

**PUNJAB STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
SCO NO. 220-221, SECTOR 34-A, CHANDIGARH**

**PETITION No. 34 of 2016**

**DATE OF ORDER:14.02.2017**

Present: Shri D.S.Bains, Chairman

Shri S. S. Sarna, Member.

In the matter of: Petition under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 in the matter of non-compliance of the Supply Code, 2007, Reg. 19.7 relating to refund of excess amount of Security (works)

AND

In the matter of: T C Terrytex Limited, Village Sarsini (Lalru), Tehsil Derabassi, District SAS Nagar through its Director Ajay Jindal

.....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State power Corporation Limited, The Mall, Patiala.

.....Respondent

**Order:**

The petitioner TC Terrytex Limited who is running a Spinning Mill under Operation Circle, PSPCL Mohali filed the present petition through its Director under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 alleging non-compliance of the regulation 19.7 of Supply Code, 2007 by the respondent i.e PSPCL and submitted as under:-

- 1.1 The petitioner having a sanctioned contract demand of 2500 kVA fed at 11 kV, applied for extension in load/demand to 5500 kVA on

10.04.2012. After feasibility clearance, demand notice was issued on 28.09.2012 and the petitioner was asked to deposit various charges. Accordingly, the petitioner deposited ₹44,000/- as survey fee on 03.08.2012, ₹68.0 lac as cost of 66 kV bay plus service connection charges on 28.01.2013 and ₹49,12, 504/- as estimated cost of 66 kV line including cost difference of 66 kV bay on 28.01.2013. Thus, the total amount of ₹1,17,56,504/- was deposited by the petitioner as Security (works).

- 1.2 The extension in load was released at 66 kV on 17.10.2013. As per regulation 19.7 of the Supply Code, 2007, PSPCL was required to compute the expenditure actually incurred for release of load within 60 days from the date of release of connection and adjust the Security (works) against such recoverable amount. In the event Security (works) is in excess of recoverable amount, such excess amount was to be refunded by adjustment against electricity bills of immediate succeeding months. In case of failure to do so, interest is payable as per Supply Code.
- 1.3 As per assessment made by the petitioner, the actual cost of 66 kV line including bay is much less than Security (works) deposited by the petitioner and as such, PSPCL is required to refund the excess amount along with interest as per Regulation 19.7 of Supply Code, 2007.
- 1.4 Despite making efforts, the excess amount has not been refunded by PSPCL for more than two years and this excess amount may be of the tune of ₹50 lac. Since, the amount of Security (works) was paid to PSPCL by the petitioner by raising loan from the bank, for which he is paying hefty interest to the bank, so the petitioner prayed that action under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003

may be initiated against the delinquent respondent for their failure to comply with the Supply Code Regulations.

- 2.0 The petition was admitted on 10.05.2016 and PSPCL was directed vide Order of the Commission dated 12.05.2016 to file reply by 31.05.2016 with a copy to the petitioner by e-mail as well as by hard copy. The petition was fixed for further hearing on 07.06.2016, which was postponed to 09.06.2016. During hearing on 09.06.2016, the petitioner submitted a copy of the Memo. No. 1803 dated 23.05.2016 issued by Addl.S.E/Grid Const. Divn. Patiala along with enclosures obtained under RTI Act.
- 3.0 PSPCL vide CE/ARR&TR letter dated 07.06.2016 (received on 09.06.2016) filed reply and submitted as under:
  - 3.1 After feasibility clearance and sanction of extension in load/demand from 2500 kVA to 5500 kVA, PSPCL through demand notice dated 28.09.2012 asked the petitioner to deposit the following charges:
    - a) Service Connection Charges @₹900/kVA =₹27,00,000/-
    - b) Fixed Charges for 66 kV line from 66 kV S/S Alamgir to the premises of the petitioner as per standard cost data. =₹23,67,400/-
    - c) Cost of bay as per CC No.68/2008 =₹41,00,000/-Thus, the total demand raised through demand notice dated 28.09.2012 comes out to be ₹91,67,400.
  - 3.2 Actual recoverable charges as intimated by various departments are as under:
    - a) Actual cost as per revised estimate ₹56,15,598
    - b) Bay charges as per IUT bill ₹49,12,504
    - c) Survey fee for 66 kV line ₹44,000

- d) Proportionate cost of back up line ₹5,91,724  
(from 220kV S/s Lalru to 66 kV S/s Alamgir)  
as per CC No. 31/2012
- e) Proportionate cost of two 66 kV bays ₹6,79,034  
(O/G at Lalru & I/C at Alamgir)

- 3.3 Thus total recoverable charges from petitioner comes out to be ₹1,18,42,860 against which the petitioner has deposited ₹1,17,56,504 so ₹86,356 are recoverable from the petitioner.
- 3.4 The office of AEE/Lalru received only one request on 20.04.2016 for refund of Security (works) and before reply could be given, the petitioner filed the present petition.
- 4.0 After hearing the parties on 09.06.2016, the Commission vide Order dated 15.06.2016 directed Addl.SE/TL Divn. Patiala to finalise the accounts as per actual expenditure incurred on construction of line by 23.06.2016 on the basis of which PSPCL will file reply/submission by 30.06.2016 with copy to the petitioner through email and hard copy. The petitioner was directed to file rejoinder, if any, by 05.07.2016. The petition was fixed for final arguments on 12.07.2016.
- 5.0 PSPCL vide letter dated 06.07.2016 (received on 08.07.2016) filed reply as per the Order of the Commission dated 15.06.2016 and made the following submissions:
- 5.1 As brought in PSPCL reply dated 07.06.2016 and reproduced at para 3.2 above, the petitioner was asked to deposit ₹91,67,400/ through demand notice dated 28.09.2016.
- 5.2 The actual expenditure recoverable from the petitioner as per orders of the Commission during hearing on 09.06.2016 are as under:

a)	Expenditure on 66 kV line from Alamgir S/s to the premises of the consumer	₹42,95,892
b)	Survey fee.	₹44,000/-
c)	Expenditure on electrical works of 66 kV bay at Alamgir Grid.	₹22,15,620/-
d)	Expenditure on Civil Works of bay at Alamgir S/S	₹3,00,000/-
e)	Cost of land & building used for erection of 66 kV bay at Alamgir S/S.	₹10,00,000/-
f)	Proportionate cost of back up line from 220 kV S/S Lalru to 66 kV S/S Alamgir as per CC No. 31/2012	₹10,84,828/-
g)	Proportionate cost of 2 No.66 kV bays (O/G at Lalru & I/C at Alamgir)	₹12,44,987/-

5.3 Thus, total recoverable charges from petitioner are ₹1,01,85,237/- and as the petitioner has deposited a total amount of ₹1,17,56,504/- so an amount of ₹15,71,267/- is refundable.

6.0 The petitioner filed rejoinder dated 09.07.2016 to the reply of PSPCL during hearing on 12.07.2016 and stated as under:

- a) The cost of ₹42,95,892/- for 66 kV line has not been supported by Initial Works Register (IWR).
- b) Admitted that the charges ₹ 44,000 on account of survey fee and ₹22,15,620 for expenditure on electrical works of 66 kV bay are correct.
- c) The expenditure of civil works including land and building of ₹13 lac is wrong and against the regulations as neither the expenditure ₹ 3 lac is supported by IWR and nor amount of

₹10 lac is based on any regulations, approved by the Commission.

- d) The proportionate cost of 66 kV back up line has been calculated as per CC No.31/2012 whereas CC No.68/2008 was applicable at the time of issue of demand notice.
- e) The proportionate cost has been calculated on the total load of 5500 kVA instead of extension in load of 3000 kVA applied by the petitioner.
- f) As per the petitioner, the chargeable proportionate cost of back up line comes out to be ₹4,29,654/- and similarly, the proportionate cost of 2 No.66 kV bays comes out to be ₹5,65,517/-.

Petitioner contested the refundable amount of ₹15,71,267/- worked out by PSPCL and demanded re-calculation by applying relevant instructions prevalent at that time.

- 7.0 The Commission vide order dated 21.07.2016 directed PSPCL to file reply to the rejoinder of the petitioner, if any, by 26.07.2016 and the petitioner was directed to file sur-rejoinder, if any, by 02.08.2016. The petition was fixed for hearing arguments of the parties on 04.08.2016.
- 8.0 PSPCL vide letter dated 29.07.2016 filed reply to the rejoinder of the petitioner and brought out that the actual recoverable charges re-calculated as per the directions given by the Commission during hearing on 12.07.2016 are as under:
  - a) Expenditure on 66 kV line from 66 kV Sub-station Alamgir to the premises of the petitioner ₹42,95,892/-
  - b) Survey fee ₹44,000/-
  - c) Expenditure on electrical works of 66 kV ₹22,15,620/-

bay at Alamgir Sub-station

- d) Recoverable cost of 66 kV bay as per ₹41,00,000  
cost data (instead of ₹13 lac intimated earlier)
- e) Proportionate cost of the back up line is to be calculated on the total load because no proportionate cost of the back up line and the bay were recovered at the time of release of connection at 11 kV in the year 2008.

So, the proportionate cost of the backup line based on full load as per CC No.68/2008 is ₹7,87,701/-.

- f) Proportionate cost of two No. Bays on the basis of full load and as per CC No.68/2008 is ₹10,36,782/-.

9.0 Thus, the total recoverable charges from the petitioner is ₹1,02,64,375/- and the refundable amount works out to be ₹14,92,132/-.

10.0 The petitioner filed sur-joinder dated 01.08.2016 to PSPCL's reply to the rejoinder of the petitioner and submitted as under:

- a) Although there are discrepancies in the IWR but to settle the matter, the petitioner admitted ₹42,95,892/- as the cost of 66 kV line.
- b) Admitted that the charges of ₹ 44,000 on account of survey fee and ₹22,15,620 for expenditure on electrical works of 66 kV bay are correct
- c) The amount of ₹10 lac for land and building is not based on any regulation approved by the Commission and has been added arbitrarily by PSPCL. No building space has been used for releasing the load as the space occupied by 66 kV C&R panel is much less than 11 kV breaker, which has been spared with the conversion from 11 kV to 66 kV supply. Also

the Commission's letter dated 05.12.2008 cited by PSPCL is not applicable in the present case.

- d) The proportionate cost of 66 kV backup line has not been calculated on the basis of extension in load which is against the regulations. According to the petitioner, the chargeable proportionate cost of backup line comes out to be ₹4,29,654/- and similarly the proportionate cost of 2 No. 66 kV bays comes out to be ₹5,65,517/-.

The petitioner calculated the refundable amount as ₹39,49,821/- which the petitioner demanded along with interest as per regulation 19.7 of Supply Code, 2007.

11.0 During hearing on 04.08.2016, the officers of PSPCL and authorized representative of the petitioner argued the case at length. The Commission heard the arguments and as per the Commission's Order dated 16.08.2016, the Order was reserved.

## 12.0 **Commission's findings and Order:**

12.1 The petitioner who is running a Spinning Mill at Lalru, applied on 10.04.2012 for extension in its existing load/demand of 2500 kVA, which was fed at 11 kV, to 5500 kVA which was to be catered at 66 kV. In compliance to the demand notice issued by PSPCL and subsequent demands, the petitioner deposited a total amount of ₹1,17,56,504/- as Security (works) under regulation 19 read with regulation 9 of the Supply Code, 2007 and the extension in load/demand was released at 66 kV on 17.10.2013. All these facts have been admitted in its reply by PSPCL.

12.2 The petitioner brought out in the petition that in accordance with regulation 19.7 of Supply Code, 2007, PSPCL was required to compute the expenditure actually incurred (recoverable amount)

for releasing the connection within 60 days from the date of release of connection and adjust the Security (works) against such recoverable amount. In case, the Security (works) deposited by the consumer is excess to the recoverable amount such excess amount was required to be refunded to the consumer by adjustment against electricity bills of the immediately succeeding months. But accordingly to the petitioner, despite his efforts, PSPCL failed to settle his accounts, forcing the petitioner to approach the Commission for justice. The petitioner prayed for action under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against PSPCL for its failure to refund the excess amount of Security (works) within the stipulated time.

12.3 PSPCL in its reply dated 07.06.2016 claimed that the total recoverable charges from the consumer are ₹1,18,42,860/- against which the petitioner had deposited ₹1,17,56,504/- and so ₹86,356/- are recoverable from the petitioner. Thus in its reply, PSPCL admitted the fact that it has not determined the recoverable amount within 60 days of release of connection otherwise it would have raised demand for recovery of this amount of ₹86,256/- from the consumer as required under regulation 19.8 of the Supply Code, 2007.

12.4 Keeping aside the matter regarding admissibility or genuineness of various charges claimed by PSPCL for the time being, it is an admitted fact that the concerned office of PSPCL has not only failed to implement provisions of the Supply Code, 2007 regarding calculation of recoverable amount but also specific directions issued to PSPCL by the Commission in its Order dated 25.06.2015 in petition no. 5 of 2015 on this matter, which are reproduced below:

*"A number of cases have come to the notice of the Commission where after completion of work, the account of the consumer is not overhauled by PSPCL as per regulation 19 of the Supply Code 2007 causing either a loss to the utility in some cases due to non-recovery of actual expenditure or harassment & loss to the consumer due to denial of refund of excess amount of Security (works) got deposited from the consumer.*

***The Commission thus directs PSPCL that in respect of cases where cost of the line/works is to be borne by the consumer, it shall be ensured that after completion of work, the account of the consumer is overhauled as per regulation 19 of Supply Code 2007 and regulation 9.3 of Supply Code 2014, as the case may be. A certificate regarding compliance of these regulations in respect of already released connections to such consumers shall be submitted by PSPCL to the Commission by 30.09.2015. Any laxity in compliance to these directions shall invite action under section 142 of the Act in addition to the penal provisions provided in the Supply Code."***

The Commission reminded PSPCL through letter dated 30.10.2015 for ensuring compliance of the above Orders of the Commission and also to submit the certificate regarding its compliance as mentioned in the aforesaid Order. PSPCL vide CE/ARR&TR letter dated 15.12.2015 informed that all the field officers have certified that compliance has been/is being done. The present petition was filed on 27.04.2016 i.e almost after 10 months of the issue of specific Orders by the Commission as quoted above but the concerned officers of the licensee did not bother to implement the directions and a wrong & misleading certificate was

submitted to the Commission about its compliance. We are convinced that it is a fit case for initiating action under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 because *prima-facie* it has been established that not only the provisions of the Supply Code have been violated but specific directions by the Commission in this regards has been floated with impunity. Section 142 of the Act reads as under:

*"142. Punishment for non-compliance of directions by Appropriate Commission.- In case any complaint is filed before the Appropriate Commission by any person or if that Commission is satisfied that any person has contravened any of the provisions of this Act or the rules or regulations made thereunder, or any direction issued by the Commission, the Appropriate Commission may after giving such person an opportunity of being heard in the matter, by order in writing, direct that, without prejudice to any other penalty to which he may be liable under this Act, such person shall pay, by way of penalty, which shall not exceed one lakh rupees for each contravention and in case of a continuing failure with an additional penalty which may extend to six thousand rupees for every day during which the failure continues after contravention of the first such direction."*

The present petition has also been filed by the petitioner under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the specific prayer is that action under section 142 of the Act be taken against the respondent i.e PSPCL for its failure to comply with regulation 19.7 of the Supply Code, 2007. In this petition, sufficient opportunity has been provided to the licensee to defend itself but no plausible explanation for its failure to determine the actual cost of release of extension in load/demand to the consumer within the stipulated

time has been offered which tantamount to admission of guilt by the respondent i.e PSPCL. Accordingly, we direct Registrar/PSERC to initiate proceeding under section 142 of the Act for willful contravention of the provisions of the Supply Code Regulations and specific Orders dated 25.06.2015 of the Commission in petition no. 5 of 2015.

- 12.5 The claim of PSPCL submitted vide letter dated 07.06.2016 wherein it has been mentioned that ₹ 86,356/- are recoverable from the petitioner was based on revised estimates and were not as per the actual expenditure incurred for release of connection in accordance with the provisions of the Supply Code. The Commission vide Order dated 15.06.2016 directed PSPCL to finalize the accounts on actual basis. PSPCL submitted revised details of the expenses actually incurred for release of connection vide letter dated 06.07.2016 and arrived at a total recoverable amount of ₹1,01,85,237/. PSPCL agreed that an amount of ₹15,71,267/- is refundable to the petitioner.
- 12.6 The petitioner in its rejoinder dated 09.07.2016 contested the amount calculated by PSPCL on the following grounds:
- i) The line expenditure is not supported by IWR.
  - ii) Civil works expenditure of ₹ 13 lac. is wrong and not based on any regulations.
  - iii) Proportionate cost of back up line including bays has been calculated on the basis of cost data which was effective from 01.10.2012 whereas demand notice to the petitioner was issued on 28.09.2012. Thus the cost data applicable at the time of issue of demand notice is required to be considered for working out the proportionate cost. Secondly it was

calculated on total load/demand and not on additional load/demand.

The petitioner submitted its own calculations and challenged the refundable amount of ₹15,71,267/- worked out by PSPCL.

12.7 PSPCL in its reply dated 29.07.2016 to the rejoinder again worked out the expenditure actually incurred and arrived at a total recoverable amount of ₹1,02,64,375/- instead of ₹1,01,85,237/- claimed in its earlier reply. In its revised calculations, PSPCL conceded to the petitioner's argument for calculating the proportionate cost of line including bay(s) as per cost data applicable at the time of issue of the demand notice i.e as per cost data approved by the Commission vide letter dated 05.12.2008 circulated by PSPCL vide CC No. 68/2008. However, PSPCL argued for calculating the proportionate cost of line including bay(s) on the basis of total load/demand instead of additional load/demand.

12.8 Regarding claim of ₹ 13 lac on account of civil works for bay at Alamgir sub-station, CE/TS instead of replying to petitioner's objection with respect to booking of land & building cost of ₹10 lac for bay, further raised the demand from a total cost of ₹35,15,620/- (₹22,15,620 for electrical works plus ₹13 lac for civil works including cost of land and building) to ₹ 41 lac by quoting the cost data approved by the Commission vide letter dated 05.12.2008 ignoring the fact that cost data is meant to work out Security (works) and not to arrive at the actual expenditure incurred by the licensee. The Commission in its Order dated 15.06.2016 in the present petition had specifically pointed out this fact and instructed PSPCL to finalise the accounts on actual basis, which has been complied with by PSPCL and claim has been re-submitted vide

letter dated 06.07.2016 wherein total cost of electrical works for 66 kV bay was intimated as ₹22,15,620 plus actual cost of civil works as ₹3 lac but further added ₹10 lac for land & building as per CE/TS Patiala letter dated 04.07.2016, which was contested by the petitioner. Surprisingly, the same office instead of quoting the relevant regulations or the instructions or justification for booking an amount of ₹13 lac including additional ₹10 lac on account of land & building for civil works of 66 kV bay, further revised the amount by quoting the cost data approved by the Commission, which was discarded in the first instant. If such is the attitude and conduct of PSPCL officers while filing replies before the Commission, we can well imagine the plight of common consumers of the State. **Such conduct of senior officers is highly deplorable and we direct the management of PSPCL to take note of such misadventure of the concerned officers and take appropriate action under intimation to the Commission.**

12.9 The petitioner in its sur-rejoinder dated 01.08.2016 again contested the following amounts calculated by PSPCL for various works:

- I. ₹10 lac as the cost of land and building for working out the total cost of 66 kV bay.
- II. Calculation of the proportionate cost of 66 kV back-up line including bays calculated on the basis of total load/demand of 5.5 MVA instead of extension in load/demand of 3 MVA.

The petitioner submitted its calculations and worked out refundable amount as ₹39,49,821 which it demanded with interest as per regulation 19.7 of the Supply Code, 2007.

- 12.10 Thus two issues, which are left to be resolved are regarding the cost of civil works for 66 kV bay erected for the consumer at 66 kV S/s Alamgir and calculation of the proportionate cost of the 66 kV back-up line including bay(s) in the present case.
- 12.11 Before we proceed further to resolve these two issues, it may be noted that we have not gone into the authenticity, admissibility or veracity of the charges or the components claimed by PSPCL and agreed upon by the petitioner. Both the parties have agreed to claim of ₹42,95,892 as cost of 66 kV line from Alamgir sub-station to consumer premises, ₹40,000 as survey cost, ₹22,15,620 as cost of electrical works of 66 kV bay erected for the petitioner at Alamgir S/s, ₹3 lac as cost of civil works for 66 kV bay and proportionate cost of 5.5 KM back line from 220 S/S Lalru to 66kV s/s Alamgir including two number bays except that according to the petitioner these proportionate costs should be calculated on the basis of additional load/demand and not on the total load/demand as has been done by PSPCL.
- 12.12 Whereas recovery of cost for erection of 66 kV bay at Alamgir sub-station is concerned, the bone of contention is the cost of land & building for erection of 66 kV bay which is to be recovered from the petitioner. PSPCL in its reply dated 06.07.2016 claimed an expenditure on civil works for 66 kV bay as ₹ 3 lac and added ₹10 lac as cost of land and building. The petitioner raised objection particularly regarding ₹10 lac booked on account of land and building since it is not as per regulations. PSPCL in its reply dated 29.07.2016 instead of justifying booking of ₹ 10 lac by quoting the relevant instructions or regulations, revised the amount to ₹ 41 lac (including cost of electrical works) by referring

to letter dated 05.12.2008 from the Commission vide which cost data effective from 22.12.2008 was approved. It clearly shows that PSPCL has failed to justify the claim for recovery ₹10 lac raised by it as cost of land and building for erection of 66 kV bay at Alamgir S/s. However, the cost of land and building used for 66 kV bay cannot be ignored since this component is included while determining the cost of 66 kV bay in the cost data. Thus the argument of the petitioner that proportionate cost of land & building used for erection of 66 kV bay is not recoverable is devoid of any merit. Since PSPCL has not submitted any justification of booking ₹10 lac. on this account so there is no alternative but to refer to the cost data approved by the Commission vide Memo. No.13759 dated 18.12.2014 wherein cost of land & building considered while calculating the cost of 66 kV bay has been taken as ₹3.27 lac. **Thus the actual cost of ₹ 3 lac for civil works intimated by AO Civil works, Patiala plus ₹3.47 lac as cost of land & building for erection of 66 kV bay is recoverable from the petitioner.**

- 12.13 Regarding calculation of proportionate cost of the common portion/ back up line particularly in cases where there is change of Supply Voltage level, we may refer to Regulation 9.1.2 (i)(c) of the Supply Code, 2007 which provides that in case of a consumer with supply voltage of 33 kV and above, the consumer will be liable to pay cost of the service line and proportionate cost of back-up/common portion of EHT line including bay. The proportionate cost is the share of the consumer for usage of the common portion and/or back up line in proportion to his load/demand on that particular line, which is also being used by

other consumers. In case of a new connection, the proportionate cost is per kVA per KM cost of the line multiplied by demand of the consumer. In case extension in load/demand is to be released at the same voltage level, then proportionate cost will be per kVA per KM cost of the line multiplied by additional demand because the consumer has already paid his share for using the common portion &/or the backup line in proportion to his original load/demand at the time of release of connection. However, in case the release of additional load/demand involves change in Supply Voltage then proportionate cost will be per kVA per KM cost of the line multiplied by total load/demand since the consumer has not paid any proportionate cost of the higher voltage level line for his original load/demand. In the present case, the sanctioned demand of 2500 kVA was released at 11 kV so the petitioner might have paid the full cost of 11 kV service line plus proportionate cost of common portion of 11 kV line, if any or kW/kVA charges, whichever higher, as per applicable regulations at that point of time. But the petitioner has not paid any proportionate cost of the 66 kV line at the time of release of his connection for a demand of 2500 kVA at 11 kV. Now since the extension in load/demand was to be released at 66 kV so the petitioner is liable to pay full cost of service line and proportionate cost of 66 kV back up line including bay corresponding to the full load of 5500 MVA. Thus PSPCL's claim to recover proportionate cost of 66 kV back up line from 220 kV sub-station Lalru to 66 kV sub-station Alamgir along with bay (s) in proportion to the total demand is justified.

- 12.14 Accordingly the total amount recoverable from the petitioner is as under:

I.	Cost of 66 kV line from Alamgir s/s to consumer premises	₹42,95,892/-
ii.	Survey fee	₹40,000
iii	Cost of electrical works of 66 kV bay for the petitioner at Alamgir s/s	₹22,15,620/-
iv.	Cost of civil works for erection of 66 kV bay at Alamgir S/s including cost of land & building for the bay	₹6,47,000
v.	Proportionate cost of back up line from 220 S/s Lalru to Alamgir S/s	₹7,87,701/-
vi.	Proportionate cost of two number bays	₹10,36,782/-
<b>TOTAL RECOVERABLE AMOUNT</b>		<b>₹90,22, 995/-</b>

The balance amount ₹27,33,509/- (₹1,17,56,504/- minus ₹90,22,996/-) is refundable to the petitioner. PSPCL is directed to adjust the refundable amount of ₹27,33,509 against the electricity bills of the immediately succeeding months of the petitioner till the excess amount is adjusted.

The petition is disposed of accordingly.

<b>Sd/-</b>	<b>Sd/-</b>
<b>(S. S. Sarna)</b>	<b>(D.S.Bains)</b>
<b>Member</b>	<b>Chairman</b>

**Dated: 14.02.2017**

**Chandigarh**