

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM, SHIMLA**

**Complaint No 3157/202407/20**

**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 a Large Industrial Power Supply (LIPS) category electricity consumer of Respondent HPSEBL having connected load of 320 kW with contract demand of 320 kVA;
- (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 7004 of 2024 which was disposed by the Hon'ble Court vide Order dated 23.07.2024 (**Annexure P4**). 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 7004 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-24/20-01 dated 12.08.2024**). In this Order Hon'ble Court was pleased to order as follows-  
*“.....it is ordered that impugned demand notice dated 25.05.2024 (Annexure P-1) 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 06.09.2024, 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 29,41,028/-;

- (6) Briefly, the Complainant has come before the Forum being aggrieved by the action of Respondent to raise upon it impugned Demand Notice dated 25.05.2024 (**Annexure P-1**) for Rs 29,41,028/-. Within this demand the Complainant is further aggrieved by the charging of Contract Demand Violation Charges (CDVC) to the tune of Rs 4,29,468/- (**Annexure A** attached with **Annexure P-1**);

**COMPLAINANT –**

- (7) That on 03.08.2023, Respondent on its own replaced the CT/PT unit and thereafter continued to bill on the basis of old multiplication factor (MF) which were paid by it;
- (8) That in accordance with Instruction 26.4.2 the Respondent has to issue revised bills with correct MF;
- (9) That Respondent on receiving Report from M&T Banikhet vide letter dated 15.05.2024, has raised upon it Demand Notice dated 25.05.2024 (**Annexure P-1**) for Rs 29,41,028/- which is due to incorrect application of old MF of 1.66 instead of new MF of 3.33, after CT/PT unit was replaced on 03.08.2024. Assessment is at **Annexure A attached with Annexure P-1**. This also includes violation charges penalty of Rs 4,29,468/-;
- (10) That despite CT/PT Unit having been replaced on its own by the Respondent and bills issued by Respondent without changing the MF from 1.66 to 3.33 and these bills stand paid, it is clear that there is no mistake on its part and therefore it cannot be punished by Respondent by issuing Annexure P-1 which is injustice on part of Respondent;
- (11) That had it been informed in the start, it could have taken corrective measures and now it is finding it difficult to meet the said demand. It had also submitted case for enhancement of power load in November 2023 against which final application is now being submitted and the same is still pending with the Respondent;
- (12) That it has deposited Rs 12,66,903/- under protest (**Annexure P8**) which jumped. On its jumping, payment was again made but for Rs 12,53,683/- ;

- (13) That vide application (**Annexure P3**), it had approached the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and thereafter it filed Writ in the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh which was disposed with directions to approach this Forum (**Annexure P4**);
- (14) That the action of the Respondent is contrary to settled principles of legitimate expectations.
- (15) **In Rejoinder:**
- (a) That perusal of bills from 9/23 to 5/24 depict that the load of 320 kVA was never exceeded and excess contract demand was not drawn;
- (b) The judgement of Hon'ble Apex Court relied upon and cited by the Respondent is clearly distinguishable and not applicable in the facts of the present case;
- (16) **Relief Sought:** For passing directions / order to the effect that order dated 25.05.2024 (**Annexure P-1**), may be quashed and set aside and for directions to the Respondent to not recover this demand and Respondent be restrained from charging Interest. In the alternative it be allowed to make the payment in 12 equal instalments but penalty of Rs 4,29,468/- be withdrawn.

**RESPONDENT –**

- (17) That on 09.05.2018, it has sanctioned 320 kW load with 320 kVA Contract Demand in favour of Complainant (**Annexure RA-1**);
- (18) That on 03.08.2023, it replaced the 25/5 with a new 50/5 CT/PT unit (**Annexure RA-2**). This was done at behest of M&T Banikhet report dated 07.06.2023 (**Annexure RA-3**) as Test results of the CT/PT unit were found beyond permissible limits;
- (19) The change of ibid CT/PT unit resulted in new multiplication factor (MF) of 3.33 which was not updated in billing system resulting in issuance of electricity bills from September 2023 to May 2024 on old MF of 1.66 and this oversight further resulted in short assessment of energy consumed. This error was again reported by the M&T lab on 16.05.2024 (**Annexure RA-4**);

- (20) That subsequently new multiplication was updated in the billing system and Complainant's account overhauled for the under billed past period of electricity bills from September 2023 to May 2024 and an assessment of Rs 29,41,028/- was made out based on actual energy consumption by applying correct MF of 3.33 and accordingly detailed calculation along with Demand Notice dated 25.05.2024 (**Annexure P-1**) was served upon the Complainant;
- (21) That 2 reminders dated 20.06.2024 (**Annexure RA-5**) and 01.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-7**) were issued by it to the Complainant;
- (22) The Complainant started the process of obtaining Power Availability Certificate (PAC) for the purpose of its load enhancement in October 2023 (**Annexure RA-12**) and thereafter submitted the online Application on 01.07.2024 which is admitted by Complainant in its letter dated 18.06.2024 (**Annexure RA-7**) and after completion of all necessary formalities, load enhancement of 949.834 kW with contract demand of 832 kVA was sanctioned by the Respondent on 06.07.2024 (**Annexure RA-19**);
- (23) That Complainant has not disputed the accuracy of the assessment but has challenged the contract demand violation charges (CDVC) which is as per approved Tariff by the HPERC and which has been responded to vide letter dated 24.06.2024 (**Annexure RA-8**). The MRI record clearly shows that Complainant started drawing demand in excess of sanctioned contract demand from month of January 2024 ie before approval was granted by it for enhancement of contract demand from 320 kVA to 832 kVA;
- (24) That it has right to recover short billed amount including the CDVC. The position is supported by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in similar matter in case of M/s Prem Cortex vs Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitaran Nigam Ltd. & others as per Civil Appeal No 7235 of 2009 decided on 05.10.2021 (**Annexure RA-11**);
- (25) **Prayer:** That the complaint being devoid of merit may be dismissed and Complainant be directed to pay the demand of Rs 29,41,028/- raised by the Respondent along with Interest.

**ORDER**

- (26) 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, 2012, HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009, Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC, Respondent' HPSEBL's Sales Manual Instructions, Central Electricity Authority (Installation and Operation of meters) Regulations, 2006 and amendments thereto 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 fair facts, evidences and correspondence placed on record and arguments adduced by both the parties;
- (27) Forum observes from record that impugned demand dated 25.05.2024 (**Annexure P-1**) for Rs 29,41,028/-has been raised by the Respondent upon the Complainant towards short assessment of the metered consumption in Complainant's billing in the past from September 2023 to May 2024 (9 months). This short assessment by the Respondent arose due to the wrong application of multiplication factor (MF) of 1.66 instead of 3.33 to the Complainant's meter reading / consumption pursuant to replacement of its faulty current transformer / potential transformer (CT/PT) unit on 03.08.2024 which further resulted in its wrong billing. The fact of faulty CT/PT unit and the application of incorrect multiplication factor was pointed out by the Metering and Testing (M&T) Lab of the Respondent (**Annexure RA-3 and Annexure RA-4**);
- (28) Briefly, it is Complainant's case that that despite CT/PT Unit having been replaced on its own by the Respondent and erroneous bills raised by Respondent without changing the MF from 1.66 to 3.33 and despite these erroneous bills having been paid, thus there is no mistake on Complainant's part and therefore it cannot be punished by the Respondent by issuing the impugned Demand Notice dated

25.05.2024 (**Annexure P-1**). The action of the Respondent to do so is against the principles of legitimate expectations;

- (29) Further, it is Complainant's allegation that it had also submitted case for enhancement of power load in November 2023 against which final application is now being submitted and the same is still pending with the Respondent. Had it been informed in the start, it could have taken corrective measures with regard to Contract Demand Violation Charges (CDVC), and now it is finding it difficult to meet the said demand;
- (30) Forum observes and finds that Complainant in its submissions and arguments has relied upon Sales Manual Instruction No 26 of the Respondent distribution licensee;
- (31) Forum after examining the Sales Manual of the Respondent HPSEBL, finds that this is an internal document of the Respondent carrying therein instructions to the field units with regard to common operational procedures to be adopted by them. Therefore, when statute under the Electricity Act, 2003 has already been laid down and notified by the HP Electricity Commission and the Central Electricity Authority (CEA) by way of the HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 and the CEA (Installation and Operation of meters) Regulations respectively, then this Sales Manual in the opinion of the Forum does not supersede the said prevailing statute and thus cannot help the Forum in determining the instant complaint, which has to be based upon the prevailing statute. Forum after placing reliance on the statute notified under the Act, proceeds to determine the instant complaint-
- (32) Forum further observes from examination of complaint that the Complainant has neither denied the consumption of electricity nor denied over-drawl of demand (kVA/MVA) done during the past period nor has it disputed the replacement of metering equipment (CT/PT) by the Respondent nor is there challenge to the consequential application of new multiplication factor (MF) of 3.33 by the Respondent as being wrong in any way nor has it disputed the accuracy of the impugned monetary demand dated 25.05.2024

(**Annexure P1 Colly** with **Annexure A**). The Complainant has also not shown as to how is the action of the Respondent against the statute or mala-fide in any way;

- (33) The Complainant has simply contended that when it is the mistake of the Respondent to not apply the correct MF in the past or not sanction its enhancement of load in time, then the action of the Respondent to raise the impugned demand by application of new multiplication factor at a later stage and for charging contract demand violation charges (CDVC), is against the principles of legitimate expectations;
- (34) On the other hand, the Respondent has defended its action to raise monetary demand for past period arrears arising from application of correct MF, by stating that it is its right to recover arrears amount in accordance with section 56 of the Act including the said CDVC in accordance with HPERC Tariff Orders while at the same time citing and relying on Judgement passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in a similar matter of application of incorrect MF;
- (35) After examining the record, facts and settled position of law in the matter coupled with provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 and Regulations and Code notified by the Ld HPERC and Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC, it is established that in view of the settled position of law laid by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the matter titled as Assistant Engineer (D1) Ajmer Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd and Anr Vs Rahamutullah Khan alias Rahamjula in Civil Appeal No 1672/2020 decided on 18.02.2020 and M/s Prem Cottex Vs Uttar Haryana Vijli Vitran Ltd in Civil Appeal No7235 of 2009 decided on October 5, 2021, which is also referred to by the Respondent, the issue of recovery of past dues of arrears by the DISCOM is no more res-integra;
- (36) In the ibid Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 18.02.2020, which refers to other Judgments as well, electricity has been held to be 'goods' by a constitution bench of the Hon'ble Apex Court in a case titled State of Andhra Pradesh Vs National Thermal Power Corporation Ltd. Further, as also referred to in the Judgment ibid,

under the Sale of Goods Act, 1930, a purchaser of goods is liable to pay for it at the time of purchase or consumption and that the quantum and time of payment may be ascertained post facto either by way of an agreement or the relevant statute;

- (37) It is therefore clear from settled law that while the consumer uses electricity being a good, the distribution licensee charges for this electricity / good at the specified tariffs/ charges of electricity, which in the State of Himachal Pradesh are determined by the Ld HP Electricity Regulatory Commission (HPERC) vide its Tariff Orders passed in pursuance to Regulations framed under the Electricity Act, 2003. Thereafter, these tariffs / charges are applied to the goods purchased which here is the electricity consumption done by a consumer and thereafter a Bill or monetary demand is raised to the consumer;
- (38) Further, this Forum is of the considered opinion that the Respondent HPSEBL being a distribution licensee cannot recover any tariff / charges in excess of that specified by the Ld HPERC. These Tariff Orders lay out statutory charges. At the same time, it is also relevant in the context of the instant matter, that the Respondent HPSEBL being a distribution licensee, is bound to recover the cost / price of electricity consumed by a consumer. This accordingly has strictly to be as per tariffs /charges that are determined and specified by the Ld HPERC vide its Tariff Orders. Accordingly, the consumer is bound to pay for the electricity consumption at the determined tariffs / charges being of statutory nature. Any lapse, mistake or bona-fide error by the distribution licensee with regard to under recovery of actual tariff / cost / price of electricity, if not recovered from the respective consumer, who has availed the goods, may result either in permanent financial loss to the distribution licensee being a regulated public utility or with the burdening of this utility's loss upon other consumers. Both of these situations or eventualities are bad and against mandated provisions of Tariff Regulations on the matter;

- (39) Forum is also of the considered opinion that short recording or non-recording or incorrect recording of actual consumption by personnel or systems of distribution licensee / utility, results in loss to the distribution licensee / utility and a free ride to the consumer which cannot be allowed. Thus, Complainant is liable to make good any such loss to the Respondent and make payments towards the full metered consumption for the sole reason that electricity/energy to that extent has actually been consumed by the consumer. Here, the monies involved are not of individuals but of a regulated entity, being a Company. No one is entitled to adversely use the deficiencies in a system to their advantage, such as to cause loss in any way to the distribution licensee / utility. Not allowing such loss to be recovered likely results in malpractices and connivances which are detrimental to the system;
- (40) In the matter, this Forum concludes that the Respondent HPSEBL did make a bona-fide mistake / error in the past by missing to raise statutory amounts in the original electricity bill arising out of less recording of consumption due to error or mistake of wrong application of multiplication factor (MF) of 1.66 instead of 3.33, which resulted in less consumption being billed to the Complainant in the past and which went unnoticed for some time. The Complainant has actually consumed electricity which is more than that which was originally billed and this fact is not in dispute by the Complainant. From perusal of statute, Forum finds that the Respondent is certainly within its legal rights to replace defective metering equipment in accordance with the said CEA Metering Regulations and the Electricity Supply Code notified by the CEA and the HPERC respectively and further to recover the statutory charges towards the actual consumption made by the Complainant by raising monetary demand towards past arrears or dues of statutory nature, not raised earlier due to any mistake as has been held in Hon'ble Apex Court Judgment dated 18.02.2020 in Civil Appeal 1672/2020 while interpreting section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. However, onus

would still lie on the Complainant to show that such arrears have been calculated wrongly;

- (41) Having gone through the instant case and having heard the matter by way of arguments extended by the parties, this Forum holds that there was mistake or bona-fide error by the Respondent HPSEBL in not applying the correct multiplication factor (MF) of 3.33 to the metered consumption of the Complainant during the past period. Multiplication factor (MF) is a condition of metering / meter reading. Non application of correct MF has caused error in recorded consumption resulting in the Complainant being billed in the past for less electricity consumed as against its actual electricity consumption. This eventually resulted in arising of past arrears / dues recoverable from the Complainant;
- (42) Forum, on the anvil of ibid interpretation rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court, holds that the Complainant as the purchaser of goods of the form of electricity consumed in the past, was liable to pay for it at the time of purchase or consumption in accordance with the prevailing statute. The Respondent in the past had erred in not fully charging for this electricity / good at the specified tariffs/ charges of electricity. However, on this error being later noticed and pointed by the M&T lab on 16.05.2024 (**Annexure RA-4**), the Respondent raised the impugned demand upon the Complainant only for the shortfall in electricity consumption which remained unrecorded in the past. Forum holds that the Complainant is liable to pay the same.
- (43) Forum further holds that by charging for the actual electricity consumption made by the Complainant based on correct MF and at Ld HPERC determined Tariffs, it cannot be said that the Complainant is being punished. The Respondent is liable to recover ex post facto for the shortfall of statutory charge not billed earlier, which the Complainant is liable to pay towards the consumption of goods done by it, if not paid earlier and accordingly the Forum does not find any violation of principles of legitimate expectation in the matter;

- (44) Further, in Reply by the Respondent Forum finds mention of applicability of section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003 to the drawl of demand by the Complainant in excess of the Contract Demand. Here, Forum does not observe that the Respondent has any-where raised objection with regard to complaint having wrongly been filed before this Forum nor raised the issue of maintainability on grounds of ibid section 126. Further, Forum no-where finds, neither in the Electricity Act, 2003 nor in the Supply Code that the Contract Demand violation results in unauthorised use of electricity or assessment there-against. Thus for the Respondent to even state application of section 126 in the present matter, Forum holds such to be wrong and out rightly rejects the same;
- (45) Further, on Complainant's allegation of submission of case for enhancement of power load in November 2023 by it which is still pending with the Respondent, Forum finds such allegation not to be relevant in the facts and circumstances of the instant matter and accordingly rejects the same;
- (46) It is observed from the complaint that the Complainant has paid some amount towards the impugned demand dated 25.05.2024 (**Annexure P1**) for Rs 29,41,028/-. Thus no question of considering payment in instalments, as prayed by the Complainant, exists at this stage;
- (47) Now coming to the Complainant's contention with regard to Contract Demand Violation Charges (CDVC), that had it been informed in the start, it could have taken corrective measures. Forum from examination of Annexure A to impugned Demand dated 25.05.2024 (**Annexure P1**) observes that before the issue of wrong application of MF arose in the instant matter, the Complainant was not in violation of contract demand which has been linked to a higher tariff in the Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC and which is apparent from the said Annexure A. However, when the bona-fide error was noticed or discovered by the Respondent and correct MF applied to the consumption of the Complainant, then by virtue of computation, Complainant's Maximum Demand (in kVA) by default resulted in

Contract Demand (in kVA) of 320 kVA being exceeded, further resulting in the Contract Demand violation. From perusal of Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC, Forum finds that this CDVC is linked to a higher special tariff. Forum understands and to an extent agrees that the Complainant within its ignorance of the condition of wrong application of MF, was never in any position to see the violation and accordingly to take corrective action either of managing its actual Maximum Demand or for enhancement of its Contract Demand;

- (48) Complainant has no-where denied that it was not consuming electricity. Forum is aware that consumption of electricity results in demand (in kVA). For demand not exceeding contract demand, Forum is also aware that the Complainant is charged normal demand charges (Rs) at the rates specified by the Ld HPERC. However, when Complainant is not at fault while there is a bona-fide error on the part of the Respondent, Forum holds that Complainant cannot be held to be at fault or in violation under the typical circumstances confronted by the Complainant. Here equitable treatment necessitates that when the Complainant is not at fault while there is a bona-fide error on the part of the Respondent, then for the months for which the CDVC has been raised by the Respondent at a higher rate on the part of demand (in kVA) in excess of the Contract Demand (in kVA), then the Complainant is certainly entitled to relief under the presumption that there is no violation. However, as prayed by the Complainant, Forum cannot accept complete waiver of the CDVC. Under the facts and circumstances of the instant matter, Forum further holds that the Complainant's part of demand (in kVA) in excess of the Contract Demand (in kVA) has also to now be charged at normal rates of demand charges (Rs/kVA) and CDVC to be revised accordingly;
- (49) In view of foregoing, no illegality is observed in the impugned demand dated 25.05.2024 (**Annexure P1**) for Rs 29,41,028/-. This impugned demand being a legal one is upheld to the extent as aforesaid. In the first instance, Complainant is directed that it shall

within a period of 10 days from this Order, pay in full the impugned demand after deducting the monies already paid against this Demand;

- (50) Further, in view of reasons laid out and consequent relief granted by the Forum in paras supra, the Respondent against the CDVC charged for the months of February 2024 to May 2024 (as reflected in Annexure A of Annexure 1), is subsequently directed to re-compute the demand charges for the demand (in kVA) in excess of the Contract Demand (in kVA) also at normal rates of Demand Charges. Forum observes that this amount reflected in said Annexure A towards the CDVC is Rs 4,29,468/- which shall now be required to be determined afresh at normal rates by the Respondent. Thereafter, Respondent is directed that any excess recovered by it on account of CDVC as a result, be refunded in the next electricity bill to be raised upon the Complainant.

On aforesaid terms, the complaint is decided on merits and is **Partly Allowed** and is 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.: - 3157/202407/20**

**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. 3157/202407/20**

**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**

**Complaint No. 3157/202407/20**

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.