

**COURT OF THE LOK PAL (OMBUDSMAN),
ELECTRICITY, PUNJAB,
PLOT NO. A-2, INDUSTRIAL AREA, PHASE-1,
S.A.S. NAGAR (MOHALI).**

**(Constituted under Sub Section (6) of Section 42 of
Electricity Act, 2003)**

APPEAL No. 17/2022

Date of Registration : 14.03.2022

Date of Hearing : 29.03.2022

Date of Order : 29.03.2022

Before:

**Er. Gurinder Jit Singh,
Lokpal (Ombudsman), Electricity, Punjab.**

In the Matter of:

M/s. Sohi Cold Store,
C/o Sh. Naib Singh Sohi S/o Sh. Santokh Singh,
Village Jhar Sahib (Chuharpur), PO Behlolpur,
Distt. Ludhiana.

Contract Account Number: R71MS710002F (MS)
...Appellant

Versus

Addl. Superintending Engineer,
DS Division,
PSPCL, Samrala.

...Respondent

Present For:

Appellant: 1) Sh. Gurcharan Singh Mittal,
Appellant's Representative.
2) Sh. Naib Singh Consumer.

Respondent : 1) Er. Kanwalpreet Singh Sidhu,
Addl. SE/ DS Division,
PSPCL, Samrala.
2) Er. Balbir Singh, AE.

Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Appellant against the decision dated 10.02.2022 of the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (Forum), Patiala in Case No. CGP-352 of 2021, deciding that:

“The petitioner’s account be overhauled for (-) 63.37% slowness of meter, as per Enforcement cum MMTS Wing, Ropar ECR no. 37/154 dated 17.8.2021 and letter no. 222 dated 19.08.2021, for period from 29.5.2021 to 17.8.2021.”

2. Registration of the Appeal

A scrutiny of the Appeal and related documents revealed that the Appeal was received in this Court on 14.03.2022 i.e. within the period of thirty days of receipt of the decision dated 10.02.2022 of the CGRF, Patiala in Case No. CGP-352 of 2021, received by the Appellant on 13.02.2022. The Appellant deposited the requisite 40% of the disputed amount. Therefore, the Appeal was registered on 14.03.2022 and copy of the same was sent to the Addl. SE/ DS Division, PSPCL, Samrala for sending written reply/ parawise comments with a copy to the office of the CGRF, Patiala under intimation to the Appellant vide letter nos. 241-43/OEP/A-17/2022 dated 14.03.2022.

3. Proceedings

With a view to adjudicate the dispute, a hearing was fixed in this Court on 29.03.2022 at 12.30 PM and intimation to this effect was sent to both the parties vide letter nos. 291-92/OEP/A-17/2022 dated 22.03.2022. As scheduled, the hearing was held in this Court and arguments of both the parties were heard.

4. Submissions made by the Appellant and the Respondent

Before undertaking analysis of the case, it is necessary to go through written submissions made by the Appellant and reply of the Respondent as well as oral arguments made by the Appellant's Representative and the Respondent alongwith material brought on record by both the parties.

(A) Submissions of the Appellant

(a) Submissions made in the Appeal

The Appellant made the following submissions in its Appeal for consideration of this Court:-

- (i) The Appellant was having a MS Category Connection, bearing Account No. R71MS710002F with sanctioned load of 97.67 kW/ CD as 100 kVA in the name of his sole proprietorship firm M/s. Sohi Cold Store under DS Division, PSPCL, Samrala. The

nature of the business was Cold Storage and supply voltage was 11 kV being HT connection.

- (ii) The Appellant was not satisfied with the decision dated 10.02.2022 of the CGRF, Patiala in Case No. CGP-352/2021 and as such, the Appellant filed the Appeal against the decision of the CGRF, Patiala in this Court. The copy of the decision was dispatched by the Forum vide Memo No. 2971/CGP-352/2021 dated 10.02.2022 and the same was duly received through registered post on 13.02.2022 by the Appellant.
- (iii) The order of the Forum was against the rules/ regulations of the PSPCL and was also against the principle of natural justice. The Appellant had requested to hear him and to do justice.
- (iv) The Appellant was running a Cold Store for the last 10 years and monthly consumption during March to August was 30,000 to 40,000 units and during off season (September to February), it remained in between 1,500 to 5,000 units. This consumption pattern was continuously similar in every year as there was no specific type of production due to which it could be assumed that the consumption increased due to more production of items. The supply was being used for cooling the fruits/ vegetables (Potatoes etc.) on a fixed low temperature and every

year this process was being continuously followed being no drastic changes in Punjab's atmosphere.

(v) The connection of the Appellant was checked by the Enforcement Staff on 17.08.2021 as a routine checking which meant that it was not due to reporting of low consumption or variation in consumption. As per checking report, it was reported that there was some fault in CT/ PT unit and it needed replacement. The checking staff told the Appellant to deposit the cost of CT/ PT unit in the concerned office. On the advice of checking staff, the Appellant deposited ₹ 34,080/- as requisite cost of CT/ PT unit on verbal assurance that it would be refunded/ adjusted in the bills after checking of old CT/ PT unit in ME Lab. The Appellant was surprised that instead of refunding back this amount, the Respondent issued a notice no. 502 dated 20.08.2021 to deposit a sum of ₹ 89,534/- as average charges. When the Appellant visited the Respondent office, he was informed that earlier notice of ₹ 89,534/- had been revised to ₹ 2,76,764/-.

(vi) On checking the calculations, the Appellant noticed that amount had been charged @ ₹ 5.80/- (non-subsidized rate) and account had been overhauled for the month of June to August, 2021 by showing one phase dead during these 3 months and

consumption had been increased from 63.37% by adding 36.63% and making it to 100% (presuming one phase dead). The total chargeable amount had been worked out as 47718 units X 5.80 = ₹ 2,76,764/-. The Respondent also told that in case the amount was not deposited, supply would be disconnected. However, on asking the reason of issuance of two notices on the basis of single checking, the Respondent kept mum and blamed that this was due to some clerical mistake.

- (vii) Since the Appellant was already paying the bills on actual consumption basis and he had not utilized more energy than already billed, the Appellant filed his case before the Forum by depositing the requisite 20% of challenged amount of ₹ 2,76,764/- i.e. ₹ 55,500/- on 28.09.2021 and prayed before the Forum to give justice on this illegal and unjustified demand of ₹ 2,76,764/-. The Appellant submitted that the Respondent again revised the demand of ₹ 2,76,764/- to ₹ 7,38,997/- at its own level even when the case was pending in the Forum and already charged amount was “Under Stay” by the competent Court of Law. The considerable point before the Hon’ble Ombudsman was also to see whether any rule permitted the Respondent to revise the demand and issue fresh notice to the

Appellant when the case was going on in the Forum for its final verdict. The Forum had also erred in giving suitable directions and asking the Respondent as to how the Respondent could revise a demand which was already under consideration with the CGRF and also had been challenged by the Appellant before the competent Court of Law.

- (viii) The action of the Respondent as well as CGRF was highly unjustified, unnatural, illegal and wrong in the eyes of law. The Forum was only supposed to give its verdict on the demand of ₹ 2,76,764/- which was challenged by the Appellant before the CGRF and question of considering the demand of ₹ 7,38,997/- should not be the subject matter of this case as neither it was challenged by the consumer nor the Respondent office was competent to revise it at its own level and issuance of revised notice was itself a contradictory action of the Respondent. It was the duty of the CGRF to decide only about the original challenged amount of the Appellant and gave its decision only on this charged amount on the basis of merits of the case. But allowing the Respondent to enhance its original claim and considering it even without getting deposited additional requisite 20% of challenged amount, clearly showed that CGRF was too eager to recover the amount of PSPCL dues by

snatching the right of the Appellant as prescribed under Consumer Complaint Handling Procedure.

- (ix) The Appellant submitted that every consumer has a right to approach the Civil Court, Lok Adalat, Dispute Settlement Committee and by giving decision on that notice, which was not even prepared by the Respondent at the time of registration of the case, was not correct. The case was registered by CGRF on 29.09.2021 and revised notice of ₹ 2,76,767/- to ₹ 7,38,997/- was issued by Respondent vide Memo No. 622 dated 21.10.2021. The Forum had also snatched the right to challenge the bill of the Appellant. This action of the Forum was not as per any rule/ regulation of the Supply Code. Instead, the CGRF should have considered the legitimacy of the amount of ₹ 2,76,764/- which was debited to the Appellant for which the Appellant had approached the CGRF and completed all formalities. The Appellant humbly prayed either to issue directions to CGRF to reconsider the legitimacy of the demand of ₹ 2,76,764/- with the directions that if any other amount became recoverable, the Appellant had equal right to challenge it in any Competent Court of Law at his own will and all doors which had been closed by the CGRF should be kept open for all innocent consumers like the Appellant or to issue any

appropriate order in this respect, if this Court deemed it fit and could decide the issue, since the Appellant had full faith in this Court and any action of this Court would definitely minimize grievances of the Appellant.

- (x) The CGRF also erred in deciding that although as per Enforcement Staff orders, the period of overhauling had been taken from 29.05.2021 to 17.08.2021 but consumption history proved that during this period the consumption pattern was same to that of previous five years. Even after change of meter, there was no abnormal increase in subsequent months and there must be some technical mistake in DDL, otherwise all the facts proved that enhancing of consumption to three times was not genuine and was illogical and appeared to be not real when there was no evidence on record that production had inordinately increased during this period.
- (xi) The maximum demand during the overhauling period was recorded as 74.24 kVA in bill of 05/2021 and after resetting in 06/2021, it was recorded as 86.24 kVA and again after resetting in 07/2021, it was recorded as 73.68 kVA. Had there been any fault like 2 Phase dead, the demand would have also been found reduced. On the other hand, if for argument sake it was presumed that maximum demand was also less recorded, then it

was not possible to run on 100 kVA transformer which had been installed alone for the Appellant being 11 kV/ HT consumer. The fact could also be got verified from any other metering equipment if installed at sending end of the feeding line/ Sub-Station.

- (xii) The consumption of the Appellant during this period was recorded from 05.04.2021 to 05.05.2021 as 31016 kVAh/ 29824 kWh/ 80.32 kVA and during 04.06.2021 to 05.07.2021; kVAh consumption was 28542, kWh-28410 and MDI 86.24 kVA. During 03.08.2021 to 01.09.2021, consumption was recorded as 25002 kVAh/ 24406 kWh/ MDI 83.6. As per LDHF formula if load of 86.24 kVA was found running on 30 days on 24 hours basis even then the consumption arrived at as $86.24 \times 30 \text{ days} \times 24 \text{ hours} \times 60\%$ which came to approximately 37255 units per month which also tallied with the original consumption recorded as per bills. It also proved that DDL data had not exhibited facts of the case and there might be some technical fault and CGRF had also erred while deciding the case keeping in view these facts. The CGRF only relied upon the Enforcement order and even the complete DDL had neither been provided to the Appellant nor considered by the CGRF.

- (xiii) The Appellant further prayed that the meter be got tested from the manufacturer and it was also ready to deposit any amount as required under rules. The Appellant also submitted that CGRF had neither considered the DDL nor supplied complete copy to the Appellant and therefore, opportunity of challenging the working of the metering equipment could not be availed.
- (xiv) The meter was working well and only CT/ PT unit had been changed and an amount of ₹ 34080/- got deposited, which was also refundable as no investigation report regarding reasons for damage to the meter or CT/ PT attributable to consumer had ever been supplied to the Appellant nor produced by the Respondent as required in Regulation 21.4.1 of Supply Code.
- (xv) The calculation appeared to have been made without giving HT rebate of 20 paise per unit, which was being already allowed in the monthly bills. If any amount was found recoverable, the benefit of HT rebate should also be allowed which had not been allowed earlier.
- (xvi) As per Regulation 21.5.2 of Supply Code-2014, in case of defective meters the accounts can be overhauled on the basis of corresponding previous year consumption. If in this case, it was proved from the consumption already billed and the Enforcement checking report dated 17.08.2021 that it might be

a case of damaged PT and if any average was still required to be payable, the Appellant was ready to pay even on the basis of highest consumption ever recorded in the past. But charging of consumption by multiplying to 3 was highly objectionable, unrealistic, unnatural and was also ignorable on technical grounds as charging of average more than double of LDHF formula (which was generally charged in direct supply/ theft cases) and in this case, the Respondent charged two time more of LDHF units which was very unfair, unconstitutional and deserved for review on compassionate grounds also.

(xvii) The Appellant prayed that either issue direction to CGRF to reconsider the case for original demand of ₹ 2,76,764/- as per Notice No. 545 dated 09.09.2021 which was only challenged by the Appellant. However, the Respondent could raise fresh demand afterwards and the Appellant would have equal right to challenge it in any Competent Court of Law. The Appellant also gave consent before this Court to decide the issue at its own if it minimized the grievances of the Appellant. The Appellant had full faith in the decision and orders of this Court.

(xviii) Any amount if found chargeable on the basis of defective metering equipment, the Appellant gave consent to overhaul the account as per Regulation 21.5.2 of Supply Code, 2014 as

charging of consumption by increasing it 3 times was neither justified nor realistic and was also more than double of consumption arrived by applying LDHF formula which was adopted in direct supply/theft cases.

(xix) The HT rebate of 20 paise per unit be also allowed on the average so charged as this rebate was already being allowed in monthly bills. The subsidized tariff was also applicable as per tariff policy.

(xx) The amount of ₹ 34,080/- as cost of CT/ PT unit was also refundable as neither the investigation report as required in Regulation 21.4.1 of Supply Code was ever issued nor produced in the record.

(xxi) Any other relief/ orders which this Court deemed fit as per rules be also allowed. The Appellant prayed for sympathetic consideration of the Appeal.

(b) Submission during hearing

During hearing on 29.03.2022, the Appellant's Representative (AR) reiterated the submissions made in the Appeal and prayed to allow the same. He pleaded that the case may be decided by this Court on merits instead of remanding back to the Forum as prayed in the Appeal.

(B) Submissions of the Respondent**(a) Submissions in written reply**

The Respondent submitted the following written reply for consideration of this Court: -

- (i) The Appellant was having a Medium Supply Industrial Connection with sanctioned load of 97.67 kW and CD 100 kVA under DS S/D, Behlolpur.
- (ii) The premises of the Appellant was inspected by Sr. Xen/ Enforcement-cum-MMTS, Ropar on 17.08.2021 vide ECR No. 37/154. During the checking, it was found that the meter of the Appellant was running slow and the Appellant was issued a notice for ₹ 2,76,764/- vide Memo No. 545 dated 09.09.2021 which was further revised vide Memo No. 622 dated 21.10.2021 for ₹ 7,38,997/- on account of slowness of the meter by (-) 63.37% as per Memo No. 222 dated 19.08.2021 of Sr. Xen/ Enforcement-cum-MMTS, Ropar.
- (iii) The Appellant filed the Case No. CGP-352 of 2021 before the CGRF, Patiala and the case was decided in favour of Respondent by the Forum.
- (iv) As per checking of Sr. Xen/ Enforcement-cum-MMTS, Ropar vide ECR No. 37/154 dated 17.08.2021, the CT/ PT of the

Appellant was found faulty and the cost of CT/ PT i.e. ₹ 34,080/- was recovered from the Appellant.

- (v) It was the duty of every consumer to pay bill timely. The amount had been charged to the Appellant as per actual consumption. When the actual consumption was available then the formula of LDHF could not be considered. The notice of ₹ 7,38,997/- vide Memo No. 622 dated 21.10.2021 had been issued on the basis of DDL as provided by the Enforcement-cum-MMTS, Ropar vide Memo No. 222 dated 19.08.2021.
- (vi) It was case of slowness of meter and not of maximum demand. The connection of the Appellant was checked by the Enforcement-cum-MMTS, Ropar during its routine checking and found that the meter was slow by 63.37%. The Appellant had never informed the Department regarding CT/ PT unit being faulty. The amount charged to the Appellant was correct and recoverable.

(b) Submission during hearing

During hearing on 29.03.2022, the Respondent reiterated the submissions made in the written reply to the Appeal and prayed for the dismissal of the Appeal. The Respondent had admitted during hearing on 29.03.2022 that the accuracy of the disputed meter was not checked at site or in ME Lab as per Regulation

No. 21.3.6 of Supply Code, 2014. Accordingly, Regulation No. 21.5.1 of Supply Code, 2014 meant for “Inaccurate Meters” cannot be made applicable to overhaul the accounts of the Appellant.

5. Analysis and Findings

The issue requiring adjudication is the legitimacy of the demand issued by the Respondent vide Memo No. 622 dated 21.10.2021 for ₹ 7,38,997/- on account of slowness of meter by (-) 63.37% as per checking by Sr. Xen/ Enforcement-cum-EA & MMTS, Ropar vide ECR No. 37/154 dated 17.08.2021.

My findings on the points emerged, deliberated and analysed are as under:-

- (i) The Appellant’s Representative (AR) reiterated the submissions made in the Appeal. He pleaded that the connection of the Appellant was checked by Sr. Xen/ Enforcement-cum-EA & MMTS, Ropar vide ECR No. 37/154 dated 17.08.2021 as a routine checking and some fault was found in CT/ PT unit. The Appellant was told to deposit ₹ 34,080/- as cost of CT/ PT unit which the Appellant deposited on the verbal assurance that it would be refunded/ adjusted in bills after checking the CT/ PT unit in ME Lab. The Respondent issued Notice No. 502 dated

20.08.2021 to deposit ₹ 89,534/- which was revised to ₹ 2,76,764/- vide Notice No. 545 dated 09.09.2021 and further revised second time to ₹ 7,38,997/- vide Notice No. 622 dated 21.10.2021, even when the proceedings were pending before the Forum, on account of slowness of meter by (-) 63.37% for the period from 29.05.2021 to 17.08.2021 as per letter no. 222 dated 19.08.2021 of Sr. Xen/ Enforcement-cum-EA & MMTS, Ropar. The Appellant approached the Forum but did not get any respite. He further argued that the decision of the Forum was against the rules/ regulations of the PSPCL. He prayed that the Forum allowed the Respondent to revise the disputed amount from ₹ 2,76,764/- to ₹ 7,38,997/-, as such his Appeal be heard for increased disputed amount of ₹ 7,38,997/-. He prayed that the Appellant was charged three times than the consumption recorded by the metering equipment which was neither justified nor realistic and was more than double of consumption arrived by applying LDHF formula and the account of the Appellant be overhauled as per Regulation 21.5.2 of Supply Code, 2014. He further prayed that the HT rebate of 20 paise per unit be also allowed as applicable as per Tariff Orders and an amount of ₹ 34,080/- recovered as cost of CT/ PT unit be also refunded as neither the investigation report

as required in Regulation 21.4.1 of Supply Code was ever issued nor produced in the Court. The Appellant prayed for sympathetic consideration of the Appeal.

(ii) On the other hand, the Respondent controverted the pleas raised by the Appellant in its Appeal and reiterated the submissions made by the Respondent in the written reply. The Respondent argued that the Forum had rightly decided the case in favour of the Respondent. The amount had been charged to the Appellant as per actual consumption. When the actual consumption was available then the formula of LDHF could not be considered. He argued that during the checking of Sr. Xen/ Enforcement-cum-MMTS, Ropar vide ECR No. 37/154 dated 17.08.2021, the CT/ PT of the Appellant was found faulty so the cost of CT/ PT i.e. ₹ 34,080/- was recovered from the Appellant. The Respondent submitted that the amount charged to the Appellant was correct and recoverable.

(iii) The Forum in its order dated 10.02.2022 observed as under:

“Forum observed that the petitioner is having MS connection with sanctioned load of 97.67 KW and CD 100 KVA. The premises of petitioner was inspected by Enforcement vide checking no. 37/154 dated 17.8.2021. As per memo no. 222 dated 19.8.2021 of Enforcement-cum-MMTS, Ropar, during checking it was observed that the meter belonging to consumer was found to be running (-) 63.37% slow. In compliance, the petitioner was served with a notice no. 545 dated 09.09.2021 for Rs. 2,76,764/-. During proceedings respondent stated that this notice was revised from Rs. 2,76,764/- to Rs. 7,38,997/- vide memo no. 622 dated 21.10.2021, as the Y phase and Blue phase of meter were recording less energy making (-) 63.37% slowness of meter. As per checking report voltage at the Y-phase was 0.04KV and at B-phase voltage was 0.74KV. Yellow and Blue

phase PT was also found damaged. As per memo no. 222 dated 19.8.2021 of Sr.Xen/ Enf-cum-MMTS, Ropar addressed to AE/ DS S/D, Behlolpur, Y-phase and B-phase voltage was contributing less and as per DDL of meter, at Y-phase and B-phase voltage was found less from 29.5.2021 at 7:49:12Hr at reading 402273.50 kWh/ 419590.20 kVAH. Damaged CT/ PT were changed vide SJO no. 03/1510 dated 17.8.2021. Forum observed that DDL of meter was taken on site. As intimated by Sr. Xen/ Enforcement, there was voltage drop at Y-phase and B-phase from 29.05.2021 and account of petitioner was asked to be overhauled from 29.5.2021 to 17.8.2021 by the respondent as per prevailing provisions of the supply code regulations.

As per Supply Code Regulations clause 21.5.1, If a consumer meter on testing is found to be beyond the limits of accuracy as prescribed hereunder, the account of the consumer shall be overhauled and the electricity charges for all 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 meter has been tested at site to the satisfaction of the consumer or replacement of inaccurate meter whichever is later.

Accordingly, respondent has charged Rs. 7,38,997/- as per sundry notice no. 622 dated 21.10.2021, on account of (-) 63.37% slowness of meter, as per checking by Enforcement Cum MMTS Wing , Ropar vide ECR no 37/154 dated 17.8.2021.

After considering all written & verbal submissions by the petitioner and the respondent & scrutiny of record produced, Forum is of the opinion that petitioner's account need to be overhauled for (-) 63.37% slowness of meter, as per Enforcement Cum MMTS Wing , Ropar ECR no 37/154 dated 17.8.2021 and letter no. 222 dated 19.08.2021, for period from 29.5.2021 to 17.8.2021.

Keeping in view the above, Forum came to the unanimous conclusion that petitioner's account be overhauled for (-) 63.37% slowness of meter, as per Enforcement Cum MMTS Wing, Ropar ECR no 37/154 dated 17.8.2021 and letter no. 222 dated 19.08.2021, for period from 29.5.2021 to 17.8.2021."

- (iv) I have gone through the written submissions made by the Appellant in the Appeal, written reply of the Respondent as well as oral arguments addressed by both the parties during the hearing on 29.03.2022. This Court observed that the metering equipment of the Appellant was not checked for calculating the slowness of the meter using ERS set neither at site nor at the

ME Lab. The Respondent was asked about this but he could not give satisfactory reply. So, considering the fact that the accuracy of the metering equipment was not checked at site or in ME lab, the account of the Appellant cannot be overhauled as per Regulation 21.5.1 of Supply Code-2014 as decided by the Forum. Overhauling of account as per Regulation No. 21.5.1 of Supply Code, 2014 by treating the meter as inaccurate is wrong because the accuracy of the meter was not determined as per Regulation No. 21.3.6 of Supply Code-2014. The account of the Appellant cannot be overhauled on the basis of incomplete checking report. So, the Notice No. 545 dated 09.09.2021 and further revised Notice No. 622 dated 21.10.2021 based on the said incomplete checking report vide ECR No. 37/154 dated 17.08.2021 are hereby quashed.

- (v) CT/ PT unit was found damaged in the checking report issued vide ECR No. 37/154 dated 17.08.2021. CT/PT unit is a part of Meter as per definition given in Regulation 2 (zo) of Supply Code-2014. So, the meter in dispute is required to be treated as 'Defective Meter' for overhauling purpose. The overhauling of account is required to be done by treating the meter as defective. Accordingly, the account of the Appellant shall be overhauled as per Regulation 21.5.2 (d) and (e) of Supply

Code-2014 for the period the metering equipment remained defective from 29.05.2021 to 17.08.2021.

- (vi) The Appellant had prayed that HT rebate of 20 paise per unit should also be given on the units assessed as per regulations. The HT rebate shall be payable strictly as per tariff orders of the Commission issued from time to time.
- (vii) The Appellant had prayed for refund of ₹ 34,080/- deposited as cost of CT/ PT unit because the Respondent had not given the investigation/ checking report as per Regulation 21.4.1 of Supply Code, 2014 before the Forum. This issue was not raised in the petition filed before the Forum. As such, the Appellant cannot raise it now before this Court in an Appeal. So, the claim of the Appellant regarding this issue is hereby rejected.

6. Decision

As a sequel of above discussions, the order dated 10.02.2022 of the CGRF, Patiala in Case No. CGP-352 of 2021 is hereby quashed. The Account of the Appellant shall be overhauled as per Regulation 21.5.2 (d) and (e) of Supply Code-2014 for the period the metering equipment remained defective from 29.05.2021 to 17.08.2021.

- 7.** The Appeal is disposed of accordingly.

8. As per provisions contained in Regulation 3.26 of Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations-2016, the Licensee will comply with the award/ order within 21 days of the date of its receipt.
9. In case, the Appellant 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.

March 29, 2022
S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali)

(GURINDER JIT SINGH)
Lokpal (Ombudsman)
Electricity, Punjab.