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

**ELECTRICITY, PUNJAB,**

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

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

**APPEAL NO. 36/2020**

**Date of Registration : 29.07.2020**

**Date of Hearing : 21.08.2020**

**Date of Order : 26.08.2020**

**Before:**

**Er. Gurinder Jit Singh,**

**Lokpal (Ombudsman), Electricity, Punjab**.

**In the Matter of:**

Varinder Kumar Mittal,

C/o M/s Blue Dot,

Bahadur Ke Road,

Ludhiana.

**Contract Account Number: 3002961826**

...Appellant

Versus

Additional Superintending Engineer,

DS City West Division (Special),

PSPCL, Ludhiana.

...Respondent

**Present For:**

Appellant: Sh. Parvesh Chadha

Appellant’s Representative (AR).

Respondent: Er. Ramesh Kaushal,

Addl. Superintending Engineer,

DS City West Division (Special),

PSPCL, Ludhiana.

Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Appellant against the order dated 16.03.2020 of the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (Forum), Ludhiana in Case No. CGL-355 of 2019, deciding that:

*“The bills issued to the petitioner as per readings recorded by the meter during 07/2019 and 10/2019 are justified and recoverable.”*

**2*.* Registration of the Appeal**

A scrutiny of the Appeal and related documents revealed that the Appeal was received in this Court on 29.07.2020 i.e. after more than one month of receipt of the decision dated 16.03.2020 of the CGRF, Ludhiana. An application for condonation of delay giving reasons was also received with the Appeal. Besides, the Appellant had deposited the disputed bill for ₹ 1,47,540/- for 07/2019 vide receipt no. 133566162 dated 08.08.2019. The Appellant also deposited the other disputed bill for ₹ 1,91,230/- vide Receipt No. 136642023 dated 01.11.2019. As such, the entire amount of the two disputed bills had already been deposited. The Appellant also submitted a copy of both the receipts, alongwith the Appeal. Accordingly, the Appeal was registered and a copy of the same was sent to the Addl. SE/ DS City West Division (Special), PSPCL, Ludhiana for furnishing written reply/ parawise comments and also to the office of the CGRF, Ludhiana for sending the case file under intimation to the Appellant vide this office letter no. 643-45/OEP/A-36/2020 dated 29.07.2020.

**3.** **Proceedings**

With a view to adjudicate the dispute, a hearing was fixed in this Court on 21.08.2020 at 11.00 AM and intimation to this effect was sent to both the sides vide letter No. 726-27/A-36/2020 dated 14.08.2020. As scheduled, the hearing was held on 21.08.2020 and copies of the proceedings were sent to both the sides vide this office letter No. 760-761/A-36/2020 dated 21.08.2020.

**4. Condonation of Delay**

At the start of hearing on 21.08.2020, the issue of condonation of delay was taken up. The Appellant’s Representative, in its application received alongwith the Appeal, stated that the order dated 16.03.2020 was received by the Appellant on 27.05.2020. The Unit of the Appellant was not operating due to COVID-19 Lockdown. The Appellant was busy in arranging labour and funds to restart the unit. As a result, delay of about one month beyond the stipulated period occurred which was beyond control of the Appellant. As such, the Appellant’s Representative requested to entertain the Appeal and to condone the delay in filing the Appeal in this Court as the same was not intentional and it was due to unavoidable circumstances as stated above.

I find that the Respondent, in its written reply, stated that the Appeal was barred by limitation and merits dismissal. Further, the delay in filing the Appeal had not been explained with cogent and sufficient reasons.

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

*“No representation to the Ombudsman* shall lie unless:

*(ii) The representation is made within one month from the date of receipt of the 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 non condonation of delay would deprive the Appellant of the opportunity required to be afforded to defend the case on merits. Therefore, with a view to meet the ends of ultimate justice, the delay in filing the Appeal in this Court beyond the stipulated period was condoned and the Appellant’s Representative was allowed to present the case.

**5.** **Submissions made by the Appellant and the Respondent**:

With a view to adjudicate the dispute, it is necessary to go through written submissions made in the Appeal by the Appellant and reply of the Respondent as well as oral submissions made by their respective representatives along with material brought on record by both the sides.

1. **Submissions of the Appellant**
2. **Submissions made in the Appeal**

The Appellant made the following submissions in the Appeal, received in this Court on 29.07.2020, for consideration:

1. The Appellant was having a MS category connection in its name installed at its site office at Bahadur Ke Road, Ludhiana. The sanctioned load of this connection, bearing Account No. 3002961826 was 89.90 kW/ 99.89 kVA. (Contract Demand)
2. The Appellant was issued bill for the period 05.06.2019 to 17.07.2019, showing consumption of 21891 kVAh (the units recorded by old and new meter) amounting to ₹ 1,47,540/-. Subsequently, another bill was issued for the period 05.09.2019 to 10.10.2019, showing consumption of 11881 kVAh amounting to ₹ 1,91,230/-. In this way, the Appellant was issued two bills amounting to ₹ 3,38,770/-. The Appellant deposited these bills and challenged the working of the meter.
3. The Appellant had not accepted the observations of the Forum who observed that the bills issued to the Appellant were as per reading recorded by the meter during 07/2019 & 10/2019 and were justified & recoverable.
4. The consumption shown in bills had increased from 2018 to 2019 and there was a variation/increase from 121257 to 135900 units. The bill under dispute for the month of 07/2019 was issued for 20875+1016 = 21891 units which was much higher than the last year’s (2018) consumption as 9136. All the bills were issued with ‘O’ Code and the consumption of the Appellant during 2017 was 9478. The observations of the Forum regarding concealment of readings by Meter Reader and not recording the readings at the screen of the meter correctly was a deficiency on the part of PSPCL. The Appellant had suffered due to the negligence of the Meter Reader. The reading as pointed out in the table at page 11 on 03.08.2018 was 484633 of DDL and on 05.08.2018 as 472481 of Meter Reader. These two sets of readings revealed difference of 11152 units. So, these readings were wrong prior to 03.08.2018.
5. The Energy Meter might have jumped earlier or had some defect in screen display. The Meter Reader had never pinpointed incorrect display. It was added that the connection was of MS category and JE was recording readings every month and was well versed with the working of meter display. The bill under dispute was on very high side and needed to be charged on the basis of last year’s consumption. Besides during 2018, consumption from January, 2018 to July, 2018 (217 days) was 59163 kVAh units and in 2019 for the same period (224 days) was 76982 kVAh units and for 217 days, it was 74576 kVAh Units.
6. The second bill under dispute for the month of 10/2019 was also of high consumption as per production/use of factory. Thus, working of Energy Meter was challenged by depositing fee ₹ 1200/- on 07.10.2019 but it was replaced on 16.11.2019 i.e after 40 days. This was despite the fact that according to Instruction No. 57 of ESIM, the meter was to be replaced within 7 days and was to be sent to ME Lab within 15 days. As a result of the delay, the Appellant had suffered nearly 4000 units as compared to last year’s consumption.
7. The Forum had decided that this bill of excess consumption during 2019 as compared to the consumption of 2018 was due to less recorded during 2018. Accordingly, bills issued to the Appellant as per readings recorded by the meter seemed to be justified and recoverable. It was added that DDL readings of the challenged meter were as under: -
   * 1. kVAh = 25475
     2. kVAh = 28693-3218 units for 5 days

10.10.2019 kVAh = 37356-8663 units for 30 days

10.11.2019 kVAh = 50413-13056 units for 31 days

1. The disputed bills were not correct and the Appellant was required to be charged on the basis of last year’s consumption.
2. **Submissions in the Rejoinder**

The Appellant’s Representative made the following submissions in its Rejoinder to the written reply of the Respondent, vide e-mail dated 17.08.2020, for consideration of the Court:

1. The Appellant received the decision of the Forum on 27.05.2020 and the stipulated time limit was upto 27.06.2020. The factory was not working due to lockdown and the Appellant was busy to arrange labour and funds to run the factory, so, the first choice was to start the unit. As such, the Appeal was filed late and the delay in filing the Appeal in this Court may please be condoned.
2. The Respondent had not replied to the facts submitted in the Appeal. In para 1 of Grounds of Appeal, the Appellant had pinpointed that the bill for the month of 07/2019 was excessive. But, the Respondent, in its reply, only mentioned about the bill of 09/2019 issued in 10/2019. In the Appeal, a mention was made about the higher consumption recorded in 07/2019 which was considered by the Forum while deciding the case. However, the Forum did not correctly decide the same since the consumption considered for 2017 as 9478, for 2018 as 9136 and for 2019 as 21891 (20875+1016) was more than double.
3. The energy variation was not checked as required under Instruction No. 104.7.2 of ESIM, 2018 and had not explained about the readings mismatch with DDL. The Appellant was billed as per recording of Meter Reader (JE) who was well versed with the instructions of recording the reading and rules and regulations of PSPCL. The yearly consumption was given as under for sake of comparison:

Jan., 2017 to July, 2017 for 243 days=70155 units and for 217 days=62648 units

Jan., 2018 to July, 2018 for 217 days=59163 units

Jan., 2019 to July, 2019 for 224 days=76982 units and for 217 days=74576 units

1. The consumption for the month of 07/2019 was shown excess and the Appellant was required to be charged on the basis of last year’s consumption.
2. The delay in replacement/ testing by the Respondent was not justified. There was delay of 40 days in testing the meter after replacement. The loss to the Appellant was of 4000 units as compared to last year’s consumption. The amount due for excess billing done be refunded.
3. The Appeal may be accepted and relief in both the bills be given by revising the bills on the pattern of consumption of last year.

**(c) Submissions during Hearing**

During hearing, the Appellant’s Representative reiterated the submissions already made in the Appeal as well as in the rejoinder dated 17.08.2020 to the written reply and prayed for allowing the Appeal. During hearing, he was asked to refer to the relevant Regulation of Supply Code-2014 or instructions of PSPCL under which relief was claimed. But he failed to give any reply to this query.

1. **Submissions of the Respondent**
2. **Submissions made in the Written Reply**

The Respondent, vide its email dated 14.08.2020, submitted the following in its defence for consideration of this Court:

1. The Appellant was the holder of electric connection, bearing Account No. 3002961826, under MS category with sanctioned load of 89.90 kW/ CD as 99.89 kVA.
2. The Appellant was issued bill for the period 05.06.2019 to 17.07.2019 with consumption of 21891 kVAh (the units recorded by old and new meter) amounting to ₹ 1,47,540/-. Another bill was issued for the period 05.09.2019 to 10.10.2019 with consumption of 11881 kVAh amounting to ₹ 1,91,230/-. In this way, the Appellant was issued two bills amounting to ₹ 3,38,770/-. The Appellant had deposited these bills and challenged the working of the Energy Meter by depositing meter challenge fee of ₹ 1200/- on 07.10.2019.
3. The Meter was checked by ASE/ Enforcement-4, Ludhiana vide ECR No. 48/3164 dated 17.10.2019 and reported that accuracy of the meter at running load was checked with LTERS meter and found its working within permissible limit.
4. The challenged Energy Meter was replaced vide MCO No. 100009148346 dated 18.10.2019 effected on 16.11.2019 at final reading of kWh as 46149 and kVAh as 52475.
5. The replaced meter was sent to ME Lab vide Store Challan No. 427 dated 12.12.2019. ME Lab reported that accuracy of the Energy Meter was within permissible limits and also carried out the DDL of the meter with MRI. The final readings recorded in the ME Lab were as kWh-46149, kVAh-52475.
6. The Appellant did not agree to the bills issued during 07/2019 and 10/2019 and approached the CGRF, Ludhiana, who decided that the bills issued to the Appellant as per reading recorded by the Meter Reader during 07/2019 and 10/2019 were justified and recoverable.
7. The Appeal was barred by limitation and merits dismissal.
8. There was no infirmity or illegally in the order dated 16.03.2020 passed by the CGRF, Ludhiana. The said order was a well reasoned and speaking order. All the grounds submitted by both the Appellant and the Respondent were considered by the Forum who passed a legal and valid order.
9. It was, therefore, prayed that the Appeal filed by the Appellant may be dismissed with costs.
10. **Submission during Hearing**

During hearing on 21.08.2020, the Respondent reiterated the submissions made in its written reply and prayed to dismiss the Appeal.

**6.** **Analysis and Findings**

The issue requiring adjudication is the legitimacy of the energy bill dated 29.07.2019 for the period from 05.06.2019 to 17.07.2019 amounting to ₹ 1,47,540/- and energy bill dated 30.10.2019 for the period from 05.09.2019 to 10.10.2019 amounting to ₹ 1,91,230/-.

*My findings on the points emerged, deliberated and analyzed are as under:*

1. In the present dispute, the Appellant has challenged the order dated 16.03.2020 of CGRF, Ludhiana in Case No.355 of 2019. As per the above order, the energy bills issued on 29.07.2019 and 30.10.2019 amounting to ₹ 1,47,540/- and ₹ 1,91,230/- respectively as per meter readings recorded were held justified and recoverable. The Appellant had pleaded that the said decision of the Forum was not correct as both the aforesaid bills were on higher side and showed energy consumption more than that recorded in the previous years.
2. The Appellant’s Representative stated that the bill dated 29.07.2019 for the period from 05.06.2019 to 17.07.2019 showed energy consumption of 21891 kVAh(20875 kVAh of old Energy Meter and 1016 kVAh of the new Energy Meter). This bill amounting to ₹ 1,47,540/- was deposited by the Appellant on 08.08.2019. He submitted that the energy consumption shown in the above bill was almost double the energy consumption during 2017(9478 units) and 2018(9136 units). The Appellant’s Representative did not agree with the observations of the Forum that increased consumption in this bill for 7/2019 was due to concealment of previous months’ readings or not taking meter readings correctly by the Meter Reader. He termed it as a deficiency in service on the part of PSPCL.

The Energy Meter installed at site was non DLMS Meter and its DDL could not be done to get ToD readings. Accordingly, in compliance to instructions of PSPCL for replacement of all non DLMS Meters, it was replaced vide Device Replacement No.100008498584 dated 27.06.2019 effected on 05.07.2019.

The connection of the Appellant was checked vide LCR No.21/318 dated 28.06.2019 whereby, it was reported that:

“ਇਸ ਅਹਾਤੇ ਦਾ ਮੀਟਰ ਉੱਚ ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ DDL ਨਾ ਹੋਣ ਕਾਰਨ ਬਦਲੀ ਕਰਨ ਲਈ ਚੈੱਕ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ, ਪੈਰਾਮੀਟਰ ਇਸ ਪ੍ਰਕਾਰ ਹਨ:-

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| V1 | 229 Volts | R | 64 Amperes |
| V2 | 231 Volts | Y | 85 Amperes |
| V3 | 232 Volts | B | 80 Amperes |

3 Phase ਮੀਟਰ ਦੀ Pulse Load ਪਾਉਣ ਤੇ Blink ਕਰਦੀ ਹੈ।”

The removed Energy Meter was checked in M.E Lab., vide Store Challan No.561 dated 05.02.2020, in the presence of the Addl.S.E/Enforcement and DDL was taken. M.E Lab., in its Checking Report, declared as under:

“ਮੀਟਰ ਐਕੁਰੇਸੀ ਸੀਮਾ ਵਿੱਚ ਹੈ। DDL MRI ਤੇ ਲਿਆ ਹੈ।”

I also find that final meter reading recorded in MCO dated 27.06.2019 effected on 05.07.2019 i.e 597864 kVAh tallied with reading as per DDL printouts(at the time of checking of the removed Energy Meter) in M.E Lab. showing the same reading i.e 597864 kVAh.

In view of the above, it is observed that accuracy of this removed Energy Meter was reported to be within permissible limits.

In such a situation, the reasonability/correctness of the bill dated 29.07.2019 for the period from 05.06.2019 to 17.07.2019 amounting to ₹ 1,47,540/- cannot be questioned. Besides, the Appellant, on being asked during hearing on 21.08.2020, could not refer to any Regulation of Supply Code-2014 or any instruction of PSPCL as an evidence in support of his prayer for setting aside the decision of the Forum and for issuing directions to the Respondent to charge the Appellant for the billed period on the basis of consumption of last year.

1. As per material on record, bill dated 30.09.2019 for the period from 10.08.2019 to 05.09.2019(26 days) amounting to ₹ 1,03,830/- was subsequently issued to the Appellant for energy consumption of 15641 kVAh. After receipt of this bill, the Appellant challenged the working of the Energy Meter on 07.10.2019 by depositing Meter Challenge Fee of ₹ 1200/-. The site was visited by ASE/Enforcement 4, Ludhiana which reported, vide ECR No.48/3164 dated 17.10.2019, as under:

“Connection checked as per letter of AEE(C) City West Division, Ludhiana No.1099 dated 07.10.2019.

ਖਪਤਕਾਰ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਮੀਟਰ ਚੈਲਿੰਜ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ। ਮੀਟਰ ਦੀ Accuracy ਚਲਦੇ ਲੋਡ ਉੱਪਰ LTERS ਮੀਟਰ ਨਾਲ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ। ਜੋ ਕਿ ਸੀਮਾ ਅੰਦਰ ਪਾਈ ਗਈ। ਖਪਤਕਾਰ ਦਾ ਮੀਟਰ ਬਦਲੀ ਕਰਕੇ ME ਲੈੱਬ ਵਿੱਚ ਚੈੱਕ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।

In compliance to the above directions of the Enforcement, the Energy Meter was replaced vide MCO No.100009148346 dated 18.10.2019 effected on 16.11.2019 at final reading of kWh 46149/kVAh 52475.The removed Energy Meter was sent to M.E Lab vide Store Challan No. 427 dated 12.12.2019 as per which, it was reported that:

“ਮੀਟਰ ਐਕੁਰੇਸੀ ਸੀਮਾ ਵਿੱਚ ਹੈ। DDL MRI ਤੇ ਲਿਆ ਹੈ।”

The final readings recorded in M.E Lab. were 46149 kWh and 52475 kVAh.

1. In the present dispute, the Appellant has also challenged the decision dated 16.03.2020 of the Forum in regard to chargeability of another bill issued on 30.10.2019 for the period from 05.09.2019 to 10.10.2019 showing energy consumption of 11881 kVAh. The Appellant has pleaded that energy consumption shown in this bill was excessive.

I find that the said bill dated 30.10.2019 related to the period 05.09.2019 to 10.10.2019 during which the Energy Meter (challenged on 07.10.2019 and replaced on 16.11.2019) remained installed.

I also find that accuracy of this Energy Meter was checked at site and in M.E Lab. and found within permissible limits. Besides, final reading of the challenged/removed Energy Meter (as per whose readings, bill dated 30.10.2019 was issued) taken at the time of its removal from site matched with the reading as per DDL print out taken in M.E Lab. at the time of checking.

I find it worthwhile to reproduce the contents of e-mail/reply dated 19.08.2020 from the Addl. SE/ ME Division, PSPCL, Ludhiana to the Addl. S.E/City West Division (Special), PSPCL, Ludhiana stating as under:

“ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਵਿਸ਼ੇ ਦੇ ਸਬੰਧ ਵਿੱਚ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਖਾਤਾ ਨੰ.CN06/729/MS ਖਪਤਕਾਰ Varinder Kumar Mittal ਦਾ ਮੀਟਰ ਸੀਰੀਅਲ ਨੰ.19491775 ਮੇਕ L & T ਕੈਪ 200/5 ਐੱਮ.ਈ. ਲੈਬ ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ ਵਿਖੇ ਚਲਾਨ ਨੰ 427 ਮਿਤੀ 12.12.2019 ਰਾਹੀ ਚੈਕ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ। ਜਿਸ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਮੀਟਰ ਦੀ ਦੋਨੋ ਮੋਡ ਦੀ ਐਕੁਰੇਸੀ ਸੀਮਾ ਵਿੱਚ ਪਾਈ ਗਈ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਸਬੰਧਤ ਮੀਟਰ ਦਾ ਡੀ.ਡੀ.ਐੱਲ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਦਫਤਰ ਨੂੰ ਈਮੇਲ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਭੇਜ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ।”

I observe that the Appellant’s Representative was asked during hearing on 21.08.2020 to refer to any Regulation of Supply Code-2014 or other instruction of PSPCL as per which, relief was sought in regard to disputed bill dated 30.10.2019. But, he could not provide evidence to prove the legitimacy of his submission that energy consumption during disputed period as per reading recorded was not genuine/correct. On the other hand, the reports of checking of the Energy Meter done at site and in M.E Lab. proved that accuracy of the Energy Meter of the Appellant was within permissible limits and the final reading at the site matched with that in M.E Lab.

1. There is no denying the fact that the Licensee defaulted in complying with its own instructions regarding replacement of the Energy Meter challenged by the consumer and its subsequent testing in M.E Lab. as stated by the Appellant’s Representative in the Appeal, Rejoinder and also during hearing on 21.08.2020. The Respondent did not even provide the report regarding testing of Energy Meter in M.E Lab. to the Appellant. In this case, the Meter Challenge Fee was deposited on 07.10.2019 whereafter, the Energy Meter was checked at site on 17.10.2019, replaced on 16.11.2019(after 30 days) while the same was checked in M.E Lab. on 12.12.2019. The delay in not ensuring timely testing of disputed Energy Meter and not providing the Checking Report of M.E Lab. to the consumer were in contravention of provisions contained in Regulation 21.3.6(b) of Supply Code-2014 which provides as under:

**21.3.6** **Testing of Inaccurate Meters**

*“b) A consumer may also request the distribution licensee to test the meter, if he doubts its accuracy. The distribution licensee shall undertake such testing either at site or in the laboratory within seven (7) days on payment of fee by the consumer as specified in the Schedule of General Charges approved by the Commission. The standard reference meter of better accuracy class than the meter under test shall be used for site testing of consumer meter upto 650 volts. The testing of consumer meter above 650 volts should cover entire metering system including CTs, VTs and may be carried out in the laboratory. The onsite testing may be carried out as per regulations 18(2) of CEA (Installation and Operation of Meters) Regulations, 2006, as amended from time to time. A copy of the test results indicating the accuracy of the meter shall be provided to the consumer immediately.”*

1. From the above analysis, it is concluded that energy bills for the period from 05.06.2019 to 17.07.2019 showing energy consumption of 21891 kVAh and for the period from 05.09.2019 to 10.10.2019 showing energy consumption of 11881 kVAh were correctly issued on the basis of energy recorded and reflected in the meter readings of the respective Energy Meter. The legitimacy/correctness of the aforesaid two disputed bills was proved beyond any doubt when accuracy of the respective Energy Meters (on the basis of whose readings, these bills were issued) was found within permissible limits during checking in M.E Lab. Secondly, final readings of the respective Energy Meters recorded at the time of removal from site matched with the final readings as per DDL done in M.E Lab. On the other hand, the Appellant or its Representative failed to prove that the Energy Meters sent to M.E. Lab for testing were inaccurate. Mere submission that energy consumption shown in these two bills was on higher side as compared to previous year’s consumption does not suffice. The relief claimed has to be supported by the testing results of challenged meters. The Appellant failed to quote any regulations/instructions of PSPCL on the basis of which relief can be granted as per prayer in the Appeal. The Appeal is without merits and deserves to be dismissed without cost.

**7.** **Decision**

As a sequel of above discussions, the order dated 16.03.2020 of the CGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CGL-355 of 2019 is upheld.

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

**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.

(GURINDER JIT SINGH)

August 26, 2020 Lokpal (Ombudsman)

SAS Nagar (Mohali) Electricity, Punjab.