019, the PSPCL had given the contract of spot billing to M/s Cosyn Pvt. Ltd. and one of its Meter Reader, Sh. Sukhdev Singh was not working properly and was terminated by the company. After the contract termination with M/s Cosyn Pvt. Ltd., the contract was given to M/s Sterling Pvt. Ltd. from 07/2020 onwards. The bill for 7808 units was not from

01.12.2019 to 22.05.2020 rather it was from 01/2019 to 05/2020 which is correct and recoverable.

(c) Submission during hearing

During hearings on 18.12.2024, 03.01.2025 & 10.01.2025, the Respondent reiterated the submissions made in the written reply to the Appeal and prayed for the dismissal of the Appeal.

6. Analysis and Findings

The issue requiring adjudication is the legitimacy of ₹ 1,32,050/- charged to the Appellant vide Revised Notice No. 717 dated 08.11.2024 after implementation of the decision dated 27.09.2024 of the Corporate Forum, Ludhiana in Case No. CF-153/2024.

My findings on the points that emerged and my analysis is as under:

- (i) The Corporate Forum in its order dated 27.09.2024 observed as under:-

“Forum observed that Petitioner received bill for the month of 07/2020 and 09/2020 issued on O-code for a consumption of 3309 and 2804 units respectively. Petitioner did not agree to these bills and challenged his meter after depositing challenging fee vide B.A.16 No.342/53305 dated 23.03.2021. Meter of the petitioner was replaced vide MCO no. 43/2015 dated 23.03.2021 effected on 26.04.2021 at final reading of

14753 kWh. Replaced meter was checked in ME Lab, where accuracy of meter was found within limits as entered on page14/2606 of meter challenge register. After change of meter bills up to 17.09.2021 were issued on F-code on average basis. Not satisfied with the bills, petitioner filed a case with Zonal CGRF, South Zone, Patiala. Zonal CGRF in its hearing dated 28.5.2024 decided the case as under: -

“ਫੋਰਮ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਖਪਤਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਮਹੀਨਾ 07/2020 ਅਤੇ 09/2020 ਦੌਰਾਨ ਜਾਰੀ ਹੋਏ ਬਿਲ ਡੀ. ਡੀ. ਐਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਦਰਜ ਹੋਈ ਅਸਲ ਖਪਤ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਅਤੇ ਮਿਤੀ 03.10.2020 ਤੋਂ ਮੀਟਰ ਬਦਲਣ ਦੀ ਮਿਤੀ 26.04.2021 ਤੱਕ ਦੀ ਖਪਤ ਮਹੀਨਾ 10/2021 ਤੋਂ 04/2024 ਦਰਮਿਆਨ ਦਰਜ ਹੋਈ ਖਪਤਕਾਰ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਸੋਧ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ। ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਇਲਾਵਾ ਖਪਤਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਮਹੀਨਾ 07/2021 ਅਤੇ ਮਹੀਨਾ 09/2021 ਦੌਰਾਨ F-Code ਉੱਪਰ ਕ੍ਰਮਵਾਰ 6064 kwh ਯੂਨਿਟ ਅਤੇ 2132 kwh ਯੂਨਿਟ ਦੇ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਬਿਲ ਵੀ ਅਸਲ ਖਪਤ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਸੋਧ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਜਾਣ।”

Not satisfied with the decision of Zonal CGRF, petitioner filed his case in Corporate CGRF, Ludhiana. Forum observed the consumption pattern of the petitioner provided by the Respondent reproduced as under: -

	2017		2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		2024	
Month	Cons	Co de	Cons	Co de	Cons	Co de	Cons	Cod e	Cons	Co de	Cons	Co de	Cons	Co de	Cons	Co de
Jan	247	O			181	F					47	O	209	O		
Feb			155	O			51	I	221	O					228	O
Mar	131	O			45	O	39	N	2205	N	17	O				
Apr			62	O							48	O	58	O	48	O
May	279	O			39	O	35	avg								
Jun			195	O							198	O	223	O	223	L
July	478	O			61	O	3309	O	6064	F						
Aug			550	R							315	O	269	O	229	L
															557	O
Sep	312	O	245	R			2804	O	2095	F						
Oct					53	I							77	O		
Nov	58	O	56	F					934	O						
Dec					59	O	392	O			84	N	173	O		
Total	1505		1263		438		6591		9314		625		1009		833	

From the above consumption table, Forum observed that consumption of the petitioner from 2017 to 08/2024 is 1505, 1263, 438, 6591, 9314, 625, 1009 and 833 respectively. The

consumption is almost consistent year by year except in the year 2020 & 2021. Forum observed that the consumption recorded during 07/2020 & 09/2020 is exceptionally on higher side but at the same time the consumption of 39 & 61 units recorded during 05 & 07/2019 respectively is quite lower than the corresponding period of previous year. Forum observed the cumulative energies recorded as per DDL report and corresponding readings recorded by the meter reader as under:

Date	Reading taken by Meter reader	Date	Reading as per DDL
27.07.2019	381		
03.10.2019	5084 (I code)	02.11.2019	5556.61
04.12.2019	440	06.12.2019	6017.36
		11.01.2020	6595.79
01.02.2020	6604 (I code)	15.02.2020	6890.85
		10.03.2020	7204.23
		30.04.2020	7617.05
22.05.2020	8248 (I code)	26.05.2020	8678.09
		11.06.2020	10203.12
27.7.2020	11557	07.07.2020	11783.52
		17.08.2020	13322.39
22.09.2020	14361	20.09.2020	14724.14
		01.10.2020	14753.56
3.12.2020	14753		
06.02.2021	14974		

Forum observed that the readings recorded by the meter reader are almost matching with that recorded in DDL report except on 04.12.2019 when M.R. had recorded 440Kwh whereas the same as per DDL on dated 06.12.2019 is 6017.36Kwh. Forum further observed that this disputed meter was installed in 11/2018 and removed in 04/2021 at final reading of 14753Kwh. This means consumption of 14753 units in about 29 months i.e. the average consumption of about 508 units per month or 6104 units annually. Such a high annual consumption for a load of about 2.4Kw does not seem to be correct. Forum also observed the History Data of DDL report and observed that for the period from 11/2019 to 10/2020, MDI of the range of 2.56 to 6.26 kw had been recorded and

that too in the very early hours of the day which does not seem to be genuine one. Further meter of the petitioner was replaced on 26.04.2021 at final reading of 14753Kwh, whereas as per History Data of DDL report, this reading was recorded on 01.10.2020, which means that meter became dead on 01.10.2020 but at the same time it was found in working condition in ME Lab and its accuracy was found within limits. This also confirms that behavior of the meter is unpredictable.

The site of the petitioner was checked vide LCR no. 07/531 dated 23.09.2024 when connected load was found as 2.366KW and the reading has been recorded as 9344kWh, meaning thereby a consumption of (9344-5802) 3542 units in about 40 months i.e., about 88 units per month or 1062 units annually. Even before the installation of the disputed meter the annual consumption during 2017 & 2018 has been recorded as 1505, 1263 units respectively. Petitioner also in her petition submitted that she resides alone in this house and for most of the time she lives outside. Also, during oral discussion, she stated that she resides in Mohali with her sister and occasionally visits this premises and her children are residing abroad, therefore such huge consumption bills are not possible. In view of the above discussion, Forum is of the opinion that, the meter of the petitioner is required to be treated as defective although its accuracy was found within limits in ME Lab. The relevant Regulation 21.5.2 of PSERC Supply Code 2014 dealing with the defective meters is reproduced below:

Regulation 21.5.2 of Supply Code 2014 dealing with Defective (other than inaccurate)/Dead Stop/Burnt/Stolen Meters is as under: -

“The accounts of a consumer shall be overhauled/billed for the period meter remained defective/dead stop and in case of burnt/stolen meter for the period of direct supply subject to maximum period of six months as per procedure given below:

a) *On the basis of energy consumption of corresponding period of previous year.*

- b) In case the consumption of corresponding period of the previous year as referred in para (a) above is not available, the average monthly consumption of previous six (6) months during which the meter was functional, shall be adopted for overhauling of accounts.*
- c) If neither the consumption of corresponding period of previous year (para-a) nor for the last six months (para-b) is available then average of the consumption for the period the meter worked correctly during the last 6 months shall be taken for overhauling the account of the consumer.*
- d) Where the consumption for the previous months/period as referred in para (a) to para (c) is not available, the consumer shall be tentatively billed on the basis of consumption assessed as per para-4 of Annexure-8 and subsequently adjusted on the basis of actual consumption recorded in the corresponding period of the succeeding year.*
- e) The energy consumption determined as per para (a) to (d) above shall be adjusted for the change of load/demand, if any, during the period of overhauling of accounts”.*

Forum has gone through the written submissions made by the Petitioner in the petition, written reply of the Respondent, oral discussions as well as other material brought on record. Keeping in view the above facts and discussion, Forum is of the opinion that bills issued for the period from 22.05.2020 to 26.04.2021 i.e. date of replacement of meter are liable to be quashed along with LPS/LPI till date. The decision of Zonal CGRF, Patiala dated 28.5.2024 is required to be set aside. The account of the petitioner for the period from 22.05.2020 to 26.04.2021 is required to be overhauled as per Reg. 21.5.2(d) of Supply Code-2014 as the consumption of previous period is also not reliable. Further all the bills after change of meter are to be revised on the basis of actual readings/consumption.”

- (ii) I have gone through the written submissions made by the Appellant in her Appeal, written reply of the Respondent & the data placed on the record by both the parties as well as oral

arguments of both the parties during the hearings on 18.12.2024, 03.01.2025 & 10.01.2025. The Appellant pleaded that even after implementation of the decision of the Corporate Forum, the Respondent's office issued Revised Demand Notice bearing Memo No. 717 dated 08.11.2024 for ₹ 1,32,050/-, whereas she was living alone in the house & her sanctioned load was 2.700 kW only. This Court asked the Respondent the detailed calculation of ₹ 1,32,050/- which was provided by the Respondent with the Reply. On perusal of this detailed calculation, this Court found that the amount of ₹ 1,32,050/- included defaulting amount of ₹ 71,969/- standing against the Appellant as on 22.05.2020. This Court directed the Respondent to submit full details of this amount of ₹ 71,969/-. In reply, the Respondent submitted that this amount was for the bill dated 22.05.2020 issued to the Appellant for the period from 04.12.2019 to 22.05.2020 of 7808 units. It is observed by this Court that although the Appellant's sanctioned load was 2.700 kW, she apparently consumed 7808 units in 170 days, i.e., approx. 46 units/day, that too during mostly winter months. In the submission to Corporate Forum, the consumption for the months of Dec, 2019 to May, 2020 was submitted as under:-

Months	Consumption	Code
December	59	O
January	0	-
Ferbruary	51	I
March	39	N
April	0	-
May	35	avg
Total	184	

However as indicated on Page no. 14 the meter readings from Dec, 2019 to May, 2020 are indicating a total consumption of 7808 units as under:-

Date	Reading taken by reader	Date	Reading as per DDL
04.12.2019	440	06.12.2019	6017.36
		11.01.2020	6595.79
01.02.2020	6604 (I code)	15.02.2020	6890.85
		10.03.2020	7204.23
		30.04.2020	7617.05
22.05.2020	8248(I code)	26.05.2020	8678.09
Total	7808		2660.73

The Respondent was asked to explain the same. The Respondent submitted that the Appellant's sanctioned load was 2.7 kW but with the LCR No. 34/502 dated 13.12.2024, the connected load was found as 4.686 kW. Further, the Respondent submitted that the in the year 2019, the PSPCL had given the contract of spot billing to M/s Cosyn Pvt. Ltd. & one of its Meter Reader, Sh. Sukhdev Singh was not working properly who put wrong readings of many consumers including the Appellant. This Court studied the LCR No. 34/502 & found that as per this report, 02

no. Air Conditioners were found connected among other things. But this bill of ₹ 71,969/- was for the period from 04.12.2019 to 22.05.2020, i.e. mostly winter months. It is observed that the Respondent could not prove that the bill dated 22.05.2020 of ₹ 71,969/- issued to the Appellant for the period from 04.12.2019 to 22.05.2020 was correct.

- (iii) The bills for the period from 22.05.2020 to 26.04.2021 were already quashed by the Corporate Forum, Ludhiana. Therefore, in view of above, the bill dated 22.05.2020 of ₹ 71,969/- issued to the Appellant for the period from 04.12.2019 to 22.05.2020 is also quashed.

7. Decision

As a sequel of above discussions, the order dated 27.09.2024 of the CCGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CF-153/2024 is amended. Bill dated 22.05.2020 of ₹ 71,969/- for the period from 04.12.2019 to 22.05.2020 alongwith the bills for the period from 22.05.2020 to 26.04.2021 issued to the Appellant are quashed along with LPS and/or LPI till date. The account of the Appellant be overhauled for the maximum period of six months immediately preceding the date of replacement of meter i.e. 26.04.2021 as per Regulation 21.5.2 (d) of Supply Code-2014. Further all bills issued for the period after installation of new

meter on 26.04.2021 are to be revised on the basis of actual readings/consumption.

8. The Appeal is disposed of accordingly.
9. As per provisions contained in Regulation 3.26 of Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations-2016, the Licensee will comply with the award/order within 21 days of the date of its receipt.
10. In case, the Appellant or the Respondent is not satisfied with the above decision, he/she is at liberty to seek appropriate remedy against this order from the Appropriate Bodies in accordance with Regulation 3.28 of the Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2016.

January 24, 2025
S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali).

(ANJULI CHANDRA)
Lokpal (Ombudsman)
Electricity, Punjab.