

**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. 98/2021

**Date of Registration : 17.12.2021
Date of Hearing : 04.01.2022
Date of Order : 04.01.2022**

Before:

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

In the Matter of:

Smt. Neeru Matta,
M/s. Shoe Hut, Model Town Market,
Near Gulati Chowk,
Ludhiana.

Contract Account Number: 3002861220 (NRS)

...Appellant

Versus

Additional Superintending Engineer,
DS Model Town (Spl.) Division,
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Present For:

Appellant : Sh. Rajesh Jain,
Appellant's Representative.

Respondent : 1. Er. M.P.Singh,
ASE/ DS Model Town (Spl.) Divn.,
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

2. Sh. Satnam Singh,
AAO (Revenue)

Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Appellant against the decision dated 30.09.2021 of the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (Forum), Ludhiana in Case No. CGL-246 of 2021, deciding that:

- i. *“The account of the Petitioner be overhauled for six months prior to the date of checking i.e. 19.02.2021. The notice issued vide memo no. 802 dated 24.05.2021 to deposit Rs. 427312/- be revised accordingly.*
- ii. *Dy. CE Suburban Circle PSPCL Ludhiana should ensure to initiate action against officers/officials for non-compliance of instructions/regulations quoted above, leading to revenue loss to PSPCL.”*

2. Registration of the Appeal

A scrutiny of the Appeal and related documents revealed that the Appeal was received in this Court on 17.12.2021 i.e. beyond the period of thirty days of receipt of the decision dated 30.09.2021 of the CGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CGL-246 of 2021. After the implementation of the decision of the Forum, the disputed amount remained as ₹ 97,517/- and the Appellant had already deposited ₹ 85,500/- vide Receipt No. 161266831 dated 27.06.2021 as 20% of the original disputed amount of ₹ 4,27,312/- before filing her petition before the Forum. Therefore, the Appeal was registered and copy of the same was sent to the Addl. SE/ DS Model Town (Spl.) Division, 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. 1757-1759/OEP/A-98/2021 dated 17.12.2021.

3. Proceedings

With a view to adjudicate the dispute, a hearing was fixed in this Court on 04.01.2022 at 12.00 Noon and an intimation to this effect was sent to both the parties vide letter nos. 1791-92/OEP/A-98/2021 dated 29.12.2021. As scheduled, the hearing was held in this Court. Arguments of both the parties were heard.

4. Condonation of Delay

At the start of hearing on 04.01.2022, the issue of condoning of delay in filing the Appeal in this Court was taken up. The Appellant's Representative stated that the decision of the Forum was received by the Appellant on 25.10.2021. Thereafter the Appellant requested the Respondent to supply complete DDL for filing the Appeal. The Appellant's Representative prayed that the delay be kindly condoned in the interest of justice. I find that the Respondent didn't object to the condoning of delay in filing the Appeal in this Court either in its written reply or during hearing of the case 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.”

The Court observed that order dated 30.09.2021 was sent to the Appellant by the office of the Forum vide Memo No. 3644/CGL-246/21 dated 21.10.2021 and the Appeal was received in this Court on 17.12.2021 i.e. after more than 30 days of receipt of the said order. It was also observed that non-condoning of 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's Representative 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 submissions made by the Appellant's Representative 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 NRS Category connection, bearing Account No. 3002861220, with sanctioned load of 39.980 kW and CD as 44.42 kVA running under DS Model Town (Spl.) Division, PSPCL, Ludhiana.
- (ii) The Appellant was a law abiding citizen of India and was regularly paying the electricity bills raised by PSPCL office within the stipulated period as specified from time to time. Except for the present demand, her accounts with PSPCL were clear upto date.
- (iii) On 19.02.2021, the Addl. S.E./Enforcement Division, PSPCL, Ludhiana under Mass checking, checked the electricity

connection of the Appellant's shop vide Report No. 06/3250 dated 19.02.2021.

- (iv) The checking team headed by the Addl. SE noticed that display of the meter showed Star sign. The voltage on 'R' Phase was 197.1 volts, Yellow Phase voltage was 64 volts and voltage of 'Blue' Phase was 205 volts. The checking team, thereafter, checked the accuracy of the metering equipment with LTERS Meter on kVAh mode and noticed the running load as 23 kW and PF 0.93, as such declared the metering equipment slow by 38.74%. The checking team then checked the CT Chamber and noticed the formation of some material due to oxidation on the incoming supply on Red, Yellow, Blue and Neutral potential and main supply joint which was then set- right by the Operation Staff at the site and after that the voltage on Red was showing as 245, Yellow 245 and Blue 234. The accuracy of the metering equipment was again checked by the checking team with LTERS Meter and the results were within the permissible limits. The checking team suggested to overhaul the accounts of the applicant/consumer as per PSPCL instructions after verifying the complete DDL and temper data which had been obtained by the checking team.

- (v) The Enforcement Officer checked the slowness of the meter with LTERS meter on kVAh mode, whereas it should have been checked on kW Mode as mentioned in the ECR No. 06/3250.
- (vi) The checking team in para no. 3 of ECR No. 06/3250 dated 19.02.2021 desired to get the accuracy of the metering equipment in question and ME seals fixed on the meter checked by the ME Lab with complete DDL to be done, as such the metering equipment was to be sent to the ME Lab duly packed and sealed.
- (vii) The Respondent on receipt of checking report by the S.E./Enforcement dated 19.02.2021 overhauled the accounts of the Appellant for the period 04.05.2019 to 19.02.2021 (657 days) and raised the demand of ₹ 4,27,312/- vide its Memo No. 802 dated 24.05.2021 in compliance of the directions issued by the checking team of Enforcement Division in the ECR No. 6/3250 dated 19.02.2021 and directed the Appellant to pay the said amount within 15 days from the issue of that notice.
- (viii) On the receipt of notice, the authorized representative of the Appellant approached the office of the Respondent with a written request dated 11.06.2021 for the supply of following documents related to the checking dated 19.02.2021 of the metering equipment installed in the Appellant's premise:-

(a) Copy of the DDL obtained by the Enforcement Division on 19.02.2021 as per ECR No. 6/3250 and complete DDL done by the ME Lab, Ludhiana.

(b) Copy of the ME Lab checking report of the removed meter confirming the metering equipment in question slow by 38.74%.

(c) Copy of the Meter Change Order, if any.

But the Respondent did not supply the above documents to the Appellant. As such, the Appellant filed its case with CGRF on 30.06.2021.

(ix) The Respondent in its reply in the written statement to the Forum admitted in Para no. 6 that the accounts of the Appellant had been overhauled after getting the speaking order from the Enforcement wing, which was absolutely wrong. No such speaking order was ever issued by the Enforcement Division as alleged in the para.

(x) As per the procedure, the ME Lab in its report certifies that the said checking has been made on the basis of authorization letter given by the Consumer to the Respondent for which the Consumer will remain bound by the results of the checking, but there were no such remarks given by the ME Lab on the checking report while incorporating its findings on the store

Challan No. 868 dated 08.03.2021, which was absolutely wrong and against the rules and regulations framed for the checking of electric meter in ME Lab by the PSPCL. More so, there was no mention in the report as to whether the meter equipment was brought to ME Lab in seal pack condition or not. The report of the ME Lab was accepted by the Forum despite of raising objection by the Appellant's representative.

- (xi) The Respondent issued the Demand Notice vide Memo No. 802 dated 24.05.2021 without application of mind and without considering the observations made by the Checking Agency of Enforcement Division, Ludhiana in its report on ECR No. 06/3250 dated 19.02.2011. The Demand Notice had put the Appellant in quandary as every penal action should be supported by the rules, regulations and necessary record to be considered by the Respondent. The Appellant had the right to know the rules and regulations under which the Appellant was being penalized. The Respondent should quote the relevant regulations of the Supply Code or any other regulations framed by the competent authority under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003.
- (xii) The Demand Notice dated 24.05.2021, speaks only with regard to the checking of Addl. S.E./ Enforcement, PSPCL, Ludhiana

on ECR No. 06/3250 dated 19.02.2021 without fulfilling the requirement of complete DDL to be obtained from the M.E. Lab in addition to the necessary checking of the meter equipment etc.

- (xiii) The meter of the Appellant was checked by the Addl. SE/ Enforcement on 19.02.2021 by testing the connection with LTERS Meter on kVAh mode and declared the meter being slow by 38.74% due to oxidation of LT/CT wire. It appears that the DDL for the energy consumed record prior to 19.02.2021 had not been taken by the Enforcement Agency nor the Respondent had supplied the same to the Appellant despite of repeated requests given in writing to the Respondent by the Appellant.
- (xiv) The scrutiny of the DDL would reveal that the data of Load Survey report for the period prior to 19.02.2021 had not been downloaded by the Enforcement Agency as such in his checking report left the onus of complete DDL on the ME Lab while checking the meter in question. The ME Lab had only obtained the temper data which was in the possession of the Respondent earlier also and the basic requirement of the Enforcement Agency had not been looked into.

(xv) The scrutiny of the Meter Change Order dated 08.03.2021 supplied by the Respondent, revealed that the meter in question was changed on 21.05.2021 as per MCO No. 100012622018 dated 26.02.2021 and new meter bearing serial no. X03231227 was installed. Whereas, the MCO finish date had been shown as 03.03.2021 and even in the reply furnished to the Forum by the Respondent, there was no mention of the date on which the metering equipment was changed. Un-authenticated date had been written as 08.03.2021 with pen and in the column of signature of JE with date only initial had been appended and that too without date on the copy of MCO supplied by the Respondent to the Appellant. There was no mention of the name of the JE, who executed the MCO. If the same had been effected on the alleged date i.e. 08.03.2021, the same could not be checked by the ME Lab on the same date as mentioned in the Store Challan No. 868 dated 08.03.2021 then why new metering equipment bearing serial no. X0323127 was installed on 21.05.2021 as mentioned in the MCO. The contention of the Respondent that the old metering equipment was changed on 08.03.2021 and the same got checked from the ME Lab appeared to be fairytale. The ME Lab checked the metering equipment on 08.03.2021 then why the ME Lab not checked all

the parameters mentioned in the Enforcement Checking Report dated 19.02.2021? The ME Lab failed to obtain the complete DDL as asked for by the Enforcement in its report. On the contrary, the ME Lab obtained temper data only which was already downloaded by the Enforcement Staff on 19.02.2021. The report of the ME Lab was incomplete as the Load Survey Data for the period prior to 19.02.2021 had not been downloaded from where it could have been ascertained regarding the period for which the metering equipment remained slow and for how much time.

- (xvi) The Meter equipment was changed on 08.03.2021 and tested in the ME Lab on the same date where the meter in question was found within permissible limit. Actually, the data required to ascertain the slowness of the meter prior to the checking dated 19.02.2021 had not been obtained by the ME Lab.
- (xvii) ME Lab in its checking declared the accuracy of the meter within limit and the temper data obtained by ME Lab had failed to show persistence of oxidation on the joints as alleged in the ECR report. In fact, the joints in aluminum conductors which were being used by the Respondent got loosened with the passage of time which resulted in the make and break of the connection which was natural phenomena and not due to

oxidation as alleged in the checking report. The Respondent overhauled the accounts of the Appellant arbitrarily without looking for the exact cause of the slowness as alleged in the ECR which does not had any legal bearing.

(xviii) On 19.11.2021, the Appellant requested the Respondent viz.

AEE/ Commercial, PSPCL, Model Town Division, Ludhiana for the supply of the certain documents sent vide registered post. Till date, no information/ document had been supplied to the Appellant. After waiting considerably, the Appellant decided to file the Appeal in this Court.

(xix) The Appellant respectfully prayed that in view of the above submissions, the order passed by the Forum be set aside and the Respondent be directed to obtain the Fresh Load Survey Data of the meter in-question as per the observations of the Enforcement Division in the ECR dated 19.02.2021 to ascertain the exact period of slowness and to raise fresh demand of the slowness period.

(b) Submission during hearing

During hearing on 04.01.2022, the Appellant's Representative (AR) reiterated the submissions made in the Appeal and prayed to allow the same. AR pleaded that the period of overhauling

should be less than six months but he could not provide any documentary evidence to justify his claim.

(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 was having a NRS Category connection, bearing account no. 3002861220, with sanctioned load of 39.980 kW and CD as 44.420 kVA.
- (ii) The connection of the Appellant was checked by Addl. SE/ Enf.-6, Ludhiana vide ECR No. 6/3250 dated 19.02.2021. It was observed by the Enforcement staff that “Metering Equipment was running slow by 38.74% & found incoming Potential Wires of R,Y,B & Neutral Phase were oxidized at main supply joint”. The same was got corrected with the help of operation staff & accuracy of metering equipment was again checked & found within limits.
- (iii) The account of the Appellant was overhauled for the period from 04.05.2019 to 19.02.2021 as per Enforcement Wing speaking orders and was served with a Notice vide Memo No. 802 dated 24.05.2021 to deposit the amount of ₹ 4,27,312/- as per calculation sheet. The Appellant did not deposit the amount

and approached the Forum. The Forum vide its order dated 30.09.2021 received vide Memo No. 3642 dated 21.10.2021 decided the Appellant's case by reducing the overhauling period from 04.05.2019 to 19.02.2021 to 6 months period prior to the date of checking i.e. 19.02.2021. As per the decision of the Forum, the period of overhauling was curtailed to 22.08.2020 to 18.02.2021 (180 days) and the amount charged was reduced to ₹ 97,517/- from ₹ 4,27,312/- charged earlier.

- (iv) The Respondent stated that the Appellant never approached them regarding the correction of her name being printed on bills for the last so many years.
- (v) The Respondent submitted that account of the Appellant was overhauled as per speaking orders given by the Enforcement wing vide Memo No. 1510 dated 20.05.2021 after going through the tamper report of the meter and no documents were demanded by the Appellant from them related to the checking of connection.
- (vi) The Meter was checked at ME Lab vide Challan No. 868 dated 08.03.2021 which had a remarks of ਸਹਿਮਤੀ in place of the Appellant's signature & that ਸਹਿਮਤੀ ਖੱਤਰ was also submitted in the Forum at the time of reply to rejoinder of the Appellant.

- (vii) The Appellant had never raised the issue before the Forum that the Demand was raised to her without fulfilling the requirement of complete DDL by the ME Lab. The account of the Appellant was overhauled after having speaking orders & the same were issued from tamper report of checked meter which was quite relevant to overhaul the account of the Appellant. The tamper report of the meter was taken which included old period too. The tamper data was needed to have results of working of the meter which was done by the Enforcement wing.
- (viii) MCO was generated in SAP System in which the system automatically print its finish date, as it was done in this case also. MCO No. 100012622018 dated 26.02.2021 was issued & its finish date was printed by the system as 03.03.2021, but actually the meter was replaced on 08.03.2021. This Job Order was completed in SAP System by the Computer Operator as on 21.05.2021, which was reflected on Job Order. As this Job Order was being completed manually, therefore the signature of JE and date of effecting the MCO were written on this system generated Job Order (MCO).
- (ix) The Meter was sent to ME Lab after clearing oxidation, as such the accuracy of the meter was found within permissible limits in ME Lab and also the ME Lab report did not mention about

persistence of oxidation on the joints. The meter working was also OK at site too when the oxidation was removed & cleared by Enforcement team. The Appellant never raised this issue before the Forum.

- (x) The Respondent submitted that after receiving letter from the Appellant regarding survey report of DDL, the same had been forwarded to AEE, ME Ludhiana through e-mail on 10.12.2021 and due to ongoing stir from 15.11.2021 to 02.12.2021, the work of office of the Respondent was affected & due to technical staff non co-operation at ME Lab till 23.12.2021, routine work was also affected.
- (xi) The Respondent prayed for the dismissal of the Appeal.

(b) Submission during hearing

During hearing on 04.01.2022, the Respondent reiterated the submissions made in its 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 the amount of ₹97,517/- charged for the slowness of meter by 38.74% for the period from 22.08.2020 to 18.02.2021 as per the decision dated 30.09.2021 in Case No. CGL-246 of 2021 of the Forum.

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

- (i) The Appellant was having a NRS Category connection, bearing Account No. 3002861220, with sanctioned load of 39.980 kW and CD as 44.42 kVA running under DS Model Town (Spl.) Division, PSPCL, Ludhiana. The connection of the Appellant was checked by the Addl. SE/ Enf.-6, Ludhiana vide ECR No. 6/3250 dated 19.02.2021 in which it was observed that the Metering Equipment was running slow by 38.74% due to oxidization at main supply joint. The same was got corrected at the site with the help of operation staff & accuracy of metering equipment was again checked & found within limits. The meter was replaced vide MCO No. 100012622018 dated 26.02.2021 effected on 08.03.2021 and was checked in ME Lab vide Store Challan No. 868 dated 08.03.2021 where the accuracy of the meter was found within the permissible limits and DDL (only Temper data) was taken. The Respondent issued a notice for ₹ 4,27,312/- vide Memo No. 802 dated 24.05.2021 for the slowness of meter by 38.74% for the period from 04.05.2019 to 19.02.2021 on the basis of speaking orders of the Addl. SE/ Enf.-6, Ludhiana vide Memo No.1510 dated

19.02.2021. The Appellant did not agree with this and approached the Forum. The Forum vide its decision dated 30.09.2021 in Case No. CGL-246 of 2021 decided that:

“The account of the Petitioner be overhauled for six months prior to the date of checking i.e. 19.02.2021. The notice issued vide memo no. 802 dated 24.05.2021 to deposit Rs. 427312/- be revised accordingly.

Dy. CE Suburban Circle PSPCL Ludhiana should ensure to initiate action against officers/officials for non-compliance of instructions/regulations quoted above, leading to revenue loss to PSPCL.”

- (ii) The Appellant pleaded that the complete DDL was not done by the ME Lab as desired in ECR No. 06/3250 dated 19.02.2021 by the checking authority due to which the exact period for which the meter was slow by 38.74% could not be ascertained and the Respondent arbitrarily charged her an amount of ₹ 4,27,312/- vide Memo No. 802 dated 24.05.2021 for the period from 04.05.2019 to 19.02.2021 on the basis of checking vide ECR No. 06/3250 only. The ME Lab obtained Tamper Report only but the Load Survey Data for the period prior to 19.02.2021 was not downloaded from where it could had been ascertained regarding the period for which the metering equipment remained slow and for how much time and even the Forum did not consider her plea on

this fact while deciding the case on 30.09.2021. The Appellant further pleaded that meter was not checked in ME Lab in her presence.

- (iii) The Respondent controverted the pleas raised by the Appellant and argued that the amount of ₹ 4,27,312/- was charged to the Appellant on the basis of speaking orders of Addl. SE/ Enf.-6, Ludhiana delivered vide Memo No. 1510 dated 19.02.2021 and the same were issued from Tamper report of checked meter, which also had the data for the period prior to 19.02.2021, which was quite relevant to overhaul the account of the Appellant and the Appellant had never raised this issue before the Forum. The Respondent further argued that the Meter was checked at ME Lab vide Challan No. 868 dated 08.03.2021 which had a remarks of ਸਹਿਮਤੀ in place of the Appellant's signature & that ਸਹਿਮਤੀ ਪੱਤਰ was also submitted in the Forum at the time of reply to rejoinder of the Appellant. As such, the Appellant had given her consent that she would have no objection if the meter was checked in ME Lab in her absence and she would abide with the ME Lab report and would not challenge it in any court or DSC.

- (iv) The Forum in its decision dated 30.09.2021 observed that the account of the Appellant was overhauled for the period from 04.05.2019 to 19.02.2021 in line with the speaking orders of the Enf. vide Memo No. 1510 dated 20.05.2021. During proceeding dated 09.09.2021 in the Forum, the Appellant asked for the copy of consent given by her for checking the meter in ME Lab, which was provided by the Respondent on 30.09.2021. The Forum also observed that the defect due to which meter was slow was set right at site itself on 19.02.2021 and that the replacement of meter and its checking in ME Lab had no direct relevance to the case. The Forum further observed that the account of the Appellant was to be overhauled as per Regulation 21.5.1 of Supply Code-2014, but since the said Regulation allowed overhauling of account only for the period not exceeding six months immediately preceding the date of checking, so it decided that the account of the Appellant be overhauled for six months prior to the date of checking i.e. 19.02.2021.
- (v) I have gone through the written submissions made by the Appellant in the Appeal, written reply of the Respondent as well as oral arguments of both the parties during the hearing. The meter of the Appellant was checked in mass

checking by the Addl. SE/Enf-cum-EA&MMTS-6, Ludhiana vide ECR No. 06/3250 dated 19.02.2021 in which it was observed that there was star sign on the display of the meter and the voltage on 'R' Phase was 197.1 volts, Yellow Phase voltage was 64 volts and voltage of 'Blue' Phase was 205 volts. The meter was checked in the presence of Appellant's Representative and found slow by 38.74%. The checking team then checked the CT Chamber and noticed the formation of some material due to oxidation on the incoming supply on Red, Yellow, Blue and Neutral potential and main supply joint. That was got cleaned with the help of Operation Staff at site and after that the voltage on Red phase was 245 Volts, Yellow Phase was indicating 245 Volts and Blue Phase was showing 234 Volts. The accuracy of the metering equipment was again checked by the checking team with LTERS Meter and the results were within the permissible limits. The meter was removed and again checked in ME Lab on 08.03.2021 vide Store Challan No. 868 by Addl. SE/ Enf-cum-EA&MMTS-6, Ludhiana and Tamper report of the meter was taken. The Addl. SE/Enf-cum-EA&MMTS-6, Ludhiana in his speaking

orders vide Memo. No. 1510 dated 20.05.2021 explained that:

“ਡੀਡੀਐਲ ਪ੍ਰਿੰਟ (ਟੈਂਪਰ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ) ਘੋਖਣ ਤੇ ਦੇਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਕਿ ਮਿਤੀ 04-05-2019 ਤੋਂ ਤਿੰਨਾ ਫੇਸਾਂ ਤੇ ਵੋਲਟੇਜ ਠੀਕ ਕੰਟਰੀਬਿਊਟ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੋ ਰਹੀ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਮਿਤੀ 04-05-2019 ਤੋਂ ਮਿਤੀ 19-02-2021 ਤੱਕ voltage unbalance ਆ ਰਹੀ ਹੈ। ਜਿਸ ਦਾ ਪ੍ਰਿੰਟ ਆਊਟ (Tamper Report) ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਨੂੰ ਨਾਲ ਨੱਥੀ ਕਰ ਕੇ ਭੇਜੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ।

ਉਪ੍ਰੋਕਤ ਨੂੰ ਮੁੱਖ ਰਖਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਖਪਤਕਾਰ ਦਾ ਖਾਤਾ ਮਹਿਕਮੇ ਦੀਆਂ ਹਦਾਇਤਾਂ ਮੁਤਾਬਿਕ ਸੋਧਿਆ ਜਾਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਚਾਰਜ ਕੀਤੀ ਰਕਮ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਇਸ ਦਫਤਰ ਨੂੰ ਭੇਜੀ ਜਾਵੇ।”

On the basis of above, the Appellant was charged an amount of ₹ 4,27,312/- vide Memo No. 802 dated 24.05.2021 for the period from 04.05.2019 to 19.02.2021 by the Respondent.

This court agrees with the observation of the Forum that the account of the Appellant was to be overhauled as per Regulation 21.5.1 of Supply Code-2014, but since the said Regulation allowed overhauling of account only for the period not exceeding six months immediately preceding the date of checking so it decided that the account of the Appellant be overhauled for six months prior to the date of checking i.e 19.02.2021.

- (vi) I also agree with the observations recorded by the Forum in its decision dated 30.09.2021 regarding the deficiency in the services by the officials/officers of the PSPCL which caused a huge revenue loss to the PSPCL. The officials responsible for taking readings of the Appellant's connection failed to notice the star sign on the display of the meter and failed to notice whether all phases were blinking at the time of readings. The MCO did not bear the signatures of the Appellant or her representative.
- (vii) The name of Consumer should be corrected by the Respondent after completing the requisite formalities.
- (viii) This court has no reasons to disagree with the decision dated 30.09.2021 of the Forum in case no. CGL-246 of 2021. The Appellant could not produce any documentary evidence in respect of its claim to reduce the period of overhauling from six months as decided by the Forum.

7. Decision

As a sequel of above discussions, the Appeal of the Appellant against order dated 30.09.2021 of the Forum in case no. CGL-246 of 2021 is hereby dismissed.

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, 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.

January 04, 2022
S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali)

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