

**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-78 of 2013

Instituted on : 14.06.2013

Closed on : 16.07.2013

**Smt.Renu Sidhu ,
W/O Sh.Rajesh Sidhu,
233, Majithia Enclave,
Patiala.**

.... Appellant

Name of the Op. Division: Comml. Patiala.

A/c No. 300064438

Through

Sh.Rajesh Sidhu, PR

V/s

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD.Respondent

Through

Er. Surinder Loomba, ASE/Op. Comml. Divn. Patiala.

BRIEF HISTORY

Petition No. CG-78 of 2013 was filed against order dt.08.12.2012 of the DDSC, Patiala deciding that the disputed bill issued in 10/2012 be overhauled on the basis of consumption of 2731 units.

The consumer is having DS category connection with sanctioned load of 6.32 KW operating under AEE/Comml. East Sub-Divn., Patiala.

The energy bill amounting to Rs.19890/- on the average consumption of 3054 units for the period 18.06.2012 to 05.10.2012 (due to 'D' code) was issued to the consumer. The consumer contested that bill raised on the average basis of 3054 units is very much on higher side as compared to her actual present consumption.

The consumer instead of depositing the bill amount made an appeal in the DDSC, Patiala after depositing Rs. 3900/- i.e. 20% of the disputed amount of Rs.19890/-. The DDSC heard the case on 08.12.2012 and decided that as the consumption recorded during the same months of previous year i.e. 08/2011 & 10/2011 was 1821 and 910 units respectively. So the accounts of the consumer for the disputed period 08/2012 & 10/2012 be overhauled on the basis of consumption of 2731 units(1821+910 units).

Being not satisfied with the decision of the DDSC, the consumer made an appeal in the Forum. The Forum heard the case on 02.07.2013, 09.07.2013 and finally on 16.07.2013. Then the case was closed for passing speaking orders.

Proceedings:

PSPCL contended that in continuation to the reply and written arguments already submitted, the bill of the consumer has been raised earlier on LYSM and then on the basis of actual reading received from

the ME Lab during the checking of the meter. The DDSC has rightly judged the case and as such the amount as charged is correct and recoverable.

Both the parties have nothing more to say and submit and the case was closed for speaking orders.

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 consumer was billed for Rs.19890/- on the average consumption of 3054 units due to 'D' code for the period 18.06.2012 to 05.10.2012. The consumer did not agree to it and made an appeal in the DDSC, Patiala. The DDSC in its decision overhauled the account of the consumer on the basis of consumption of 2731 units recorded during the corresponding period of year 2011(08/2011 & 10/2011) .

The consumer contended that her parents and children has shifted to Delhi and at present only two members of the family are staying in the house and charging Rs.19890/- for the average consumption of 3054 units due to 'D' code was very much on the higher side.

The representative of PSPCL contended that the amount charged as per DDSC decision is correct and recoverable.

Forum is of the view that due justice to the consumer has already been given by the DDSC, Patiala by reviewing the energy bills for the months 08/2012 & 10/2012 as per consumption recorded during the corresponding period of previous year 2011.

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:

- * **To uphold the decision of the DDSC taken in its meeting held on 08.12.2012.**
- * **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