

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

**APPEAL No. 40/2021**

**Date of Registration : 12.04.2021**

**Date of Hearing : 05.05.2021**

**Date of Order : 12.05.2021**

**Before:**

**Er. Gurinder Jit Singh,  
Lokpal (Ombudsman), Electricity, Punjab.**

**In the Matter of:**

Vinay Kumar,  
GF of E-12/801, Street No. 3, Thapar Nagar,  
Karabara Road,  
Behind GMT Public School, Ludhiana.  
**Contract Account Number: 3001880003**

...Appellant

Versus

Additional Superintending Engineer,  
DS City West Division (Special),  
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

...Respondent

**Present For:**

Appellant: Sh. Kanwarjit Singh, Advocate,  
Appellant's Counsel.

Respondent : Er. K. P. S. Sidhu,  
Additional Superintending Engineer,  
DS City West Division (Special),  
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Appellant against the decision dated 15.03.2021 of the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (Forum), Ludhiana in Case No. CGL-046 of 2021, deciding that:

*“The decision taken by CLDSC/ DS, City West Circle, Ludhiana in its meeting held on dated 04.11.2020, is upheld.”*

## **2. Registration of the Appeal**

A scrutiny of the Appeal and related documents revealed that the Appeal was received in this Court on 12.04.2021 i.e. within the stipulated period of thirty days of receipt of the decision dated 15.03.2021 of the CGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CGL-046 of 2021 by the Appellant on 19.03.2021. The Appellant submitted copies of Receipt Nos. 143820414 dated 02.06.2020 for ₹ 17,100/-, 154555990 dated 29.01.2021 for ₹10,000/-, 157654798 dated 05.04.2021 for ₹15,000/- and 157888956 dated 09.04.2021 for ₹ 3,000/-. Thus the Appellant deposited ₹ 45,100/- which was more than the requisite 40% of the disputed amount of ₹ 85,320/-. Therefore, the Appeal was registered and copy of the same was sent to the Addl. Superintending Engineer/ DS, City West Division (Special), PSPCL, Ludhiana for sending

written reply/parawise comments with a copy to the office of the CGRF, Ludhiana under intimation to the Appellant vide letter nos. 601-603/OEP/A-40/2021 dated 15.04.2021.

### **3. Proceedings**

With a view to adjudicate the dispute, a hearing was fixed in this Court on 05.05.2021 at 11.30 PM and an intimation to this effect was sent to both the sides vide letter nos. 706-07/OEP/A-40/2021 dated 29.04.2021. As scheduled, the hearing was held in this Court on the said date and time. Deliberations were held and order was reserved. Copies of the minutes of the proceedings were sent to the Appellant and the Respondent vide letter nos. 740-41/OEP/A-40/2021 dated 05.05.2021.

### **4. 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 submissions made by the Appellant and the Respondent alongwith material brought on record by both the sides.

**(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 Domestic Supply Category Connection, bearing Account No. 3001880003 (New), with sanctioned load of 7 kW.
- (ii) The Appellant had filed a Petition before the Forum at Ludhiana against the decision of CLDSC/ DS, City West Circle, Ludhiana. The Respondent had removed the electric meter of the Appellant being defective and in the case of defective meter, Instruction No. 54.6 and 55 of ESIM-2018 was applicable. Instruction No. 54.6 clearly speaks that all the meters removed against the MCO shall be first checked by the concerned JE/ AAE. Similarly, Instruction No. 55.1 and 55.2 clearly speaks that advice for these MCO cases will be generated and submitted to CBC Cells alongwith data and shall be cleared in next cycle data.
- (iii) The electric connection, having Account No. SM-22/0560 (old) and 3001880003 (New), was running at ground floor of House No. E-12/801, Street No: 3, Thapar Nagar, Behind GMT Public School.

- (iv) The Respondent had changed/removed the electricity meter no. 5940268 on 27.12.2018 in the absence of the Appellant against job order for Device Replacement Application dated 20.12.2018 being defective with the final kWh reading as 1450. Thereafter, the Respondent raised the consumption bills for the period 17.11.2018 to 10.01.2019 with 'D' Code and consumption bill for the period 17.11.2018 to 14.03.2019 with 'C' Code and through these bills, the Respondent charged Appellant for consumption of 135 units and 97 units respectively (consumption recorded by meter no. 5940268 i.e. up to 1450 units). The details of readings recorded by this meter no. 5940268 were given as under:-

Sr. No.	Period	Days	New Reading	Old Reading	Consumption	Status of Mtr./Bill
A	07.11.2017 to 17.01.2018	71	171	0	177	C
B	17.01.2018 to 20.03.2018	62	391	171	220	O
C	20.03.2018 to 11.05.2018	52	580	391	189	O
D	11.05.2018 to 20.07.2018	70	942	580	362	O
E	20.07.2018 to 19.09.2018	61	1167	942	225	O
F	19.09.2018 to 17.11.2018	59	0	1167	186	D
G	17.11.2018 to 10.01.2019	54	0	1353	135	D
H	17.11.2018 to 14.03.2019	117	641+97	0	738	C



- (v) The action of removal of the meter as well as disposal of the meter was done by the Respondent at the back of the Appellant and this fact was admitted by the Respondent in the reply filed before the Forum.
- (vi) The Respondent after the gap of about one year and 4 & half months had raised demand of ₹ 85,320/- vide energy bill issued on 16.05.2020, which included the consumption charges for the period 19.03.2020 to 16.05.2020 plus previous unpaid bill arrears to the tune of ₹ 14,426/- plus ₹ 69,102/- being sundry charges totaling ₹ 85,320/-. On enquiring the matter, it was told that this amount had been charged by the Audit Party being difference of units consumed by Appellant during the tenure 17.11.2018 to 14.03.2019 vide Half Margin No. 341 dated 23.12.2019 being cost of  $10930-1450=9480$  kWh. In the above said situation, since Appellant had already deposited the upto date consumption charges at the relevant time as per the demand of the PSPCL, the question of raising any amount of arrear did not arise at all. Similarly, since the Appellant had already deposited the consumption charges upto final reading of 1450 Units, which the Respondent mentioned in the job order for Device Replacement at the time of removal of the meter, hence in that situation, the Appellant had filed an application

with the CLDSC/ DS City West Circle, Ludhiana on 02.06.2020 and deposited ₹ 17,100/- on 02.06.2020 being 20% of the disputed amount but, CLDSC disposed of the case of the Appellant with the remarks that the meter reader was not recording the correct reading and the charged amount pertained to the actual consumption, hence the claimed amount was chargeable to the consumer. The application moved by the Appellant, was clearly proving that the concerned Officers of the Respondent did not act according to the applicable instructions, which were mandatory in nature. Had the officers of the Respondent claimed the recorded reading during the tenure prescribed by the legislature in the above said instructions, then, there might have been the clarifications at the relevant time. Beside above, the job order for device replacement dated 20.12.2018, the copy of which was supplied to the Appellant by the Respondent was not having remarks N/V. Rather it was clearly having the recorded reading as 1450 kWh units at the time of removal of the meter but the copy of the job order filed by the Respondent before the Forum was having the remarks of N/V (not visible). Similarly, the consumption bill issued on 16.03.2020 which was for ₹ 14,220/- and the consumption bill issued on 16.05.2020 made available to the

Appellant was having the entry of ₹ 14,426/- in the column of previous unpaid bill arrear and entry of ₹ 69,102/- in the column of sundry charges but the consumption of bill dated 19.03.2020 submitted by the Respondent before the Forum was having the entry of sundry charges to the tune of ₹83,664/- in addition to the current charges to the tune of ₹14,426.32 and in the consumption bill issued on 16.05.2020, Respondent had added in the column of unpaid arrears to the tune of ₹ 83,528/-.

- (vii) The Respondent, in its letter no. 1100 dated 19.02.2021, claimed before the Forum that ME Lab report and e-mail relating to DDL sent by ME Lab were attached as annexures and when in true position the documents to which the Respondent was claiming to be a ME Lab report was not ME Lab report. Rather, it was a store challan vide which the meters were returned to the Respondent and which was filled by the JE concerned. Thus it was clearly proved fact that the meter No. 5940268, which was removed on 27.12.2018 was never checked in the ME Lab.
- (viii) The e-mail pertaining to the DDL sent by the ME Lab to the Divisional Office, which the PSPCL had attached with its reply before the Forum was of 17.02.2021, which did not prove that the related meter was checked in the ME Lab at



the relevant time, since as per the PSPCL itself meter was returned to the PSPCL vide store challan no. 27 dated 25.01.2019.

- (ix) The meter of the Appellant had remained in the custody of the officials of the Respondent till 25.01.2019 in loose position. The officials of the Respondent did not get noted the recorded consumption of 10930 units from the Appellant at any stage.
- (x) The DSC on 04.11.2020, while deciding the case of the Appellant, had opined that the Meter Reader was not recording the correct consumption during the year 2016- 2017, as such the recorded consumption to the tune of 10930 by meter no. 8700030 (SAP no. 5940268) on 27.12.2018 was the actual consumption. Similarly, the Forum vide its decision dated 15.03.2021 had opined that during the year 2020-21, the Meter Reader was not recording the correct reading of Meter. Kindly have a glance of the consumption data of the Appellant during the year 2016 to 2021 separately which clearly indicated that the ratio of the consumption consumed by the Appellant at 'O' Code from the very beginning and as well as the fact that there was not recording of less consumption by the Meter Reader as had been alleged by the deciding authorities during the year 2016, 2017 and

during the year 2020-21 since the consumption recorded by the installed meter during the year 2018 -2019 was at higher side.

- (xi) Similarly, recording of the consumption during the year 2018-2019 at higher side and burning of the meter during the short tenure clearly proved that the recording of the consumption during the year 2018-2019 was due to some defect in appliances installed at site and that may be the meter itself or the way of installation of the meter. Otherwise, the actual consumption of the Appellant was that consumption which had been recorded by the separately installed meters at the relevant time and the fact opined by both the authorities regarding the less recording of the reading by the Meter Reader was not correct and was mere imaginary.
- (xii) The Appellant had visited the Respondent during the year 2018-19 and accordingly requested the concerned officer that the meter installed at the premises of the Appellant was recording the consumption on higher side without use of consumption in such a higher ratio but, the concerned officer clearly said that since the meter had already recorded consumption as such the Appellant was bound to pay the same.

(xiii) There were instructions, which empowered the Respondent to charge the consumer on revised basis if at any stage, the meter installed at the premises of the consumer became defective and had recorded the less consumption and similarly, there were instructions that to make refund of the excessive charged consumption if at any stage the recorded consumption on higher side due to any defect in the meter. So for the recording of the fact by the Forum in its decision that the consumer himself had admitted that the recording of the consumption on higher side was due to some defect in the appliances installed at site that does not mean that the defect was only in the inside fittings of the appliances at the residence of the Appellant that also included the meter itself and or the way of installation of the meter. The version taken/recorded in the order announced by the Forum at page 14 of the order that “there is definitely some problem with load/appliances installed in the premises of the petitioner” was also not correct since the PSPCL as per the order of Forum had also checked the installed load vide checking report dated 03.03.2021.

(xiv) To prove the fact that Meter Reader had been recording the less consumption during the year 2016, 2017 and 2020-21, the Respondent should have brought on record the names of

the Meter Readers who remained posted during the tenure 2016, 2017 and during the 2018, 2019 and 2020-21 with the period of their appointment in the area of the Appellant.

- (xv) The Appellant prayed that the Appeal filed by him be accepted and the amount so raised by the Respondent by treating the recorded consumption to the tune 10930 Units may be quashed being an illegal, null and void and is not recoverable from the Appellant and the order announced by the DSC as well as the Forum may be set aside and the direction be imparted to the quarter concerned to charge the Appellant only as per the applicable provisions of the law and further, the direction may be issued to the concerned to make rendition of the account of the Appellant to meet the ends of justice.

**(b) Submissions in the Rejoinder**

The Appellant's Counsel submitted a rejoinder during hearing on 05.05.2021 stating, inter-alia as under:

- (i) The contents mentioned in the grounds of Appeal were reiterated since the PSPCL had not replied to the total contents mentioned in para-1 of the grounds of Appeal. Provisions of the law, rules and regulations framed by the PSPCL itself are mandatory in nature and both the parties

are bound to act according to the provisions framed by the legislature:-

- A) When it is the admitted fact that the meter of the Appellant was removed being defective, as such the action on the removal of the meter was required to be taken as per the instructions applicable on the defective meters.
- B) The contents of consumption bills of dated 19.03.2020 and 16.05.2020 brought on record by both the parties differs.
- C) The PSPCL had taken the reference of Instruction No. 93.2 of ESIM relating to Limitation, which was not the subject matter of the case in hand.
- (ii) Job order for device replacement dated 20.12.2018 was not having the remarks N/V.
- (iii) The concerned office of the PSPCL was misleading the facts. The Store Challan to which the PSPCL was claiming to be the M.E. Lab report was not the M.E. Lab Report rather it was mere a Store Challan vide which the PSPCL returned the meter to M.E. Lab in bulk. To clarify the matter, a Performa of M.E. Lab report (which was not having any relation with



the case of the Appellant) was enclosed for the kind perusal of this Court.

- (iv) The copy of the device replacement job order given to the consumer was not having any remarks of N/V rather it was having clear reading of 1450 units.
- (v) In view of the above, it was prayed that the Appeal filed by the Appellant should be accepted and amount of ₹ 85320/- charged in the consumption bill issue date of which was 16.05.2020 be quashed and the decision announced by the DSC as well CGRF may kindly be set aside and the directions may be imparted to quarter concerned to charge the consumer only for the energy he actually consumed.
- (vi) It was further prayed that the directions may be issued to the concerned to make rendition of the account of the Appellant to meet the ends of the justice.

**(c) Submissions during hearing**

During hearing on 05.05.2021, the Appellant's Counsel reiterated the submissions made in the Appeal & the Rejoinder and prayed to allow the relief claimed.

**(B) Submissions of the Respondent****(a) Submissions in written reply**

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

- (i) A Domestic Supply category connection, having Account No. SM-22/0560 (old) and 3001880003 (New) with sanctioned load of 7 kW was running in the name of the Appellant.
- (ii) The meter of the Appellant had gone defective and was replaced on 27.12.2018, vide MCO No. 100007242036 dated 20.12.2018. New meter bearing No. 192204 (SAP No. 880635) was installed at the premises of the Appellant.
- (iii) The bill under 'C' Code in respect of new meter was issued on 14.03.2019 by the Respondent, which was correct as per office record. A bill of ₹ 85,320/- was issued to the Appellant on 16.05.2020 which included current bill amounting to ₹ 1,795/- and ₹ 83,528/- was charged by the Audit Party vide Half Margin No. 341 dated 23.12.2019 on account of difference of  $10930-1450=9480$  kWh. This was shown as Sundry Charges in the bill dated 19.03.2020. The claim of the Respondent was within limitation as per following clause of ESIM:

*“93.2 Limitation:*

*Under Section 56 (2) of the Act, no sum due from any consumer shall be recoverable after the period of two years from the date when such sum became first due unless such sum has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrears of charges for electricity supplied.”*

- (iv) The reading of the meter of the Appellant was not visible (N/V) as per MCO No. 100007242036 dated 20.12.2018 because the meter was defective. Average reading of 1450 units was charged because of ‘D’ Code in the SAP System. As per e-mail sent by the ME Lab, the DDL report could not be provided because of the defect in the meter.
- (v) The Meter of the Appellant was checked vide ME Store Challan No. 27 dated 25.1.2019 in the presence of AEE/ Tech. Unit-2, City West Divn. (Spl.), Ludhiana, Sr. Xen/ Enforcement-2, Ludhiana and AEE/ ME Lab, Ludhiana.
- (vi) The reading of the meter of the Appellant was being taken by the Meter Reader, appointed by the Outsource Agency M/s. Cosyn Pvt. Ltd. (India), whose tender came to an end in the year 2020.

- (vii) It had been prayed by the Respondent that the Appeal of the Appellant should be dismissed as the amount charged from the Appellant was correct.

**(b) Submission during hearing**

During hearing, a copy of the rejoinder submitted by the Appellant's Counsel was given to the Respondent. After perusing the same, he contested the submissions made by the Appellant's Counsel and prayed to dismiss the Appeal.

**5. Analysis and Findings**

The issue requiring adjudication is the legitimacy of the amount of ₹ 83,664/- (shown as Sundry Charges in the bill dated 19.03.2020) charged to the Appellant vide Audit HM No. 341 dated 23.12.2019 on account of difference of final reading (10930 in kWh) shown on Challan No. 27 dated 25.01.2019 and reading of 1450 (in kWh) up to which the Appellant was already billed.

*My findings on the points emerged, deliberated and analyzed are as under:*

- (i) The Appellant's Counsel stated that the Respondent had changed/removed the electricity meter no. 5940268 on 27.12.2018 in the absence of the Appellant against job order

for Device Replacement No. 100007242036 dated 20.12.2018.

It is observed that Job Order for Device Replacement Application No. 100007242036 was issued on 20.12.2018 and the same was effected on 27.12.2018. A perusal of the said DRA revealed that it did not bear the signatures of the Appellant (Consumer) or its Representative. This fact, on being asked during hearing on 05.05.2021, was also confirmed by the Respondent. Thus, the plea of the Appellant about replacement of the disputed Energy Meter in his absence is correct.

- (ii) As per material available on record, the removed Energy Meter was sent to ME Lab vide Store Challan No. 27 dated 25.01.2019 whereby, the remarks 'D/Stop' and reading of 10930 (in kWh) were given against the account no. of the Appellant.

It is observed that the aforesaid (disputed) Energy Meter was not checked in the ME lab in the presence of the Appellant. Written consent/ request of the Appellant for checking of the disputed meter in ME lab in his absence was also not obtained. This was also confirmed by the Respondent on being asked during hearing dated 05.05.2021. The action of the Respondent regarding not taking the consent or ensuring



the presence of the consumer for checking the disputed/dead stop Energy Meter was unjustified. The Respondent had submitted in the written reply that final reading was recorded as N/V (Not Visible) in the MCO No. 100007242036 dated 20.12.2018. It is not understood how the final reading of 10930 (in kWh) was recorded in ME Challan No. 27 dated 25.01.2019 ? No documentary evidence about this change in Final reading was submitted by the Respondent. Further, the disputed meter no. 5940268 was removed from the site on 27.12.2018 in the absence of the Appellant (Consumer) and was not packed in the box duly sealed. It remained in the custody of the Respondent in open condition till it was handed over to ME lab vide Challan No. 27 dated 25.01.2019. It was also reported by the Respondent during hearing on 05.05.2021 that the disputed meter was not seal packed in the box after checking in ME lab on 25.01.2019 and the same was not available now. As such, the final reading of 10930 (in kWh) mentioned on Challan No. 27 dated 25.01.2019 cannot be relied upon and charging the Appellant up to 10930 (in kWh) consumption is unjustified and against the law.

The consumption details of the Appellant's connection for the period from January, 2016 to January, 2021 is tabulated below:

Sr. No.	Period	Days	New Reading	Old Reading	Consumption	Status OF Mtr./Bill
A	07.11.2017 to 17.01.2018	71	171	0	177	C
B	17.01.2018 to 20.03.2018	62	391	171	220	O
C	20.03.2018 to 11.05.2018	52	580	391	189	O
D	11.05.2018 to 20.07.2018	70	942	580	362	O
E	20.07.2018 to 19.09.2018	61	1167	942	225	O
F	19.09.2018 to 17.11.2018	59	0	1167	186	D
G	17.11.2018 to 10.01.2019	54	0	1353	135	D
H	17.11.2018 to 14.03.2019	117	641+97	0	738	C

From the above detail, it is apparent that the disputed Energy Meter was Ok at the time of taking reading on 19.09.2018. Thereafter, the status of the meter was 'D' in respect of bills for the period from 19.09.2018 to 17.11.2018 and 17.11.2018 to 10.01.2019. However, the disputed meter was replaced vide DRA dated 20.12.2018 effected on 27.12.2018. The disputed meter became defective/ dead stop after 19.09.2018. In the given circumstances, the account of the Appellant is

required to be overhauled for the period from 20.09.2018 (the date prior to which the disputed meter was ok) to 27.12.2018 (the date of replacement of the disputed Energy Meter).

- (iii) In this connection, the provisions contained in Regulation 21.5.2 of Supply Code-2014 are relevant and the same are reproduced below:

**“21.5.2 Defective (other than inaccurate) / Dead Stop/Burnt/Stolen Meters**

*The accounts of a consumer shall be overhauled/billed for the period meter remained defective/dead stop subject to maximum period of six months. In case of burnt/stolen meter, where supply has been made direct, the account shall be overhauled for the period of direct supply subject to maximum period of six month. The procedure for overhauling the account of the consumer shall be as under:*

- 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.”*

In the present case, the disputed energy meter was Dead Stop and the accounts of the Appellant are required to be overhauled as per provisions of Regulation 21.5.2 of Supply

Code-2014 as applicable from time to time. Regulation 21.5.2 (a) cannot be applied in this case because status of the meter in the corresponding period of previous year (20.09.2017 to 27.12.2017) remained 'D' code for most of the period as per consumption data supplied by the Respondent vide Memo No. 2740 dated 30.04.2021. As a result, the next option available is to consider the application of provisions of Regulation 21.5.2 (b) and overhaul the account of the Appellant from 20.09.2018 to 27.12.2018 on the basis of average consumption for the period of 20.03.2018 to 19.09.2018 when the meter was functional and showed 'O' status.

- (iv) It is observed that the Forum erred in deciding to uphold the decision of CLDSC/DS, City West Circle, Ludhiana by charging the Appellant up to final reading as 10930 (in kWh) recorded in ME Challan No. 27 dated 25.01.2019 without ensuring the observance of procedure prescribed for replacement of the disputed Energy Meter and also for checking the same in ME Lab without the consent/presence of the consumer. The Respondent had failed to ensure the compliance of Instruction Nos. 54.6 and 55 of ESIM-2018.



## 6. Decision

As a sequel of above discussions, the order dated 15.03.2021 of the CGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CGL-046 of 2021 is set-aside. It held that the account of the Appellant shall be overhauled, in terms of provisions of Regulation 21.5.2 (b) of Supply Code-2014, for the period from 20.09.2018 (the date prior to which the disputed meter was ok) to 27.12.2018 (date of replacement of the disputed meter) on the basis of average consumption for the period 20.03.2018 to 19.09.2018 when the meter was functional and showed 'O' status. Accordingly, the Respondent is directed to recalculate the demand and refund/recover the amount found excess/short after adjustment, if any, with surcharge/interest as per instructions of PSPCL.

7. The Appeal is disposed of accordingly.
8. 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.
9. In case, the Appellant or the Respondent is not satisfied with the above decision, it 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.

May 12 , 2021  
S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali)

(GURINDER JIT SINGH)  
Lokpal (Ombudsman)  
Electricity, Punjab.

