

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

APPEAL NO. 52/2021

**Date of Registration : 04.06.2021
Date of Hearing : 16.06.2021
Date of Order : 16.06.2021**

Before:

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

In the Matter of:

M/s Sidharath Exporters,
Mohkam Arriyan Road,
Jalalabad-152024.

Contract Account Number: 3000855886

...Appellant

Versus

Addl. Superintending Engineer,
DS Division, PSPCL,
Jalalabad.

...Respondent

Present For:

Appellant: Sh. Ashok Kumar,
Appellant's Representative.

Respondent : 1. Er. Ramesh Chander Makkar,
Assistant Executive Engineer,
DS Division, PSPCL, Jalalabad.

2. Sh. Gian Chand,
Upper Division Clerk.

Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Appellant against the response in case No. T-169 of 2021 conveyed by Secretary, Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Patiala vide Memo No. 1079/T-169/2021 dated 29.04.2021 stating as under:

“In reference to subject cited above, case had been received in the Forum on dated 26.04.2021. After scrutinizing the case it has been found that the Appeal relates to the period of 2014-15 and 2015-16. As such the case is time barred and cannot be entertained. Therefore, the above case is closed in the forum.”

2. Registration of the Appeal

A scrutiny of the Appeal and related documents revealed that the Appeal was received in this Court on 04.06.2021 i.e. within the stipulated period of thirty days of receipt of the communication dated 29.04.2021 of the CGRF, Patiala in Case No. T-169 of 2021 by the Appellant on 08.05.2021. The Appellant was not required to deposit the requisite 40% of the disputed amount, as the relief claimed was on account of refund of threshold rebate for the period 2014-15 and 2015-16. Therefore, the Appeal was registered and copy of the same was sent to Addl. Superintending Engineer, DS Divn., Jalalabad for sending written reply/ parawise comments with a copy to the

office of the CGRF, Patiala under intimation to the Appellant vide letter nos. 889-891/OEP/A-52/2021 dated 04.06.2021.

3. Proceedings

With a view to adjudicate the dispute, a hearing was fixed in this Court on 16.06.2021 at 12.30 PM and an intimation to this effect was sent to both the parties vide letter nos. 905-906/OEP/A-52/2021 dated 09.06.2021. As scheduled, the hearing was held in this Court on the said date and time.

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 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 Large Supply Category Connection bearing account No. 3000855886 with sanctioned load of 699.523 kW and sanctioned contract demand (CD) as

700 kVA for Rice Sheller, Saila Plant and Sortex Plant. It was running as a General Industry.

- (ii) During scrutiny of its electricity account, the Appellant had noticed that Respondent had not complied with some of its own policies and the Appellant was deprived of benefit of Threshold Scheme for the year 2014-15 and 2015-16. The Respondent had allowed rebate of ₹ 1/- per unit plus other relevant charges e.g ED etc. for the consumption exceeding Threshold limit as per CC No. 49/2014 for the year 2014-15 which was also extended to the year 2015-16 vide tariff order dated 05.05.2015. but, the Respondent had not allowed/ adjusted the benefit of threshold for the year 2014-15, which amounts to be ₹ 2,57,563/- and for the year 2015-16 ₹ 12,82,482/-. This amount was excessively recovered which had already been paid by the Appellant to the Respondent. Hence the total adjustable amount of ₹ 15,40,045/- which required to be adjusted in bills of the Appellant as rebate for threshold scheme as mentioned above had resulted a heavy loss to the Appellant.
- (iii) Since this amount had already been paid by the Appellant, therefore, it attracts payment of interest amounting to ₹ 8,67,153/- as per Regulation 35.1.3 of the Supply Code, 2014

at the rates applicable from time to time i.e @ SBI base rate of the relevant year.

- (iv) The Appellant had filed Petition registered as T-169 before the Forum but the Forum had decided the same in a hasty, unlawful and illegal way. The Forum had decided the same by declaring it as time barred, without calling for any information from the Respondent or seeking any reply. Opportunity of being heard was not allowed to the Appellant. It was a set principle of natural justice that no case was liable for dismissal without giving any opportunity of being heard.
- (v) As per Consumer Complaint Handling Procedure adopted by the Respondent and well described through Electricity Supply Instruction Manual Section viii, Regulation 2.25 & 2.27 regarding jurisdiction of the CGRF, it was clearly stated that no case, even if it is presented after 2 years, shall be rejected unless the Complainant has been given an opportunity of being heard.
- (vi) As per Regulation 2.27 of PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulation, 2016, it was clearly stated that “The Forum may reject the grievance at any stage, through a speaking order, under the following circumstances:

- a) *“In cases where proceedings in respect of the same matter and between the same Complainant and Licensee are pending before any court, tribunal, arbitrator or any other authority, or a decree or award or a final order has already been passed by any such court, tribunal, arbitrator or authority.*
- b) *In cases which fall under Section 126, 127, 135 to 140, 143, 146, 152 and 161 of the Act or the matter relating to open access granted under the Act.*
- c) *In cases where the grievances has been submitted two years after the date on which the cause of action has arisen or after two months from the date of receipt of order of DSC; and*
- d) *In the case of grievances which are:*
- *Frivolous, vexatious, malafide;*
 - *Without any sufficient cause; or*
 - *Where there is no prima facie loss or damage or inconvenience caused to the Complainant or the consumers who are represented by an association or group of consumers.*

Provided that no grievance shall be rejected unless the Complainant has been given an opportunity of being heard.”

Therefore, it was very clear that the case was received on 26.04.2021 in the office of the Forum and the same was rejected on 29-04-2021 without giving any opportunity of being heard, which was mandatory as per instructions of the PSERC as stated above.

- (vi) No case can be rejected without speaking order but the case was rejected through a simple letter vide memo no. 1079 dated 29.04.2021, against the provisions contained in Regulation 2.27 as mentioned above. In the absence of the speaking order, the said memo no. 1079 dated 29.04.2021 was invalid and illegal.
- (vii) The case was related to non-adjustment of rebate on account of Threshold for the years 2014-15 and 2015-16, which was to be adjusted in the Account No. 3000855886 and the account was running till date. Therefore, it cannot be considered as time barred as it was not a recovery suit rather it was adjustment and correction of accounts for a mistake committed by the officials of PSPCL.
- (viii) The decision of the Forum to close the file arbitrarily was against the true sense of justice and its letter dated 29.04.2021

cannot be considered as speaking order because the letter had not been signed by the quorum of the CGRF and was a simple letter written by an official of the Forum who had no right to close the file in the absence of the speaking order of the Forum.

- (ix) As per law of Limitation, “The period of limitation shall not begin to run until the plaintiff or applicant has discovered it or in the case of a concealed document, until the plaintiff or the or the applicant first had the means of producing the concealed document or compelling its production.”

In the present case, the Appellant had discovered it on 10.03.2021 when it got his audit of electricity accounts and found that it was deliberately not given the benefit of threshold rebate for the years 2014-15 and 2015-16 despite clear cut instructions given by Chief Engineer/ Commercial, Patiala vide Circular No. 49/2014. The appellant served a notice on the same date i.e. 10.03.2021 for adjustment of threshold rebate for the years 2014-15 and 2015-16, which was duly received by the Respondent. Hence two years period if made applicable becomes 25.03.2021 to 24.03.2023. So, how the file of case no. T-169/2021 could be closed. The letter dated 29.04.2021 of the Forum was not only illegal but also against the true sense of justice and against the Constitution of India.

(x) Due to spread of Covid-19 Pandemic, The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed an order dated 23rd of March, 2020 extending the limitation period w.e.f 15.03.2020 to 14.03.2021 which was further extended from 15.03.2021 to onwards by the order dated 14.03.2021. "This ruling was/ is binding to Central/ all States Legislation and Tribunals of the Country. Therefore, to close file unlawfully showed disregard and non-implementation of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

(xi) The detail of the petition was Non-Adjustment of threshold rebate for the Season 2014-15 for ₹ 2,57,563/-. The criteria for allowing rebate as per CC No. 49/2014 was as under:

(i) *"The rebate shall be allowed for any consumption during the financial year exceeding the consumption worked out on the following methodology:*

The average consumption (including purchase of power under open access) of three years shall be taken as threshold for allowing rebate, in case, period is less than three years or there is reduction or extension in load/demand/ average consumption shall be worked out on prorata basis.

(ii) *The billing at the reduced rates after allowing the rebate shall be done once the consumer crosses the target consumption as worked out under Step (i) e.g. if a consumer has average consumption of three years as 10000 units, the consumer shall be entitled for billing at the reduced rate for any consumption exceeding the threshold consumption of 10000 units during FY 2014-15. The rebate shall be allowed to the consumer as and when the consumption of the consumer exceeds 10000 units.”*

In this regard, it was submitted that PSPCL had allowed threshold rebate vide Commercial Circular No. 49/2014 for the year 2014-15, which was neither got noted from the Appellant/petitioner nor the same was implemented by the Respondent. In routine it was sent to Large Supply and other industrial consumers. But it was a matter of concern why this circular was not sent nor any information in writing or otherwise was supplied to the Appellant. As a result of which the Appellant was deprived of the benefit of threshold rebate for ₹ 2,57,563/- which was adjustable in the account no. 3003336584 during the month of March, 2015. Thus it was a clear-cut violation of the instructions of the Commercial

Circular No. 49/2014 for which the Respondent was responsible to implement but failed to discharge its responsibility thus there was deficiency in service.

- (xii) Similarly, there was Non-Adjustment of threshold rebate for the season 2015-16 for ₹ 12,82,482/-. As per above, it had been explained that the Scheme of reduced rate was made applicable vide Commercial Circular No. 49/2014 and on the same pattern the scheme of Threshold rebate was extended to the year 2015-16 vide tariff order dated 05.05.2015 for the year 2015-16, however due to non-issue of any commercial circular the benefit could not be allowed to the genuine consumers. But this fact was only known to the consumers after decision of Petition no. CGP 343 for 12/2019 and the benefit was allowed to the Appellant, the observation of the Forum in said case was reproduced as under:

“As per Petition No. 71 of 2014 Tariff Order dated 22.08.2014 for PSPCL for FY 2014-15, the tariff structure mentioned therein is to remain operative till 31.03.2015. The determination of ARR of PSPCL for FY 2015-16 is under process and is likely to take some more time. As such, the existing tariff is ordered to be charged from all categories of consumers w.e.f. 01.04.2015 till the date of issue of the Tariff

Order for the year 2015-16 subject to the condition that the Government of Punjab continues to pay subsidy to the Punjab State Power Corporation Limited in respect of the categories already being subsidized. It is further ordered that ToD tariff applicable to Large Supply and Medium Supply Industrial Category Consumers upto 31.03.2015 will not be applicable from 01.04.2015 to 31.05.2015 and Peak Load Exemption Charges (PLEC) will be charged as approved by the Commission in the Tariff Order for FY 2013-14. Further, Peak Load Hours will not be for more than 3 (three) hours between 06.00 PM to 10.00 PM. Further, as per Petition No. 79 of 2015 Tariff Order dated 05.05.2015 for PSPCL for FY 2015-16, the tariff structure mentioned therein was to remain operative till 31.03.2016. The determination of ARR of PSPCL for FY 2016-17 was under process and was likely to take some more time. As such, the existing tariff structure was ordered to be charged from all categories of consumers w.e.f. 01.04.2016 till the date of issue of the Tariff Order for the year 2016-17, subject to the condition that the Government of Punjab continues to pay subsidy to the Punjab State Power Corporation Limited in respect of the categories already being subsidized. As such, Tariff Order for FY 2014-15 and existing tariff was ordered to

be charged from all categories of consumers w.e.f. 01.04.2015 till the date of issue of the Tariff Order for the year 2015-16 and further Tariff Order dated 05.05.2015 for PSPCL for FY 2015-16, was to remain operative till 31.03.2016. As such, a rebate of ₹ 1/- per unit to all categories of consumers was to be given w.e.f. 01.4.2014 for crossing the threshold consumption worked out on the basis of average consumption during the past three financial years as above as per Commercial Circular No. 49/2014. The Respondent had agreed to the same and had submitted a calculation sheet for the same. Forum was of the opinion that threshold rebate for the year 2015-16 be given to the Appellant as per the provision of tariff order and the calculation be got pre-audited. Forum further observed that the Respondent had submitted that ToD rebate was always shown in the monthly energy bills and the same was given to the Appellant in the monthly bills and nothing more was due from the Appellant on account of ToD rebate. Keeping in view the above, Forum came to the unanimous conclusion that threshold rebate for the year 2015-16 be given to the Appellant as per the provision of tariff order and the calculation be got pre-audited. Further ToD rebate had been already in the monthly energy bills and nothing more was due on account of ToD rebate.

Keeping in view the petition, reply, oral discussions and after hearing both the parties, perusal of the record produced by them & observations of Forum, Forum decides that: Threshold rebate for the year 2015-16 be given to the petitioner as per the provision of tariff order and the calculation be got pre-audited.

(xiii) Hence, it was absolutely clear that benefit of Threshold rebate was extended to the consumers of PSPCL and needs no further clarification that same was also admissible to the Appellant.

The calculation sheet was enclosed herewith and as per calculation sheet a sum of ₹ 12,82,482/- which was to be allowed as rebate for crossing the Threshold limit, were not allowed by the Respondent.

(xiv) A sum of ₹ 12,82,482/- for the year 2015-16 and a sum of ₹ 2,57,563/- for the year 2014-15 had already been paid by the Appellant, was liable to further adjustment of interest as per regulation no. 35.1.3 of the Supply Code-2014, which is reproduced here as under:

“35.1.3 1 If on examination of a complaint, the Distribution Licensee finds a bill to be erroneous, a revised bill shall be issued to the consumer indicating a revised due date of payment, which shall not be earlier than seven days from the date of delivery of the revised bill to the consumer. If the

amount paid by the consumer under Regulation 35.1.1 is in excess of the revised bill, such excess amount shall be refunded through adjustment first against any outstanding amount due to the Distribution Licensee and then against the amount becoming due to the Distribution Licensee immediately thereafter. The Distribution Licensee shall pay to such consumer interest on the excess amount at 1 [twice] SBI's Base Rate prevalent on first of April of the relevant year plus 2% from the date of payment till such time the excess amount is adjusted. “

- (xv) The Appellant was thus entitled to the refund alongwith interest amount of ₹ 8,67,153/- and for further adjustment of interest till the said amount was adjusted as per rules and regulations of the Respondent. The Calculation sheet in this regard was attached with the Appeal.
- (xvi) So far the period of delay was concerned, it was not time barred as it calls for an adjustment in accounts and not for cash refund and adjustments was never time barred. Moreover, as per law of land under the Constitution of India, a claim against recovery for cash was not even time barred after 3 years of becoming due. Therefore, it was wrong that our case falls within the

meaning of Regulation 2.25 of the Complaint Handling Procedure of PSERC, which was reproduced as under:

“2.25 The Forum shall entertain only those complaints where the representation is made within 2 years from the date of cause of action in case the complainant approaches the Forum directly or within 2 months from the date of receipt of the orders of respective Dispute Settlement Committee constituted under CCHP. Provided that the Forum may, for reasons to be recorded in writing, entertain a complaint which does not meet the aforesaid requirements.”

(xvii) As the case of the Appellant was different and the delay had been caused by the Respondent and not by the Appellant due to reasons mentioned below so the delay if any was liable to be condoned.

- a) The instructions in different circulars and instructions as mentioned above were never brought to the notice of the Appellant even till date.
- b) As per each and at the end of each circular there was special instructions for the offices of the PSPCL to ensure the meticulous compliance and therefore, the Respondent was responsible for complying with the said

instructions of the Chief Engineer/ Commercial (The supreme authority to issue a commercial circular).

- c) When any amount more than 2 years old was charged by the Audit, the period was counted from the date of first becoming due, similarly our period of 2 years starts from the expiry of 15 days of our notice i.e. 10.03.2021 delivered to the office of the Respondent and copy of the said notice was attached as Annexure and the Appellant did not receive any reply from the offices till date.
- d) As per law of Limitation Period Act, 1963 of the Constitution of India, clause no. 17 “The period of limitation shall not begin to run until the plaintiff or applicant has discovered it or in the case of a concealed document, until the plaintiff or the or the applicant first had the means of producing the concealed document or compelling its production.
- e) This Court had full jurisdiction to entertain any complaint in this regard within the meaning of Regulation 2.25 of the CCHP, as mentioned above as the onus for non-implementation of the instructions of the Department lies on Respondent and not on the Appellant.

- f) The PSPCL is a Public Welfare Department and not supposed to do adopt unfair trade practices by non-adjustment of legitimate dues of the consumers by forfeiting the genuine claims.
- g) Further due to spread of Covid-19, business had ruined and the Appellant had suffered. It was requested to pay special consideration as the claim was 100% correct and genuine as per instructions of the PSPCL.
- h) As per the Law of limitation, the case of adjustments does not fall within the meaning and definition of limitation period. Moreover the connection of the Appellant was running till date. Further, as per orders of the Hon'ble Apex Court dated 23.03.2020 the limitation period was extended till further orders due to spread of Covid-19 and this order was binding on all legislations in India and this order was further extended on 14.03.2021 till further orders.

(xviii) No Commercial Circular was issued during the year 2015-16 and this fact came to knowledge of the Appellant after the Judgment of Case No. CGP-343. Hence the Respondent hidden this fact that threshold rebate was admissible for the year 2015-16. In other words, this information was not made public.

(b) Submissions made in the Rejoinder

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

- (i) The plea of the Respondent that claim regarding threshold rebate was time barred under Regulation 2.25 of CCHP of ESIM was not correct. Regulation 22.25 refers to the jurisdiction of the Forum and not about the limitation period of the cases and the jurisdiction of the Forum can be extended by the Forum for the reasons to be recorded in writing. The Regulation had nowhere described about the time period of the claim so far as limitation was considered.
- (ii) The second important question was how the Respondent calculated the period of 2 years, for limitation purpose, has been fully described in the Constitution of India. The period of limitation shall not begin to run until the Appellant has discovered it. The Forum had wrongly presumed the case as a time barred. As per notice dated 10.03.2021 served by the Appellant, the period of 2 years becomes 25.03.2021 to 24.03.2023.
- (iii) It was further requested that due to expansion of the Pandemic Covid-19 disease the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India had passed an order dated 23rd of March, 2020 regarding the

limitation period w.e.f 15.03.2020 to 14.03.2021 which was further extended from 15.03.2021 to onwards by the order dated 14.03.2021. This ruling was/ is binding to Central/ all States Legislation and Tribunals of the Counsel.

(iv) It was prayed to consider the case within limitation and not as per the reply of the Respondent.

(c) Submission during hearing

During hearing on 16.06.2021, the Appellant's Representative reiterated the submissions made in the Appeal/Rejoinder and prayed to allow the relief claimed in the Appeal. After deliberations the Appellant's Representative prayed to remand back the dispute case to the Forum for consideration and decision as per applicable regulations.

(B) Submissions of the Respondent

(a) Submissions in written reply

The Respondent, in its defence, made the following submissions for consideration of this Court:

(i) The Appellant was having a Large Supply Category Connection with sanctioned load of 699.523 kW and CD 700 kVA as General Industry from the year 2014.

- (ii) The Appellant had filed a Petition before the Forum demanding threshold rebate for the years 2014-15 and 2015-16. The Forum had rightly decided the case of the Appellant being a time barred because the period of dispute belonged to last four to five years and the Forum had rightly closed the case being time barred. The Appellant had not given any request to the Respondent for threshold rebate and the Appellant had applied for threshold rebate only on 10.03.2021 before filing the case in the Forum.
- (iii) The case of the Appellant for threshold rebate was very old and was accordingly not entertained by the Forum, therefore, it was rightly closed by the Forum. Further, it was discretionary power of the Forum to decide the case as per law.
- (iv) It is wrong to say that the Law of Limitation period as mentioned in the Appeal was applicable in the present dispute. The Forum had decided the case as per rules.
- (b) Submission during hearing**

During hearing on 16.06.2021, the Respondent reiterated the submissions made by it in the written reply and contested the submissions of the Appellant. Subsequently, on being inquired, the Respondent did not object to the request of the Appellant's

Representative for remanding back the case to the Forum for consideration and decision as per applicable regulations.

5. Analysis and Findings

The issue requiring adjudication is the legitimacy of order dated 29.04.2021 of CGRF, Patiala regarding entertaining of Case No. T-169 of 2021 filed by the Appellant.

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

- (i) Written and oral submissions alongwith material brought on record of this Court by both the sides have been gone through. During the hearing, the Appellant's Representative reiterated the submissions made in its rejoinder dated 15.06.2021 and stated that the Forum had conveyed to the Appellant that the dispute related to the period 2014-15 and 2015-16 and being time barred, could not be entertained. He also submitted that the Forum had erred in conveying the aforesaid order without giving the Appellant an opportunity of being heard. He added that regulation 2.25 of PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2016 refers to the jurisdiction of the Forum and not about the limitation period of the cases. The jurisdiction of

the Forum can be extended by the Forum for the reasons to be recorded in writing.

(ii) The Respondent, in its defence, submitted that the Appellant had not given any request to the Respondent for threshold rebate and the Appellant had applied for threshold rebate only on 10.03.2021 before filing the case in the Forum. The case of the Appellant for threshold rebate was very old and was accordingly not entertained by the Forum. Therefore, it was rightly closed by the Forum. Further, it was discretionary power of the Forum to decide the case as per law.

(iii) A perusal of the case file of the Forum reveals that the Forum based its decision dated 29.04.2021 by observing that the case was time barred and not considerable for decision in terms of provisions contained in Regulation 2.25 of PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2016. The said Regulation reads as under:

“2.25 The Forum shall entertain only those complaints where the representation is made within 2 years from the date of cause of action in case the complainant approaches the Forum directly or within 2 months from the date of receipt of the orders of respective Dispute Settlement Committee constituted under CCHP.

Provided that the Forum may, for reasons to be recorded in writing, entertain a complaint which does not meet the aforesaid requirements.”

- (iv) The Court observes that it is worthwhile to peruse the provisions contained in Regulation 2.27 of PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2016 which are reproduced below:

“2.27 The Forum may reject the grievance at any stage, through a speaking order, under the following circumstances:

- a) In cases where proceedings in respect of the same matter and between the same Complainant and the Licensee are pending before any court, tribunal, arbitrator or any other authority, or a decree or award or a final order has already been passed by any such court, tribunal, arbitrator or authority;*
- b) In cases which fall under Sections 126, 127, 135 to 140, 142, 143, 146, 152 and 161 of the Act or the matters relating to open access granted under the Act.*
- c) In cases where the grievance has been submitted two years after the date on which the cause of action has*

arisen or after two months from the date of receipt of the orders of DSC; and

d) In the case of grievances which are:

- Frivolous, vexatious, malafide;*
- Without any sufficient cause; or*
- Where there is no prima facie loss or damage or inconvenience caused to the Complainant or the consumers who are represented by an association or group of consumers.*

Provided that no grievance shall be rejected unless the Complainant has been given an opportunity of being heard.”

(v) After deliberations on 16.06.2021, the Appellant's Representative prayed to remand back the case to the Forum for consideration and decision after giving the Appellant due opportunity of being heard. On being asked, the Respondent did not object to the said prayer of the Appellant's Representative.

(vi) In view of the above, the Court is inclined to remand back the present dispute to CGRF, Patiala for consideration and decision as per procedure laid down in PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2016. The complainant should be

given opportunity of being heard before deciding the Case as per law/regulations.

6. Decision

As a sequel of above discussions, the order dated 29.04.2021 of the CGRF, Patiala in Case No. T-169 of 2021 is set-aside. CGRF, Patiala will consider and decide the dispute case of the Appellant after following due procedure and as per applicable regulations as expeditiously as possible.

7. The Appeal is disposed of accordingly.

June 16, 2021
S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali)

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

