IN THE COURT OF THE LOKPAL (OMBUDSMAN),

ELECTRICITY, PUNJAB,

66 KV GRID SUB-STATION, PLOT NO. A-2,

INDUSTRIAL AREA, PHASE-1, S.A.S NAGAR (MOHALI)

Appeal No. 58/2017

Date of hearing: 08.02.2018 & 15.02.2018

Ess Pee Industrial Corporation,

Kapurthala Road,

Jalandhar.

…….Petitioner

Account No. 3002811299

*Through:*

Shri Ashwani Kalra, Petitioner’s Representative (PR)

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited

…..Respondent

*Through:*

Er. Pardeep Kumar,

Additional Superintending Engineer,

DS Model Town Commercial Division,

PSPCL, Jalandhar.

Petition No. 58/2017 dated 07.09.2017 was filed against order dated 11.08.2017 in Case No. CG-153 of 2017 of the Consumers Grievances Redressal Forum (Forum) deciding that:

*“The amount charged to the Petitioner, vide notice bearing memo no. 408 dated 26.04.2017, amounting to Rs. 10,37,900/-, for the period from 17.08.2016 (date on which Red Phase CT was emanating nil current) to 06.01.2017 (date of replacement of CT PT unit), is correct and chargeable.”*

2. Arguments, discussions and evidence on record were held on 08.02.2018 and 15.02.2018.

3. Shri Ashwani Kalra, Petitioner’s Representative (PR), attended the Court proceedings on behalf of the Petitioner. Er. Pardeep Kumar, Addl. Superintending Engineer, DS Model Town Commercial Division, PSPCL, Jalandhar, appeared on behalf of the Respondent-Punjab State Power Corporation Limited (PSPCL).

4. Presenting the case on behalf of the Petitioner, Shri Ashwani Kalra, Petitioner’s Representative (PR) stated that the Petitioner was running an industrial unit at Kapurthala Road, Jalandhar, in the name of Ess Pee Industrial Corporation, having Large Supply category electricity connection bearing Account No. J75-LS-02-00271 (New 3002811299) with Sanctioned Load of 892.150kW and Contract Demand (CD) of 480kVA. The connection was checked on 08.12.2016 by the Addl. S.E/MMTS-2, PSPCL, Jalandhar who reported, inter-alia, that the CT/PT unit was defective due to Red Phase CT not contributing and issued instructions to replace the defective CT/PT set. Based **o**n the above report, a demand of Rs. 15,39,350/- was raised against the Petitioner vide AEE, Commercial Unit No. 5, Jalandhar’s office memo no. 248 dated 29.03.2017 by overhauling the account of the Petitioner for more than six months onwards from the date, the Energy Meter was declared defective. The Petitioner objected to the demand raised which was reduced to Rs. 10,37,900/- vide AEE’s office memo no. 408 dated 26.04.2017. According to the said letter, the account of the Petitioner had been overhauled from 17.08.2016 to the date of replacement of CT/PT set by enhancing the consumption by 50%.

PR stated that the slowness of the Energy Meter by 33% had been reported without testing the accuracy of the Energy Meter at site with Meter Testing Equipment (MTE) set as required under ESIM/Supply Code Regulations. Moreover, the Additional S.E./MMTS-2 itself recorded at Sr. No.4 of the Enforcement Checking Register (ECR) dated 08.12.2016 that no visible abnormality was detected on the Red Phase CT of CT/PT unit.

PR added that as per ECR dated 08.12.2016, the Red Phase CT was contributing and drawing 0.06Amp and not 0.00 Amp. A perusal of snapshot/tamper data revealed that the Red Phase CT did not stop contributing permanently w.e.f. 17.08.2016. The connection of the lead joining CT terminal and the meter terminal might have become loose, on account of which, the make and break of the connection was going on. Besides, the current related events depicted on the snapshots/tamper data, on being perused, showed that the events of the “CURRENT TERMINAL OPEN – START ON L-1” and “CURRENT TERMINAL OPEN – END ON L-1” occurred 40 times each.

PR further stated that the time of every tamper of the current related event had been recorded on the tamper data and the total time of these 80 nos. Current related events/tampers from 01.09.2016 to 03.12.2016 had been recorded as 25 Hrs. 10 Minutes. Moreover, the make and break of the current terminal connections did not occur daily. For example, after 07.10.2016, the next tamper occurred on 27.10.2016 which meant that the Energy Meter kept on working/contributing properly for 20 days continuously. Similarly, the Energy Meter kept on working properly for 24 hours from 27.10.2016 to 19.11.2016 (24 days), 19.11.2016 to 23.11.2016 (4 days), 30.11.2016 to 03.12.2016 (4 days) and 30.09.2016 to 07.10.2016 (8 days).

PR also stated that he most important thing required to be noticed was that the tampered data did not show any tamper during the period from 03.12.2016 to the date of the DDL i.e. 08.12.2016. Had the Energy Meter not been working accurately on the date of checking by MMTS i.e. 08.12.2016, the same would have been depicted on the tamper data/snapshots, because the DDL recorded the complete data from the last 70 days to the date/time of carrying out DDL. As mentioned in ECR dated 08.12.2016, the load on Red Phase CT on 08.12.2016, at the time of checking, was 0.06 Amp and not 0.00 Amp.

PR contended that this Device Language Message Specification (DLMS) Category-C H.T. Meter was purchased against Purchase Order No. 13 MPQ-95/2015-16, and the Clause 16 (x) of the Tender Enquiry of this Purchase Order read as under:

*“16 (x) Meter shall log the actual date and time of occurrence and restoration of tamper. Meter will also log the snap shot of instantaneous data i.e. individual voltages, currents, power factors, kWh etc. alongwith tamper events. Snapshot for occurrence shall be taken at the end of persistence time of 3 minutes and snapshot for restoration shall be taken at the end of restoration time of 3 minutes after actual removal of tamper. The actual time of occurrence and actual time of removal of tamper or actual duration of tamper will be indicated in the printout.* ***(In case of conflict with any standard, this clause of the specification shall prevail upon).***

*16 (xi) All tampers “Cover Open” and “Power Off” will be recorded if the tamper persists for three minutes and restoration after 3 minutes.*

***16(xv) Snap short shall be lodged as per clause 16 (x) and (xi) of Tender Enquiry ( i.e. if tamper persists for 3 minutes). The accuracy test/dial test shall be performed after logging of this event is confirmed ( i.e. after 3 minutes) at the time of testing of sample meters/meters.”***

PR contended that the DDL was carried out on 08.12.2016, read by MMTS on 14.12.2016 and the CT/PT set was replaced on 06.01.2017. As per above mentioned Clause 16 (xv) of the Purchase Order, it was mandatory on the part of the MMTS to carry out the Dial Test/Accuracy Test of the Energy Meter at site before removing the CT/PT set from the site, because it was very well in the knowledge of the MMTS that number of Tampers had been recorded/depicted on the Tamper Data. But, the reason as to why, the MMTS could not perform the accuracy test at site was not known. This test could bring the facts to the fore.

PR also stated that the CT/PT set was checked in the ME Lab on 26.04.2017 i.e. after about 3½ months of its replacement. This set was replaced on 06.01.2017 and remained lying in the open for so many days. As per ME Lab report, the Red Phase of CT was not contributing on that day. There was every possibility that the wire/terminal of the Red Phase of CT, which was contributing intermittently, might have become defective on that day because of weather effect (due to lying in open).

PR further stated that during oral discussions before the Forum, it was pleaded that the action of the PSPCL to overhaul the account of the Petitioner, considering the non-contribution of Red Phase CT in the report of MMTS, was not correct because the tamper data, which was an authentic record, revealed that Red Phase CT had not stopped contributing permanently w.e.f. 17.08.2016, rather, it contributed most of the time except for 25 Hours 10 Minutes from 01.09.2016 to 03.12.2016 on account of 80 Nos. tamper of current related events. The duration of every tamper had been depicted on the snapshots.

PR further stated that the Forum had mentioned in its decision that the current on Red Phase recorded zero Amp on 17.08.2016 in the voltage related events and remained Zero from 01.09.2016 to 03.12.2016 in the current related events. In this regard, it was pleaded that as per Clause 16 (x) of the Purchase Order :

*“Snapshot for the occurrence of the tamper will be taken at the end of persistence time of 3 minutes and snapshot for the restoration shall be taken after 3 minutes of the end of removal of tamper or the actual duration of the tamper will be indicated in the printout ( in case of conflict with any standard, this clause will prevail) and as per the tamper data/snapshot the total duration of these 80 Nos. tamper is 25 hours 10 minutes from 01.09.2016 to 03.12.2016”.*

The Forum was of the view that 1st tamper had not ended because the current at the time of restoration was Zero (0). In this regard, it was pleaded that “if as per their view, the 1st tamper did not end because the current at the time of restoration was Zero (0), then it was not understood as to why 39 more times the current terminal open even started on L1 and again ended 39 more times on L1 and why, the duration of each and every tamper had been depicted on the tampered data”. Besides this, it was not understood as to why, for number of days, there was no occurrence/restoration of any current related event e.g. from 07.10.2016 to 27.10.2016 (21 days) and so many more times as revealed by tamper data/snapshot. It was hardly likely that all the events depicted on the tamper data were wrong. There was no reply from the Respondent side and the case was decided by the Forum by comparing the consumption of the corresponding months of the last year, which was applicable in the case of dead stop/stolen Energy Meters where the consumption could be ascertained (Regulation 21.5.2 (a) of Supply Code-2014). But this was a case where it was alleged that Red Phase CT was not contributing. This was a Large Supply category connection, where every information about the working of the Energy Meter was available in the data, retrieved from the DDL of the Energy Meter and from this data, it was substantiated that the Red Phase CT remained contributing continuously except for 25 Hrs. 10 Minutes as only 80 Nos. tamper recorded on the snapshot in DDL.

PR contended that from the above explained facts, it was evident that the decision of the Forum was not based on the facts and rules and regulations notified by Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (PSERC), hence, may be quashed and the account of the Petitioner may be overhauled by enhancing the consumption for the period when the Red Phase CT did not contribute as substantiated by the current related events of the Tamper Data i.e. 24 Hrs. 10 Minutes. PR prayed that the 40% of the disputed amount deposited by the Petitioner may be refunded along with the interest as per rules.

5. Defending the case on behalf of the Respondent – PSPCL, Er. Pardeep Kumar, Addl. Superintending Engineer stated that the Petitioner was having a Large Supply category connection with Sanctioned Load 892.150kW and Contract Demand 480kVA The connection of the Petitioner was checked on 08.12.2016 by the MMTS which reported that Segment 1 on display of Energy Meter was blinking while Segments 2 & 3 were stable. There was Zero current on Red Phase on display of the Energy Meter. The current was measured with clip-on-Meter and found as under:

*Red Phase = 0.06 Amp*

*Yellow Phase = 3.70 Amp*

*Blue Phase = 3.80 Amp*

The MMTS declared the CT/PT unit defective as its Red Phase CT was not contributing towards consumption and directed to replace 11kV/110V, CT/PT unit. In compliance to above directions, the CT/PT unit was replaced on 06.01.2017.

The Respondent stated that the MMTS issued the speaking orders on 15.03.2017 and directed to overhaul the account of the Petitioner from 17.08.2016 till the replacement of defective CT/PT unit. On the basis of this speaking order, a notice for the demand of Rs. 15,39,530/- after overhauling the account for the period from 17.08.2016 to 28.02.2017 was issued on 29.03.2017. However, the CT/PT unit was got tested from ME Lab in the presence of the representative of the consumer on 26.04.2017 when it was found that Red Phase CT was not contributing, meaning thereby that Red Phase CT was defective. Based on the report of the ME Lab, the account of the Petitioner was overhauled from 17.08.2016 to 06.01.2017 and the amount charged earlier was revised to Rs. 10,37,900/-. The Petitioner did not agree with the above demand, and filed a Petition in the Forum which decided on 11.08.2017 that the amount of Rs. 10,37,900/- charged to the Petitioner vide memo No. 408 dated 26.04.2017 was correct and chargeable.

The Petitioner was not satisfied with the decision of the Forum and filed an Appeal in this Court praying for setting aside the decision of the Forum and refunding the amount deposited by it with interest. The Respondent prayed to dismiss the Appeal which was devoid of merit.

**Decision**

6. The relevant facts of the case are that the Petitioner was having a Large Supply category connection, with Sanctioned Load of 892.150kW and Contract Demand of 480kVA, bearing Account No. 3002811299. The connection of the Petitioner was checked on 08.12.2016 by the Addl. S.E, MMTS-2, PSPCL, Jalandhar, who reported that segment 1 on display of Energy Meter was blinking while Segments 2 & 3 were stable. There was Zero current on Red Phase on display of the Energy Meter. The current was measured with Clip-on-Meter and found as under:

*Red Phase = 0.06 Amp*

*Yellow Phase = 3.70 Amp*

*Blue Phase = 3.80 Amp*

As per its checking report, the MMTS declared the CT/PT unit defective due to Red Phase CT not contributing towards consumption and directed to replace 11kV/110V, CT/PT unit. In compliance to the above directions, the CT/PT unit was replaced on 06.01.2017. Thereafter, the MMTS issued the speaking orders on 15.03.2017 and directed to overhaul the account of the Petitioner from 17.08.2016 to the date of replacement of CT/PT unti. Accordingly, on the basis of the above speaking orders, the DS office raised the demand of Rs. 15,39,530/- vide memo dated 29.03.2017 for the period 17.08.2016 to 28.02.2017. Subsequently, the CT/PT unit was got tested from ME Lab, in the presence of consumer’s Representative, on 26.04.2017 when it was observed that Red Phase CT was not contributing. This meant thereby that Red Phase CT was defective. Following this test, the account of the Petitioner was overhauled for the period from 17.08.2016 to 06.01.2017 ( date of replacement of defective CT/PT unit) and the amount earlier charged was revised to Rs. 10,37,900/-. The Petitioner did not agree with the above demand, and filed a Petition in the Forum which, after hearing, decided on 11.08.2017 as under:

*“The amount charged to the Petitioner, vide notice bearing memo no. 408 dated 26.04.2017, amounting to Rs. 10,37,900/-, for the period from 17.08.2016 (date on which Red Phase CT was emanating nil current) to 06.01.2017 (date of replacement of CT/PT unit) is correct and chargeable.”*

I have gone through the written submissions made in the Petition by the Petitioner and written reply of the Respondent as well as the oral submissions made by the Representatives of the Petitioner and Respondent alongwith the material brought on record by both the sides.

The issue requiring adjudication is the legitimacy of the demand for Rs. 10,37,900/- raised by the Respondent, vide notice dated 26.04.2017, due to overhauling of the account of the Petitioner pursuant to checking dated 08.12.2016 when Red Phase CT was declared defective ( not contributing towards consumption) without actually checking the accuracy of the Energy Meter earlier at site or in ME Lab.

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

1. PR argued that the connection of the Petitioner was checked at site on 08.12.2016 by the Addl. S.E, MMTS-2, PSPCL, Jalandhar who reported that Red Phase CT was not contributing and directed to replace the CT/PT unit. Accordingly, a sum of Rs. 15,39,530/- was charged to the Petitioner, vide notice dated 29.03.2017, enhancing the recorded consumption by 50% from 17.08.2016 to 28.02.2017. The Petitioner objected to this amount which was reduced to Rs. 10,37,900/-, by charging the Petitioner from 17.08.2016 to the date of replacement of CT/PT unit i.e. 06.01.2017 vide AEE’s office memo no.. 408 dated 26,04,2017.

The Respondent, in its defense, stated that the Addl. S.E, MMTS-2, who checked the connection of the Petitioner on 08.12.2016, reported that Segment 1 on display of the Energy Meter was blinking while Segments 2 &3 were stable. There was zero current on Red Phase on display of the Energy Meter. The current, measured with Clip-on-Meter, was found as:

Red Phase 0.06Amp

Yellow Phase 3.70 Amp

Blue Phase 3.80 Amp

I observe that CT/PT unit was adjudged defective by the MMTS due to Red Phase CT not contributing towards consumption. Besides, directions were issued for replacement of 11kV/110V CT/PT unit which was replaced on 06.01.2017. Moreover, in compliance to the directions of the MMTS, the account of the Petitioner was overhauled from 17.08.2016 to 28.02.2017 and a sum of Rs. 15,39,530/- was charged vide memo dated 29.03.2017. Thereafter, the removed CT/PT unit was got tested from ME Lab on 26.04.2017 in the presence of the Petitioner’s representative. As per report of ME Lab, Red Phase CT was not contributing implying thereby that it was defective. Accordingly, the account of the Petitioner was overhauled from 17.08.2016 to 06.01.2017 and the amount of Rs. 15,39,500/- earlier charged was revised to Rs. 10,37,900/- vide memo no. 408 dated 26.04.2017.

1. PR also argued that the slowness of the Energy Meter had been declared 33% by the MMTS, after checking the Petitioner’s connection on 08.12.2016, without testing the accuracy of the Energy Meter at site with MTE Set as required under ESIM/Supply Code. Moreover, the Addl. S.E, MMTS-2 Jalandhar itself recorded at Sr. No. 4 of ECR that no visible abnormality was detected on the Red Phase of CT/PT unit.

I have gone through the snapshot of Tamper Data placed on record under Current Related Events and noted that current on Red Phase is zero Amp. The Line Current (L1) on Red Phase in Active and Reactive Mode is Zero Amp due to non-contribution of Red Phase CT of CT/PT unit.

I also find that Clause 16 (x) of the Technical Specifications 7M9P-95/2015-16 of DLMF HT Meter wherein, snapshot for occurrence shall be taken at the end of persistence time of three months and snapshot for restoration shall be taken at the end of restoration time of three minutes after actual removal of tamper. The actual time of occurrence and actual time of removal of tamper or actual duration of tamper will be indicated in the printout. In case of conflict with any standard, this clause of the specification shall prevail upon.

I observe that Tamper got restored due to residual current on Red Phase after sometime of occurrence of the Tamper but the accuracy of the Red Phase of the CT/PT unit was not within the accuracy limit on being tested, in ME Lab on 26.04.2017.

I have perused the definition of the Meter in terms of provisions contained in Regulation 2(zo) of Supply Code-2014 which reads as under:

***“Meter”*** *means a device suitable for measuring, indicating the recording consumption of electricity or any other quantity related with electrical system and shall include, wherever applicable, other equipments such as Current Transformer, Voltage Transformer with wiring & accessories or Capacitor Voltage Transformer necessary for such purposes.”*

I find that CT/PT unit is a part of the Energy Meter whose accuracy, alongwith that of CT/PT unit, was required to be checked on site by the Addl. S.E, MMTS-2, Jalandhar in terms of provisions contained in Instruction No. 59.4 of ESIM. Though, the CT/PT unit was tested and declared defective in ME Lab, the Energy Meter was not tested there because the same was not removed/replaced after checking on site on dated 08.12.2016 by MMTS.

1. During the course of oral arguments on 08.02.2018 the Respondent reiterated its submissions in the written reply that MMTS Data Down Load (DDL) report from April 2016 onwards showed that CT/PT was defective since April 2016 and as per this report, the Red Phase of the CT/PT unit was not contributing since 04.04.2016 and further. The Respondent had, in its written reply also mentioned that copy of the said DDL report was attached but the same was actually not found attached as per material on record. Accordingly, the Respondent was directed, during oral discussions on 08.02.2018, to place on record the said DDL. However, he Respondent did not have the said DDL and as such, did not make the same available in the Court. As such, the Respondent was directed to bring the DDL report on the next date of hearing i.e. 15.02.2018. But the Respondent did not submit the same in the Court on 15.02.2018. At the same time, the PR was directed to place on record the duly authenticated data of production of the Petitioner during the period of dispute to see as to whether the consumption pattern was comparable with that of the production pattern during the disputed period. In response, the Petitioner, vide e-mail dated 17.02.2018, sent the production data of the Petitioner’s firm for the period from April 2016 to March 2017. However, this data is not authenticated by the competent authority of the Government. The PR has also sent an e-mail dated 18.02.2018 stating that:
2. The consumption recorded by the meter was very much comparable with the production. The increase/decrease in consumption was almost in proportion to the production. which substantiated the PR’s contention that the meter was recording the consumption accurately and according to load run on it.
3. It was not a case where the Red phase CT stopped contributing permanently, rather, as evident from the temper data, the make and break of Red Phase CT connection was going on, as a result of which the temper data recorded 80 No. tampers between 01.09.2016 to 03.12.2016 on account of which, the meter remained under tamper for 25 hours 10 minutes.

Even, on the date, when DDL was carried out i.e 08.12.2016, MMTS recorded two readings of current being drawn by Red Phase CT as 0.06 Amps and 0.00Amps. However the meter did not record tamper on 08.12.2016, May be the tamper might not have persisted for 3 minutes, which was necessary for recording the tamper (as per condition 16 (x) of specification).

Moreover, had the tamper been continuous, the meter would have recorded only one tamper i.e "start of CT open" and would not have recovered uptil the time and date of carrying out DDL i.e upto 08.12.2016, but in this case, meter recorded 80 Nos. tampers (40 Nos. each for make and break of connection) and the time of each tamper had been recorded on the data.

Had the Red Phase stopped contributing permanently, the meter would have recorded 33% lesser consumption between 17.08.2016 to 06.01.2017 as compared to the average consumption of the previous months. But, in this case meter had not recorded lesser consumption, which further authenticates that it is a case of make and break of the CT connection and not the case of non contribution of Red Phase permanently as alleged by MMTS.

1. This is not a case of dead stop/defective/stolen meter, where consumption could be ascertained (Regulation 21.5.2 of Supply Code -2014) as considered by the Forum but this was is a case where the meter's DDL had recorded the exact time for which, the meter remained under tamper i.e for 25 hrs 10 minutes.
2. The decision of the Forum was against the rules and authentic technical information/ data retrieved from the DDL and may be quashed and the 40% of the disputed amount deposited by the Petitioner may be got refunded with interest after deducting the charges for 25 hours 10 minutes.

*From the above analysis, it is observed that the Petitioner has posed challenge to the decision of the Forum based on the study of DDL, dated 08.12.2016, consumption pattern and findings of the testing report of CT/PT unit in ME Lab. I find that DDL done in April 2016, as stated by the Respondent in its reply, was not produced before this court despite the fact that the respondent was afforded an opportunity of doing so by fixing another date of hearing on 15.02.2018. I have also noted that accuracy of the Energy Metter was neither checked at site nor in the ME Lab. Had this been done, facts could have come to fore as contended by PR. However, the removed CT/PT units was tested/checked in the presence the Consumer’s Representative in ME Lab which reported that Red Phase CT was not contributing. This means that CT/PT unit was defective. I have perused the DDL report dated 08.12.2016 read on 14.12.2016 and noted that the current on the Red Phase was zero Amp, w.e.f. 17.08.2016 at 11:00:18 hrs and continuously coming zero Amp. Though there was Start and End of current related event on each date, this was because of some residual current coming on Red Phase CT as is evident, from the MMTS report dated 08.12.2016 wherein the current on Red Phase at Energy Meter terminal taken with Clip on Meter, was 0.06 Amp. Moreover, on perusal of Load Survey Data, I notice that current of Red Phase remained zero Amp. throughout the disputed period. I am, therefore of the view that the Metering Equipment was defective for which the provisions contained in Regulation 21.5.2(a) of Supply Code 2014 are relevant. It is further observed that in Secure Make Energy Meters, the tempers are restored even when residual current/voltage appeared and no cumulative temper data is coming in DDL printout. The Respondent – PSPCL should take remedial measures to get the Software of the Energy Meter suitably amended to ensure that tampers are not restored when residual current/voltage appears and also the cumulative tamper data should come out in DDL printout as in the case of L&T make HT Energy Meters.*

**As a sequel of above discussions, it is held that the Petitioner should be charged for the period from 17.08.2016 (date when the current on Red Phase CT was zero Amp) to 06.01.2017 (the date of replacement of CT / PT unit) based on energy consumption for the corresponding period of the previous year in terms of provisions contained in Regulation 21.5.2 (a) of Supply Code-2014. Accordingly, the Respondent is directed to recalculate the demand without interest / surcharge and refund / recover the amount excess / short, if any.**

7. The Appeal is disposed off accordingly.

8. EIC/Commercial, PSPCL, Patiala should look into and take up the matter with Chief Engineer/Metering for taking corrective action to rectify the software of the Energy Meter and amending specifications of HT Energy Meters suitably, as observed in para No. 6 above, to be procured in future.

9. EIC/Commercial, PSPCL, Patiala should issue instructions to all the Engineers-in-Chief / Chief Engineer of DS Zones to direct all the field officers/officials to ensure during the installation of LT CT operated Energy Meters alongwith LT CT that the Potential Wires tapped from the main cable should be of the same material as that of the main cable (directly or preferably through bi-metallic thimble) to avoid bi-metallic resistance due to which the carbonization takes place and with the passage of time, the wires get disconnected contributing to less recording of consumption by the Energy Meter.

10. In case, the Petitioner or the Respondent (Licensee) is not satisfied with the above decision, they are at liberty to seek appropriate remedy against this order from the appropriate Bodies in accordance with Regulation 3.28 of Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations – 2016.

(VIRINDER SINGH)

Date: 22.02.2018 LokPal (Ombudsman)

Place: S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) Electricity, Punjab.