

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

Appeal No: CG-55 of 2013

Instituted On: 09.05.2013

Closed On: 30.05.2013

**Sh. Harbhajan Singh
C/o Sh. Parshotam Kinger
H.No.857, Street No.12
Tripuri Town, Patiala.**

.....Appellant

A/c No.: 3000023440

Through

Sh. Parshotam Kumar, Petitioner

V/s

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD

.....Respondent

Name of Op/Division: Commercial Patiala.

Through

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

BRIEF HISTORY

The petitioner has filed appeal No. CG-55 of 2013 against order dated 10.01.2013 of DDSC Patiala deciding that the amount charged to the consumer is correct and recoverable.

The petitioner is having DS category connection in the name of Sh.Harbhajan Singh having sanctioned load of 2.760 KW operating under AEE/West Comml. Sub Division,Patiala.

In the month of Oct.2012 (29.10.2012) energy bill on 'D' code (defective meter status) having an average consumption of 577 units for Rs. 3370/- was issued to the consumer. The consumer did not agree to it and made an appeal in DDSC on the ground that he had purchased this house in the month of Jan.2012 and the house remained lock till Sept.2012. Consumer also argued that some labourers are residing in this house since Oct.2012. The DDSC in its meeting dated 08.12.2012 directed the AEE/Tech. North S/D Patiala to submit site report. On the basis of site report the DDSC decided in its meeting that amount charged to the consumer is correct as per guidelines of the PSPCL and is recoverable.

Not satisfied with the decision of the DDSC. The consumer made an appeal in the Forum, Forum heard the case on 23.05.2013 and finally on 30.05.2013 when the case was closed for passing speaking orders.

Proceedings:

On 23.05.2013, Representative of PSPCL submitted four copies of the reply and the same has been taken on record. One copy thereof has been handed over to the PR.

PR submitted four copies of the written arguments and the same has been taken on record. One copy thereof has been handed over to the representative of PSPCL.

Representative of PSPCL stated that the reply submitted on 23.05.2013 be treated as their written arguments.

Representative of PSPCL contended that the meter of the consumer was defective during that period the bill was raised on the basis of consumption of last year's corresponding period. The load of the consumer is 2.7 KW and with LDHF, it works out to 1132 units. Also

the consumer has never intimated S/D in this regard, and also not applied for temporary disconnection during the period when the consumer claims that the premises was lying lock and not being used by him as such the amount is calculated is correct and chargeable.

Petitioner also submitted the undertaking for non-occupancy of the house from purchase till today and copy of the registry of the house.

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

Observations of the Forum:

After the perusal of petition, reply, written arguments, proceedings, oral discussions and record made available to the Forum, Forum observed as under:-

The petitioner is having DS category connection in the name of Sh.Harbhajan Singh having sanctioned load of 2.760 KW operating under AEE/West Comml. Sub Division, Patiala.

Forum observed that energy bill on 'D' code for the month of Oct.2012 for average consumption of 577 units for Rs. 3370/- was issued to the consumer. The consumer made an appeal in the DDSC Patiala that he had purchased this house in Jan.2012 and nobody was residing during Jan.2012 to Sept.2012 and some labourers are residing in the house from Oct.2012. The DDSC heard the case and charged the amount.

Forum observed that the meter of the consumer was defective during this period, so he was required to be charged on the basis of average consumption as per instructions of the PSPCL. The petitioner submitted the undertaking for non occupancy of the house from the date of purchase to Sept. 2012 and also submitted copy of the registry of the house in support of it. Forum is of the view that the amount charged Rs. 3370/- on the basis of consumption of the same period of

previous year when somebody else was residing is not justified because the consumer has purchased the said house in Jan.2012 and his house remained vacant from Jan.2012 to Sept. 2012 as per undertaking submitted by the consumer.

Decision:-

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

- **That the account of the consumer for the disputed period be overhauled on the basis of average consumption from Nov.2012 to May,2013.**
- **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.**

(Rajinder Singh)
CAO/Member

(K.S. Grewal)
Member/Independent

(Er. Ashok Goyal)
EIC/Chairman