

**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. 50/2022

Date of Registration : 30.09.2022

Date of Hearing : 11.10.2022

Date of Order : 11.10.2022

Before:

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

In the Matter of:

Sh. Varinder Kumar,
Plot No.-4, Phase-7,
Focal Point, Ludhiana.

Contract Account Number: 3004563633 (MS)

...Appellant

Versus

Senior Executive Engineer,
DS Focal Point (Spl.) Division, PSPCL,
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Present For:

Appellant: Sh. Parvesh Chadha,
Appellant's Representative.

Respondent : Er. Jagdeep Singh,
Senior Executive Engineer,
DS Focal Point (Spl.) Division, PSPCL,
Ludhiana.

Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Appellant against the decision dated 30.08.2022 of the Corporate Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Ludhiana (Corporate Forum) in Case No. CF-014 of 2022, deciding that:

“The amount of unbilled units is recoverable from the petitioner. However, the exact amount of unbilled (42167 X 0.75MF) = 31625 units, be checked by the respondent and the amount be recovered accordingly.”

2. Registration of the Appeal

A scrutiny of the Appeal and related documents revealed that the Appeal was received in this Court on 30.09.2022 i.e. within the period of thirty days of receipt of the decision dated 30.08.2022 of the CCGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CF-014 of 2022, received by the Appellant's Representative on 12.09.2022 from the office of the Corporate Forum. The Appellant deposited the requisite 40% of the disputed amount. Therefore, the Appeal was registered on 30.09.2022 and copy of the same was sent to the Sr. Xen/ DS Focal Point (Spl.) Division, PSPCL, Ludhiana for sending written reply/ parawise comments with a copy to the office of the CCGRF, Ludhiana under intimation to the Appellant vide letter nos. 1057-59/OEP/A-50/2022 dated 30.09.2022.

3. Proceedings

With a view to adjudicate the dispute, a hearing was fixed in this Court on 11.10.2022 at 12.00 Noon and intimation to this effect was sent to both the parties vide letter nos. 1076-77/OEP/A-50/2022 dated 06.10.2022. As scheduled, the hearing was held in this Court on 11.10.2022 and 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 deliberations 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. 3004563633 with sanctioned load of 87.66 kW and CD as 97.40 kVA running in his name under DS Focal Point Division, PSPCL, Ludhiana.

- (ii) The Appellant received a bill issued on 19.11.2021 for ₹ 2,28,810/-, inclusive of ₹ 1,17,993/- as previous adjustment amount, with due date on 29.11.2021. The Appellant contacted the office of the Respondent to obtain the detail. He was told that the charges were related to old Account No. E32MS460505A (3002956512 new) running in his premises.
- (iii) The property was purchased and its title was changed on 30.05.2016. The Appellant applied for the change of name of existing electricity connection from the name of old owner. The first bill was issued on 10.03.2017 for new A/c No. 3004563633. No balance was outstanding at that time. The Respondent's office had not issued any notice-cum-supplementary bill before charging this amount in current bill, a violation of its own Instruction No. 93 of ESIM-2018. No details of charges were supplied with the bill.
- (iv) The Appeal was made in CLDSC. During case under review in CLDSC, no reply or detail of charges were provided to the Appellant by the Respondent. The decision of CLDSC was arbitrary and no opportunity was accorded to the Appellant to verify the facts/calculation or to file any rejoinder, which was totally against the CCHP procedure and injustice to the Appellant.

- (v) The Appellant filed an Appeal against the decision of CLDSC before the CGRF, Ludhiana now Corporate Forum, Ludhiana vide Case No. CGL-039/2022 (Old) and new CF-014/2022. The Corporate Forum decided the case against the Appellant on 30.08.2022, hence this Appeal was filed.
- (vi) The Corporate Forum, Ludhiana had ignored the below noted points while deciding the case:-
- (a) Both the old and new Original consumer cases were not produced by the PSPCL in spite of various dates given.
 - (b) Copy of PDCO & SCO relating to CON were not obtained before taking the decision.
 - (c) No FIR was called for of both missing cases as some official/officer was involved for concealment of consumption.
 - (d) Without concluding the old final reading of PDCO and new initial reading of SJO/SCO, the difference could not be charged.
 - (e) The Respondent had failed to justify on day of hearing, the consumption of $(42167 \times MF.75) = 31625$ kVAh units. Even reading record (chlamju) was not produced.
- (vii) As per PSPCL record, "On Line" bill appeared of A/c No. 3002956512 was of ₹ 34,530/- issued on 20.09.2021 with due date as 30.09.2021. No such bill was ever delivered to the

Appellant and no such notice was issued. This bill, if sent by SMS/E-mail, might be to the earlier owner.

- (viii) The charges levied were not correct and not admitted. All the dues were cleared before CON. The new ACD & MS were also paid on CON, but the ACD & MS of this old account had yet not been transferred in the Appellant's account.
- (ix) As per decision, the detail of non-billed units to the tune of $42167 \times MF.75 = 31625$ kVAh had not been justified during the proceedings. No detail or documentary proof of units consumed by the Appellant had been provided. Copies of SCO/SJO of CON, LCR, reading record of old account were called for, but these were not supplied by the Respondent. The Respondent failed to justify the consumption of 31625 units in one day.
- (x) The 20% payment, i.e., ₹ 23,600/- was deposited vide Receipt No. 173577812 dated 22.02.2022 and the balance 20%, i.e., ₹ 23,600/- was deposited vide Receipt No. 186309881 dated 16.09.2022.
- (xi) The Appellant prayed this Court to review his Appeal in the interest of justice.
- (xii) The relief be given as the amount charged was not justified as the consumption recorded in one day and it was not relating to the Appellant. The same may be recovered from the

official/officer at fault. The PSPCL failed to justify consumption of 31625 units in one day. No record had been produced to show the reading recorded and the Respondent charged the amount after expiry of 4 years & 8 months (10.03.2017 to 19.11.2021).

(b) Submissions made in the Rejoinder:

The Appellant submitted the following Rejoinder to the written reply filed by the Respondent, for consideration of this Court:

- (i) The written reply is not correct. No Bill of final reading was issued having readings kWh 1784480, 1901522 kVAh as stated in the reply. Actually final bill was issued on 08.03.2017 upto readings 1742519 kWh, 1859355 kVAh and first bill after CON from 1784480 kWh, 1901522 kVAh w.e.f. 10.03.2017. The Respondent issued the difference of readings from 08.03.2017 to 10.03.2017 after 4 years. The Respondent failed to justify the difference of consumption of this final bill as stated in the reply.
- (ii) The old Meter reading record before 06.05.2017 has not been provided to authenticate the readings mentioned of March, 2017 i.e. 08.03.2017, 10.03.2017 respectively. There must be authenticity. There was no doubt that the meter was replaced on 31.07.2018. The PSPCL had not charged the difference at that

time. After 4 years of consumption, bill cannot be charged. The office has to justify the consumption of one day. Had they charged at that stage then meter was to be got checked from ME Lab.

- (iii) In reply to para 3 it is submitted that these documents were submitted by the Appellant on demand by Corporate Forum during the proceeding of case and not by the PSPCL. The Respondent intentionally misplaced the consumer case to save the negligence of staff involved in this case. Even no FIR was lodged with the Police against the missing of consumer case. A letter was received to submit the documents for preparing the duplicate case without lodging the FIR.
- (iv) The Respondent had justified the consumption of average of 4 months from 17.11.2016 to 08.03.2017 as 22403 units but failed to justify the consumption of 31471 Units of 1 day from 08.03.2017 to 09.03.2017. The Hon'ble Court can see the consumption data submitted by the Respondent that after the CON, consumption was not equal to before CON. It varied from 13000 to 17000 for the first 6 months (03/17 to 09/17) as the business was fresh. The consumption of 31471 was totally wrong and it was a case of concealment by JE and the Respondent's office who were handling the CON to give

benefit to old consumer. There was no clerical mistake as stated in the reply.

- (v) The respondent had not lodged FIR and fixed the responsibility of the person(s) who had misplaced the record. The facts can be hidden by preparing the duplicate case and the Appellant faces the financial loss due to the negligence of the Respondent. The Appellant was ready to submit the documents as required for duplicate case but before that a copy of FIR be supplied to him. No PDCO, SCO/ SJO were submitted whereas these documents were attached with SAP System. This Court must call for the old reading records to justify the readings of 08.03.2017, missing reading record required, FIR against Meter Reader. The Respondent always trusted on the readings recorded by JE-1 and Respondent was now escaping that he must had not taken the actual readings from site. Then what action was taken against him by PSPCL or proposed to be taken for making loss of Revenue to PSPCL. No such action has been taken. The clumtechu of 2018 as authenticated by the Respondent be taken for average of ONE day consumption under dispute (six month consumption).
- (vi) The reply was not admitted as per Petition, the bill of ONLINE was ₹ 34,350/- issued on 20-09-2021 was not delivered but the

Respondent had not replied whether it was delivered and to whom. Either to old consumer or new consumer.

- (vii) Nothing was due at the time of CON. NO ACD/ MS was transferred to new account. The Respondent had failed to justify the consumption of 31625 units of 1 day and cannot claim from the Appellant.
- (viii) The amount charged was not justified and was not relating to the Appellant and be recovered from the official at fault.

(c) Submission during hearing

During hearing on 11.10.2022, the Appellant's Representative (AR) reiterated the submissions made in the Appeal as well as in the Rejoinder and prayed to allow the same.

(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 MS Category Connection, bearing Account No. 3004563633 with sanctioned load of 87.660 kW running under DS Focal Point (Spl.) Division, PSPCL, Ludhiana in his name.
- (ii) The Appellant had applied for the change of name from Sh. Davinder Singh (CA No. 3002956512) to his name in the year

2017. The change of name was effected and the final bill of ₹ 2,08,787/- was issued upto reading 1784480 kWh/ 1901522 kVAh. But the Appellant did not deposit the bill and on 06.10.2021, the amount of ₹ 2,12,272/- was charged in the new a/c of the Appellant, which was correct and recoverable.

- (iii) As per the Meter Reading Record (Clumtchu) of this MS account for the year 2018, the last reading was taken on 20.07.2018 and it was found to be 2189822 kWh. The MCO of the old meter was done on 31.07.2018. Therefore, it was itself certified that the reading as questioned by the Appellant was correct as per the meter reading record of the said account.
- (iv) It was also intimated that as per the PSIEC allotment letter submitted by the Appellant during the hearing in the Corporate Forum, the allotment was given to the Appellant by PSIEC vide its Memo No. 5426 dated 30.05.2016. It was clear that the electricity consumption after 05/2016 was done by the Appellant himself. Therefore, the amount charged to the Appellant was correct and recoverable.
- (v) It was stated that the average consumption of 4 months from 17.11.2016 up to 08.03.2017 was 22403 kVAh units, it was clear from the consumption data also. Therefore, it could be

some clerical mistake from the concerned official who took the reading but did not enter the actual reading.

- (vi) The original consumer case of Sh. Varinder Kumar was not found, therefore as per Corporate Forum proceedings, the Appellant was issued a letter vide Memo No. 13614 dated 18.08.2022 to provide necessary documents so that a duplicate Consumer case of the connection be prepared.
- (vii) The Court of Ombudsman, Electricity, Punjab was requested to consider the SAP reading record and consumption data for verifying the consumption in the March, 2017. The signed copy of orders related to change of name were not yet found.
- (viii) It was probable that JE-1 concerned at that time must have not taken the actual readings as per the site.
- (ix) It was submitted that in the bill dated 18.12.2021, the amount was charged to the Appellant in his a/c no. 3004563633.
- (x) It was submitted that the defaulting/outstanding amount pertaining to change of name cases were transferred to the new a/c of the consumers all over Punjab, through mass transfer by IT Cell, Patiala in the month of 10/2021.

(c) Submission during hearing

During hearing on 11.10.2022, the Respondent did not provide any documentary evidence to explain the consumption of

31625 units in 2 days. He stated that documents relevant to the case are not available in their records. He himself admitted that the consumption of 31625 units in 2 days for load of 91.00 kVA (MDI recorded during disputed period) is not possible. He reiterated the submissions made in the written reply to the Appeal and prayed for the dismissal of the same.

5. Analysis and Findings

The issue requiring adjudication is the legitimacy of amount of ₹ 1,17,993/- charged to the Appellant for the consumption of 31625 kVAh units for the period of 2 days from 08.03.2017 to 10.03.2017, pertaining to previous owner of the same premises.

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 property was purchased by the Appellant and its title was changed on 30.05.2016. He applied for the change of name of existing electricity connection from name of old owner. The first bill was issued on 10.03.2017 for new A/c No. 3004563633. No balance was outstanding at that time. Then in 2021, the Appellant received bill dated 19.11.2021 in which pending dues

of ₹ 1,17,993/- pertaining to Account No. 3002956512 of previous owner were charged. The AR pleaded that the Respondent's office had not issued any notice-cum-supplementary bill before charging this amount in current bill, a violation of its own Instruction No. 93 of ESIM-2018. No details of charges were supplied with the bill. The Appellant challenged this amount in CLDSC. But, the decision of CLDSC was arbitrary and no opportunity was accorded to the Appellant to verify the facts/calculation or to file any rejoinder, which was totally against the CCHP procedure and injustice to the Appellant. The Appellant then filed an Appeal before the CGRF, Ludhiana (now Corporate Forum, Ludhiana) vide Case No. CGL-039/2022 (Old) and new CF-014/2022. The Corporate Forum decided the case against the Appellant on 30.08.2022, hence this Appeal was filed. He further pleaded that the charges levied were not correct and not admitted. All the dues were cleared before CON. The new ACD & MS were also paid on CON, but the ACD &MS of this old account had yet not been transferred in the Appellant's account. The Respondent failed to justify the consumption of 31625 units in one day. No record had been produced to show the reading recorded and the Respondent charged the amount after expiry

of 4 years & 8 months (10.03.2017 to 19.11.2021). He prayed that the relief be given as the amount charged was not justified as the consumption recorded in one day and it was not relating to the Appellant.

- (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. He argued that the Appellant had applied for the change of name of the electricity connection from Sh. Davinder Singh (CA No. 3002956512) to his name in the year 2017. The change of name was effected and the final bill of ₹ 2,08,787/- was issued upto reading 1784480 kWh/ 1901522 kVAh. But the Appellant did not deposit the bill and on 06.10.2021, the amount of ₹ 2,12,272/- was charged in the new a/c of the Appellant, which was correct and recoverable. He argued that as per the PSIEC allotment letter submitted by the Appellant during the hearing in the Corporate Forum, the allotment was given to the Appellant by PSIEC vide its Memo No. 5426 dated 30.05.2016. It was clear that the electricity consumption after 05/2016 was done by the Appellant himself. Therefore, the amount charged to the Appellant was correct and recoverable. He further argued that the average consumption of 4 months from 17.11.2016 up to

08.03.2017 was 22403 kVAh units, it was clear from the consumption data also. Therefore, it could be some clerical mistake from the concerned official who took the reading but did not enter the actual reading. He prayed for the dismissal of the Appeal.

(iii) The Forum in its order dated 30.08.2022 observed as under:

“Forum observed that Petitioner applied for change of name of this connection from Sh. Davinder Kumar to Sh. Varinder Kumar and job order no. 100002822537 dated 08.11.2016 was issued which was affected on 10.03.2017. The old account no. 3002956512 (in the name of Sh. Davinder Kumar) was changed with new account no. 3004563633 (in the name of Sh. Varinder Kumar). The first bill of new a/c no. was issued from reading of 1901522 to 1918941 for the period of 10.03.2017 to 16.05.2017 of 17419KVAH units. But the old account was billed and closed at last reading of 1859355Kvah. Accordingly correcting the error, IT Patiala issued a bill in SAP system for difference of reading of $(1901522-1859355) = 42167KVAH$ (x MF) and the amount was transferred to new account. The Petitioner was issued bill dated 19.11.2021 amounting Rs. 228810/- (including amount of Rs. 117993 as previous adjustment). Petitioner did not agree to it and filed his case at CLDSC. CLDSC in its meeting held on 09.02.2022 decided as under:

“ਪੀ.ਓ ਵਲੋਂ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕੀਤੇ ਤੱਥਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮੁੱਖ ਰੱਖਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਫੋਰਮ ਵਲੋਂ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਖਪਤਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਚਾਰਜ ਹੋਈ ਰਕਮ ਅਸਲ ਖਪਤ ਨਾਲ ਸਬੰਧਤ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਵਸੂਲਣਯੋਗ ਹੈ।”

Not agreed with the decision of the CLDSC, the petitioner filed an appeal in the Corporate Forum.

Forum observed that the petitioner in his petition has stated that the official/officer who has issued final bill before CON has issued bill properly as per readings recorded on 08.03.2017 and the old consumer has paid. The consumption of 1 day i.e., 8 March to 9 March is kwh-41961 & Kvah-42167. Why it was not billed and undue benefit to old consumer was given which needs to be investigated. Forum directed the respondent to submit SAP reading record of both the accounts and specific comments along with relevant document

about final reading at which old account was closed and initial reading of new account along with Meter blank of 03/2017. But Respondent did not submit any documents as directed during the hearings. No any record of old meter was found. Nos. of opportunities were given to Respondent for submitting records, consumer case, billing status while effecting change of name. Forum also directed the Respondent that if the record is not found then action be taken against the custodian of the record and action against delinquent officials/officers responsible for entering readings in SAP while effecting change of name, be also taken. Further Petitioner was directed to submit copy of land purchase record/registry, to the Respondent. On the basis of the land purchase record, respondent submitted his comments that as per the PSIEC allotment letter in the name of Mr. Varinder Kumar, the allotment is given to the consumer on dated 30.05.2016 vide PSIEC memo no. 5426, so, it is clear that the electricity consumption after 05/2016 is done by Mr. Varinder Kumar himself only. Therefore, the amount charged to the consumer is correct and recoverable. Petitioner did not further commented upon the above statement. Forum have gone through the written submissions made by the petitioner in the petition, written reply of the Respondent, rejoinder by the petitioner as well as oral arguments made by the petitioner and the Respondent along with the material brought on the record. It is observed that allotment to the petitioner was given on 30.05.2016 and he might have taken the possession of the premises immediately. Also, the change of name has been applied on dated 08.11.2016, whereas the dispute has arisen in March/2017. Therefore, the disputed consumption of 42167 (x MF) units, belongs to the petitioner which was later on detected by IT Patiala in SAP system and accordingly amount charged for unbilled reading pending while affecting change of name, is recoverable from the petitioner. Forum further observed that bill no. 51209255797 issued on dated 20.09.2021 for the difference of unbilled $(42167 \times 0.75MF) = 31625$ units, is just for Rs. 34530/- only, in which energy charges are zero, whereas the disputed amount in question, is termed as Rs. 117993/-, as per CLDSC. But on the other hand, respondent in his reply has mentioned that the amount charged is Rs. 212272/-. Respondent could not explain the same during discussion. Keeping in view the above, Forum came to unanimous conclusion that amount charged by respondent is correct and chargeable. However, the exact amount of unbilled $(42167 \times 0.75MF) = 31625$

units, may be checked by the respondent and the amount be recovered accordingly.”

- (iv) I have gone through the written submissions made by the Appellant in the Appeal/ Rejoinder, written reply of the Respondent as well as oral arguments of both the parties during the hearing on 11.10.2022. It is observed by this court that the decision of the Forum is not based on any regulations/ instructions of the Distribution Licensee and the Forum has erred in passing such order. The Reading Record of the Appellant's and the previous owner's i.e Sh. Davinder Singh's consumer accounts shows that, before the change of name effected on 10.03.2017, bills were regularly being issued to Sh. Davinder Singh on the basis of 'O' code. On 08.03.2017, kVAh reading was recorded as 1859355 and then on 10.03.2017, the kVAh reading was recorded as 1901522 and MDI 91.00, which means Sh. Davinder Singh consumed 31625 kVAh units in 2 days, which is very high and not possible. Even, if it is considered that he used the electricity for 24 hours on the sanctioned CD of 97.400 kVA for these 2 days from 08.03.2017 to 10.03.2017, then also the maximum consumption for 2 days will be 4675 kVAh. The Respondent was asked to explain the consumption of 31625 kVAh in 2 days. But the Respondent did not provide any documentary evidence to prove

that Sh. Davinder Singh had consumed these units in 2 days. This Court observed that the Respondent neither produced the PDCO of Sh. Davinder Singh's account nor the SJO of release of connection to the Appellant from which the reliable final reading could have been derived. The Respondent also failed to prove that the readings recorded by the Meter Reader during the period upto 08.03.2017 were incorrect.

- (v) The onus to prove the correctness of amount charged was on the Respondent, which he failed to prove on the basis of any documentary evidence. So this Court is of the opinion that the Appellant cannot be burdened with the unrealistic consumption of 31625 kVAh for 2 days. The demand of ₹ 1,17,993/- charged to the Appellant is quashed. The Respondent is directed to recalculate the demand for 2 days from 08.03.2017 to 10.03.2017 on the average basis of the consumption recorded during the period from 10.02.2017 to 08.03.2017.
- (vi) As regards the contention of the Appellant that he was not liable to pay any dues pertaining to the electricity account of the previous owner is concerned, I am of the opinion that it is not correct as Regulation 30.15 of the Supply Code-2014, reproduced below, is very clear on this issue.

"30.15 In case of transfer of property by sale/inheritance, the purchaser/ heir shall be liable to pay all charges due with respect to

such property and found subsequently recoverable from the consumer.”

The Appellant is liable to pay dues of previous consumer (Sh. Devinder Singh)

- (vii) In view of the above, this court is not inclined to agree with the decision dated 30.08.2022 of the Corporate Forum in Case No. CF-014 of 2022. The Respondent failed to prove that Sh. Davinder Singh consumed 31625 kVAh in 2 days. So, the demand of ₹ 1,17,993/- charged to the Appellant is quashed. The Respondent is directed to recalculate the demand for 2 days from 08.03.2017 to 10.03.2017 on the average basis of the consumption recorded during the period from 10.02.2017 to 08.03.2017 and same be recovered from the Appellant as per Regulation 30.15 of the Supply Code-2014.

6. Decision

As a sequel of above discussions, the order dated 30.08.2022 of the CCGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CF-014 of 2022 is hereby quashed. The demand of ₹ 1,17,993/- charged to the Appellant is quashed. The Respondent is directed to recalculate the demand for 2 days from 08.03.2017 to 10.03.2017 on the average basis of the consumption recorded during the period from 10.02.2017 to 08.03.2017 and same be recovered from the Appellant as per Regulation 30.15 of the Supply Code-2014.

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.

October 11, 2022
S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali)

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