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 Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Petitioner against the order dated 20 .11.2017 of the CGRF (Forum) in Case No. CG-219 of 2017 deciding that:

* *“Account of the Petitioner be overhauled for a period of six months preceding the date of checking i.e. 01.06.2017 taking into consideration slowness factor as 68.14%.*
* *The notice for unauthorized use of electricity under Section 126 also need to be served for using the electricity for construction purposes.”*

2. **Facts of the Case:**

 The relevant facts of the case are that:

1. The Petitioner was having a Domestic Supply (DS) Category connection with Sanctioned Load of 35.660kW. The Metering was being done by providing Static LT CT Energy Meter.
2. The connection was checked by the Addl. S.E/Enforcement-3, Ludhiana vide ECR No. 01/3357 dated 01.06.2017 on the request of the AEE, Commercial, City West Division (Special), Ludhiana, after the Petitioner applied for shifting of the Energy Metering equipment outside the premises.
3. At the time of checking the “STAR” was coming on the display of the Energy Meter which, on being checked with LT ERS Meter and the Energy Meter was found running slow by 68.14% when tested on Pulse and Dial Modes.
4. On opening of CT Chamber (CTC), it was found that there were wrong connections at the Energy Meter terminals and **the Potential wire of the Red and Blue Phase were interchanged.**
5. After correcting the wrong connections, the accuracy of the Energy Meter installed at the premises was again checked with LT ERS Meter and the accuracy of the Energy Meter was found within the limits.
6. As the DDL taken by the Enforcement was incomplete, it issued directions to replace the said Energy Meter and getting the same tested in ME Lab.
7. The Energy Meter and LTCTs were replaced vide Device Replacement Application No. 100004021103 dated 02.06.2017, effected on 20.06.2017.
8. The Energy Meter was checked in ME Lab on 22.06.2017 and the accuracy was found within limits and the DDL was taken.
9. The Respondent overhauled the account of the Petitioner from the date of installation of the disputed Energy Meter i.e. from 12.09.2014 to 05/2017 for 33 months and a Notice bearing No. 1086 dated 02.06.2017, was issued to the Petitioner for depositing Rs. 18,91,583/-.
10. The Petitioner did not agree with the notice dated 02.06.2017 and filed a Petition in the Forum who, after hearing, passed order dated 20.11.2017 (Reference: Page 2, Para 1).
11. Based on the decision of the Forum, the disputed amount was reduced to Rs. 4,03,161/- and a new notice, bearing No. 1604 dated 26.12.2017 was issued to the Petitioner.

**(xii)** Not satisfied with the decision of the Forum, the Petitioner preferred an Appeal in this Court praying for justice.

3. **Submissions made by the Petitioner and the Respondent.**

Before undertaking analysis of the case, it is necessary to go through written submissions made by the Petitioner and reply of the Respondent as well as oral submissions made by the Representatives of the Petitioner and the Respondent alongwith material brought on record by both the sides.

1. **Submissions of the Petitioner**:

The Petitioner submitted the following for consideration of this Court:

1. The Petitioner was having Domestic Supply Category connection with Sanctioned Load as 35.660 kW. The reading of the Energy Meter was taken every month and the bills, as raised by the department from time to time on the basis of measured consumption, were duly paid.
2. The Petitioner applied for shifting of the Metering Equipment outside its premises. As the Energy Meter was CT operated, so, the concerned office requested the Addl. S.E/Enforcement for the requisite checking before its shifting. Accordingly, the connection was checked at site by Addl. S.E/Enforcement-3 Ludhiana, on 01.06.2017 and the Energy Meter was reported running slow by 68.14%, when checked with LT ERS Meter.
3. The Enforcement attributed slowness to wrong connections as ‘Red’ phase potential wire connected to ‘Blue’ phase and ‘Blue’ phase potential wire was connected to ‘Red’ phase. The DDL of the Energy Meter was taken at site, which was mentioned as incomplete in the Enforcement report.
4. The Addl.S.E/Enforcement-3 directed to replace the Metering Equipment for testing and taking DDL in ME Lab. Accordingly, the Energy Meter and LT CTs were replaced.
5. The AEE/Commercial City West Division (Special) vide Notice, bearing Memo No. 1086 dated 02.06.2017 asked the consumer to deposit a sum of Rs.18,91,583/- within seven days due to wrong connections, by overhauling the account from 09/2014 to 05/2017 on the basis of report of the Addl. S.E/Enforcement-3. The amount was charged without reference to any rule/regulation of the Supply Code or Electricity Act, 2003, especially considering the fact that the account had been ordered to be overhauled for 33 months and huge amount had been ordered charged to a Domestic Supply consumer.
6. The Petitioner approached the Forum for registration and review of disputed case in July 2017. The case (CG 219 of 2017) of the Petitioner was registered for review in the Forum. However, the Forum did not consider all the pleadings of the Petitioner and provided partial relief. The Forum decided on 20.11.2017 that “*account of the Petitioner be overhauled for a period of six months preceding the date of checking i.e.01.06.2017, taking into consideration slowness factor of* as 68.14% and also directed to issue notice for Unauthorized Use of Electricity under Section 126 of Electricity Act, 2003 for using this electricity connection for construction purpose.”
7. Based on the order of the Forum, AEE/Commercial issued notice, bearing Memo No. 1604 dated 26.12.2017, revising the disputed amount from Rs. 18,91,583/- to Rs.4,03,161/-.
8. The consumption of the Petitioner was very consistent from the last so many years and variation in consumption during various months was due to summer/winter period. The official of the PSPCL was recording regular readings and the bills as issued on the basis of recorded consumption had been paid in due course. The energy consumption was commensurate with the Sanctioned Load of Domestic Supply (DS) consumer. The consumption during winter was in the range of 2000 - 4000 units and during summer period, it was 5000-7000 units, before the replacement of the Energy Meter in 09/2014. Almost the same trend continued (with minor variation) after installation of new Energy Meter in 09/2014. The variation in consumption was due to the fact that children of the family had taken admissions in professional colleges and are staying out of Punjab in Hostels and normally visited the home after 4-6 weeks. Thus, some fall in consumption was bound to be there. Moreover, with the advent of new energy saving devices, the Petitioner also changed some old ACs with new ones besides installation of LED lights by replacing conventional tube lights and there was nothing wrong in it. This was the reason for some fall in consumption during the disputed period. However, there was also some decline in consumption after the installation of new Energy Meter in 06/2017. As such the account should not be overhauled on the basis of vague/apparent wrong report of slowness by 68.14%. Thus, the notice issued by the AEE/Commercial, City West Division (Special), PSPCL, Ludhiana, was not justified and the demand raised by the respondent was required to be revised with some realistic average basis instead of with slowness by 68.14%.
9. The Energy Meter was accurate and recording correct readings and not slow to the extent of 68.14%. For the sake of arguments, if it was presumed that working of the Energy Meter was effected with wrong connections to the extent of slowness of 68.14% from 09/2014, then by applying this slowness factor the resultant consumption for 06/2015, 07/2015, 06/2016 and 07/2016, came to 12677 units, 27410 units, 19178 units and 16331 units per month respectively. Similar was the position for other periods. However, this much of consumption was not possible with sanctioned load of 35.660 kW, by applying any standard formula for DS consumer, approved by PSPCL. The consumption with approved LDHF formula (35.660 x 30 x 8 x 30%) comes to 3563 units per month. Further, if the entire sanctioned load was used for 24 hours continuously for 30 days then the consumption worked out as 25632 units, which was even less than the chargeable consumption of 27410 units as calculated for 07/2015 (with slowness of 68.14% ). This was imaginary situation ( full load running for 24 hours continuously for 30 days) and practically this was not possible in the prevailing circumstances. Thus, it was proved beyond doubt that checking by the Addl. S.E/Enforcement-3, reporting slowness of 68.14%, was wrong and not reliable for overhauling the account, as done by the Respondent. The Petitioner was busy on the day of checking by the Addl. S.E/Enforcement-3 and could not attend the checking team and also could not witness the testing properly. From the consumption pattern, it appeared that Energy Meter was accurate and if it was defective (presumed), then, it could not be slow to the extent of 68.14%, as explained above.
10. As per the provisions contained in Supply Code-2014 (made applicable w.e.f. 01.01.2015), the account against inaccurate Energy Meter could be overhauled as prescribed in Regulation 21.5.1 of the Supply Code-2014, as mentioned below:

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

***a)*** *date of test in case the Energy Meter has been tested at site to the satisfaction of the consumer; or replacement of inaccurate Energy Meter, whichever was later; or*

***b)*** *date the defective Energy Meter was removed for testing in the Lab of the Distribution Licensee”.*

**(xi)** The accuracy of the Energy Meter as tested at site, reporting slowness of 68.14%, was wrong and not reliable, as explained above. The testing of the Energy Meter was also done on 22.06.2017 in ME Lab which reported that the accuracy of the Energy Meter was within limits. As such, the account cannot be overhauled even for a period of 6 months with slowness factor of 68.14%. In any case, if overhauling of account was required, the same may be ordered on the basis of average consumption as recorded after the replacement of the Energy Meter or with standard LDHF formula.

**(xii)** In order to further substantiate the argument that the Energy Meter (if it was defective) was not slow to the extent of 68.14%, it was brought out that the consumption after replacement of Energy Meter on 02.06.2017 to 06.11.2017 came to 27839 kWh (reading as per ECR No.13/3361 dated 06.11.2017). The proportionate consumption of the same period i.e. 02.06.2016 to 06.11.2016, worked out to be more than 30,000 units viz consumption during the period when the Energy Meter had been considered slow by 68.14% was even more than the consumption after the replacement of Energy Meter. Further, if the consumption of about 30000 units as recorded during the period from 02.06.2016 to 06.11.2016, was enhanced by slowness factor of 68.14%, then, the resultant consumption came to more than 90,000 units i.e more than three times the consumption as recorded after the replacement of Energy Meter, which was not possible under any circumstances. It was quite possible that there was no reversal/wrong connections as reported by Addl. S.E/Enforcement-3 or the internal recording of consumption was not effected by the phase reversal and the case has been deliberately made with some ulterior motive. Due to inbuilt feature of L&T make Energy Meters, the recording of consumption was not effected due to wrong connections of potential wires of phases.

**(xiii)** In Appeal Case No. 30/2017 titled King Industries, decided by the Court on 05.09.2017, the Respondent admitted that “*It was correct that in case of the L&T Make Energy Meter, the internal recording of consumption was not affected if the secondary wires of CT are reversed.”* In the case of Petitioner, there may be reversal of secondary wires of CTs, due to which actual recording of consumption was not effected at all. This fact was also substantiated from the consumption pattern of the consumer, as explained above. The consumer was not aware and could not observe about the technical aspect of alleged reversal of connections or reversal of secondary wires of CT.

**(xiv)** The monthly readings of the Energy Meter were recorded by competent official of the PSPCL who was supposed to report the defect in the Energy Meter (if any), whereupon the department was to ensure the replacement of Energy Meter within prescribed time. Instruction No. 104 of ESIM provided for checking of every Domestic Supply (DS) Category connection on regular basis. In such a situation, if the connection was not checked as per instructions, then the onus for default was on the part of the officials concerned.

**(xv)** The Forum also decided that the notice for Unauthorized Use of Electricity (UUE) under Section 126 of Electricity Act, 2003, also need to be served for using the electricity for construction purposes. This part of the decision was very regrettable as the cases of UUE and theft, covered under Section 126 and 135 of the Electricity Act, 2003, did not fall in the purview of the Forum. Besides, the Forum never gave any order/decision in any case of UUE and theft, since its inception. As such, the Forum was not required to give order for issue of notice for UUE under Section 126 of Electricity Act, 2003. The case was otherwise also not covered under UUE but after the decision dated 20.11.2017 of the Forum, the AEE/Commercial issued notice of provisional assessment for UUE, vide Memo No. 1552 dated 27.11.2017 for Rs.1,09,540/- and then final notice of Rs. 2,00,822/- (further enhancing the amount from Rs. 1,09,540/-). The Petitioner contacted the AEE/Commercial and requested him that UUE was never noticed by any authorized officer during checking of load but the Petitioner was told that there was clear decision of the Forum regarding issue of notice for using the electricity for construction purposes. However, the facts of the case were that the load of the Petitioner’s connection was checked as per directions of the Forum and connected load of 39.599 kW was reported vide ECR No.13/3361 dated 06.11.2017, which was also not correct. The load of Geyser, Oven, and Toaster, totalling to 10 kW had been taken separately although these were being operated through Power Plugs (PP) (the load of 24 Nos. PP had also been taken in the load calculation as per ECR). Further, during discussion on the case, it was pleaded before the Forum that at the time of checking, repair/renovation of the building was going on and one No. Wood Cutting/Aara machine of 3 BHP was at site for repair/renovation work of the building (which was constructed long ago) and after 5-6 years, repair/renovation (as per requirement) had been done earlier also. There was no new construction activity at the time of checking also and no new construction machinery at site was existing except Wood Cutting/Aara Machine of 3 BHP, for which, supply was used from regular connection. Inspite of all these submissions, the Forum ordered that the *notice for unauthorized use of electricity under Section 126 of Electricity Act, 2003,also needed to be served* for using the electricity for construction purposes. This may start new trend and Forum may order for issue of notice of UUE in similar cases and consumer may be unnecessarily harassed on the pretext of decision of the Forum. Needless to mention here that the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum has been constituted as per orders of the Hon’ble PSERC, with specific powers to adjudicate the disputed cases/complaints (except the cases covered under Section 126, 135 etc. of Electricity Act, 2003). But, in the case of the Petitioner, new grievance (case of UUE) had been created in view of decision of the Forum, which was highly unjustified.

**(xvi)** The decision of the Forum was wrong, illegal and biased and may be set-aside and the overhauling of the account be ordered on the basis of average of consumption as recorded after the replacement of the Energy Meter or with standard LDHF formula for a maximum period of six months. Further, the decision of the Forum regarding issue of notice for Unauthorized Use of Electricity (UUE) under Section 126 of Electricity Act, 2003, may be quashed, in the interest of natural justice and fairness.

 **(b) Submissions of the Respondent:**

The Respondent, in its defence, submitted the following for consideration of this Court:

1. The Petitioner was having Domestic Supply Category connection, bearing Account No.3002862813 with Sanctioned Load of 35.660 kW.
2. The Petitioner’s connection was checked on 01.06.2017 by the Additional S.E/Enforcement-3 vide ECR No. 01/3357 and it was reported that the Energy Meter when checked with LT ERS Meter found running slow by 68.14%. The Enforcement also reported that Red Phase potential wire and Blue Phase potential wire were inter-changed and for this reason, the Energy Meter was running slow. It was further reported that the connections were set-right and the accuracy of the Energy Meter came to within limits.
3. On the basis of the said checking report, a notice bearing Memo No. 1086 dated 02.06.2017, was served upon the Petitioner to deposit a sum of Rs.18,91,583/- due to overhauling of the account for the period from 09/2014 to 05/2017.
4. The Petitioner did not agree with the said demand and filed a Petition in the Forum which, after hearing the matter, ordered the joint checking by Additional S.E/DS and Addl. S.E/Enforcement-3. The connection was checked by the said officers jointly as per the directions of the Forum and it was reported that the total running load was 39.599 kW and it was also reported that the said Load is running on first two floors. A lift was also installed in the said premises and the brother of the consumer, Sh. Rajiv Kumar admitted that the construction on first and second floor had just completed and the construction and renovation was still going on the ground floor and for that purpose, 4.498 kW Load was used for temporary/construction purposes.
5. The Forum passed a well-reasoned and speaking order in this case on 20.11.2017. The Petitioner was not satisfied with the decision of the Forum and preferred an Appeal in this Court praying for justice.
6. The Checking Report dated 01.06.2017 proved that it was a clear cut case of under billing on account of wrong connections which was due to wrong phase association and the Red Phase potential wire and Blue Phase potential wire were interchanged and computed the slowness of the Energy Meter with the help of LT ERS Meter and quantified the slowness at 68.14%. The said wrong connections could be visualized from the tampered data report of DDL wherein prior to 01.06.2017, the current reversal events of the Red Phase and Blue Phase were being recorded. There was no in-built feature in the Energy Meter in question where the recording of the consumption was not affected due to wrong connections of potential wires of phases and the accounts were rightly overhauled in terms of Regulation 21.5.2 of the Supply Code-2014.
7. The Petitioner had a three storey house with lift and 50 kVA generator installed as standby. The total connected load of first and second floor was about 40 kW in addition to temporary load of almost 5 kW, being used for construction purpose on the ground floor and for this reason also, the amount charged was correct
8. The Forum had already given much relief to the Petitioner by holding that the case was covered under Regulation 21.5.1 of the Supply Code-2014 and directed to overhaul the account for a period of six months preceding the date of checking taking into consideration slowness factor as 68.14% despite the fact that the case of the consumer was covered under Regulation 21.5.2 of the Supply Code-2014.
9. There was no infirmity in the orders passed by the Forum stating that the notice for unauthorized use of electricity under Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003 also needed to be served for using the electricity for construction purpose because it was clearly mentioned in the checking report that the electricity was used for the construction purpose also.
10. Considering that the Forum gave full opportunity of being heard to both the parties, considered all the aspects of the case and passed a well reasoned and speaking order in this case, the present Appeal may be dismissed.

**4. Analysis:**

 The issues requiring adjudication are the legitimacy of the:

1. amount charged to the Petitioner due to overhauling of its account for a period of six months preceding the date of checking of the connection i.e. 01.06.2017 (when wrong connections at Energy Meter terminals were noticed by the Enforcement) taking into consideration the slowness as 68.14%.
2. issuance of notice for Unauthorised Use of Electricity (UUE) under Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and levy of UUE charges.

*The points emerged are deliberated and analysed as under:*

**Issue (i):** The dispute in the present case arose when the Domestic Supply Category connection of the Petitioner was checked by the Addl. S.E/Enforcement-3, Ludhiana vide ECR No. 01/3357 dated 01.06.2017 on the request of the AEE/Commercial, City West (Special), Ludhiana as the Petitioner had applied on 05.05.2017 for shifting of the Energy Metering equipment outside the premises. At the time of checking, the “STAR” was coming on the display of the Energy Meter which, on being checked with LT ERS Meter, was found running slow by 68.14% when tested on Pulse and Dial Modes. On opening of CT Chamber (CTC), it was found that there were wrong connections at the Energy Meter terminals and the Potential wire of the Red and Blue Phase were interchanged. After correcting the wrong connections, the accuracy of the Energy Meter installed at the premises was again checked with LT ERS Meter and found within the limits. As the DDL taken by the Enforcement was incomplete, it issued directions to replace the said Metering Equipment for getting it tested from the ME Lab. The Energy Meter and LTCTs were replaced vide Device Replacement Application No.100004021103 dated 02.06.2017, effected on 20.06.2017. The Energy Meter was tested on 22.06.2017 in ME Lab wherein the DDL was taken and the accuracy was found within the limit. The Respondent overhauled the account of the Petitioner from the date of replacement of the Energy Meter i.e. from 12.09.2014 to 05/2017 for 33 months and Notice, bearing No. 1086 dated 02.06.2017, was issued to the Petitioner for depositing Rs. 18,91,583/-. Aggrieved with the demand raised, the Petitioner approached the Forum which, vide order dated 20.11.2017, decided to overhaul the account of the Petitioner for a period of six months preceding the date of checking taking into consideration the slowness factor as 68.14%.

 *I agree with the Petitioner that the monthly readings of the Energy Meter were recorded by the competent official of the PSPCL who was supposed to report the defect in the Energy Meter (if any), whereupon the Respondent was to ensure to take corrective action including the replacement of Energy Meter, where required, within prescribed time. I find that the Distribution Licensee defaulted in ensuring compliance of itsInstruction No. 104 of ESIM which provided for checking of every Domestic Supply (DS) Category connection on regular basis.*

 *I observe that the DDL of the disputed Energy Meter, taken at site by the Addl. S.E/Enforcement-3, Ludhiana on 01.06.2017, was incomplete. Accordingly, it issued directions to replace the said Metering Equipment for getting the same tested in ME Lab wherein the DDL was taken on 22.06.2017 and the accuracy of the Energy Meter was found within the limits. I have perused the Tamper Report of the DDL which shows that the Electrical Parameters (Voltage, Current and Power Factor) are very much inconsistent due to wrong connection of the Potential Wires at the Energy Meter Terminals, which created Phase disassociation conditions. Under this condition, the slowness will not remain the same but will depend on Electrical Parameters (Voltage, Current and Power Factor) at each time. Hence, there is merit in the contention of the PR that in the given situation, the account of the Petitioner can not be overhauled with slowness factor of 68.14% as determined at site and that the overhauling is required to be done in terms of provisions of Regulation 21.5.2 (a) of the Supply Code-2014 i.e. on the basis of energy consumption of the corresponding period of previous year.*

**Issue (ii):** Another issue raised by the Petitioner in the present dispute is the validity/legality of the order dated 20.11.2017 of the Forum directing the Respondent to issue a notice to the Petitioner for Unauthorised use of Electricity (UUE) under Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003 as the Petitioner used electricity for construction purpose in excess of Sanctioned Load in contravention of the provisions contained in Regulation 8.3.5 of the Supply Code-2014.

*I observe that the Forum, on coming to know about Unauthorised Use of Electricity (UUE) by the Petitioner, pursuant to the checking dated 06.11.2017 at its (Forum’s) own instance, acted beyond its jurisdiction in issuing directions to the Respondent to serve a notice upon the consumer for violation of the provisions ibid of Electricity Act, 2003. I also observe that the Respondent, during the course of hearing, intimated that the Petitioner was issued Notice, bearing No. 1608 dated 26.12.2017 for final order of assessment for UUE under the provisions of Section 126 of Electricity Act, 2003 in compliance to the Forum’s order dated 20.11.2017 and the Petitioner submitted the Appeal before the Sub Divisional Magistrate (the authority designated for the purpose) after depositing the 50% amount assessed by the Respondent and the matter is pending adjudication.*

*I have also gone through the Regulation 8.3.5 of the Supply Code-2014, which read as under:*

*“Existing consumers temporarily using supply for construction purposes or for construction after demolishing existing structure shall be allowed to use load from the existing connection provided the total sanctioned load/demand is not exceeded.”*

 In the present case, the Connected Load was 39.599kW + Temporary Load of 4.498kW on the date of checking i.e. 06.11.2017 against the Sanctioned Load of 35.660kW. Hence, as per regulation ibid, the Petitioner can temporarily use supply for construction purpose and thus is liable to be charged load surcharge only. However, since, the matter regarding UUE is already under adjudication of the Sub Divisional Magistrate (SDM), no decision is being taken in this regard as it does not fall within the jurisdiction of this Court.

From the above analysis, it is concluded that:

The account of the Petitioner is required to be overhauled, for six months preceding the date of checking i.e. 01.06.2017, based on the consumption of the corresponding period of previous year, in terms of provisions contained in Regulation 21.5.2 (a) of the Supply Code-2014 i.e. on the basis of energy consumption of corresponding period of previous year.

**5. Decision:**

 **As a sequel of above discussions, it is held that the account of the Petitioner should be overhauled as per conclusion arrived at in Para 4 above. Accordingly, the Respondent is directed to recalculate the demand and refund/recover the amount found excess/short, if any, after adjustment without interest.**

**6.** The Appeal is disposed off accordingly.

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

 (VIRINDER SINGH)

July 20, 2018 LokPal (Ombudsman)

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