**COURT OF THE LOK PAL (OMBUDSMAN),**

**ELECTRICITY, PUNJAB,**

 **PLOT NO.A-2, INDUSTRIAL AREA, PHASE-1,**

**S.A.S. NAGAR (MOHALI).**

**APPEAL NO. 28/2019**

**Date of Registration : 09.06.2019**

**Date of Hearing : 18.07.2019**

**Date of Order : 01.08. 2019**

**Before:**

 **Er. Virinder Singh, Lokpal (Ombudsman), Electricity**

**In the Matter of :**

 M/s. Laxmi Spinners

VPO Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road,

Ludhiana,

 ...Petitioner

 Versus

 Senior Executive Engineer,

DS, Estate Division (Special),

PSPCL, Ludhiana.

 ...Respondent

**Present For:**

Petitioner : Sh. Sukhminder Singh,

 Petitioner’s Representative (PR).

Respondent : 1. Er. Amandeep Singh,

 Senior Executive Engineer,

 DS, Estate Division (Special),

 PSPCL, Ludhiana.

 2. Sh. Krishan Singh,

 Assistant Accounts Officer.

Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Petitioner against the order dated 27.03.2019 in Case No. CGL-038 of 2019 of the Consumers Grievances Redressal Forum , Ludhiana, deciding as under:

*“Rs.9,59,850/- is recoverable from the petitioner along with interest at SBI base rate prevalent on 1st April of relevant year plus 2% for the period from the date the payment becomes payable/ receivable as per Regulation 2.42 (ii) of Forum and Ombudsman Regulations-2016 and Section (VII), Regulation 6(5)(ii) of ESIM-2018 after getting it pre-audit”.*

**2.** **Condonation of Delay:**

At the outset, the issue for condonation of delay in filing the Appeal in this Court was taken up. Petitioner’s Representative (PR) submitted that the Petitioner had filed a Petition, bearing No. CGL-038/2019 in the CGRF, Ludhiana who decided the case on 27.03.2019 and a copy of the same was sent by the Forum to the Petitioner, vide its Memo no.1280 dated 28.03.2019. Thereafter, the Petitioner, vide its application dated 10.04.2019, requested the Addl. SE/DS, Estate Division (Special), Ludhiana for some clarification and for issuing revised Demand Notice in the light of the decision ibid of the Forum. But the Petitioner did not receive any reply till the date of filing of Appeal in this Court. However, the Petitioner deposited tentative amount of Rs. 11,86,950/- on 17.01.2019 under protest to avoid disconnection of Supply. PR added that the delay of about one month in preferring the Appeal in this Court had occurred due to the aforesaid reasons and prayed that the same may be condoned in the interest of justice.

The Respondent, in its reply to the Appeal, did not offer any comments on the submissions made by the Petitioner and also did not object, during the course of hearing, to the condonation of delay in filing the Appeal in this Court.

In this connection, I have gone through Regulation 3.18 (ii) of the PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulation-2016 which reads as under:

“*No representation to the Ombudsman shall lie unless the representation is made within one month of the date of receipt of order of the Forum.*

 *Provided that the Ombudsman may entertain a representation beyond one month on sufficient cause being shown by the complainant that he/she had reasons for not filing the representation within the aforesaid period of one month”.*

I observe that though the Petitioner has given reasons for not filing the Appeal within the stipulated period, it ought to have ensured to avoid the delay to the extent possible and should have filed the Appeal with due promptitude. But the Petitioner did not do so and filed the present Appeal after about a month of expiry of the stipulated period. I also observe that non condonation of delay would deprive the Consumer of the opportunity, required to be afforded, to seek remedy and would also not meet the ends of ultimate justice. With this in view, the delay in filing the Appeal in this Court is condoned and the Petitioner is afforded an opportunity to present the case.

**3**. **Facts of the Case:**

The relevant facts of the case are that:

1. The Petitioner was having a Large Supply Category connection with

Sanctioned load of 1898 kW and contract demand (CD) of 1723 kVA.

1. The Account of the Petitioner was checked by the Special Audit

Party which observed that payments in excess amounting to Rs.11,74,296/- were posted in excess in the its account due to excess credit given through three Check Lots amounting to Rs.1,40,454/-, Rs.1,32,178/- and Rs.9,01,664/-.

1. In view of the Audit observations, a Supplementary Notice,

bearing Memo No.13 dated 03.01.2019 asking the Petitioner to deposit a sum of Rs.15,53,141/- (including interest of Rs.3,78,545/-) was issued. The Petitioner deposited Rs.11,86,950/- on 17.01.2019 under protest to avoid disconnection.

1. Subsequently, after checking of record, it was found that

Rs.9,59,850/- (Principal amount) was recoverable from the Petitioner against Check Lot amount.

1. The Petitioner did not agree with the supplementary bill dated

03.01.2019 and filed a Petition dated 18.02.2019 in the CGRF, Ludhiana, who, after hearing passed order dated 27.03.2019 (Page 2, Para 1),

1. Aggrieved with the decision of the CGRF, Ludhiana, the Petitioner

preferred an Appeal in this Court and prayed that the demand of interest and surcharge due to difference in billing of previous period was unwarranted and illegal. However, the Petitioner was ready to pay the actual amount of less billing/excess refund allowed.

 **4**. **Submissions made by the Petitioner and the Respondent:**

Before undertaking analysis of the case, it is necessary to go through the 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 along with material brought on record by both the sides.

**(a) Submissions of the Petitioner**:

The Petitioner made the following submissions for consideration of this Court:

1. The Petitioner was having a Large Supply (LS) Category connection

with sanctioned load of 1898 kW and contract demand of 1723kVA. The reading of the Energy Meter was being taken every month and the bills as raised by the department from time, to time, on the basis of measured consumption, were duly paid.

**(ii)** AEE/Commercial, Estate Division, vide Memo No.13 dated 03.01.2019, issued provisional notice wherein it was mentioned that: *As per report of Special Audit Party, your Account was checked and through check lot wrong/ excess credit has been given, as per list attached. Accordingly, for charging the amount along with interest, provisional supplementary notice is being issued”. The amount of Rs.11,74,296/- had been taken for 3 Nos. Check Lots and Rs.3,78,845/- as interest, thus, total amount as per notice was Rs.15,53,141 (Rs.11,74,296 + 3,78,845 ).*

**(iii**) The huge amount was charged to the Petitioner without reference to any rule/ regulation of the Supply Code, EA-2003, Tariff Order or ESIM. The Petitioner was not given any report of Audit Party, on the basis of which, demand had been raised. Therefore, it approached the CGRF, Ludhiana for registration of case. The Petitioner also deposited an amount of Rs.11,86,950/- under protest, vide receipt dated 17.01.2019, to avoid disconnection of power supply.

**(iv)** The Forum did not provide any relief to the Petitioner (except for adjustment against calculation mistakes as pointed out by the Petitioner) as admissible on merit. As such, the Petitioner was not satisfied with the decision of the Forum, therefore, the present Appeal was being filed.

**(v)** As per billing system prevailing in PSPCL, if any bill remained unpaid, then, outstanding amount was always shown in the regular bill as per item “Arrears Curr.Fin.Year” and the same was continued to be shown in every subsequent bill, until the outstanding amount was fully cleared/ paid.

The Petitioner had thoroughly checked its record (after raising demand of disputed amount by the Respondent) and noticed that there was excess amount of Rs.67,754/- (as violation penalties) and Rs.11,560/- as previous arrears in the bill issued for the period 31.3.2016 to 30.4.2016. The Petitioner had taken Peak Load Exemption (PLE) of 1300 kW (PLEC were also charged in the bill) and had deposited the previous bills, therefore, the Representative of the Petitioner approached the concerned office and bill was rectified as Rs.71,59,480/-. The Petitioner deposited the payment of Rs.71,59,480/- within due date.

**(vi**) In the bill issued for the period from 30.06.2016 to 28.07.2016, there was excess amount of Rs.39,465/- (as Peak Load Violation Penalties) and Rs.79,800/- as previous arrears. The concerned official rectified the bill to Rs.64,65,720/- after deducting Rs.39,465/- and Rs.79,800/-. The Petitioner deposited the payment of Rs.64,65,720/- within due date. Similarly, the next bill for the period 28.7.2016 to 31.08.2016, was rectified as Rs.86,90,710/- after adjusting excess charges and the same was deposited before the due date.

**(vii)** In the bill issued for the period 28.02.2017 to 31.03.2017, there were Sundry Charges of Rs.1,81,989/- and Sundry Allowances of Rs.9,09,944/-. The Representative of the Petitioner, inquired these charges and allowances from the concerned office and was told that allowances of Rs.9,09,944/- was interest on Security (consumption) and charges of Rs.1,81,989/- were on account of TDS. The concerned official also allowed higher consumption rebate for Threshold limit for the year 2016-17, amounting to Rs.8,07,352/-. The bill of Rs.40,75,288/- was revised to Rs.31,76,940/- after adjustments. The Petitioner paid the revised amount of Rs.31,76,940/- within due date. However, in the next bill for the period 31.03.2017 to 06.05.2017, an amount of Rs.1,76,700/- was shown as arrears of previous bill. The Petitioner paid the entire amount of Rs.87,36,280/- (including excess amount of Rs.1,76,700), within due date.

From the above details, it was clear that the Petitioner had paid all the bills as issued/ revised by the concerned office, within due date. The Petitioner also submitted before the Forum that “*If any less charges as per bills are noticed afterwards, the petitioner is ready to pay (after verifying the record).* *But the petitioner is not liable to pay any interest for less billing during the previous period.”*

**(viii)** In view of a number of billing mistakes pointed out in the Petition submitted before CGRF(about which, the Respondent was not aware while raising demand on the Petitioner for Rs.15,53,141/-), the Respondent submitted revised calculation sheet for Rs.9,59,850/. From a bare perusal of the bill wise/ revised calculation sheet from 10/2015 to 05/2017, ***it would be clear that the concerned office had charged excess amount in certain months and also less amount in some cases.*** The major difference in billing had been noticed in the bill issued in the month of 04/2017, wherein interest on Security had been now calculated as Rs.5,51,266/- whereas, it was earlier allowed as Rs.9,09,944/- (as mentioned in the calculation sheet). Further, an amount of Rs.1,38,223/- was pointed out as Late Payment Surcharge (LPS) for the payment deposited on 21.10.2016 against bill of Rs.77,44,300/- (due date shown as 14.10.2016). The recoverable amount was revised to Rs.9,59,850/- against disputed amount of Rs.15,53,141/-. But, the Respondent did not supply the detail of interest calculation, applicable rate of interest, TDS etc. It was also clearly submitted before the Forum that *“the petitioner shall pay the difference of interest on security excess provided after verifying calculation (as may be provided by the respondent)”.* However, the Petitioner was not liable to pay any interest due to billing mistakes as mentioned in calculation sheet/ billing details provided by the Respondent.

**(ix)** In the case of the Petitioner, the amount as per bills issued/ revised stood paid within due date. Thus, there was no question of any payment of surcharge. But the Petitioner paid the entire amount of the bill/ rectified bill within due date, as such, Surcharge was not payable. After verifying the record, the Petitioner came to the conclusion that there was possibility of excess adjustment as per bill issued for the period 28.02.2017 to 31.03.2017. The bill as issued on 05.04.2017 for Rs.40,75,288/- was revised to Rs.31,76,940/-. The Petitioner was ready to pay the amount of less billing but the Petitioner was not liable to pay any Surcharge for less billing.

 The present case of the consumer should be considered as dues relating to previous months/ years, as per Instruction No.93.1 of ESIM.

**(xi)** Before filing the present Appeal the Petitioner wanted some clarification regarding liability of payment of late payment surcharge where the bill was delivered late and revised due date was given to the Petitioner (by the concerned office) and payment was deposited within revised due date. The clarification was needed in view of observation of the Forum that If the petitioner has not received the bill in time he should have approached the office before due date of bill or should have checked the online portal where his bill was uploaded on **0**5.10.2016. Needless to mention here that there were clear instructions of the PSPCL that any penalty/ charges should be supported by specific rule/ instruction. The applicant could not find any instruction where it was prescribed that consumer was responsible to collect the bill at its own or check the online portal. Therefore, clarification was sought from ASE/ DS Estate Division (Special), vide letter dated 10.04.2019. However, neither copy of rule/instruction was supplied as requested in the said letter nor revised Notice as per decision of the Forum was issued till date. Thus, in order to avoid further delay, the present Appeal was filed before this Court.

**(xii)** In the disputed case of Pack Industries Ltd. (CGL-033/2019, Date of Order 10.5.2019), the Late Payment Surcharge, as charged by the Respondent, was waived off due to late delivery of bill to the consumer. The Forum in its said order observed that Bill was amended by RA and signed without date. Bill was deposited 11 days after the due date. In all such cases, the Forum mentioned that Respondent could not submit proof of timely delivery of the bill, so, LPS was not recoverable. But in the present case of the Petitioner, the Forum upheld the levy of LPS of Rs.1,38,223/- for the payment deposited on 21.10.2016 against the bill of Rs.77,44,300/-. The bill was delivered late and due date was revised by the RA. The Petitioner deposited payment within revised due date. However, the Forum did not consider the pleadings of the Petitioner and observed that If the Petitioner has not received the bill in time he should have approached the office before due date of bill or should have checked the online portal where his bill was uploaded on 05.10.2016. It was worth mentioning that the Petitioner deposited the payment against bills/ revised bills within due date/ revised due date but the interest/ surcharge, as levied by the Respondent, had not been waived off.

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

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

**(i)** In the bill issued for the period 31.03.2016 to 30.04.2016, the Petitioner was charged for the Peak Load Violation charges amounting to Rs.67,754/- out of which, Rs.59,982/- was charged due to wrong calculation by the PSPCL system and the remaining amount of Rs.7,774/- was charged for the time slot of 18:00 hours to 20:00 hours. As per PR Circular No.01/2015 dated 31.03.2015, peak load timings for Central Zone was 19:00 hours to 22:00 hours, hence, peak load violation charges were wrongly charged to the Petitioner and were not thus, recoverable from it. The excess payment made on account of peak load violation penalties was adjusted in calculation sheet.

**(ii)** The Petitioner had been wrongly charged Rs.39,465/- and Rs.17,066/- against the bills dated 01.08.2016 and 01.09.2016 respectively for the peak load violation charges during the time period 18:00 hours to 20:00 hours. But, as per PR Circular No.01/2015 dated 31.03.2015, peak load timings for Central Zone was 19:00 hours to 22:00 hours. So, peak load violation (PLV) charges had been wrongly charged to the Petitioner and were not recoverable from it. These bills were rectified by the RA and the Petitioner deposited the bills after correction by the RA.

1. The Bill dated 05.04.2017 was issued for Rs.48,03,243/- (Current

Bill amount) out of which, Rs.31,76,940/- was deposited by the Petitioner due to excess interest credited on Security for Rs.7,27,955/- instead of Rs.5,51,266/-. An adjustment was carried out manually for Rs.90,994/- against TDS and an amount of Rs.8,07,532/- against threshold refund for FY 2016-17 instead of actual refundable amount of Rs.85,517/- . As a result of these events Rs.9,89,520/- was short deposited against that bill only. However, Rs.1,76,700/-, on account of amount already paid in excess, had been adjusted in bill dated 20.05.2017 and was also considered in calculation sheet.

1. Earlier, interest amounting to Rs.7,27,955/- was credited by CBC on

dated 05.04.2017 for the year 2016-17 which was further rectified to Rs.5,51,266/- on 12.04.2017 and Rs.7,27,955/- was reversed by CBC. Hence, CBC had given allowance of Rs.5,51,266/- which was correct and this amount had been correctly taken in calculation sheet submitted before CGRF Ludhiana. Besides, the bill issued on 05.04.2017 was for Rs.48,03,243/- with due date 17.04.2017 but the consumer deposited Rs.31,76,940/-. Hence, Rs.16,26,303/- was deposited short by the consumer, out of which, Rs.5,51,266/- on account of interest on Security (consumption) refund was deductible and net balance of Rs.9,89,520/- had been correctly charged in the revised account statement submitted to the CGRF.

 In addition, a sum of Rs.1,38,223/- had been correctly charged as surcharge in the month of 10/2016 as the bill had been paid by the consumer on 21.10.2016 whereas the due date was 14.10.2016.

 **(v)** The demand raised, vide supplementary notice bearing No.13 dated 3.01.2019, was as per rules and regulations of the PSPCL.

**(vi)** The demand was raised as per bills short deposited by the consumer after getting it corrected/rectified from the RA. The adjustment given in the bill was not clear/ correct in the absence of calculation. Hence, interest needed to be recovered on the short deposited amount.

**(vii)** The CGRF had given relief in the interest charged to the Petitioner by charging on the basis of SBI base rate prevalent on 1st April of relevant year plus 2% for the period from the date, the payment became payable. The Petitioner was earlier charged an amount of Rs.11,74,296/- towards amount of check lots and the finally settled amount was Rs.9,62,233/- .

**5.** **Analysis:**

The issue requiring adjudication is the legitimacy of charging the following amounts less paid by the Petitioner with Late Payment Surcharge and Interest as per details tabulated below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sr | Check Lot Date and Amount (Rs.) | Particulars | Amount Chargeable(in Rupees) |
| a. | 08.09.20161,40,954/- | Peak Load violation charges, wrongly charged in the bill dated 12.05.2016,03.06.2016,01.07.2016,01.08.2016 and 01.09.2016 by PSPCL | 13,908/- |
| b. | 12.10.20161,32,178/- | Late Payment Surcharge due to deposit of bill dated 04.10.2016(due date 14.10.2016)on 21.10.2016  | 1,32,178/- |
| c. | 29.03.2017Rs.15,63,029/- |  15,63,029-6,61,365[Security (consumption) deposited on 19.12.2016]-85,517(Threshold rebate)= 8,16,147/- | 8,16,147/- |
|  |  | Total | 9,62,233/- |
| Interest from 09/2016 to 17.01.2019 against less deposit | 1,96,371/- |
| Gross Recoverable Amount | 11,58,604/- |

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

1. In the present dispute, the Petitioner was charged, as per revised calculations, a sum of Rs. 9,62,233/- less paid by it on account of billing mistakes/excess refund by the Respondent, relating to Peak Load Violations (PLVs) wrongly charged by the PSPCL System (through Check Lots dated 08.09.2016 and 12.10.2016) and also short deposit including adjustment of Threshold Rebate (through check Lot dated 29.03.2017) alongwith Late Payment Surcharge on bill dated 04.10.2016 and interest against the amount less paid during the previous period. In its rebuttal to the written reply given by the Respondent and also during the course of hearing on 18.07.2019, Petitioner’s Representative submitted that the Petitioner was ready to pay the actual amount less paid/excess refund allowed to it. PR added that the Petitioner was, however, was not liable to pay interest wrongly charged amounting to Rs. 1,96,371/- (as per revised calculations) from 09/2016 to 17.01.2019 against short payment less billing during the previous period especially when it had deposited the payment as per bills issued/revised by the concerned office of the PSPCL. PR also sated that the Petitioner was also not liable to pay Late Payment Surcharge on bill dated 04.10.2016 which was paid by it on revised due date (21.10.2016) as allowed as by the RA.

PR contended that it wanted clarification from the concerned office of the Respondent regarding liability of the Consumer for Late Payment Surcharge, in case where the bill was delivered late and due date was revised by the office of the Respondent. The clarification was required due to the reason that the bill dated 04.10.2016 for Rs. 77,40,300/- was not delivered by due date i.e. 14.10.2016 (actually delivered on 21.10.2016) which was got revised by the Petitioner from the then Revenue Accountant under its signatures. Thus Late Payment Surcharge, levied on the plea of late deposit of the said bill, was not justified as the same was not in accordance with the instructions of the PSPCL which prescribed that levy of any penalty/surcharge should be supported by specific rules/instructions. The applicant could not find any rule/instruction of the PSPCL which prescribed that the consumer was responsible to collect the bill on its own or check the online portal.

While making oral submissions, the Respondent, in its defence, submitted that the disputed bill dated 04.10.2016 for Rs, 77,44,300/- (with due date 14.10.2016), bearing Account No. 3003018335, was uploaded on the online portal of the PSPCL on 05.10.2016. However, the Petitioner visited the office of the Respondent on 21.10.2016 and told the then Revenue Accountant that it had not received the bill (in physical form) by due date and had received the same on 21.10.2016. The Petitioner requested that due date may be extended to enable it to make payment of the bill without interest/surcharge. The said Revenue Accountant, then, allowed making payment of the aforesaid bill under its signatures on 21.10.2016 by extending the due date to 21.10.2016. The bill was, then, deposited on 21.10.2016 itself.

 With a view to arrive at the factual position, the Respondent was directed orally and also in writing, vide e-mail dated 19.07.2019, to get in touch with IT wing and intimate, by 24.07.2019, as to whether the consumer’s e-mail ID and Mobile Number were registered in the PSPCL system and if so, on which date, the same were entered. The Respondent was also directed to ascertain as to whether the bill dated 04.10.2016 was sent by e-mail to the Petitioner or any SMS was sent at its registered Mobile Number.

 I find that the Sr. Executive Engineer DS, Estate Division (Special), PSPCL, Ludhiana, vide e-mail dated 29.07.2019, forwarded the reply given by IT Wing, PSPCL, Patiala vide its e-mail dated 26.07.2019, stating as under:

 **“The Mobile No. for this Account No. was updated on 19.01.2018 and E-mail ID on 12.07.2018.”**

 *I observe that the Petitioner expressed its willingness in the present Appeal followed by confirmation by its Representative, during hearing on 18.07.2019, to pay the Principal amount short deposited /less paid as per revised calculations prepared by the Respondent. However, the Petitioner Representative objected to make payment of Late payment Surcharge of Rs.1,32,178/- on the bill dated 04.10.2016 amounting to Rs. 77,44,300/- deposited on 21.10.2016 as the Petitioner had not received the said bill by due date (14.10.2016) and received the same on 21.10.2016 and the same paid on 21.10.2016 itself after getting the due date revised as 21.10.2016 from the then RA.*

 *I find that though extension of due date of bill dated 04.10.2016 from 14.10.2016 to 21.10.2016 by the RA concerned was beyond its (RA’s) jurisdiction, the Respondent was not able to produce any documentary evidence about delivery of the bill ibid to the Petitioner by due date i.e. 14.10.2016. Beside, the fact that Mobile No. and e-mail ID of the Consumer were updated in the PSPCL system on 19.01.2018 and 12.07.2018 respectively as per information given by IT wing Vide e-mail dated 26.07.2019 confirms the impression that neither the bill dated 04.10.2016 was sent to the Consumer by e-mail nor any intimation was sent to the Consumer by SMS. As such, the plea of the PR that the Petitioner was not liable to pay Late Payment Surcharge, due to the omissions on the part of the Respondent to ensure delivery of bill by due date, is not without merit. However, the Petitioner is liable to pay interest as per applicable regulation on the amount short deposited/refunded in excess by it as also decided by the Forum.*

**6. Conclusion:**

From the above analysis, it is concluded that the Petitioner is

required to be charged the sums Rs.13,908/-(against Check Lot date 08.09.2016) and Rs.8,16,147/- (Check Lot dated 29.03.2017) on account of short deposit/excess refund as per revised calculations prepared by the Respondent and sent vide e-mail dated 29.07.2019 and also admitted by the Petitioner. In addition, the Petitioner is also required to be charged the interest as per applicable regulations from 09/2016 to 17.01.2019, on the aforesaid amounts short deposited previously. However, the Petitioner is not required to be charged Late Payment Surcharge on deposit of bill dated 04.10.2016 (with due date as 14.10.2016) which was revised to 21.10.2016 by the RA concerned and the Respondent failed to prove that the said bill was delivered to the Petitioner by due date i.e. 14.10.2016.

**7. Decision:**

As a sequel of above discussions, the order dated 27.03.2019 of the CGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CGL- 038 of 2019 is partly modified in terms of conclusion arrived at in Para 6 above. Accordingly, the Respondent is directed to recalculate the demand and refund/recover the amount found excess/short, if any, after adjustment, without interest.

**8.** The Appeal is disposed of accordingly.

 **9.**  In case, the Petitioner or the Respondent 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)

August 01, 2019 Lokpal (Ombudsman)

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