

**PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LIMITED  
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF GRIEVANCES OF CONSUMERS  
P-1 WHITE HOUSE, RAJPURA COLONY, PATIALA  
PHONE: 0175-2214909 ; FAX : 0175-2215908**

Case No. CG-75 of 2013

Instituted on : 04.06.2013

Closed on : 23.07.2013

**Dr.Hardeep Singh Aulakh,  
Aulakh Children Hospital,  
Near HDFC Bank, Bassi Road,  
Sirhind, Pin - 140406  
Distt. Fatehgarh Sahib.**

**.... Appellant**

**Name of the Op. Division: Sirhind.**

A/c No. KC-45/164

Through

Dr.Hardeep Singh, PR

V/s

**PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD. ....Respondent**

Through

**Er. A.S. Gill, Sr.XEn/Op. Divn., Sirhind.**

**BRIEF HISTORY**

Petition No. CG-75 of 2013 was filed against order dt.26.03.2013 of the CDSC, deciding that the consumption for the disputed period be taken as per LDHF formula i.e. 5280 units per bi-monthly.

The consumer is having NRS category connection (Hospital) with sanctioned load of 11 KW operating under AEE/Op. City Sub-Divn., Sirhind.

The consumer was billed for Rs. 90,360/- for the consumption of 15137 units in the month of March,2011, which was on the higher side as compared to his previous bills. The meter was challenged by the consumer and the energy meter of the consumer was changed on 12.05.2011 vide MCO No.32/73538 dt. 20.04.2011. The meter was sent to ME Lab for testing vide challan No. 51 dt. 20.10.2011. The ME Lab reported that the meter was operating/recording fast by @99.99%. Bill for the month of March, 2011 was revised as per consumption of the same month of the previous year (i.e.4847 units). The energy bill for the month of 05/2011 was also revised on the consumption of previous year. The new meter installed also got defective in Jan,2012 and billing for this month(01/2012) was made on MMC basis. The meter was replaced vide MCO No.33/101646 dt. 20.03.2012. The bi-monthly electricity bills of the consumer for 7/2011, 09/2011, 11/2011 & 01/2012 were overhauled by AEE/Op. City Sub-Divn., Sirhind as per the recommendations of Internal Auditor, Sirhind vide his H.M.No. 262 dt. 31.10.2012. The amount of Rs.1,14,193/- was charged to the consumer on the basis of consumption recorded during the same months of the previous year.

The consumer did not agree to it, thus he made an appeal in the CDSC. The CDSC in its decision dt. 26.03.2012 decided to overhaul

the account of the consumer for the disputed period i.e. 07/2011 to 01/2012 on the basis of LDHF formula i.e. 5280 units per bi-monthly.

Being not satisfied with the decision of the CDSC, the consumer made an appeal in the Forum. The Forum heard the case on 02.07.2013, 11.07.2013 and finally on 23.07.2013. Then the case was closed for passing speaking orders.

**Proceedings:**

PR stated that petition and written arguments already submitted may be treated as part of oral discussion.

Representative of PSPCL contended that the CDSC while making a decision asked for charging the consumption on the basis of LDHF formula by taking no. of Hrs. of operation as 20 Hrs., thereby charging average @ 5280 units per bi-monthly which is as per rules of PSPCL are justified.

PR further contended that he had already made payment on the basis of measured consumption thus LDHF formula should not be applied while charging average for the period the consumption was being recorded with the meter. PR further stated that consumption after the replacement of meter in 3/2012 should be taken on the basis of charging the average where nil consumption has been reported with the meter.

**Observations of the Forum:**

Written submission made in the petition, reply, written arguments of the respondents as well as petitioner and other material on record have been perused and carefully considered.

Forum observed that the energy bill for the month of March,2011 was issued for Rs. 90360/- for 15137 units, which was very much on the higher side as compared to his previous bills. The consumer challenged the meter and defective meter was sent to ME Lab for checking. The ME Lab reported that the meter was running 99.99% fast. The new meter installed in 05/2011 also got defective in Jan,2012 and billing for this month was made on MMC basis. The account of the consumer for the bi-monthly bills 07/2011 to 01/2012 was overhauled on the basis of consumption recorded during the same months of the previous year, when the meter was running 99.99% fast.

Forum is of the view that the amount charged for the bi-monthly bills 7/2011 to 01/2012 on the basis of consumption recorded during the same months of the previous year is not justified as the meter of the consumer was recording fast by 99.99%. Further as per the decision of the CDSC Khanna, the consumer was charged for the said period on the basis of LDHF formula is also not correct because this formula is applicable only in the theft cases or where no consumption (before or after change of meter) is available.

Forum concludes that the account of the disputed period i.e. 04/2011 to the date of replacement of meter i.e. 14.03.2012 be

overhauled on the basis of the consumption recorded during corresponding succeeding year as the meter was having 'O.K'. status during this period.

**Decision:**

Keeping in view the petition, reply, oral discussions, and after hearing both the parties, verifying the record produced by them & observations of Forum, Forum decides that:

- \* **The account of the consumer for the period 04/2011 to 14.03.2012 be overhauled on the basis of consumption recorded during corresponding period of succeeding year (05/2012 to 03/2013).**
- \* **Forum further decides that the balance amount recoverable/refundable, if any, be recovered/refunded from/to the consumer along-with interest/surcharge as per instructions of PSPCL.**
- \* **As required under Section-19 (1) & 19 (1A) of Punjab State Regulatory Commission (Forum & Ombudsman) Regulation-2005, the implementation of this decision may be intimated to this office within 30 days from the date of receipt of this letter.**

(CA Rajinder Singh)  
Member/CAO

(K.S.Grewal)  
Member/Independent

(Er.Ashok Goyal)  
EIC/Chairman