

**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. 61/2022

Date of Registration : 28.10.2022

Date of Hearing : 07.11.2022

Date of Order : 07.11.2022

Before:

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

In the Matter of:

M/s. Chugh Industries,
Kahne Wala Road,
Jalalabad.

Contract Account Number: 3002310033 (LS)

...Appellant

Versus

Senior Executive Engineer,
DS Division, PSPCL,
Jalalabad.

...Respondent

Present For:

Appellant: Sh. Ashok Dhawan
Appellant's Representative.

Respondent : (1) Er. Vipin Kumar,
Asstt. Executive Engineer,
DS City Sub Divn., PSPCL, Jalalabad.
(2) Sh. Gian Chand, UDC.

Before me for consideration is an Appeal preferred by the Appellant against the decision dated 30.09.2022 of the Corporate Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Ludhiana (Corporate Forum) in Case No. CF-095 of 2022, deciding that:

“Bills issued from 01/2018 to till the date of PDCO during 06/2022, be revised considering the tariff type of General category. The revised amount due to/from Petitioner be refunded/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 28.10.2022 i.e. within the stipulated period of thirty days of receipt of the decision dated 30.09.2022 of the CCGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CF-095/2022. The Appellant was not required to deposit requisite 40% of the disputed amount because it was a refund case. Therefore, the Appeal was registered on 28.10.2022 and copy of the same was sent to the Addl. SE/ DS Division, PSPCL, Jalalabad for sending written reply/ parawise comments with a copy to the office of the CCGRF, Ludhiana under intimation to the Appellant vide letter nos. 1173-1175/OEP/A-61/2022 dated 28.10.2022.

3. Proceedings

With a view to adjudicate the dispute, a hearing was fixed in this Court on 07.11.2022 at 01.00 PM and intimation to this effect was sent to both the parties vide letter nos. 1211-12/OEP/A-61/2022 dated 02.11.2022. 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 deliberations made by the Appellant's Representative and the Respondent along with 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 Large Supply Category connection bearing Account No. 3002310033 with Sanctioned Load as 500 kW/ CD 450 kVA for running a Rice Mill/Saila/Sortex Plant. The industrial connection was being operated as General Industry since Jan-2018 at the time of dispute and previously it

was being run as Mixed Load Industry. The connection was permanently disconnected during February-2022.

- (ii) The Appellant had deposited a sum of ₹ 12,27,109/- from time to time on account of ACD/Meter Security, but only a sum of ₹ 8,05,569/- was credited to his account after many years. Therefore, a sum of ₹ 2,28,465/- on account of interest and a sum of ₹ 1,13,015/- on account of interest on interest had become adjustable towards the Appellant's account. A sum of ₹ 4,21,540/- less updated was required to be refunded alongwith interest.
- (iii) A sum of ₹ 2,53,409/-, a time barred amount, was wrongly charged to the Appellant's account after more than 2 years in violation of the instructions of the PSPCL as laid down vide Regulation 32.2 of the Supply Code-2014. This amount was related to the arrears for the months of 05/2017 & 06/2017, which was charged in the electricity bill for the month of 12/2020.
- (iv) Refund of ₹ 7,65,079/- due to wrong billing was not given as the Appellant applied for extension in Contract Demand from 350 kVA to 450 kVA and change of nature of industry from Mixed Load Category to General Industry on 13.11.2017. However, the Defendant office continued to charge the

Appellant as Mixed Load Industry till 01/2019. Therefore, a sum of ₹ 79,65,079/- was required to be refunded on account of overhauling from 01/2018 to 01/2019. This issue had been decided in the favour of the Appellant by the Corporate Forum.

- (v) The excess amount of ₹ 7,65,079/- had been paid. Therefore, it attracted interest under Regulation 35.1.3 of the Supply Code. So, kindly allow interest for ₹ 1,34,750/- as per calculation sheet.
- (vi) **ToD Rebate not allowed.** ToD Rebate was allowed only upto 11/2015 but from 12/2015 to 04/2019, ToD Rebate was not allowed for the night consumption from 22.00 hrs. to 06.00 hrs. Being less educated, the Appellant was not able to check the bills in this regard. The same may please be allowed now alongwith interest as admissible under rules.
- (vii) It was added that all disputed amounts as per para no. 5, stood deposited and interest which became due as per Regulation 35.3.1 of the Supply Code, 2014 would be intimated after finalization of the amount.
- (viii) Only issue no. 3 was taken as dispute in the Corporate Forum, and rest of the issues were declined citing reasons being disputed amount less than ₹ 5.00 lacs in each issue. Therefore, the Appellant humbly requested to allow this Appeal.

- (ix) It was submitted that the Appeal Case was submitted before the CGRF, Patiala during the month of October, 2021 and was registered as Case No. T-386/2021 and no further action was taken. No hearing was given for the reasons best known to that office. Meanwhile, the Court was disbanded and the Case was transferred to the Corporate Forum and the Case was decided on 30.09.2022. But only issue no. (iii) out of four no. issues was decided. The issue nos. i, ii, iv were left unheard and undecided. Therefore, the case was fit for an Appeal.
- (x) The Corporate Forum had decided only one issue regarding wrong billing for the period 01/2018 upto PDCO and no speaking orders were issued for the issue no. 1, 2 & 4 and interest due, as mentioned above. The Appellant humbly prayed that the case was fit for an Appeal.
- (xi) The Case was not decided on the merits of the Case and only monetary limit i.e. ₹ 5.00 lac per issue was taken as the base for disposal of the case and even the monetary limit taken by the Forum was not correct. However, as per CC No. 39/2021, the minimum limit of ₹ 5.00 lac was fixed for the Case as a whole and not for any particular issue.
- (xii) The issues 1, 2 & 4 as mentioned above, were dropped without giving an opportunity of being heard and only monetary limit

was considered, which was against the instructions as laid down by the Hon'ble PSERC in this regard vide Regulation 2.31 of the PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) (2nd Amendment) Regulations, 2021 and also against the instructions contained in the CC No. 39/2021.

(xiii) Although the Forum had exclusive right to reject any claim or accept it, but the Forum had pre-decided the case without giving any opportunity of being heard, which was against the true sense of justice.

(xiv) The Case was decided after a long period of more than 11 months from the date of submission of grievances before the CGRF, Patiala during Oct-2021, whereas the prescribed time limit of only 45 days was allowed, as per Regulation 2.31 of the PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) (2nd Amendment) Regulations, 2021, reproduced as under:

“2.31 On receipt of the comments from the concerned officer of the licensee or otherwise and after conducting or having such inquiry or local inspection conducted as the Forum may consider necessary and after affording reasonable opportunity of hearing to the parties, the Forum shall pass appropriate orders for disposal of the grievance, within a period not exceeding forty five (45) days from the date of receipt of the complaint/ grievance. The complaint/ grievance by senior citizens physically challenged or person suffering from serious ailments shall be disposed of on priority. However, the order in case of grievance relating to non-supply, connection or disconnection of supply shall be issued by the Forum within 15 days of the filing of the grievance.”

(xv) It was further added that several cases registered after the month of Oct-2021 were decided by the Forum. Meanwhile, the Court of the CGRF, Patiala was disbanded and hearing of this Case was postponed indefinitely, which led to further delay, for which the Appellant was not in any way responsible.

(xvi) The issue nos. 1,2,4 plus interest were dropped wrongly, only on the ground that said issues were less than ₹ 5.00 lac each, more over when the Case was initially submitted before the CGRF, Patiala during the month of 10/2021, the monetary limit was not mandatory. So, the Case was fully fit to be considered as an Appeal. It was humbly prayed that if this Appeal was not allowed, the Appellant was likely to suffer irreparable losses. It was further added that several cases with even lesser amount were decided which were registered after Case No. T-386/2021.

(xvii) It was specifically mentioned that as per Commercial Circular No. 39/2021, the criteria of amount was for per case and not per issue as taken by the Forum. The instructions as mentioned above are reproduced as under:-

“2.9.1 Corporate Forum

(i) The Corporate Forum shall have the jurisdiction to dispose of all the monetary disputes of an amount exceeding Rs. Five lakh (Rs.5,00,000/-) in each case. Provided that the complaint/representation is made within two years from the date of cause of action.

(ii) Any complainant aggrieved by non-redressal of his grievance within the time period specified by the Commission or is not satisfied with the redressal of the complaint by the Zonal or Circle or Divisional Forum may himself or through his authorized representative, approach the Corporate Forum in writing for the redressal of his grievance.

Provided that the Corporate Forum shall entertain only those complaints against the orders of Zonal or Circle or Divisional Forum, as the case may be, where the representation is made within 2 months from the date of receipt of the orders of respective Zonal/Circle/Divisional Forum, as the case may be.

Provided further that the Corporate Forum may, for reasons to be recorded in writing, entertain a complaint which does not meet the aforesaid requirements.”

(xviii) The case was decided on 30.09.2022 and the copy of order was received on 10.10.2022. Therefore, the Appeal was being submitted within one month of the receipt of copy of the Judgment.

(xix) The issue regarding monetary limit had already been decided by this Hon'ble Court in the Appeal Case Nos. A-46, A-47, A-49, A-51 of 2022. On 15.09.2022, a rejoinder in this regard was also submitted before the Corporate Forum, but the same was not considered while deciding this case.

(xx) Therefore, it was humbly prayed to direct the Corporate Forum to provide an opportunity of being heard and to decide the case on merits, which was mandatory as per above mentioned Regulations as approved by the Hon'ble PSERC. It was further prayed to accept and decide the Appeal in favour of the Appellant.

(b) Submission during hearing

During hearing on 07.11.2022, 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 remanded back to the Corporate Forum for hearing/ decision on merits on the remaining issues not decided earlier by the Corporate Forum on merits.

(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 LS Category Connection under Mix Load Industry (Rice mill) bearing A/c no. 3002310033 with sanctioned load/ CD as 500 kW/ 450 kVA running under DS

Division, PSPCL, Jalalabad in the name of M/s Chugh Industries.

- (ii) The connection of the Appellant was permanently disconnected on 06.02.2022 with ₹ 10,31,954/- outstanding against the Appellant.
- (iii) The Appellant filed a Dispute Case No. T-386/2021 in the Corporate Forum, Ludhiana against the 5 no. issues. Out of these, 3 no. issues (at Sr no. 2, 4, 5) were below than ₹ 5 lac therefore the dispute of less than ₹ 5 lac cannot be considered in the Corporate Forum, Ludhiana as per CC No. 39/2021 and the Corporate Forum advised the Appellant to approach appropriate Forum.
- (iv) Only the point no. 1 & point no. 3 regarding up-dation and interest on security and excess charged/ recovered billed amount for the period 01/2018 to 01/2019 were decided. The Appellant deposited ₹ 12,27,109/- on a/c of security/ACD/AACD from time to time but only ₹ 8,05,869/- were updated in the Appellant's account. So, ₹ 2,29,980/- were payable on account of interest on difference of updated Security. The case for refund of interest on security was forwarded to the office of AO Field, Faridkot vide Memo No. 3266 dated 04.11.2022 for pre-audit and the same would be credited to the Appellant's

account. The calculation sheet for the period 01/2018 to 06/2022 considering the tariff type of General Category was forwarded to the office of AO Field, Faridkot for pre-audit as per decision of Corporate Forum. Hence, the Corporate Forum rightly decided as per Commercial Circular No. 39/2021. However, the Appellant was at liberty to approach appropriate Forum for redressal of his grievance.

- (v) However, the point/ parawise reply was given as:- **Interest on Security:-** In this regard, it was submitted that there was a difference of security/ACD/ AACD deposited by the Appellant and updated in the bills. The Appellant deposited ₹ 12,27,109/- on a/c of security/ACD/ AACD from time to time but only ₹ 8,05,869/- were updated in the Appellant's account. So, ₹ 2,29,980/- was payable on account of interest on difference of updated Security. The Appellant had not given any request in the office of AE, City Sub division, Jalalabad. The case for refund of interest on security was forwarded to the office of AO Field, Faridkot vide Memo No. 3266 dated 04.11.2022 for pre-audit and the same would be credited to the Appellant's account.

- (vi) It was submitted that ₹ 2,53,409/- were charged against the Half Margin No. 62 dated 07.11.2017. As per Regulation of

PSPCL, a Notice No. 456 dated 29.03.2018 was issued to the Appellant within stipulated period but the Appellant did not deposit the amount of ₹ 2,53,409/-. Then, again, a Notice No. 1547 dated 19.08.2020 was issued to the Appellant but again the Appellant failed to deposit the said amount. The amount ₹ 2,53,409/- was then charged to the Appellant a/c no. 3002310033 vide SCA No. 54/101 R-127 in the month of 09/2020.

- (vii) **Para No. 3 & 4 Refund for period 1/2018 to 01/2019:-** This point was decided by the Corporate Forum and as per decision, the calculation sheet was forwarded to the office of AO Field, Faridkot vide Memo No. 3266 dated 04.11.2022 for pre-Audit.
- (viii) **TOD Rebate:-** In this regard, it was submitted that the claim being more than two year old became time barred under Regulation 2.25 of the PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations-2016.

(b) Submission during hearing

During hearing on 07.11.2022, the Respondent reiterated the submissions made in the written reply to the Appeal. He submitted that he has no objection if the remaining undecided issues are remanded back to the Corporate Forum.

5. Analysis and Findings

The issue requiring adjudication is whether the decision of the Corporate Forum, to direct the Appellant to approach the Appropriate Forum as the various issues raised by the Appellant amounting to ₹ 15,39,118/- collectively in one case, but individually 4 issues out of total 5 issues were of amount less than ₹ 5 Lac as the Corporate Forum can deal with monetary disputes above ₹ 5 Lac only, is tenable or not.

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

- (i) The Corporate Forum in its order dated 30.09.2022 observed as under:-

“Forum observed that Petitioner has raised the following issues in his Petition:

- i. Interest on securities due to non updation & security amounting to Rs. 228465/- & penal interest amounting to Rs. 113005/-.
- ii. Refund of Rs. 253409/- against time barred charges levied for the month of 05/2017 & 06/2017.
- iii. Refund of excess tariff charged from 01/2018 to 01/2019 amounting to Rs. 765079/- and interest thereon Rs. 134750/-.
- iv. TOD rebate from 12/2015 to 04/2019 and interest there upon due to non-refund of TOD rebate till date.

Petitioner filed his case in CGRF, Patiala, which was later transferred to Corporate Forum, Ludhiana (came into existence on dated 06.07.2022) for claiming refund on the

above issues amounting to Rs. 1539118/- + TOD rebate. The case was heard on pre hearing dated 01.04.2022, 22.04.2022, 06.05.2022 (in CGRF Patiala) & 26.07.2022 (in CCGRF Ludhiana) where it was decided that all disputes other than the dispute of billing of wrong type of industry from 01/2018 to 01/2019, are of amount less than Rs. 5 lac each, therefore the same cannot be heard in Corporate Forum as per PSERC (Forum & Ombudsman) (2nd Amendment) Regulation 2021. However, petitioner was advised to approach appropriate Forum for redressal of these grievances and decided to register the case on the issue of Rs. 765079/- on account of wrong tariff due to incorrect type of industry for the period 01/2018 to 01/2019. As such refund on account of incorrect type of industry is being discussed only.

Forum observed as under:

- Petitioner in his petition submitted that application for change of category was given in 11/2017 and application for Extension of CD was given in 12/2017. Extension in the CD was effected in 01/2018 but change in type of industry was not done from mix to general industry.
- Forum observed that the demand notice no. 1749590 dated 18.12.2017 was issued for extension of contract demand by 100 KVA in which existing category was shown as LSSI + LS-GEN and applied category was shown as LS-General Industry. Forum also observed that the extension in demand of 100 KVA was sanctioned along with Type of Industry by Respondent vide his memo no. 6851 dated 28.12.2017 addressed to AE/City Sub division, Jalalabad.
- Forum observed that in the loading data sheet type of industry is mentioned as General Industry and total sanctioned CD as $350+100=450$ KVA & the same is also shown in the A & A form. No where it is mentioned as General or seasonal separately. Forum also observed that the bills for the month of 04/2019 & 05/2019 were issued with CD as 450 KVA and are duly paid by the Petitioner &

bills issued up to 10.07.2019 were later on cancelled by the Respondent without assigning any reason and a revised bill of 126 days was issued of the same amount which was duly paid by the petitioner earlier against cancelled bills and due to which the cancellation of bills had no effect.

- Forum also observed that Petitioner again applied for change of tariff category from seasonal to general vide dairy no. 178 date 31.08.2018 and in compliance to this, SJO no. 129/5321 dated 07.09.2018 was issued for change of category from 01.10.2018 but whether the same had been complied or not is not brought on record by the Respondent.
- Forum also observed that audit party vide half margin no. 62 dated 17.11.2017 also charged MMC charges for the month of 05/2017 & 06/2017 as connection was running for the whole year instead of seasonal period from which it is evident that the Petitioner had already been running the Industry under General category and that is why he has applied for change of category in 11/2017 and again in 12/2017. Petitioner also stated that test report for seasonal and non-seasonal load is taken separately whereas in his case test report for total load was submitted/ accepted.

Relevant regulation regarding change of industry is as under: -

32 CHANGE OF INDUSTRY

32.1 *Whenever there is any change in industry, due intimation shall be given by the consumer to the AE/AEE/XEN (DS).*

32.2 *For carrying out any such change of industry, consumer is required to get prior sanction from the competent load sanctioning authority. The consumer is also required to give a fresh A&A form and test report, if any changes are made in electrical installation.*

- Contention of the Petitioner that he had submitted A & A form for change of Industry from mixed load to General category on dated 13.11.2017 is incorrect as only

application was submitted by the Petitioner at that time without complete set of documents required however while applying for extension of CD in the month of 12/2017 change of category was also applied.

- Respondent in its reply submitted that the claim being more than two years old became time barred. The contention of the Respondent was denied as the Forum had already registered the case considering the delay.

Forum have gone through the written submissions made by the Petitioner in the petition, written reply of the Respondent as well as oral arguments made by the Petitioner and the Respondent, along with the material brought on the record. Forum observed that the petitioner applied for change of category of industry from seasonal to General vide his application dated 13.11.2017, which is duly received in the office and marked to RA by the SDO, on same day. Demand notice was issued vide DN no. 1749590 dated 18.12.2017 for extension in load where existing category has been shown as LSSI+LSGEN and applied category was shown as LS-General Industry. The load was extended but the category was not changed by the respondent. Petitioner again applied for change of category of industry from seasonal to General and the request is duly diarized vide diary no 178 dated 31.08.2018. In compliance to this, Job order no. 129/5321 dated 07.09.2018 was issued to keep the category as General category w.e.f. 01.10.2018. But no action was taken on this job order too, by the respondent. In this regard, respondent has stated that RA posted in the office retired on dated 30.06.2018 and in the absence of the RA, action could not be taken to change the category of industry to General industry. Forum observed that it is a clear negligence on the part of the respondent and category of the petitioner is required to be changed to general category, when the compliance of the DN no.

1749590 dated 18.12.2017 for extension of load was made in 01/2018.

Keeping in view of the above, Forum came to unanimous conclusion that change of category shall be effected from the date when the extension in load was effected in compliance to the DN no. 1749590 dated 18.12.2017, in 01/2018. Bills issued from 01/2018 to till the date of PDCO i.e., during 06/2022 be revised accordingly considering the tariff type of General category. The amount due to/ from Petitioner be refunded/recovered accordingly.”

- (ii) I have gone through the written submissions made by the Appellant in the Appeal, written reply of the Respondent as well as oral arguments of both the parties during the hearing on 07.11.2022. It is observed that the Appellant had raised five issues in its Petition and the total disputed amount was ₹ 15,39,118/- which was more than ₹ 5.00 lac. But the Corporate Forum had decided only one issue out of these five issues. The Corporate Forum did not decide other 4 issues of the Appellant and directed the Appellant to approach the Appropriate Forum as all these 4 issues raised by the Appellant in its case were less than ₹ 5 Lac each. Regulation 2.9 of Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum and Ombudsman) (2ndAmendment) Regulations-2021 prescribes the limits of Monetary Complaints to be dealt by the different Forums. The Corporate Forum can directly deal with monetary

disputes above ₹ 5 Lac as per Regulation 2.9.1 (i), reproduced as under:-

“The Corporate Forum shall have the jurisdiction to dispose of all the monetary disputes of an amount exceeding Rs. Five lakh (Rs. 5,00,000/-) in each case. Provided that the complaint/representation is made within two years from the date of cause of action.”

This Court had observed that the Monetary Limit mentioned in the Regulation 2.9.1 (i) above is on “each case” basis and not on “each issue” basis.

- (iii) This Court observed that the Appellant had filed the petition before the CGRF, Patiala mentioning the disputed amount as ₹ 15,39,118/-. After the CGRF, Patiala was disbanded; this case was transferred to the Corporate Forum as per the Monetary Limits mentioned in Regulation 2.9.1 of Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum and Ombudsman) (2nd Amendment) Regulations-2021. So, the decision of the Forum regarding issue nos. 1, 2, 4 & 5 is not correct and tenable.
- (iv) The Appellant approached the CGRF, Patiala in October, 2021 for the redressal of its grievances and the Corporate Forum, after nearly 11 months decided only one issue of refund leaving aside other four issues raised by the Appellant in its Petition filed before the Forum. The Forum is bound to decide the

Petition within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of complaint/ grievance as per Regulation 2.31 of PSERC (Forum and Ombudsman) (2nd Amendment) Regulations, 2021 which is reproduced below:

“2.31 On receipt of the comments from the concerned officer of the licensee or otherwise and after conducting or having such inquiry or local inspection conducted as the Forum may consider necessary, and after affording reasonable opportunity of hearing to the parties, the Forum shall pass appropriate orders for disposal of the grievance, within a period not exceeding forty five (45) days from the date of receipt of the complaint/grievance. The complaint/grievance by senior citizens physically challenged or person suffering from serious ailments shall be disposed of on priority. However the order in case of grievance relating to non-supply, connection or disconnection of supply shall be issued by the Forum within 15 days of the filing of the grievance.”

- (v) The Forum should have passed a speaking/ detailed order on the issues involved in this case after giving an opportunity of hearing to both parties. Detailed deliberations were not held and due process of law was not followed in the Corporate Forum in respect of issues raised by the Appellant in the dispute case filed before the Corporate Forum. With a view to meet the ends of ultimate justice, this Court is inclined to remand back this Appeal case to the Corporate CGRF, Ludhiana for hearing, adjudicating and passing of speaking orders in respect of issue nos. 1, 2, 4 & 5 of the original petition raised before the Corporate Forum as per PSERC (Forum & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2016 as amended from time to time. This dispute case is already delayed by more than 12 months

and as such, the Corporate Forum should decide the case on priority basis.

- (vi) In view of above, this Court is of the opinion that the Corporate Forum should also decide the remaining issues raised by the Appellant in its Petition as proper adjudication of the case had not been done at the Corporate Forum level.
- (vii) As regards the third issue heard and decided by the Corporate Forum, the Appellant is satisfied with the decision of the Corporate Forum and hence not raised the same in this Appeal. So, no intervention of this Court is needed on this issue. The decision of the Corporate Forum in this regard had been implemented.
- (viii) Both parties agreed during hearing on 07.11.2022 that Appeal case may be remanded back to the Corporate Forum for deciding the remaining issues (1, 2, 4 & 5) on merits.

6. Decision

As a sequel of above discussions, the order dated 15.09.2022 of the CCGRF, Ludhiana in Case No. CF-095 of 2022 is hereby partially quashed to the extent that the issue nos. 1, 2, 4 & 5 which were raised by the Appellant in its original Petition before the Forum have not been adjudicated upon on merits by the Corporate Forum. The Appeal case is remanded back to the

Corporate Forum, Ludhiana with a direction to hear and decide remaining four issues on merits expeditiously as per PSERC (Forum & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2016 as amended from time to time.

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.

November 07, 2022
S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali)

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