

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM, SHIMLA

Complaint No 1421/202608/14

M/s Parwanoo Industries Association

Vs

Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd & Others

ORDER

- (1) The present complaint has been filed under Regulations 16, 17 and 18 of HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013 by Parwanoo Industries Association, House No. 11, Sector-3, Parwanoo, Distt. Solan (H.P.), registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, bearing Registration No. 6015/87 through its authorized representative, Sh. Rakesh Bansal, nominated by the Honorary Secretary General on 26.07.2026 (Annexure C4).
- (2) The Complainant has stated that it is a registered voluntary consumer association representing various industrial consumers of Parwanoo industrial area and filed this complaint under Regulation 3(1)(d) (ii) of ibid Regulations in the larger common or similar interest of consumers. The grievance relates to disconnection/reconnection charges debited in the electricity bills of its member consumers under Electrical Sub-Division, Parwanoo (Annexure C1).
- (3) The complainant has further stated that amounts of Rs.500/-, Rs.1,000/- and Rs.1,500/- were debited in different consumer accounts as sundry charges/arrears on the basis of audit observations. According to the Complainant, the supply of the concerned consumers had neither been physically disconnected and nor reconnected thereafter.
- (4) The complainant has placed on record Annexure C1 containing the details of 25 affected consumer under Parwanoo Sub-Division along with copies of their electricity bills. Through Annexure C3, particulars of certain similar charges appearing in consumer accounts of some other Sub-Divisions were also placed on record to support the plea that the matter was not confined to Parwanoo alone.

- (5) The case of the Complainant is that disconnection/reconnection charges can be levied only where such service has actually been rendered. The Complainant relied upon the Appendix-A: Schedule of General and Service Charges to the Business Plan and MYT Order for 5th Control Period (FY25-29) approved by Hon'ble Commission (Annexure C5). The Complainant also relied upon paragraph 5.2.5(b) of the Himachal Pradesh Electricity Supply Code, 2009 regarding billing of arrears arising out of under-assessment or checking.
- (6) The Complainant pray for reversal/refund of the disputed charges. It also sought a direction to the Chief Engineer (Commercial) for issuance of a State-wide advisory/circular so that similar disconnection/reconnection charges were not debited merely on the basis of audit observations where no physical disconnection had taken place.
- (7) The Respondents (HPSEBL) opposed the complaint and raised objections regarding maintainability, jurisdiction, locus of the Association and limitation. It was also submitted that some of the reliefs sought by the Complainant were beyond the jurisdiction of the Forum.
- (8) On factual grievance, however, the Respondents examined the relevant record. In their reply, they stated that no physical disconnection had taken place in respect of the concerned consumers. The disputed disconnection/reconnection charges were thereafter reversed and credited back in the accounts of the 25 consumers under ESD Parwanoo vide Sundry item No. 289/48 and the said credit shall be reflected in the respective electricity bills for October, 2026.
- (9) The Complainant filed a rejoinder and acknowledged the corrective action taken by the Respondents. It sought wider directions so that similar charges were not levied in cases where no physical disconnection had taken place.

- (10) During the final hearing, authorised representative of the Complainant, submitted a separate written statement before the Forum. He stated that the disputed amount involved in the present complaint had already been refunded by the respondent, as stated in the reply filed by the Respondent.
- (11) He further stated that, in view of the refund, nothing remained to be adjudicated in the present complaint. He requested that the complaint be disposed of as settled without going into the merits of the case or other consequential issues.
- (12) The Forum has considered the complaint, reply, rejoinder, documents placed on record and the written statement of the authorised representative of the Complainant. The parties have also been heard. The Respondents has raised objections regarding maintainability, jurisdiction and limitation in their reply. However, during the pendency of the complaint, the Respondents examined the matter and refunded the disputed amount through sundry item. In view of this subsequent development and statement made by the Complainant, learned counsel for the Respondent did not press these preliminary objections for adjudication. He also submitted that, having regard to nature of the grievance, suitable general advice may be issued to the concerned authorities of the Respondents for dealing with similar matters in accordance with the applicable provisions.
- (13) Regulation 16 of the HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013 provides for approaching the Forum in matters falling within its jurisdiction. Regulation 17 provides for scrutiny of the complaint. Regulation 19 lays down the limitations and other conditions under which a grievance may be rejected.
- (14) In the facts of the present case and submission of the Respondents, the Forum does not consider it necessary to decide preliminary objections raised by the Respondents. The disputed amount has already been

reversed by the Respondents and the Complainant has accepted the same.

- (15) The Complainant has also made a clear statement that nothing further remains to be adjudicated. A finding on maintainability, jurisdiction or limitation is therefore not required for disposal of the present complaint. These questions are left open.
- (16) The Forum also does not find it necessary to examine each disputed debit separately. The Respondents have themselves stated that no physical disconnection had taken place in the concerned cases and have reversed the charges.
- (17) The Complainant has also placed on record details of similar charges in certain other Sub-Divisions. Those consumer accounts have not been individually examined in these proceedings. No finding can therefore be given regarding their liability or entitlement to refund.
- (18) However, the action taken by the Respondents in the present 25 accounts shows that the matter required re-examination at their own level. Where a charge is linked with disconnection or reconnection of supply, its levy must be supported by the facts of the particular case and the applicable charges and regulatory provisions.
- (19) The competent authority of Respondents is, therefore, advised to examine whether similar disconnection/reconnection charges have been raised in other cases where no actual disconnection or reconnection had taken place. If such cases are found, appropriate action may be taken in accordance with the applicable Tariff Order, Supply Code and Regulations.
- (20) The competent authority may also consider issuing suitable instructions to the concerned field offices and audit offices so that such charges are raised only where they are supported by the applicable provisions and on the factual record.

- (21) In view of the refund of the disputed amount and the written statement of the authorised representative of the Complainant, Complaint is disposed of as settled and satisfied.
- (22) No opinion is expressed on the objections regarding maintainability, jurisdiction and limitation. The advisory given above shall also not be treated as a direction for refund in any individual account not examined in the present proceedings.

The complaint is disposed of on aforesaid terms.

Parties are left to bear their own costs.

Order is announced today on 23.09.2026 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.

(Rakesh Chand Negi)
(Member)

(Madan Dhiman)
(Member)

(Harinder Thakur)
(Chairman)

CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI-9.

No. CGRF/Complaint No. 1421/202608/14

Dated: -

Complaint No.: - 1421/202608/14
Date of Admission: - 11.08.2026
Quorum: - Er. Harinder Thakur, Chairman.
Er. Rakesh Chand Negi, Member.
Er. Madan Dhiman, Member.

M/s Parwanoo Industries Association,
Plot No.4 A Sector-2, Parwanoo,
District Solan (HP). 173320

Complainant

V/s.

1. The Chief Auditor, HPSEBL,
Vidyut Bhawan Shimla,
Shimla-171004.
2. The Chief Engineer (Comm.)
HPSEBL, Vidyut Bhawan,
Shimla-171004.
3. The Executive Engineer,
Electrical Division HPSEBL
Parwanoo, Distt, Solan HP.
4. The Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Sub-Division HPSEBL,
Parwanoo, Distt. Solan HP.

Respondents

Complaint Regarding: -

Final hearing: -

16.09.2026

Present for: -

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Complainant | 1. Sh. Rakesh Bansal (A.R) |
| Respondent | 1. Sh. Kamlesh Saklani, Deputy Secretary (Law).
2. Sh. Rajesh Kashyap, Ld. Advocate. |

Date of Decision: -

23.09.2026

CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI SHIMLA-171009.

No. CGRF/Complaint No. 1421/202608/14

Dated:-

M/s Parwanoo Industries Association,
Plot No.4 A Sector-2, Parwanoo,
District Solan (HP). 173320

Complainant

V/s.

HPSEBL & Others.

Respondents

Complaint No. 1421/202608/14

1. The Chief Auditor, HPSEBL,
Vidyut Bhawan Shimla,
Shimla-171004.
2. The Chief Engineer (Comm.)
HPSEBL, Vidyut Bhawan,
Shimla-171004.
3. The Executive Engineer,
Electrical Division HPSEBL
Parwanoo, Distt, Solan HP.
4. The Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Sub-Division HPSEBL,
Parwanoo, Distt. Solan HP.

Respondents

The Certified copy of final order dated 23.09.2026 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.