

**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. 01/2025
PROCEEDINGS DATED 24.01.2025**

In the Matter of:

M/s. G.M. Pepsu Road Transport Corporation,
Chandigarh Depot, Bus Stand,
Chandigarh Road, Zirakpur.

Contract Account Number: 3007362906 (NRS)

...Appellant

Versus

Adl. Superintending Engineer,
DS Division, PSPCL,
Zirakpur.

...Respondent

Present For:

Appellant:

Adv. Tarranum Madan,
Sh. Satinder,
Appellant's Representative.

Respondent :

Er. Hemant Kumar,
AEE/Commercial, DS Division,
PSPCL, Zirakpur.

At the start of hearing, the issue of condoning of delay in filing the Appeal beyond the stipulated period was taken up. The Appellant's Representative submitted that the Appellant was regularly requesting the Respondent office to rectify their bills, but their grievance was not resolved. When the Appellant approached the CCGRF, Ludhiana, their

case was not heard on merits & was dismissed as non-maintainable in view of Regulation 2.9.1(1) of PSERC (Forum & Ombudsman) (2nd Amendment) Regulations, 2021. She further submitted that there was delay by the Appellant in depositing the requisite 40% of the disputed amount as the Appellant being a Transport Corporation was required to take necessary approvals from higher authorities before depositing a huge amount. The Appellant's Representative requested for the condonation of delay in filing the Appeal & prayed that Appeal be heard on merits in the interest of justice. I find that the Respondent did not object to the condoning of the delay in filing the Appeal in this Court either in its written reply or during hearing in this Court.

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

“No representation to the Ombudsman shall lie unless:

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

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

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

Arguments of both the parties were heard. This Court directed the Respondent to explain why CT meter was not installed on the premises of the Appellant as the Sanctioned Load of the Appellant was 42.240 kW. He was also directed to explain how the Appellant was billed 25720 units for the period of 7 days in Dec-2021 on 'O' code. Further, he was told to submit consumption data of the Appellant from the year 2019 onwards.

The next date of hearing is fixed for 31.01.2025 at 01.00 PM. Both the parties are directed to be present on the next date of hearing.

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

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