CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM, SHIMLA

Complaint No 1431/202507/19

M/s Pooja Cotspin Pvt. Ltd

Vs

Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd and ors

Complaint No 1431/202507/20

M/s GC Fibers

Vs

Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd and ors

BRIEF FACTS OF CASES–

(1) Complaints have been filed under regulation 16, 17 and 18 of the HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013 by Large Industrial Power Supply (LIPS) consumers of the HP State Electricity Board Ltd -

(a) **Complaint No 1431/202507/19:** M/s Pooja Cotspin Pvt Ltd – Village Sallewal, Tehsil Nalagarh H.P 174101, bearing Account No 100012000781, (hereinafter referred to as complaint No '19);

(b) **Complaint No 1431/202507/20:** M/s GC Fibers, Village Sallewal, Tehsil Nalagarh, HP-174101, bearing Account No 100012000783, (hereinafter referred to as complaint No '20);

(2) In these matters, the HP State Electricity Board Ltd is the distribution licensee and the Respondent herein;

(3) During the proceedings in the matters, after the Forum had passed Orders on 20.08.2025 for final hearing in the matters on 03.09.2025, the Complainants herein under Regulation 28(1)(a), by way of Applications No 30 and 31 had on 01.09.2025 approached the Ld Ombudsman, wherein the Ld Ombudsman while dismissing these Applications was pleased to pass Orders on 04.09.2025 as follows:-

Application No 30:

"*As this authority has not passed any order as yet, the Complaint filed by M/s G.C Fibers Ltd., Village Sallewl, Tehsil Nalagarh, Distt. Solan, H.P.-174101 is hereby disposed as dismissed and in due cognizance to the* ***'Hierarchy of Adjudication system' with further directions to Id. CGRF to first decide the matter and liberty to the Complainant to file afresh representation in line with the order to be passed by the ld. CGRF, if impugned.***"

Application No 31

"*As this authority has not passed any order as yet, the Complaint filed by M/s Pooja Cotspin Pvt. Ltd., Village Sallewl, Tehsil Nalagarh, Distt. Solan, H.P.-174101 is hereby disposed as dismissed and in due cognizance to the* ***'Hierarchy of Adjudication system' with further directions to Id. CGRF to first decide the matter and liberty to the***

Complainant to file afresh representation in line with the order to be passed by the ld. CGRF, if impugned."

(4) Complainants are primarily aggrieved by the non-action of the Respondent to give rebates for additional consumption over previous year's consumption as well as rebates on approved energy charges, to existing industries which have undergone expansion/ undergoing expansion (hereinafter referred to as expansion rebate), as provided in Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC;

(5) In the instant complaints, grievances of the Complainants are that pursuant to provisions on rebates in respect of additional consumption contained in Tariff Orders for FY19 and FY20 with regard to complaint No'19 and Tariff Order for FY20 and FY25 with regard to complaint No'20 and provision on rebates for expansions as provided in Tariff Order for FY21 with regard to both complaints, the Respondent has not charged correct tariff by not allowing for these rebates. Further, because of the delay in not allowing these rebates, the Respondent is liable to pay Interest as per Clause 5.7.3 of the HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009;

(6) Grounds for grievance raised by the Complainants are that the Respondent being bound by law is liable to issue bills as per tariff determined by the Ld HPERC under Section 62 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and therefore the distribution licensee is in breach of terms under the HPERC (General Conditions of Distribution Licensee) Regulations, 2004 and can even attract suspension / termination of distribution license. Further, Section 62(6) of the Act, clearly bars over recovery in terms of price or charge;

(7) Complainants have submitted claims of rebates as follows:-

(a) **In complaint No '19:-** Claim of Rs 12,93,562.63 (**Annexure C-6**) towards additional consumption done in FY19 over the consumption done in FY18 (Tariff Order for FY19 dated 04.05.2018 with Tariffs and other charges to come into force from 01.04.2018) and claim of Rs 2,04,961.58 (**Annexure C-7**) towards additional consumption done in FY20 (Tariff Order dated 29.06.2019 for FY20 with Tariffs and other charges to come into force from 01.07.2019) over the consumption done in FY19. Further the sanction for load extension was done by the Respondent vide Office Order dated 26.03.2018 and Sundry Job Order issued by the Respondent on 03.04.2018 (**Annexure C-1 Colly**). Accordingly, with regard to expansion carried out before 26.03.2018 / 03.04.2018**,** claim of Rs 23,94,034.52 (**Annexure C-8**) for the period from May 2018 to April 2021, simpliciter based on Tariff Order for FY21 **(Annexure C-3 Colly)** dated 06.06.2020 (with Tariffs and other charges to come into force from 01.06.2020)**;**

(b) **In complaint No ’20:-** Claim of Rs 11,15,524.95 (**Annexure C-6**) towards additional consumption done in FY20 (Tariff Order for FY20 dated 29.06.2019 with Tariffs and other charges to come into force from 01.07.2019) over the consumption done in FY19 and claim of Rs 63,000.73 (**Annexure C-8**) towards additional consumption done in FY25 (Tariff Order for FY25 dated 15.03.2024) over the maximum of consumption done in FY22, FY23 and FY24. Further the sanction for load extension was done by the Respondent vide Office Order dated 03.08.2018 (**Annexure C-1**). Accordingly, with regard to expansion carried out before 03.08.2018**,** claim of Rs 44,23,682.03 (**Annexure C-7**) for the period from October 2018 to September 2021, simpliciter based on Tariff Order for FY21 **(Annexure C-3 Colly)** dated 06.06.2020 (with Tariffs and other charges to come into force from 01.06.2020)**;**

(c) In both the complaints, entitlement of rebate for night time consumption, peak hour consumption and Interest has also been raised on grounds that the Respondent was aware of the load extension done by it;

(8) On foregoing grounds, facts and submissions, the Complainants have sought relief in terms of directions to the Respondent to overhaul past bills during eligibility period of expansion rebate as well as additional consumption rebate and to refund the difference whatsoever and also

to direct Respondent to pay Interest in accordance with Clause 5.7.3 of the HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009;

(9) On the other hand, it is the case of the Respondent that the complaints with regard to respective claims pertaining to years FY19, FY20 are barred by limitation of 2 years as provided in regulation 19(c) of the HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013. Further, the expansion rebate in complaint No ’19 is not eligible for the reason that the expansion was carried out before Office Order for load extension dated 26.03.2018 and therefore provisions of relevant Tariff Orders are not applicable. Further, with regard to claim in complaint No ’20 pertaining to FY25, whatever admissible rebate entitlement shall be given;

(10) Still further, that the provisions on Interest contained in 5.7.3 of the of the HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 are not applicable as present case is beyond the scope and definition of billing disputes. Further, Interest if any to be paid is to be from the date of representation or filing of complaint;

(11) Respondent has prayed for dismissing the complaints being merit less.

(12) On foregoing facts and circumstances, Forum finds that the nature of complaints being similar, these are hereby disposed by common Order –

ORDER

(13) Forum has examined the relevant provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, various relevant Regulations framed by the Ld HP Electricity Regulatory Commission (or the HPERC) including relevant provisions of the HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013 (or in short referred as the ‘CGRF Regulations 2013’), HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 (or in short referred as ‘the Supply Code 2009’) and amendments thereto, relevant Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC and record as facts along with pleadings of the parties. Forum has heard the parties

present on the dates of admission and final hearing. The considered opinion of the Forum has been gathered after considering the fair facts, evidences and correspondence placed on record and pleadings of the parties;

(14) At the outset Forum observes that the Complainants herein, at the behest of Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC, have raised multiple issues with regard to rebates for additional consumption and for expansion rebates arising in past years during different time periods;

(15) Before the Forum delves on the claim of rebates made in the instant complaints, Forum finds it imperative to reproduce for sake of convenience the provisions of rebates contained under Schedule - Large Industrial Power Supply (LIPS) in various Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC and which have been relied upon by the Complainant –

(a) Tariff Order passed on 04.05.2018 by the Ld HPERC for FY 2018-19 (applicable w.e.f 01.04.2018 to 30.06.2019)-

<u>Quote</u>

……
……
3. Two part Tariff
……
……
b) Energy charge (Charges-2)
……
……
**Note*:

a. For existing industrial consumers, a rebate of 10% on energy charges shall be applicable for additional power consumption beyond the level of FY 2017-18

b. For new industries coming into production after 01.04.2018 the energy charges shall be 10% lower than the approved energy charges for the respective category for a period of 3 years

……
……
c) Demand Charge (Charges-3)
……
……
4. Peak load charges (PLC)
……
……

<u>Un-Quote</u>

(b) Tariff Order passed on 29.06.2019 by the Ld HPERC for FY 2019-20 (applicable w.e.f 01.07.2019 to 31.05.2020) --

Quote

……

……

3. Two part Tariff

……

……

b) Energy charge (Charges-2)

……

……

***Note**:

a. For existing industrial consumers, a rebate of 15% on energy charges shall be applicable for additional power consumption beyond the level of FY 2018-19

b. For new industries which have come into production between 1.04.2018 to 30.06.2019, the energy charges shall be 10% lower than the approved energy charges for the respective category for a period of 3 years

c. For new industries coming into production after 01.07.2019 the energy charges shall be 15% lower than the approved energy charges for the respective category for a period of 3 years

……

……

c) Demand Charge (Charges-3)

……

……

4. Peak load charges (PLC)

……

……

Un-Quote

(c) Tariff Order passed on 06.06.2020 by the Ld HPERC for FY 2020-21 (applicable w.e.f 01.06.2020 to 31.05.2021) --

Quote

……

……

3. Two part Tariff

……

……

b) Energy charge (Charges-2)

……

……

***Note**:

a. For new industries coming into production after 01.06.2020, the energy charges shall be 10% lower than the approved energy charges for the respective category for a period of 3 years.

b. For existing industries which have undergone expansion in the FY 2018-19 onwards and/or shall be undergoing expansion in this financial year i.e. FY2020-21, energy charges shall be 10% lower than the approved energy charges corresponding to the respective category for a period of three years for quantum of energy consumption corresponding to proportionate increase in contract demand.

Provided that such expansion if undertaken during 1.07.2019 to 31.05.2020, the energy charges shall be 15% lower than the approved energy charges for the respective category for a period of 3 years for quantum of energy consumption corresponding to proportionate increase in contract demand.

……

……

4. Peak load charges (PLC)

……

……

Un-Quote

(d) Tariff Order passed on 15.03.2024 by the Ld HPERC for FY 2024-25 (applicable w.e.f 01.04.2024 to 31.03.2025) –

Quote

13. Rebate for New and Expansion Industries:

…...

……

c. For existing industries, which have undergone expansion during 01.06.2020 to 31.05.2021, Energy Charges shall be 10% lower than the approved Energy Charges corresponding to the respective Category for a period of three years for quantum of energy consumption corresponding to proportionate increase in Contract Demand.

Provided that such expansion, if undertaken during 01.06.2021 to 31.03.2024 and/or shall be undergoing expansion on or after 01.04.2024, the Energy Charges shall be 15% lower than the approved Energy Charges for the respective Category for a period of 3 years for quantum of energy consumption corresponding to proportionate increase in Contract Demand.

d. Example: In case of Contracted Demand is increased by an industry from 2 MVA to 3 MVA, the monthly units consumption for the purpose of lower Energy Charges shall be considered in proportion of the Original Contracted Demand and increased Contracted Demand. i.e., in case of the monthly consumption is 6 LUs, the lower Energy Charges shall be applicable on 2 LUs while 4 LUs shall be billed at the regular Energy Charge.

e. The above-mentioned rebate on Energy Charges shall be applicable during normal and peak hours. In case of night hours, night-time concession shall only apply.

f. For those industries having operation for more than three years in the State and are the electricity consumers of the HPSEBL, the energy charges shall be 15% lower than the approved Energy Charges for the respective category for quantum of energy consumption corresponding to additional energy consumption over and above that of maximum of the yearly consumptions of the last three financial years only. The quantity of additional energy consumption for the purpose of the rebate will be worked out at the end of the financial year. The amount of rebate will be calculated multiplying the quantum of additional energy consumption to the 15% rate of normal energy charges for the corresponding tariff category as determined by the Commission for the period applicable. It is also to clarify that in case any industrial consumer is availing the benefit of reduced energy charges in case of the increase in their contract demand shall not be eligible for availing the benefit of this new rebate introduced from 01.04.2024.

….

….

Un-Quote

(16) Forum now proceeds to examine the claims on expansion rebate made by the Complainants. From perusal of the provisions of expansion rebates in Tariff Orders reproduced foregoing and after perusal of

HPERC Supply Code, 2009 / Regulations notified by the HPERC, Forum observes that the provisions on expansion rebates are specific only to the Tariff Orders and no provisions exist in the Supply Code nor in other Regulations which may regulate this rebate. This 'expansion' rebate is a tariff provision to be computed on the energy consumption corresponding to proportionate increase in Contract Demand (in kVA). However, before such rebate is computed it becomes incumbent upon the Respondent to first determine and decide expansion;

(17) Forum now proceeds to understand the term 'expansion' ibid. In the opinion of the Forum, the term 'expansion' in the instant matters cannot be simpliciter. It is a known fact that the term 'expansion' implies physical increase of factors such as size, number, importance etc. Forum observes that what may constitute expansion in industry, has not been defined in the ibid Tariff Orders nor is it regulated by way of Supply Code / Regulations so as to enable the Respondent to assess the nature, fact and effective time of expansion for the purpose of allowing the said expansion rebate. This nature and fact may also be with regard to whether industries expansion results from merging or undergoing increase/decrease in production or increase/decrease of capital/manpower with or without increase in capacity or the point of start/end of capital infusion or some yardstick which may be as per the electricity distribution licensee's technical standards;

(18) Here, even the perception of expansion between the consumer and the distribution is bound to differ. For an electricity distribution licensee, obviously the addition of buildings, structures, manpower, capital infusion in company, investments in other companies etc cannot be construed as expansion so as to become the basis to give rebates on electrical consumption. A consumer may be inclined to consider factors like enhancement of maximum demand occurring in a month or enhancement in Contract Demand (Temporary or Permanent) or even a letter by the Industries Department of the Government as expansion, whereas the distribution licensee may be inclined to

consider some other factor of enhancement as expansion. Even the enhancement of any factor done in different time periods, may be construed differently by the two. A consumer may be inclined to consider an enhancement of any factor done during different time periods to mean expansion within each period whereas the distribution licensee may be inclined to consider some other effective date for the purpose of such enhancement, thus resulting in different perceptions of enhancement by the two;

(19) Forum in the instant matter clearly finds that the term ‘expansion’ in Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC, has not been defined and is also not regulated by way of Supply Code / Regulations notified by the HPERC, which may enable the Respondent to first decide on expansion and thereafter to allow rebates on the same;

(20) Thus, before the said expansion rebates are allowed by the distribution licensee to a consumer, at the outset it becomes imperative for it to conclusively confirm expansion and also its effective date for the purpose of entitlement/ eligibility of such rebates by the consumer. Forum holds that the Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC do not define the term ‘expansion’ and neither do the Supply Code / Regulations notified by the HPERC regulate the said expansion for the purpose of allowing the expansion rebates specified in these Tariff Orders and accordingly difficulty arises before the Respondent to implement rebates while at the same time difficulty has arisen before the Forum to pass Orders on such expansion rebate;

(21) It therefore becomes clear to the Forum as to why has the Respondent in unambiguous terms, not raised any contention on the expansion carried out by the Complainants and consequently on the entitlement or eligibility of the expansion rebate by them;

(22) Forum now proceeds to examine the claims on additional consumption over previous year(s) for the years FY19, FY20, FY25 which have also been raised by the Complainants. Forum finds these having been raised straight before this Forum and not before the

Respondent. Forum does not find anything on record that may show that the Complainants may have ever approached the Respondent for settlement of their grievances as is also mandated under code 5.7.2 of the HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 notified by the HPERC;

(23) With regard to claims for rebates on additional consumption over previous year(s) for FY19 and FY20 which have been raised by the Complainants directly before this Forum, Forum also finds that these claims have been raised alongside claims for expansion rebates and that the period of these overlap. Forum does not find any provision in the Tariff Orders reproduced foregoing, that entitles a consumer to two rebates during the same period simultaneously i.e rebate on consumption arising on account of expansion and rebate for additional consumption arising during the same period. Accordingly Forum holds that difficulty has arisen before the Forum to pass any Order on these claims of Complainants as well;

(24) Forum is also of the considered view that it is incumbent upon a consumer to approach the distribution licensee accompanied with a claim for the rebates specified. This is on similar analogy of an electricity bill raised by the distribution licensee upon the consumer despite consumer being in knowledge or aware of the metered energy consumption done by it as has also been argued by the Complainant. Only on receipt of this claim can the distribution licensee decide on the entitlement, eligibility, effective date and validity of such claims for the purpose of allowing rebates as may be specified in Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC;

(25) The above can clearly be observed from the claim of expansion rebate raised in complaint No '19 where Forum finds that the Complainant has raised claim against rebate for expansion based on the Sundry Job Order (SJO) issued by the Respondent on 03.04.2018, which in the opinion of the Forum, the Complainant's claim for rebate based upon such sundry order is clearly based on faulty premise. It is clearly a wrong argument that the issue date of this sundry order is the date of Complainant's expansion. The date of SJO for release of load by the

Respondent cannot remotely imply expansion. Here any expansion alleged to have been done by the Complainant has to pre-date the sanction letter dated 26.03.2018 issued by the Respondent for the extension of load from 1934.73 kW to 2834.73 kW and therefore the alleged expansion at the best pertains to the year FY2017-18 or FY18 and clearly not FY19. Thus validation by the Respondent of any claim by the Complainant is essential as well as necessary;

(26) Further, the necessity of validation of a claim by the Respondent can also be observed from the Tariff Order for FY21 **(Annexure C-3 Colly)** passed by the Ld HPERC on 06.06.2020 and which in its opening pages clearly specifies the Tariffs and other charges to come into force from 01.06.2020. Thus validation is the right of the Respondent to verify the applicability of statute. When the provisions on expansion rebates specified in the Tariff Order are read vis-à-vis the applicability of these Orders, then even in the opinion of the Forum, the Tariff Order for FY21 and the provisions therein on expansion rebates, cannot become applicable in the instant complaints which have to be verified and thus both the Complainants herein would not automatically become entitled to any expansion rebate;

(27) Still further after examination of provisions of Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC, Forum does not find any provision in the relevant Orders for FY19 and FY20 that may entitle the Complainants to rebates on night time and peak hour consumption. The provision of rebate is clearly only enshrined under the normal energy charges and not under night time and peak hour charges and thus applicable to only normal hours. In context of the Complainants reference to Respondent’s letter dated 24.08.2020, Forum holds that such letter cannot have any overriding effect on the Orders passed by the Ld HPERC. Thus necessity of verification of a claim by the Respondent shall again become essential;

(28) Thus, Forum holds that on a claim by the Complainants of rebate for expansion or for additional consumption or for both, it falls upon the Respondent to verify and accept such claim and therefore it becomes

incumbent upon the Complainant to file a claim before the Respondent which the Complainants have clearly failed to do. Argument by the Complainant with regard to assumption of knowledge by the Respondent of expansion or additional consumption done by it, clearly does not hold good and cannot sustain and is accordingly rejected. The Respondent is rightfully entitled to verify and validate for eligibility/ entitlement and effective date of expansion or for additional consumption, so as to enable it to pass the benefit of rebates as may be enshrined in the Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC;

(29) With regard to Complainant No ’20 in respect of claim of rebate on additional consumption for FY25 over previous year(s), Forum finds that the Respondent in its Reply has stated that “whatever admissible rebate entitlement is there shall be given to the complainant”. Accordingly, the Forum is not inclined to interfere and the Complainant is at liberty to approach the Respondent for the redressal of its grievance on this count;

(30) On foregoing facts and circumstances and contentions by the Complainant, it cannot be held by the Forum that the Respondent’s electricity bills raised upon the Complainant are incorrect. No-where has the Complainant shown to the Forum that the bills paid by the Complainant contained undue charges and neither can the Forum find any bill that may be disputed by the Complainant to carry undue charges. Non-inclusion of rebate in a bill by the Respondent does not make the bill to become not-due or erroneous. It has to be shown by the Complainant that the charges included in the bill were not due but were paid by the Complainant. Merely the non-inclusion of rebate by the Respondent in a bill does not make the bill to become erroneous. This rebate is separate and it may be a case that such rebate is also computed and paid separately by the Respondent. Further, as has already been held by the Forum in paras supra, the eligibility/entitlement for Rebate and its effective date, has to be assessed, validated and verified by the Respondent distribution

licensee on a claim which has to be raised by the Complainant and which the Forum finds as not having been done by the Complainants;

(31) Now coming to the grounds raised by the Complainants, Forum finds that these grounds have been raised on considerations of provisions of Section 62 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the HPERC (General Conditions of Distribution Licensee) Regulations, 2004. As per the Complainants, the Respondent is liable and bound under law to issue bills as per tariff determined under the said section which clearly bars over recovery in terms of price or charge and therefore the distribution licensee is in breach of terms and can even attract suspension / termination of distribution license;

(32) Forum observes that when the Tariff Orders are passed by the Ld HPERC, these have to be implemented by the Respondent distribution licensee. When the implementation includes determining and deciding eligibility/ entitlement and effective date of expansion for purpose of expansion rebates and rebates for additional consumption or for considering allowing the expansion rebates alongside claims of rebates for additional consumption, then it is not for the Forum to suggest or direct the Respondent on the levy of a particular tariff or rebate or the manner in which to do so. Therefore, it becomes clear to the Forum, that it is for the Respondent to observe the Tariff Orders and to implement these and accordingly it has been left to the Respondent distribution licensee to interpret, determine, decide and implement the rebates specified in the Tariff Orders;

(33) On perusal of the Electricity Act, 2003, it further becomes clear to the Forum, that if any person finds violation or contravention, then it is empowered under the Act to raise complaint under Section 142 of the Act. In the grounds of complaints raised by Complainants, referring therein to Section 62 of the Act, Forum observes that the Complainants have virtually raised the said contravention or violation under said Section 142 of the Act, which Forum finds as being beyond the jurisdiction of this Forum to redress. Accordingly, on the grounds raised by the Complainants, Forum holds that the instant

complaints get governed by section 142 of the Act and accordingly cannot fall within the jurisdiction of this Forum;

(34) In view of foregoing, Forum concludes that when the Electricity Act, 2003, the Regulations and the Codes notified by the HPERC under the Act are the basis for the Forum to determine and decide complaints and when these Regulations and the Codes do not regulate the term 'expansion' specified in Tariff Orders nor do the Tariff Orders specify any provision with regard to meting out simultaneous rebates for expansion as well as for additional consumption, then this Forum finds that it is unable to pass any directions in the instant complaints.

(35) Forum further concludes that on the grounds raised in the instant complaints, these complaints automatically get governed under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and thus cease to fall within the jurisdiction of this Forum and on this count too, this Forum is unable to pass any directions.

On aforesaid terms the Complainants are given liberty to approach the Ld HPERC. Accordingly, the instant complaints No 1431/202507/19 and No 1431/202507/20 respectively, are Dismissed;

Parties are left to bear their own costs.

Order is announced before the parties present today on 18.09.2025 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: 18.09.2025
Shimla

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

CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI, SHIMLA-9.

Complaint No.: -	**1431/202507/19**
Date of Admission:-	**15.07.2025**
Quorum: -	**Er. Tushar Gupta, Chairman**
	Er. Vikas Gupta, Member

In ref:-

M/s Pooja Cotspin Pvt. Ltd.
Village Sallewal, Tehsil Nalagarh,
District Solan (HP). 174101 **Complainant**

V/s.

HPSEBL & Others. **Respondents**

1. The Executive Director (Pers.),
HPSEBL,Vidyut Bhawan,
Shimla-171004.

2. The Sr. Executive Engineer
Electrical Division HPSEBL,
Nalagarh, District Solan (HP).

3. Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Sub-Division No.1, HPSEBL,
Nalagarh, District Solan HP. **Respondents**

Final hearing:- 04.09.2025.

Counsels:-

Complainant 1. Sh. Rakesh Bansal (Authorized Representative)

Respondent 1. Sh. Rajesh Kashyap, Advocate
2. Sh. Kamlesh Saklani, U.S. Law

Date of Decision:- 18.09.2025

Notice

Registered

CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI SHIMLA-171009.

No. CGRF/Complaint No. 1431/202507/19 Dated:-

M/s Pooja Cotspin Pvt. Ltd.
Village Sallewal, Tehsil Nalagarh,
District Solan (HP). 174101 **Complainant**

V/s.

HPSEBL & Others. **Respondents**

Complaint No. 1431/202507/19

1. The Executive Director (Pers.),
HPSEBL,Vidyut Bhawan,
Shimla-171004.

2. The Sr. Executive Engineer
Electrical Division HPSEBL,
Nalagarh, District Solan (HP).

3. Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Sub-Division No.1, HPSEBL,
Nalagarh, District Solan HP. **Respondents**

The Certified copy of final order dated 18.09.2025 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.