**IN THE COURT OF OMBUDSMAN, ELECTRICITY PUNJAB,**

**66 KV GRID SUBSTATION, PLOT NO: A-2, INDL AREA, PHASE-I, S.A.S. NAGAR, MOHALI**

**APPEAL No: 03 / 2017** D**ate of Order: 12 / 04 / 2017**

**SH. RAVINDER SINGH,**

**OPPOSITE PETROL PUMP,**

**VILLAGE GILL**

**LUDHIANA**. ………….. PETITIONER

Account No. MS-44/0092

*Through:*

Sh. Sukhminder Singh, Authorized Representative

VERSUS

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LIMITED. ………………………. RESPONDENTS

*Through:*

Er. Amarjit Singh Grewal

Addl. Superintending Engineer

Operation Suburban Division,

P.S.P.C.L, LALTON KALAN.

Petition No: 03/2017 dated 23.01.2017 (received on 24.01.2017) was filed against order dated 23.12.2016 of the Forum for Redressal of Grievances of Consumers Grievances (Forum), PSPCL, Patiala in case no: CG – 124 of 2016 deciding that the account of the petitioner be overhauled for the defect period of 1476 days by excluding the previously overhauled period from 11/2011 to 04/2012. It was also decided that Superintending Engineer/Operation, Sub-urban Circle, Ludhiana would initiate disciplinary proceedings against delinquent officials/officers for not checking the petitioner’s connection in accordance with ESIM 104.1 (ii).

2. Arguments, discussions and evidences on record were held on 12.04.2017.

3. Sh. Sukhminder Singh, Authorized Representative attended the court proceedings on behalf of the petitioner. Er. Amarjit Singh Grewal, Addl. Superintending Engineer / Operation, Suburban Division, PSPCL, Lalton Kalan, Shri Tej Pal Singh, Revenue Accountant appeared on behalf of the respondent, Punjab State Power Corporation Limited (PSPCL).

4. Sh. Sukhminder Singh, the petitioner’s representative stated that the petitioner was having an MS category electricity connection bearing Account No. MS-44 / 0092 with sanctioned load of 97.930 KW and Contract Demand (CD) of 100 KVA, operating under Sarinh Sub-Division of Operation Division, PSPCL, Lalton Kalan, Ludhiana. He stated that the bills raised by PSPCL were being paid regularly. The petitioner noticed that the consumption in 06/2016 was on the lower side and made request to Assistant Executive Engineer in writing on 20.06.2016 for checking of meter. As such, the connection of the petitioner was checked at site by the Addl. S.E. / Enforcement-I, Ludhiana on 08.08.2016 vide Enforcement Checking Register (ECR) No: 48 / 456 wherein it was reported “ that the display of the meter was stuck and the pulse of the meter is not working on the running load. The potential was checked after opening of terminal plate. Red & Yellow Phase potentials were found healthy but potential of Blue Phase was missing, meaning thereby the meter was not contributing on Blue Phase. DDL was also taken. Blue phase was made healthy by peeling/cleaning of wire. Moreover, the Addl. SE/Enforcement also added remarks that meter be replaced and brought in M.E. Lab for further testing. The meter was then replaced on 27.08.2016 and was tested in the M.E. Lab on 03.11.2016, where the accuracy was reported within limits.

Petitioner’s representative further submitted that the Addl. SE / Enforcement-1, Ludhiana through its memo No. 411 dated 24.08.2016 , addressed to AEE, Sarinh S/Division, Ludhiana pointed out that “ potential of Blue phase was carbonized due to which the voltage was not coming and that the potential of Blue phase was made in order/corrected by peeling/cleaning of wire and reconnections were made. The Addl. S.E. / Enforcement-1 also asked to replace the meter as display of the meter was stuck. DDL of the meter was taken at site and on scrutiny of DDL print out, it was noted that potential of Blue phase was not coming to meter from the last 1476 days and meter was contributing less consumption on one phase, which was a serious matter. It was also pointed out in the letter ibid that the official recording the readings of the consumer could not take notice of this. As such, it was desired that the account of the consumer be overhauled as per instructions and this office be informed accordingly:

The Petitioner’s representative stated that based on the above checking report of Addl. S.E. / Enforcement-I, Ludhiana, the Respondents, the AE/Operation, Sarinh, Sub-Division overhauled the account of the petitioner from 08/2012 to 08/2016 (1476 days) by enhancing the recorded consumption of this period by 50% and asked the petitioner to deposit an amount of Rs. 10,76,706/- vide notice bearing memo No. 1878 dated 06.09.2016. He contended that the demand raised for a period of more than four years was not as per speaking orders of Addl. SE/Enforcement and was also against the rules and unjustified. Therefore, the petitioner approached the Forum which in turn, did not consider the genuine pleadings of the petitioner for overhauling of account as per instructions and decided to overhaul the account for the period of 1476 days ( by excluding the previously overhauled period from 11/2011 to 04/2012 ) by ignoring the clear provisions of restricting the period of overhauling to six months as provided in Regulations 21.5.1 of the Supply Code-2014. Hence, the appeal has been filed before the court of Ombudsman.

Petitioner’s representative also submitted that after coming into the force of Electricity Act-2003 & Supply Code-2007, every penal action on the consumer should be supported by Rules/Regulations because it is the consumer who is to bear the liability and has every right to know under which Regulations, he is being penalized. A reference was invited to the Chief Engineer / Commercial’s CC No. 53/2013 and CC No. 59/2014 has issued instructions on the basis of order dated 26.09.2013 passed by the Hon’ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 10644 of 2010 that while initiating proceedings against any consumer, the competent authority of PSPCL must quote the relevant regulations of the Supply Code or any other Regulations framed by the competent authority under the EA-2003. These instructions have again been re-iterated vide CC No. 30/2015 dated 05.08.2005 for strict compliance as Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (PSERC) has taken serious view of non-compliance of these instructions. Furthermore, the Forum has also not referred to any Regulation of Supply Code under which the amount charged for a period of more than four years has been held to be recoverable.

It was also submitted that as per Regulation No: 21.5 of the Supply Code-2014, which pertains to overhauling of consumer accounts clearly indicate in Regulation *21.5.1 “Inaccurate Meters: “If a consumer meter on testing is found to be beyond the limits of accuracy as prescribed hereunder, the account of the consumer shall be overhauled and the electricity charges for all categories of consumers shall be computed in accordance with the said test results for a period not exceeding six months immediately preceding the:-*

1. *Date of test in case the meter has been tested at site to the satisfaction of the consumer or replacement of inaccurate meter whichever is later;*

*OR*

1. *Date the defective meter is removed for testing in the laboratory of the distribution licensee”.*

The petitioner also represented that the accuracy of the meter was tested at site and it was found that Blue Phase was not contributing. The reasons of slowness as alleged in the findings of Addl. SE / Enforcement, was carbonization of potential of Blue phase. But in every case of inaccurate / defective meter, the overhauling can be done only for a maximum period of six months, as provided in the Regulation. It is desired that if there is any other instruction / Rule to overhaul the account for such a long period, then the same should be mentioned by the respondent, so that appropriate objections can be raised. This is because that is mandatory to mention the Regulation under which the consumer is being penalized. Further as per Electricity Supply Code-2014, which has been made applicable from 01.01.2015, in the note, it has been clearly mentioned that the PSPCL is empowered to overhaul the account of any consumer for the period, the defect remained continuous only in the cases:-

*“Where accuracy of the meter is not involved and it is a case of application of wrong multiplying factor, the account shall be overhauled for the period this mistake continued”.*

In all other cases of inaccurate meter, the overhauling can be done only for maximum period of six months.

The Petitioner’s representative contested that the monthly readings of the meter were required to be recorded by competent official of PSPCL and he was supposed to report the defect in the meter (if any), whereupon the department was to ensure the replacement of meter within prescribed time. Moreover, the Addl. SE / Enforcement in his speaking orders given vide memo No. 411 dated 24.08.2016 has clearly mentioned that the official recording the readings of the consumer could not take notice of defect in the meter for a long period. He further stated that there are also instructions for checking of every MS connection exceeding sanctioned load of 50 KW, twice a year as per ESIM - 104. In such a situation, if the connection is not checked as prescribed or alleged defective meter is not replaced as per instructions, then the fault lies on the part of concerned officials. Further, even after petitioner made request in writing on dated 20.06.2016 for checking of meter, the said connection was checked at site by Addl. SE/Enforcement-1, Ludhiana on 08.08.2016 (49 days after the date of request for testing of meter ). As such, the amount of loss, if any, beyond six months, can not be recovered from the concerned officials for not performing their duty. However, the petitioner is ready to pay charges for six months to settle the dispute and concentrate on his business activities.

He next submitted that the meter in question was also checked by Addl. SE/Enforcement in 05/2012 and similar defect was noticed and was set right at site but the meter was not replaced. The meter was installed in the premises of the consumer in the year 2004. DDL of the meter depicts Voltage Failure / B phase as 35 count and 1476 days. Further, at the same place, DDL shows Current Failure R phase 396 days, Current failure ‘Y’ phase 330 days and Current Failure B Phase 313 days The consumption as recorded from the last so many years was very consistent which makes clear that above parameters of current/voltage failure can not be considered as continuous / reliable. It was also stated that the Forum in its otherwise non-speaking orders, has decided to adjust the amount earlier charged for the period 10/2011 to 04/2012 ( based on checking done in 05/2012), whereas in the present disputed amount, the account of the petitioner was overhauled from 08/2012 to 08.08.2016 ( 1476 days). Thus, the data as per DDL can not be taken as the basis for overhauling of account by considering non-contribution of one phase during the period from 08/2012 to 08/2016. The missing of voltage ( if any), partial or complete may relate to the period before the checking carried out by Addl. SE/Enforcement in 05/2012. Further, Addl. SE / Enforcement, in its speaking order mentioned that the potential of Blue phase was carbonized, due to which the Voltage was not coming, the process of carbonization of potential wires is not at once & carbonization may have started in 06/2016 ( when the consumption was less and petitioner himself requested for testing of meter) and complete carbonization of potential wires of Blue phase might have occurred just before the checking of Addl. SE/Enforcement on 08.08.2016. Further, the consumption as recorded after replacement of meter in 08/2016 is matching / comparable with the consumption recorded during previous period (before 06/2016). As such, overhauling of account is required to be done only for the period 06/2016 to 08.08.2016 or for maximum six months as per Regulation 21.5.1 of the Supply Code-2014.

The Petitioner’s representative also referred to appeal case No. 04/2016 of Sh. Mandeep Singh Versus PSPCL, in which this court through its order dated 10.05.2016 has restricted the period of overhauling to six months. Similarly, in the case of Anmol Saluja & many other cases, the period of overhauling against defective/in-accurate metering equipment, the period of overhauling was reduced to six months in view of Regulation 21.5.1 of the Supply Code-2014. He further mentioned that in the case of petitioner, the connection was checked on 08.08.2016 by Addl. SE/Enforcement, Ludhiana. DDL of the meter was also done at site on the same day viz. checking of connection and DDL was done after coming into force, Supply Code-2014, as such Regulation 21.5.1 of Supply Code is squarely applicable (which prescribes the period of overhauling for a maximum period of six months only).

Further he stated that the Forum did not give weightage to the fact that, in a situation, when the connection is not checked as prescribed or alleged defective meter is not replaced as per instructions, then the fault lies on the part of the concerned officials and the petitioner should not be penalized by imposing penalty that too against the Rules. In the present disputed amount, the account of the petitioner was overhauled for continuous period from 08/2012 to 08.08.2016 (1476 days). The Petitioner’s representative also stated that the decision of the Forum was silent and non-speaking regarding which period from installation of meter in the year 2014 to the date of checking 08/08/2016), was considered when ‘B’ phase was not working. The Forum should also have mentioned the Regulation of Supply Code, under which overhauling of account for 1476 days (after adjusting the amount charged the period of 11/2011 to 04/2012- period already overhauled), is justified. In all the cases of defective/in-accurate, the maximum period of overhauling is six months. Thus, the respondent and the Forum (while deciding the case) has not mentioned any Regulation of Supply Code or provision EA-2003 under which the present case of the petitioner is covered, if it is presumed ( for the sake of arguments), that regulation 21.5.1 of Supply Code is not applicable in the case of petitioner. In the end, he prayed for setting aside the decision of the Forum and the overhauling of account for a maximum period of six months as provided in Regulation 21.5.1 of the Supply Code-2014 keeping in view the principles of natural justice and fairness.

5.. Er. ­­­­­Amarjit Singh Grewal, Addl. Superintending Engineer, representing the respondents submitted that the account of the petitioner was overhauled as per provision of Regulation 21.5.2 of the Supply Code - 2014, wherein it has been described that “ the account of the consumer shall be overhauled/billed for the period meter remained dead /defective”. He also stated that meter was defective as D code was printed on the bill issued to the consumer. Hence, Enforcement-1 was informed vide memo No. 1584 dated 02.08.2016 about the fact and the meter was checked on 08.08.2016 vide ECR No. 48/856 dated 08/08/2016 by Addl. SE/Enforcement-1, Ludhiana as per report “ the display of the meter got stuck. The pulse of the meter was not working on the running load. However, the potential was checked after opening the meter terminal plate. Red and Yellow phase potential were found healthy but the potential of Blue Phase was found missing, meaning hereby that the meter is not recording reading on one phase due to missing of blue phase. The Respondent ‘s side stated that readings were recorded on Battery Mode after extracting the potential. DDL was also taken and Blue Phase potential was made healthy after cleaning the potential. It was desired that the meter may be replaced due to stucking of display and the defective meter may be sent to M.E. Lab for further investigation. M.C.B. and MTC were sealed.

The Respondent’s also submitted that it was true that the meter in question was also checked by the Enforcement in 05/2012 and similar defect was noticed and was set right. However, it was denied that the demand of Rs. 10,76,706/- had been raised against the petitioner only on the basis of checking report No. 48/456 dated 08/08/2016. It was also mentioned that speaking orders were issued by the Addl. SE/Enforcement-I, Ludhiana to AEE, Sarinh vide memo No. 411 dated 24.08.2016 in which, it was directed that the display of meter was missing. Blue phase potential for the last 1476 days as per DDL report and the meter was recording less consumption on the phase. Hence, AEE, Sarinh was directed to overhaul the account of the consumer as a result of which the account was overhauled for the actual period in which the meter of the consumer recorded less consumption on one phase and accordingly, the consumer was asked to deposit Rs. 10,76,706/- as per AEE/Sarinh Memo No. 1878 dated 06.09.2016. As per the record available, the connection was checked vide ECR No. 39/395 dated 05.05.2012 and ECR No. 48/456 dated 08.08.2016 both by the Addl. SE/Enforcement, Ludhiana. The Respondents admitted that no checking of the said connection was carried out by the Operation office as per record available. As such, the amount charged to the consumer is correct and recoverable. So far as reference given by to the case of Sh. Mandeep Singh Versus PSPCL (Appeal No. 04/2016) is concerned, it was commented that decision differed from case to case as per history and nature of the consumer. In the end, the Respondents prayed to dismiss the appeal of the petitioner.

6. The relevant facts of the case are that the Petitioner’s MS category connection was checked by the Enforcement on 08.08.2016 as the petitioner vide letter dated 20.06.2016 wrote to respondents that Electric Meter installed at his premises is not working properly and to get it checked. In response, the respondents wrote a letter to Enforcement on 02.08.2016 to check the meter of the consumer. The Enforcement in his checking dated 8.8.2016 observed as under:-

*“ fJj e{B?e;B dcso d/ gZso BzL 1584 fwsh 2-8-2016 nB{;ko u?e ehsk frnk j? . whNo dh display stuck j' rJh j? . whNo gb; th ubd/ Gko s/ Bjh ubdh . NowhBb gb/N y'be/ Ppotential u?e ehs/ rJ// . Red ns/ Yellow c/; d/ Ppotential j?bdh gkJ/ rJ/ ns/ Blue c/; dk Potential Miss gkfJnk frnk . Gkt whNo B{z Blue Miss j'D ekoD fJZe c/i s/ whNo foekofvzr BjhA eo fojk . pPotential eZY e/ Battery Mode s/ fofvzrK foekov ehshnK rJhnK . DDL b? fbnk frnk j? . Blue Potential fSb e/ ;kc eoe/ d[pkok Healthy eo fdZsk j? . whNo dh display stuck j' ikD ekoD fJ; B{z jNkfJnk ikt/ . pdfbnk whNo M.E. Lab ftZu j'o iKu bJh G/fink ikt/ . MCB ns/ CTC B{z ;hbK brk fdZshnK jB .*

*whNo dh Display fofvzr stuck j' rJh j? . ubd/ Gko s/ gb; pfbze BjhA eodh whNo yokp j' frnk j? . “*

Accordingly, the meter was replaced vide MCO dated 08.08.2016 effected on 27.08.2016 and got checked in M.E. Lab on 03.11.2016 wherein the meter accuracy was checked and found within limits. Based on the report of Enforcement, the Petitioner’s account was overhauled for 1476 days by taking one phase not contributing towards consumption because as per DDL report, Blue Phase potential was missing for 1476 days and directed the Petitioner to deposit Rs. 10,76,706/- on dated 06.09.2016. The Petitioner contested this amount in CGRF which, on the basis of the Tamper Report of DDL, decided to overhaul the account for defect period of 1476 days by excluding the previously overhauled period from 11/2011 to 04/2012.

The Petitioner in his prayer has raised his eye-brows on the main issue regarding period of overhauling of the accounts for the whole period and vehemently argued that as per Enforcement checking dated 08.08.2016, the potential of Blue Phase was missing and was not contributing towards consumption. The meter display was also found to be stuck and readings were taken on Battery Mode. However, after peeling of the Blue Phase wire, it was made healthy but the Enforcement termed the meter defective because display of the meter was found to be stuck. The account of the Petitioner was overhauled as per provisions contained in Regulation 21.5.2 of Supply Code-2014 for 1476 days by taking one phase not contributing towards consumption and termed the meter as defective whereas M.E. Lab. report dated 03.11.2016 clearly mentioned that accuracy of the meter was within limits and did not term the meter as defective. He also argued that the Respondents are duty bound to check the connections periodically after every six months as per provisions contained in instruction No. 104.1 (ii) of ESIM but they failed to check the connection within mandatory period. Moreover, monthly readings are being taken by AAE and he never noticed such fault since installation of the meter. The Petitioner also argued that the meter was earlier checked by the Respondents on 05.05.2012 and meter was found slow by 33.28% and DDL was also done at site. As per this report, the Petitioner’s account was also overhauled for the period 11/2011 to 04/2012 and the Petitioner paid the amount. As such, the meter in question was not defective, when the consumption pattern is kept in view. The petitioner also argued that no doubt, the potential on Blue Phase was Zero Volts but the accounts have not been overhauled as per provisions contained in Regulations which provides for overhauling of accounts for maximum period of six months as per Reg. 21.5.1 of Supply Code-2014. Accordingly he prayed to allow the appeal.

The Respondents argued that the overhauling of account has been correctly done for the actual quantum of energy consumed by the Petitioner but could not be billed earlier due to slow running of the meter during whole period of the default as per DDL taken by Enforcement on 08.08.2016 at site. The Respondents further clarified that the consumer’s account was overhauled as per provisions contained in Reg. 21.5.2 of Supply Code-2014 wherein, the account of the consumer shall be overhauled for the period meter remained dead/defective. In the present case, the meter was found defective at site by Enforcement during checking dated 08.08.2016 and as per DDL print-out, the Blue Phase potential was not contributing towards consumption for 1476 days, hence, the overhauling was correctly decided to be done by CGRF in view of speaking orders given by the Enforcement on 24.08.2016. The meter display was found stuck during checking at site, hence, the meter was found defective. The petitioner’s plea to overhaul the accounts as per Reg. 21.5.1 of supply Code-2014 is not correct. The account was overhauled on the basis of actual consumption recorded by the meter. The quantum of energy consumed by the consumer was not recorded by the meter accurately due to non-contribution of Blue Phase towards consumption, hence, the amount charged is correct and is in accordance with the Regulation of Supply Code-2014. He prayed to dismiss the appeal.

The Petitioner, in his Petition, apart from raising the issue of overhauling of his account under the provisions of Regulation 21.5.1 of Supply Code has also raised the issue regarding technical aspects involved in report dated 08.08.2016 of Enforcement wherein the meter pulse was not coming and display of the meter was found stuck whereas M.E. Lab. report dated 03.11.2016 clearly mentioned that accuracy of the meter was within limits and not adjudged the meter as defective. Hence, the account can be overhauled for maximum period of six months as per Regulation 21.5.1 of Supply Code-2014. I find merits in the arguments of the Petitioner that Enforcement report dated 08.08.2016 and M.E. Lab. report dated 03.11.2016 are contradictory. The Enforcement adjudged the meter as defective at site and no pulse was coming due to which the accuracy was not checked at site by Enforcement whereas in M.E. Lab. the accuracy of the meter was checked and found within limits and did not adjudge the meter as defective. I am of firm view that M.E. Lab. report is final and only Blue Phase was not healthy during checking at site due to carbonization of Blue Phase lead connected with meter terminal as per Enforcement report.

Next issue raised by the Petitioner for adjudication is whether or not, the Respondents have overhauled the accounts of the Petitioner for whole period of default as per applicable regulation / law by enhancing the consumption by 50% by assuming that Blue Phase was not contributing for 1476 days as per DDL Tamper Report. While analyzing the evidences placed on record, I have observed that as per DDL report dated 08.08.2016 the voltage on Blue Phase was Zero Volts and as per failure Type / Status report, voltage failure was for 1476 days 7 hours and 50 Minutes, meaning thereby that the meter’s working on the date of checking was found to be inaccurate. Being the effective date of dispute as 08.08.2016, the provisions of Regulation 21.5.1 of Supply Code-2014, effective from 1.1.2015, are applicable in the present case; relevant extract of the Regulation is:

*Overhauling of Consumer Accounts:*

*21.5.1: Inaccurate Meters*

*“If a consumer meter on testing is found to be beyond the limits of accuracy as prescribed hereunder, the account of the consumer shall be overhauled and the electricity charges for all categories of consumers shall be computed in accordance with the said test results for a period not exceeding six months immediately preceding the:*

1. *date of test in case the meter has been tested at site to the satisfaction of the consumer or replacement of inaccurate meter whichever is later; or*
2. *date the defective meter is removed for testing in the laboratory of the distribution licensee.*

*Note: Where accuracy of meter is not involved and it is a case of application of wrong multiplication factor, the accounts shall be overhauled for the period this mistake continued.”*

The above regulation is clear on the issue and requires no explanation or discussions. While deciding the representation of the Petitioner against overhauling of his account, the Enforcement, in view of Tamper Report of DDL dated 08.08.2016, overhauled the accounts for 1476 days prior to checking since the voltage on Blue Phase was found Zero as per Tamper Data Report of DDL under the provisions of Reg. 21.5.2 of Supply code-2014 which is applicable in case of defective (other than Inaccurate) / Dead Stop / Burnt / Stolen meter. The CGRF has also upheld the decision of Enforcement without analyzing the applicable regulations for overhauling of the accounts for the whole period of default because as per M.E. Lab. report, the meter was not defective and accuracy of the meter was within limits. Hence, in my view, the overhauling in such cases can be done only in accordance with the provisions of applicable Rules / Regulations. The CGRF’s decision is out of the scope of applicable regulations and thus I would not find it appropriate and justified. Hence, the meter was out of the definition of defective meter as per Regulation. 21.5.2 of Supply Code-2014. I have also observed that since the slowness factor was not determined at site by the Enforcement due to non-blinking of Pulse on Load, hence, it is appropriate to overhaul the account of the consumer by taking the average of consumption of six months recorded after replacement of meter i.e. 03.11.2016.

As a sequel of above discussions, surely the account of the Petitioner is required to be overhauled but in accordance with the applicable Regulations. Therefore, I have no hesitation to set aside the decision dated 23.12.2016 of CGRF in case No. CG-124 of 2016 and to hold that the account of the Petitioner should be overhauled in accordance with provisions of Regulation 2.1.5.1 of Supply Code - 2014 for a period of six months prior to the date of replacement of meter 03.11.2016) by taking the average consumption of six months recorded by the meter after its replacement as a natural justice.

Accordingly, the Respondents are directed to re-calculate the demand as per above directions and amount excess / short, after adjustment, if any, may be recovered / refunded from / to the Petitioner with interest under the provision of ESIM-114.

7. The appeal is allowed.

8. The S.E. / Operation, Sub-urban Circle, PSPCL, Ludhiana may ensure initiating the disciplinary action against delinquent officials/officers in accordance with their Service Rules, who are responsible for not checking the Petitioner’s connection in accordance with ESIM 104.1 (ii).

9. In case, the Petitioner or the Respondents (Licensee) is not satisfied with the above decision, he is at liberty to seek appropriate remedy against this order from the appropriate Body in accordance with Regulation 3.28 of Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum & Ombudsman) Regulations – 2016.

(MOHINDER SINGH)

Place: SAS Nagar (Mohali) Ombudsman,

Dated: 12.04.2017 Electricity Punjab

S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali.).