

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM, SHIMLA

Complaint No 3157/202407/19

M/s Classic Engineering Works

Vs

Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd and Ors

BRIEF FACTS OF CASE–

- (1) Complaint is filed under Regulations 16, 17 and 18 of the HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013 by M/s Classic Engineering Works, Plot No 104, Phase-III, Industrial Area, Sansarpur Terrace, Tehsil Jaswan, District Kangra, H.P;
- (2) Complainant bearing Consumer ID 100011000226 is Large Industrial Power Supply (LIPS) category consumer of Respondent HPSEBL;
- (3) In the matter the Complainant before approaching this Forum, had earlier approached the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh by way of CWP No 7126 of 2024 which was disposed by the Hon'ble Court vide Order dated 23.07.2024 (**Annexure P7**). In this Order the Hon'ble Court was pleased to order as follows-
“In view of above, this writ petition is disposed of reserving liberty to the petitioner to seek the remedy available to it under the provisions of Electricity Act, 2003. ” ;
- (4) Thereafter, Complainant filed an Application for recall of ibid Order passed by the Hon'ble Court on 23.07.2024 in CWP No 7126 of 2024, which was allowed and the writ petition disposed vide Order passed on 26.07.2024 (**Placed on record vide miscellaneous application No MA-24/19-01 dated 12.08.2024**). In this Order Hon'ble Court was pleased to order as follows-
“.....it is ordered that impugned demand notice dated 12.07.2024 (Annexure P-4) shall remain stayed for a period of four weeks in order to enable the petitioner to effectively avail the alternative remedy in accordance with law.”
- (5) Accordingly, complaint was filed in the Forum on 24.07.2024. In accordance with regulation 25 of the ibid CGRF Regulations, 2013, Interim Order was passed by the Forum on 27.08.2024, granting therein stay on any coercive action against the Complainant pursuant to deposit of the statutory $\frac{1}{3}^{\text{rd}}$ of disputed amount of Rs 11,77,600/-;
- (6) Complainant is aggrieved by the action of Respondent to raise upon it additional amount of Rs.10,75,200/- towards the Infrastructure

Development Charges (IDC) vide a subsequent or second Demand Notice dated 12.07.2024 (**Annexure P-4 / Annexure RA-10**) when original demand amount of Rs 1,02,400/- towards advance cost share of Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) raised by Respondent vide Demand Notice dated 30.01.2024 (**Annexure P1 / Annexure RA6**) had already been paid by it.

COMPLAINANT –

- (7) That on an Application made by it, Respondent raised Demand Notice dated 30.01.2024 (**Annexure P1**) for the issuance of Power Availability Certificate (PAC) towards the enhancement of connected load from 320 kW to 950 kW / enhancement of contract demand from 320 kVA to 832 kVA;
- (8) That in **Annexure P1** it is provided that Complainant shall deposit amount in accordance with Supply Code (First amendment) and it is also provided that advance cost share towards Normative Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) @ Rs 200/kVA amounting to Rs 1,02,400/- was required to be deposited as per HPERC Regulations 419/2012;
- (9) That on 13.02.2024, it deposited the ibid amount of Rs 1,02,400/- (**Annexure P2**) and Respondent issued PAC vide its letter dated 26.03.2024 (**Annexure P3**);
- (10) That thereafter the load applied for by it was enhanced by Respondent vide its letter dated 06.07.2024;
- (11) That Respondent issued Demand Notice dated 12.07.2024 (**Annexure P4**) demanding Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) to the tune of Rs 11,77,600/-;
- (12) That on visiting local office of Respondent, it was informed that ibid **Annexure P4** was issued in consequence to Orders passed by the HPERC on 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**). In this Order it is explained that the same is prospective in nature ;
- (13) That vide application (**Annexure P6**), it had approached the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum where it was informed that due to some orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal

Pradesh in Vardhman case, no action is being taken on the application. Thereafter it approached the office of Ombudsman which was not functional and thereafter it filed Writ Petition in the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh which was disposed with directions to approach this Forum (**Annexure P7 / miscellaneous application No MA-24/19-01 dated 12.08.2024**);

- (14) That Annexure P5 dated 05.06.2024 is having no retrospective effect. Annexure P4 qua IDC is unsustainable and liable to be quashed and set aside. IDC in Annexure P4 is also contrary to principles of legitimate expectations;
- (15) **In Rejoinder:** That it had submitted Application for enhancement of load on 28.03.2024 (**Annexure P8**) which is well within time of 3 years of validity of PAC and because no action was being taken another Application Reminder was sent. For the Respondent to hold consideration to the reminder is not in interest of justice;
- (16) **Relief Sought:** For passing directions / order to the effect that Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) to the tune of Rs 11,77,600/- in Demand Notice dated 12.07.2024 (**Annexure P4**), may be quashed and set aside and for restraining the Respondent from withdrawing the enhancement of load.

RESPONDENT –

- (17) That as per clause 38 of PAC dated 26.03.2024 (**Annexure RA-7**), and as per Electricity Supply Code, 2009, Complainant was required to build up load within 2 months for purpose of levy of Demand charges. However, application for load was received online on 01.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-8**) and sanction for extension of load was done on 06.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-9**);
- (18) That in accordance with provisions of regulation 5 of HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012 (**Annexure RA-11**), Respondent raised the Demand Notice dated 12.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-10**) comprising Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) due of Rs 10,75,200/- after adjusting for advance cost share of Rs 1,02,400/- already paid by the Complainant;

- (19) That in accordance with clause 3.2.4 of the Supply Code (**Annexure RA-3 Colly**), after issuance of PAC the applicant has to submit application for supply of electricity and the licensee is then required to adjust the advance cost share to be recoverable under the HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012. HPSEBL has already provided mechanism for adjustment of advance cost share towards IDC vide its letter dated 01.11.2016 (**Annexure RA-12**);
- (20) That in the instant case, Complainant was initially charged advance IDC @ Rs 200/- per KVA rather than full rate of Rs 1000/- per KVA for issuance of PAC. Complainant applied for load extension on 01.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-8**) which was sanctioned by Respondent on 06.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-9**) and subsequently Demand Notice dated 12.07.2024 (**Annexure P1 / Annexure RA-10**) was issued by Respondent in accordance with amended HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012 which took effect on 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**);
- (21) That because the Complainant submitted the load extension Application after the new amendment to HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012 (**Annexure P5**), it is mandatory for Complainant to pay IDC as per the revised rates;
- (22) **Prayer:** That the complaint being devoid of merit may be dismissed and Complainant be directed to pay the demand of Rs 10,75,000/- raised by the Respondent along with interest.

ORDER

- (23) Forum has examined the relevant provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, various relevant Regulations and respective amendments framed and notified by the HP Electricity Regulatory Commission (or the HPERC) including relevant provisions of HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013, HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012, HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 (or the Supply

Code), various Tariff Orders / Orders passed by the Ld HPERC along with record as facts and pleadings of the parties. Forum has heard the parties at length. The considered opinion of the Forum has been gathered after considering the fair facts, evidences and correspondence placed on record and arguments adduced by both the parties;

- (24) On facts, the Complainant applied for Power Availability Certificate (PAC) for the purpose of its load extension from 320 kW to 950 kW and Contract Demand from 320 kVA to 832 kVA. For this the Respondent originally raised Demand Notice dated 30.01.2024 (**Annexure P1 / Annexure RA6**) towards advance cost share of Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) for an amount of Rs 1,02,400/- computed @ Rs 200 per kVA. Against this, payment was made by the Complainant on 17.02.2024 and accordingly PAC was issued by the Respondent on 26.03.2024 (**Annexure P-3 / Annexure RA-7**). On 28.03.2024 (**Annexure P-8**), the Complainant submitted the Application and Agreement (A&A). Thereafter, the applied additional load of 629.834 kW / Contract Demand of 512 kVA was sanctioned by the Respondent vide its load sanction letter dated 06.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-9**);
- (25) However, the Respondent on 12.07.2024 (**Annexure P-4 / Annexure RA-10**) raised another Demand Notice upon the Complainant for additional amount of Rs.10,75,200/- towards the said IDC. Complainant is aggrieved by this additional or subsequent demand;
- (26) At the outset, Forum observes that because the Respondent has relied upon regulation 5 of the HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012 (or the RoE Regulations, 2012) (**Annexure RA-11**) and code 3.2.2 of the HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 (**Annexure RA-3 Colly**) to make out its case for recovery of additional Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) from the Complainant, thus Forum finds it necessary and expedient to foremost delve upon these Regulations -

- (27) On perusal of sub-regulation 5(2) of the ibid RoE Regulations, 2012 (**Annexure RA-11**), Forum finds that this regulation mandates the Commission to approve the normative Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) to be recovered by the Respondent Distribution Licensee under Section 46 of the Electricity Act, 2003. Forum finds that the Ld HPERC accordingly approves the said IDC by way of Orders that may be passed by it from time to time. Further, Forum nowhere finds that the specified normative rates may at the discretion of the Respondent distribution licensee be modified based on actual costs to be recovered implying thereby that these rates remain final;
- (28) However, from perusal of sub-regulation 5(3) of the ibid RoE Regulations, 2012 (**Annexure RA-11**), Forum also finds that the Respondent Distribution Licensee after the fulfilment of the special conditions specified therein, is also empowered to initially recover the cost of works on estimate basis which later is subject to future adjustment on actual cost basis under sub-regulation 18(2). Thus Forum observes that the recovery of expenditure under these regulation is not on normative basis but on estimate / actual basis;
- (29) Forum from perusal of HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 (**Annexure RA-3 Colly**), further finds that code 3.2.2 specifies the rate of Rs 1000 per kVA to be paid as advance towards the said IDC charges at the time of application for grant of Power Availability Certificate (PAC) by the consumer;
- (30) Now returning to the instant complaint, Forum from its examination finds that when Demand Notice dated 30.01.2024 (**Annexure P1**) was raised by the Respondent upon the Complainant, it was based on normative rate of IDC of Rs 200/kVA for FY2023-24 which was prevailing and applicable to two-part consumers at the time. This had been approved by the Ld Commission in para 9.6 of Tariff Order passed by it on 31.03.2023 for FY2023-24. Forum further finds that this had been continued from para 16.6 of Tariff Order passed by the Ld Commission on 29.03.2022 for FY2022-23. Even before this, the Commission vide its previous Orders specified the IDC rates which were not flat @ Rs 200/kVA but which were similar in nature to that

specified in Order passed by the Ld HPERC on 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**) and these varied for different consumer classes having contract demand ranging upward from 30 kVA. This had continued till the said Tariff Order dated 29.03.2022;

- (31) Forum from perusal of the ibid Orders passed by the Ld Commission, observes that in Order passed on 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**), which has been relied upon by the Respondent, the said IDC rates of Rs 200/kVA was revised. The revised rates varied from Rs 300 to Rs 2000 per kVA for different consumer classes having contract demand ranging upward from 30 kVA. This Order in para 21 specifies as follows –

Quote

.....
.....
21.
.....
.....

(v) In case of applicants to whom supply is to be given under two part tariff (i.e. with demand charges and energy charges) as per the tariff order of the Commission, the distribution licensee shall recover the Infrastructure Development Charges under Sub-Regulation (2) of Regulation 5 of IDC Regulation, 2012, at the following rates and associated terms and conditions:-

(B) Normative rates of Infrastructure Development Charges for applicants under two part tariff.

(i)	For the first 30 kVA of contract demand	Rs. 600/- per kVA (or part thereof) of the contract demand.
(ii)	For the next 20 kVA of contract demand	Rs. 900/- per kVA (or part thereof) by which the contract demand exceeds 30 kVA.
(iii)	For the next 50 kVA of contract demand	Rs. 1700/- per kVA (or part thereof) by which the contract demand exceeds 50 kVA.
(iv)	For the balance contract demand, if any,	Rs. 2500/- per kVA (or part thereof) by which the contract demand exceeds 100 kVA.

(vi) The rates as per Para- 21(v)(B) above shall be applicable for the demand notices to be issued under HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012 from the date of issuance of this order and shall continue to be applicable for the demand notices to be issued till 31.03.2025.

(vii) All the demand notices issued under the said IDC Regulations, 2012 prior to the date of issuance of this order shall be considered as final and no adjustment/recovery shall be made on this account.

Un-Quote

- (32) Forum from examination of complaint no-where finds that the demand dated 30.01.2024 may have been raised by the Respondent in terms of sub-regulation 5(3) of the RoE Regulations, 2012. If invoked for recovery on estimated / actual cost, then these regulations

necessitated the fulfilling of the specified special conditions prescribed therein, finally resulting either in future additional recoveries or refunds which is not the case in the instant matter;

- (33) In view of the foregoing finding, Forum without doubt holds that this demand dated 30.01.2024 was raised @ Rs 200/kVA by the Respondent on normative basis in accordance with sub-regulation 5(2) of the ibid RoE Regulations, 2012 (**Annexure RA-11**) and not on estimated / actual basis and this is apparent from para 1(a) of Demand Notice dated 30.01.2024 (**Annexure P1 / Annexure RA6**) and is thus clearly as per provisions of para 9.6 of Tariff Order passed by the Ld Commission on 31.03.2023;
- (34) Forum observes from Reply submitted by the Respondent that the Application for load sanction (A&A) was submitted online by the Complainant only on 01.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-8**). From submission made in complaint, Forum observes that Complainant had submitted original Application for enhancement of load on 28.03.2024 (**Annexure P8**). During the final hearing stage, the fact that the Application for enhancement of load was originally submitted on 28.03.2024 (**Annexure P8**) was not denied by the Respondent;
- (35) Forum sums up that that in the instant matter Respondent had originally raised the Demand for IDC on 30.01.2024 @ Rs 200/kVA which in paras supra has already been held by this Forum to be as per provisions of para 9.6 of Tariff Order passed by the Ld Commission on 31.03.2023. This was later revised by the Respondent vide demand dated 12.07.2024 i.e after the Order dated 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**) was passed by the Ld Commission, this having been done by the Respondent perhaps under the presumption that because the load of the Complainant was sanctioned by it on 06.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-9**), therefore in the matter rates as specified in ibid Order dated 05.06.2024, ought to be applicable in the instant matter;
- (36) From examination of Reply given by the Respondent, Forum finds that it is the case of the Respondent that because the load was sanctioned by the Respondent on 06.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-9**),

therefore additional demand of Rs.10,75,200/- vide Demand Notice dated 12.07.2024 (**Annexure P-4 / Annexure RA-10**) has been raised in accordance with the amended provisions of HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012 which took effect on 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P-5**), provisions of HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 and mechanism for adjustment of advance cost share contained in Ld HPERC Order dated (**Annexure RA-12**).

- (37) On the ibid Reply submitted by the Respondent, Forum holds that the Respondent is wrong in stating that this Order dated 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**) is an amendment to the Regulations. An Order passed by the Commission in pursuance to provisions of Regulations cannot be held to be an amendment to the Regulations. Such an Order in the opinion of the Forum is consequential to the Regulations;
- (38) Forum accordingly rejects the contentions of the Respondent that because the Application for load was submitted by the Complainant and sanctioned by the Respondent after the Order dated 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**) passed by the Ld HPERC thus, this Order dated 05.06.2024 is applicable in the matter. Forum finds these contentions of the Respondent as clearly faulty. Forum holds that the Application for load was originally submitted by the Complainant on 28.03.2024 (**Annexure P8**) that is before the Ld Commission's Order dated 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**) and therefore for Respondent to base its additional demand on this fact is out rightly wrong and is accordingly rejected;
- (39) Thus the impugned action of the Respondent to raise an additional or subsequent demand on 12.07.2024 (**Annexure P-4 / Annexure RA-10**) for amount of Rs.10,75,200/- basing such on Ld Commission's Order dated 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**), clearly amounts to giving retrospective effect to the said Order dated 05.06.2024 especially when the Ld Commission in the said Order dated 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**) has clearly not allowed in it any retrospective effect while also clearly specifying therein that the said Order is applicable from the date of passing the Order while also holding that demand

notices issued prior to this Order shall be final / without adjustment/ recovery. Forum agrees with the Complainant that the said Order dated 05.06.2024 cannot be given retrospective effect;

- (40) Thus, the Forum further holds that the IDC rate applicable in the instant matter is clearly governed under the provisions of para 9.6 of Tariff Order passed on 31.03.2023 and not by Order dated 05.06.2024 passed by Ld Commission and that this rate is final and not amenable to modification in the hands of the Respondent. Forum concludes that the action of the Respondent to raise additional or subsequent demand for additional amount of Rs 10,75,000/- towards the Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) vide Demand Notice dated 12.07.2024, is clearly bad in law, for the simple reason that it has retrospective effect;
- (41) Forum further observes that the Respondent has parallel also contended that the in the matter the recovery was initially to be affected @ Rs 1000/kVA in accordance with code 3.2.2 of the Supply Code, 2009 and thus the supplementary demand dated 12.07.2025 has been raised which is in accordance with already provided mechanism for adjustment of advance cost share towards IDC as specified vide HPSEBL letter dated 01.11.2016 (**Annexure RA-12**);
- (42) Forum from perusal of the Supply Code observes that the provision of code 3.2.2 of the Supply Code, 2009 is in terms of advance to be paid at the PAC application stage by a consumer against a cost yet to be incurred against IDC. When the said recovery of expenditure effected by the Respondent is on estimated / actual cost basis and is more than that arrived at while considering advance of Rs 1000/kVA or recovery of cost is on normative basis at rates higher than the specified advance of Rs 1000/kVA, then the Respondent may be justified in raising initial demand on advance basis followed by future supplementary demand towards the shortfall. However, when this recovery affected on actual cost basis is less than that arrived at considering advance @ Rs 1000/kVA or on normative basis at rates lower than that specified @ Rs 1000/kVA, then Forum fails to understand as to how will the Respondent be justified in receiving

advance from consumer who would ab-initio become entitled to refund against the excess advance recovered either on normative or on actual basis;

- (43) The instant matter is not with regard to recovery of cost on estimated / actual cost basis as per ibid sub-regulation 5(3). In the instant matter recovery is on normative rate basis which has been affected by the Respondent in accordance with sub-regulation 5(2). Here the normative rate of Rs 200/KVA specified in para 9.6 of Tariff Order passed by Ld Commission on 31.03.2023 was already less than the Rs 1000/kVA specified in the Code and therefore the Respondent was ab-initio not justified to recover the advance @Rs 1000/kVA for the simple reason that doing so would be meaningless and would entail refund along with Interest. Here in the instant matter, normative rate of IDC had already been specified by the Ld Commission in its Tariff Order dated 31.03.2023 which was lower @ Rs 200/kVA than the specified advance of Rs 1000/kVA and therefore the Respondent would not be justified in recovering the advance because if done then the Complainant would automatically ab-initio become entitled to refund along with Interest. Forum accordingly rejects the contentions and arguments of the Respondent on this count which the Forum finds as untenable and an afterthought;
- (44) Forum also rejects the argument of the Respondent that it had raised the revised demand dated 12.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-10**) in accordance with already provided mechanism for adjustment of advance cost share towards IDC vide HPSEBL letter dated 01.11.2016 (**Annexure RA-12**). On perusal of the said letter, Forum finds that the same is in terms of some Appeals filed in the Hon'ble APTEL before the year 2016. Respondent has failed to demonstrate as to how would this become applicable in the instant matter to the Complainant, especially when the demand raised by it was on 30.01.2024 and beyond this the Ld HPERC had also passed Tariff Order on 31.03.2023 for FY2023-24 containing therein rates and conditions for IDC ;

- (45) In view of foregoing discussion and findings, Forum holds and concludes that the Respondent has wrongly raised the impugned additional or subsequent demand of Rs 10,75,000/- towards the Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) in Demand Notice dated 12.07.2024 (**Annexure P-4**). Forum accordingly sets aside this additional demand of Rs 10,75,000/- raised in impugned Demand Notice dated 12.07.2024;
- (46) Respondent is directed to refund to the Complainant, in the next electricity bill, any monies as may have been received by the Respondent against the ibid impugned Demand Notice dated 12.07.2024 including that pursuant to directions for payment of $\frac{1}{3}^{\text{rd}}$ of disputed amount, passed by Forum in its Interim Order dated 27.08.2024.

On aforesaid terms, the complaint is decided on merits in favour of the Complainant and is **Allowed** and accordingly disposed.

Parties are left to bear their own costs.

Order is announced before the parties present today on 04.06.2025 at Shimla in open Forum.

Certified copies of this Order be supplied to the parties.

The complaint along with this Order be consigned to record room for safe custody.

Date: 04.06.2025

Shimla

**--Sd--
Vikas Gupta
(Member)**

**--Sd--
Tushar Gupta
(Chairperson)**

CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI, SHIMLA-9.

Complaint No.: - 3157/202407/19

Date of Admission: - 24.07.2024

Quorum: - Er. Tushar Gupta, Chairman

Er. Vikas Gupta, Member

In ref:-

M/s Classic Engineering Works,
Plot No.104, Phase-III, Industrial Area,
Sansarpur Terrace, Tehsil Jaswan,
District Kangra (HP).

Complainant

V/s.

1. HPSEBL & Others.
The Executive Director (Pers.),
HPSEBL, Vidyut Bhawan,
Shimla-171004.
2. The Sr. Executive Engineer, Electrical Division,
HPSEBL, Dehra, Tehsil Dehra,
District Kangra (HP).
3. The Assistant Engineer, M&T Sub-Division,
HPSEBL, Banikhet, Tehsil Dalhousie,
District Chamba (HP).
4. The Assistant Engineer, Electrical Sub-Division
HPSEBL, Sansarpur Terrace, Tehsil Jaswal,
District Kangra (H.P.)

Respondents

Respondents

Final hearing:- 27.05.2025.

Counsels:-

- | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| Complainant | 1. Sh. Atharv Sharma, Advocate |
| Respondent | 1. Sh. Rajesh Kashyap, Advocate |
| | 2. Sh. Kamlesh Saklani, U.S. Law |

Date of Decision: - 04.06.2025

Notice

Registered

CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI SHIMLA-171009.

No. CGRF/Complaint No. 3157/202407/19

Dated:-

M/s Classic Engineering Works,
Plot No.104, Phase-III, Industrial Area,
Sansarpur Terrace, Tehsil Jaswan,
District Kangra (HP).

Complainant

V/s.

HPSEBL & Others.

Respondents

1. The Executive Director (Pers.),
HPSEBL, Vidyut Bhawan,
Shimla-171004.
2. The Sr. Executive Engineer, Electrical Division,
HPSEBL, Dehra, Tehsil Dehra,
District Kangra (HP).
3. The Assistant Engineer, M&T Sub-Division,
HPSEBL, Banikhet, Tehsil Dalhousie,
District Chamba (HP).
4. The Assistant Engineer, Electrical Sub-Division
HPSEBL, Sansarpur Terrace, Tehsil Jaswal,
District Kangra (H.P.)

Respondents

The Certified copy of final order dated 04.06.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Forum in the aforesaid complaint is enclosed find herewith for further necessary action at your end please. The compliance be reported/ intimated within one month after the receipt of order in the office.

DA:-As above.

Secretary,
Consumers Grievances Redressal Forum,
HPSEBL, Kasumpti Shimla-9.