

**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. 63/2021**

**Date of Registration : 26.08.2021**

**Date of Hearing : 15.09.2021**

**Date of Order : 17.09.2021**

**Before:**

**Er. GurinderJit Singh,  
Lokpal (Ombudsman), Electricity, Punjab.**

**In the Matter of:**

M/s. Director Principal,  
PIMS Medical and Education Charitable Society,  
Garha Road, Jalandhar-144001

**Contract Account Number: 3002984515 (BS)**

...Appellant

Versus

Additional Superintending Engineer,  
DS Division, PSPCL, Jalandhar Cantt.

...Respondent

**Present For:**

Appellant: Sh. Inderjit Singh Bhatia,  
Appellant's Counsel.

Respondent : Er. Avtar Singh,  
Addl. SE/ DS Division, PSPCL,  
Jalandhar Cantt.

Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Appellant against the decision dated 29.07.2021 of the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (Forum), Ludhiana in Case No. CGL-59 of 2021, deciding that:

*“The amount charged is correct and is recoverable along with interest as per the prevailing instructions of Punjab State Power Corporation Limited.”*

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

A scrutiny of the Appeal and related documents revealed that the Appeal was received in this Court on 26.08.2021 within thirty days of receipt of copy of decision dated 29.07.2021. The Appellant deposited the requisite 40% of the disputed amount vide receipt nos. 154687986 dated 30.01.2021, 157326797 dated 26.03.2021 and 164163303 dated 23.08.2021. Therefore, the Appeal was registered and copy of the same was sent to the Addl. Superintending Engineer/ DS Division, PSPCL, Jalandhar Cantt for sending written reply/ parawise comments with a copy to the office of the CGRF, Ludhiana under intimation to the Appellant vide letter nos. 1179-81/OEP/A-63/2021 dated 26.08.2021.

### **3. Proceedings**

With a view to adjudicate the dispute, a hearing was fixed in this Court on 15.09.2021 at 12.00 Noon and an intimation to this effect was sent to both the parties vide letter nos. 1267-68/OEP/A-63/2021 dated 09.09.2021. As scheduled, the hearing was held on 15.09.2021 in this Court on the said date and time. Arguments were heard of both parties and order was reserved. Copies of the proceedings were sent to the Appellant and the Respondent vide letter nos. 1278-79/OEP/A-63/2021 dated 15.09.2021.

### **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's Counsel and the Respondent alongwith 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 Bulk Supply Category Connection, bearing Account No. 3002984515 with sanctioned load of 5280kW and Contract Demand (CD) as 5000 kVA under DS Division, PSPCL, Jalandhar Cantt in the name of Director-Principal/ PIMS, Jalandhar.
- (ii) The Appellant was a registered Charitable Society running a Medical College and Hospital under PPP Mode in association with Government of Punjab and the aforesaid Society was a non-profit making Organization working for charitable purposes and was providing medical services at subsidized rates. The Appellant had been regularly paying the electricity bills issued by PSPCL from time to time.
- (iii) The PSPCL had raised a demand of ₹ 92,30,649/- on account of Sundry Charges @ 3% on account of transformation losses vide Memo No. 1285 dated 06.12.2019 in respect of account of the Appellant.
- (iv) On receipt of the said demand notice, the Appellant had approached Respondent with a request for review of the impugned demand which was highly excessive and not payable by the Appellant. The Appellant had also challenged the calculations mentioned in the demand notice bearing Memo No. 1285 dated 06.12.2019.

- (v) In pursuant to the objections raised by the Appellant, Respondent admitted its fault and revised the demand and reduced the same to ₹ 41,04,228/- vide bill no. 1002633504 dated 21.04.2020. The Appellant again made a representation that the impugned revised demand was illegal and excessive and not payable by the Appellant.
- (vi) The Respondent had claimed the amount of Sundry Charges @ 3% on account of transformation losses for the period w.e.f. 01.06.2015 upto 22.11.2019. Since the disputed demand related back to the period w.e.f. June, 2015, the same was barred by time as per Section 56(2) of Punjab State Electricity Act read with Rule 93.2 of Electricity Supply Manual as per which demand for lawful arrears if any can be raised and enforced within two years from the date of such demand. The said provisions of law are reproduced hereunder:-

**Section 56(2) of Punjab State Electricity Act:-**

*“(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no sum due from any consumer, under this section 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 arrear of charges for*

*electricity supplied and the licensee shall not cut off the supply of the electricity.”*

**Rule 93.2 of Electricity Supply Manual:**

*“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.”*

- (vii) The Appellant represented that in view of Section 56(2) of Punjab State Electricity Act read with Rule 93.2 of Electricity Supply Manual, PSPCL was debarred from claiming the Sundry Charges for the period from June, 2015 to November, 2017 and requested for recall of the impugned time barred demand.
- (viii) The Appellant had already paid lawful demand for the period after November, 2017 amounting to ₹ 26,17,494/- (₹13,32,930/- and ₹ 12,84,564/- vide receipts dated 30.01.2021 and 26.03.2021 respectively). The balance amount was not due and payable being barred by time.
- (ix) The Appellant had preferred a complaint before the Forum on 15.07.2021 and had requested for waiver of the time barred

arrears alongwith interest thereon. However, the Forum had wrongly declined the lawful and genuine request of the Appellant and had imposed the recovery of ₹ 45,04,221/- alongwith interest upto 05.02.2021 amounting to ₹ 66,64,646/-.

- (x) The Forum had held that “in this case 3% consumption enhancement flag was inadvertently not updated at the time when billing was migrated in SAP on 21.07.2015.” It had further held that “Subsequently the amount had been charged on account of 3% enhancement for the period 01.07.2015 to 20.11.2019.”
- (xi) From the findings of the facts returned by the Forum, it was clearly established that there was lapse and negligence on the part of the Respondent in not updating 3% consumption enhancement flag at the time of the migration of billing in SAP. **Thus, the moot point was that who should suffer for the lapses and negligence on the part of the PSPCL and can it recover time barred arrears?**
- (xii) The recovery of the amount due from July, 2015 to November, 2017 was clearly barred by time as per Section 56(2) of Punjab State Electricity Act read with Rule 93.2 of Electricity Supply Manual. Therefore, Respondent cannot enforce time barred demand nor can recover any interest on such amount. The

Forum had not adjudicated upon the issue of time barred recovery nor had adjudicated upon the issue whether the Appellant was liable to be penalized by payment of interest on the impugned demand on account of lapses and negligence on the part of the Respondent. The law point raised by the Appellant had not been considered at all.

- (xiii) The Appellant humbly prayed that it was not liable to pay the arrears of 3% enhancement for the period July, 2015 to November, 2017 being time barred. Further, the Appellant was not liable to pay any interest on the disputed amount on account of lapses and negligence on the part of the Respondent. There was plethora of case law on the point by Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana and Hon'ble Supreme Court of India wherein Section 56(2) of Punjab State Electricity Act read with Rule 93.2 of Electricity Supply Manual had been invoked and it had been upheld that the Respondent cannot recover time barred arrears.
- (xiv) It was prayed that in the interest of justice, the Appeal may kindly be accepted, the impugned order dated 29.07.2021 passed by the Forum may kindly be set aside and the arrears for the period from June, 2015 to November, 2017 may kindly be waived off being barred by time and the entire interest amount



claimed be also waived off as the Appellant cannot be penalized for the lapses and negligence on the part of the Respondent. It was further prayed that pending the decision of the Appeal, the operation of the impugned order dated 29.07.2021 passed by the Forum may kindly be kept in abeyance.

**(b) Submissions made in Rejoinder**

The Appellant in its rejoinder to written reply of the Respondent, prayed as under:

- (i) It was denied that a sum of ₹ 45,04,321/- + ₹ 38,86,362/- amounting to ₹ 83,90,683/- was due and payable. It was also denied that a sum of ₹ 13,32,930/- only had been paid by the Appellant out of alleged amount. In fact, the Appellant had already paid lawful demand for the period after November, 2017 amounting to ₹ 26,65,858/- (₹ 13,32,930/- + ₹ 12,84,564/- + ₹ 48,364/- vide receipts dated 30.01.2021, 26.03.2021 & 23.08.2021). The balance amount was not due and payable being barred by time. The impugned demand was not legally sustainable nor legally enforceable being time barred.
- (ii) The order of the Forum dated 29.07.2021 passed in this case may be set aside. The arrears for the period from June, 2015 to November, 2017 may be waived off being barred by time and

the entire interest amount claimed be also waived off as the Appellant cannot be penalized for the lapses & negligence on the part of PSPCL.

**(c) Submission during hearing**

During hearing on 15.09.2021, the Appellant's Representative reiterated the submissions made in the Appeal as well as in 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) The last billing of the Appellant in manual ledger was in 05/2015. In addition to the consumption of electricity, the Appellant was being charged for enhanced consumption at the rate of 3%. The account of the Appellant was migrated to SAP System on 21.07.2015 but inadvertently the flag of charging 3% enhanced consumption was left to be set in the System in respect of the Appellant when the data was migrated to SAP System. The connection of the Appellant had been running on 132 kV and metering was being done on 11kV (LV side of transformers). The account of the Appellant for metering

voltage parameters was investigated and as per Clause No. 12 of the General Conditions of Tariff, the amount on account of 3% of enhanced consumption was charged to the Appellant. The Appellant was not billed for enhanced consumption for the period 01.07.2015 to 20.11.2019 and as per clause 12 of the General Conditions of Tariff, a sum of ₹ 45,04,320/- was charged to the Appellant as per CB Cell Memo No. 139/CSC/JAL dated 10.02.2020 and the amount alongwith interest upto 05.02.2021 became to the tune of ₹ 66,64,446/- and the Appellant had not paid the said amount.

- (ii) The Appellant was under obligation to pay the transformation losses by enhanced 3% consumption as per Clause 12 of General Conditions of Tariff.
- (iii) The amount charged to the Appellant on 17.03.2021 was ₹ 45,04,321/- and interest thereon was ₹ 38,86,362/-. Thus, the amount from 17.03.2021 to 31.08.2021 had become ₹ 45,04,321/- + ₹ 38,86,362/- = ₹ 83,90,683/-. Against this demand of the Respondent, the Appellant had paid an amount of ₹ 13,32,930/- on 31.01.2021 vide receipt no. 154687986.
- (iv) The Appellant had not been depositing any amount other than the current bills with the Respondent.
- (v) HT rebate was given to the Appellant in all monthly bills.

**(b) Submission during hearing**

During hearing on 15.09.2021, the Respondent reiterated the submissions made by it in the written reply and contested the submissions of the Appellant's Counsel. The Respondent confirmed that 40% of the disputed amount had been deposited by the Appellant & prayed for dismissal of the Appeal.

**5. Analysis and Findings**

The issue requiring adjudication is the legitimacy of the amount charged to the Appellant for the period 01.06.2015 to 22.11.2019 on account of 3% consumption enhancement due to non- updating of flag in SAP system by the Respondent.

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

- (i) The Appellant argued that the Respondent had earlier raised a demand of ₹ 92,30,649/- on account of Sundry Charges @ 3% on account of transformation losses vide Memo No. 1285 dated 06.12.2019 in respect of account of the Appellant. On receipt of the said demand notice, the Appellant had approached Respondent with a request for review of the impugned demand which was highly excessive and not payable by the Appellant.

The Appellant had also challenged the calculations mentioned in the said demand notice.

- (ii) Later on, in pursuant to the objections raised by the Appellant, the Respondent admitted its fault and revised the demand and reduced the same to ₹ 41,04,228/- vide bill no. 1002633504 dated 21.04.2020. The Appellant again made a representation that the impugned revised demand was illegal and excessive and not payable by the Appellant.
- (iii) The Respondent had claimed the amount of Sundry Charges @ 3% on account of transformation losses for the period 01.06.2015 to 22.11.2019. Since the disputed demand related back to the period w.e.f June, 2015, the same was barred by time as per Section 56 (2) of Punjab State Electricity Act read with Rule 93.2 of Electricity Supply Manual as per which demand for lawful arrears if any can be raised and enforced within two years from the date of such demand. The said provisions of law are reproduced hereunder:-

**Section 56(2) of Punjab State Electricity Act:-**

*“(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no sum due from any consumer, under this section 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 arrear of charges for electricity supplied and the licensee shall not cut off the supply of the electricity.”*

**Rule 93.2 of Electricity Supply Manual:**

*“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 Appellant argued that in view of Section 56(2) of Punjab State Electricity Act read with Rule 93.2 of Electricity Supply Manual, PSPCL was debarred from claiming the Sundry Charges for the period from June, 2015 to November, 2017 and requested for recall of the impugned time barred demand.
- (v) The Appellant had already paid lawful demand for the period after November, 2017 amounting to ₹ 26,17,494/- (₹ 13,32,930/- and ₹ 12,84,564/- vide receipts dated 30.01.2021 and 26.03.2021 respectively). The balance amount was not due and payable being barred by time.

- (vi) The Appellant had preferred a complaint before the Forum on 15.07.2021 and had requested for waiver of the time barred arrears alongwith interest thereon. However, the Forum had wrongly declined the lawful and genuine request of the Appellant and had imposed the recovery of ₹ 45,04,221/- alongwith interest upto 05.02.2021 amounting to ₹ 66,64,646/-.
- (vii) The Forum had held that “in this case 3% consumption enhancement flag was inadvertently not updated at the time when billing was migrated in SAP on 21.07.2015.” It had further held that “Subsequently the amount had been charged on account of 3% enhancement for the period 01.07.2015 to 20.11.2019.”
- (viii) It was clearly established that there was lapse and negligence on the part of the Respondent in not updating 3% consumption enhancement flag at the time of the migration of billing in SAP. Thus, the moot point was that who should suffer for the lapses and negligence on the part of the PSPCL and can it recover time barred arrears?
- (ix) The Respondent cannot enforce time barred demand nor can recover any interest on such amount. The Forum had not adjudicated upon the issue of time barred recovery nor adjudicated upon the issue whether the Appellant was liable to

be penalized by payment of interest on the impugned demand on account of lapses and negligence on the part of the Respondent. The law point raised by the Appellant had not been considered at all.

- (x) The Appellant prayed that it was not liable to pay the arrears of 3% enhancement for the period July, 2015 to November, 2017 being time barred. Further, the Appellant was not liable to pay any interest on the disputed amount on account of lapses and negligence on the part of the Respondent.
- (xi) It was prayed that in the interest of justice, the Appeal may kindly be accepted, the impugned order dated 29.07.2021 passed by the Forum may kindly be set aside and the arrears for the period from June, 2015 to November, 2017 may kindly be waived off being barred by time and the entire interest amount claimed be also waived off as the Appellant cannot be penalized for the lapses and negligence on the part of the Respondent.
- (xii) The Respondent, in its defence, stated that earlier the Appellant was being charged for enhanced consumption at the rate of 3%. Later on, the account of the Appellant was migrated to SAP System on 21.07.2015 but inadvertently the flag of charging 3% enhanced consumption was left to be set in the SAP System



in respect of the Appellant. The connection of the Appellant had been running on 132 kV and metering was being done on 11kV. The account of the Appellant for metering voltage parameters was investigated and as per Clause No. 12 of the General Conditions of Tariff, the amount on account of 3% of enhanced consumption was charged to the Appellant. The Appellant was not billed for enhanced consumption for the period 01.07.2015 to 20.11.2019 and as per Clause 12 of the ibid conditions, a sum of ₹ 45,04,320/- was charged to the Appellant as per CB Cell Memo No. 139 dated 10.02.2020. The amount alongwith interest upto 05.02.2021 became to the tune of ₹ 66,64,446/- and the Appellant had not paid the said amount. The said amount was recoverable from the Appellant.

- (xiii) The Clause 12 of General Conditions of Tariff is reproduced hereunder: -

***“Non availability of Metering Equipment***

*In case of an HT/EHT consumers receiving supply at 11 kV and above, where metering equipment is installed on the LV side of the transformer due to no availability of metering equipment, both the energy consumption (kWh/kVAh) and the maximum demand shall be enhanced by 3% to account for the transformation losses.”*

(xiv) The above clause unequivocally and explicitly empowers the Distribution Licensee to enhance the billing of the Appellant by 3% of the consumption and the Appellant had also admitted this fact but disputed the recovery of the amount for the period July, 2015 to November, 2017 being time barred. This plea of the Appellant is not sustainable in view of the fact that the Appellant was a Bulk Supply Consumer & had a battery of staff consisting of experts in each field to run its Institution but all of them failed to point out the mistakes in the billing. The Appellant had not pointed out this mistake with malafide intention and kept quiet for long time. This was inadvertent mistake on the part of the Respondent as it left to set flag of 3% enhanced consumption in the system at the time of migration of data to SAP system on 21.07.2015. This enhancement of 3% consumption was being recovered from the Appellant through monthly bills prior to 07/2015 & he never objected to these bills. Further, the Appellant had already taken the benefit of lesser billing for a quite long period from 01.06.2015 to 22.11.2019 and had also enjoyed the benefit of HT rebate during this period.

(xv) The Forum while deciding this case on 29.07.2021 had observed as under: -

*“Feasibility clearance for this BS connection having load of 5280 KW / 6 MVA C.D. was allowed vide memo no. 38171 dated 08.06.2004 from the office of CE Commercial of PSEB, Patiala.*

*Metering is done at 11 KV for this connection as is clear from the bill of 12/2020 and also from the notice served to the consumer vide memo no. 1285/86 dated 06.12.2019.*

*In this case is that 3% consumption enhancement flag was inadvertently not updated at the time when billing was migrated in SAP on 21.07.2015.*

*Subsequently the amount has been charged on account of 3% enhancement for the period 01.07.2015 to 20.11.2019.*

*Total amount charged is Rs. 4504221/- which along with interest upto 05.02.2021 works out to be Rs. 6664646/-.*

*As per General Conditions of tariff clause no. 12, “In case of HT/ET consumers receiving supply at 11Kv and above, if meter equipment is installed on LV side of the transformer due to non-availability of metering equipment, both the energy consumption (kWh/kVAh) and maximum demand shall be enhanced by 3% to account for the transformation losses.”*

*If before migration in SAP, the amount was duly charged. Inadvertently at the time of migration of data in SAP, this enhancement was omitted, {flag was not set}, consumer was also fully aware that he was being charged 3% less in monthly bill after migration in SAP, but he did not raise any issue. Even after 22.11.2019,*

*Petitioner is paying legitimate 3% additional consumption charges.*

*From the above, it is clear that amount charged is correct and is recoverable along with interest as per the prevailing instructions of Punjab State Power Corporation Limited”.*

- (xvi) This Court agrees with the findings of the Forum in view of the fact that the Appellant was aware of this mistake on the part of the Respondent that it was being charged 3% less in monthly bills after migration of the account in SAP system but it did not raise any issue deliberately and when the Respondent detected the mistake and raised the demand then the Appellant raised time barred plea.
- (xvii) This Court had observed that supply voltage of this Bulk Supply Consumer is 132 kV as per feasibility clearance granted vide Memo No. 38171 dated 08.06.2004. Metering equipment for this consumer for the whole supply should have been installed on 132 kV side of the Transformers at the point of commencement of supply. Metering equipment on 11kV (LV side of transformers) can be installed only in case of non-availability of metering equipment. The metering in this case is still being done on 11 kV. The Respondent failed to justify the continuance of billing at 11 kV which should be done on 132

kV side in this case. It is difficult to believe that there was shortage of 132 kV metering equipment since the release of connection on 08.10.2009.

(xviii) The Respondent had confirmed vide its Memo No. 10024 dated 14.09.2021 that HT rebate was given to the Appellant in monthly electricity bills. As such, the Appellant had availed the benefit of HT rebate during the period of dispute (01.06.2015 to 22.11.2019). This rebate was admissible only after enhancement of consumption recorded on LV side by 3% to account for transformation losses. The Appellant had been benefitted due to lapse on the part of the Respondent.

(xix) The Appellant's Counsel during hearing on 15.09.2021 quoted the following judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court :-

“C. Electricity Act, 2003, Section 185(5) and 56(2) – Interest - Electricity bill – The liability to pay electricity charges is a statutory liability – Bill raised only in 2003- The question of charging any interest thereupon from a retrospective date would not arise.”

The demand raised by the Respondent vide Memo No. 232 dated 14.02.2020 for ₹ 45,04,320/- is on account of electricity charges worked out as per tariff orders of PSERC and the Appellant is liable to clear this statutory liability. The Appellant

shall not be liable to pay any interest prior to 14.02.2020 on this amount.

The Appellant had quoted Section 56(2) of Punjab State Electricity Act but this quoted Act does not exist.

PSPCL had published Electricity Instruction Manual and it contains instructions. These are not the rules as mentioned by the Appellant in its Appeal.

- (xx) The Appellant had mentioned in its rejoinder to the reply that it had paid lawful demand for the period after November, 2017 amounting to ₹ 26,65,858/- and had paid 3% transformation charges even prior to period of dispute and after period of dispute (01.06.2015 to 22.11.2019). It cannot refuse to pay the disputed amount relating to the period June, 2015 to November, 2017 which is a statutory liability. The Appellant failed to quote any law/ rules/ regulations under which these charges can be waived off.
- (xxi) The officials/ officers of PSPCL failed to detect the errors in the monthly billing for the period 07/2015 to 11/2019 resulting into considerable loss to the Licensee. Had the Licensee taken timely action to detect the mistakes in the billing of this Bulk Supply Connection, this dispute would not have arisen.

(xxii) From the above, it is concluded that the Appellant had unnecessarily raised dispute regarding the demand raised by the Respondent. The Appellant had already taken the benefit of considerable amount by not paying the same at the relevant time, though it may be due to negligence of the Respondent but the Appellant very well knew that it was being billed less amount but the Appellant had not pointed out this mistake to the Respondent. Therefore, the demand raised by the Respondent vide Memo No. 232 dated 14.02.2020 amounting to ₹ 45,04,320/- is fully recoverable. Interest on this amount prior to 14.02.2020 shall not be charged. However, interest after this date shall be payable as per PSPCL instructions till the date the amount is recovered. The prayer of the Appellant to waive off the arrears for the period from June, 2015 to November, 2017 is hereby rejected after due consideration of all the facts and pleading of both parties.

## **6. Decision**

The Appeal No. 63/2021 is disposed of as detailed below:-

- (a) The demand amounting to ₹ 45,04,320 /- raised vide Memo No. 232 dated 14.02.2020 is fully recoverable.
- (b) Interest on this amount prior to 14.02.2020 shall not be levied.

(c) Interest on this amount shall be charged after 14.02.2020 as per PSPCL instructions till the amount is recovered.

7. 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.
8. 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.

September 17, 2021  
S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali)

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