

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM, SHIMLA

Complaint No 1453/202510/30

M/s J.S.K International

Vs

**Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Limited (HPSEBL) &
Others**

Brief Facts of Complaint:

- (1) Complaint has been filed under the HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013 by Complainant M/s JSK International, Village Gullarwala, Vardhman Budh Road, P.O Baddi, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, HP-173205, who is a consumer of HPSEBL bearing consumer ID 100012002830 and the HPSEBL is the distribution licensee and Respondent herein;
- (2) Complainant is aggrieved by the Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**), vide which the monetary demand for Rs 5,71,412/- has been raised upon it by the Respondent with regard to a left out bill component pertaining to past electricity bill of December 2018 / January 2019. The Complainant has impugned / disputed this Demand Notice;

Complainant:

- (3) That the monetary demand dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) for Rs 5,71,412/- are disputed arrears which the Respondent has levied as sundry charges in electricity bill dated 09.07.2025 (**Annexure C1**);
- (4) That against the said monetary demand, it represented to the Respondent on 21.07.2025 (**Annexure C3**) which has been ignored and no action taken resulting in late payment surcharge accruing on the disputed amount and increasing this amount to Rs 5,80,423/- in the subsequent bill dated 10.09.2025 (**Annexure C5**). In this representation it had contested that the arrears were purely an accounting error on part of the Respondent and that actually an excess payment of Rs 1,95,836/- had been made by it as shown in detailed analysis (**Annexure C8**);

--/--
Member

--Sd--
Chairperson

- (5) That to prevent disconnection (**Annexure C4**) and further penalties, vide its letter dated 26.09.2025 (**Annexure C6**), it remitted Rs 5,80,423/- strictly under protest;
- (6) That the demand is barred by limitation under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003;
- (7) That the levy is factually unjustified because it stems from accounting error by the Respondent;
- (8) That the detailed calculation sheet (**Annexure C8**) proves excess payment of Rs 1,95,836/- by it;
- (9) That there is procedural violation of clause 5.2.5(b) of the Supply Code;
- (10) **Relief Sought:** For declaring the levy of arrears of Rs 5,71,412/- (charged as Rs 5,80,423/-) as unjustified, unlawful and barred by limitation under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and to refund the said Rs 5,80,423/- paid by it under protest on 26.09.2025 and also to refund the excess payment of Rs 1,95,836/- as per its analysis (**Annexure C8**), along with Interest on these refundable amounts.
- (11) **Rejoinder cum Written Arguments:**
 - (a) That its cause of action is against impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) for Rs 5,71,412/- and the Bill dated 09.07.2025 (**Annexure C1**) whereas the Respondent has enlarged the dispute by introducing new claims amounting to Rs 44,71,845/- which includes Electricity Duty recoverable amount of Rs 11,88,474.40 and other dues under Section 126 which were never a part of impugned demand notice;
 - (b) That the dispute regarding Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003 is currently pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh;

--//--
Member

--Sd--
Chairperson

- (c) That the Forum lacks jurisdiction over matters concerning Section 126 and submissions and calculations in this regard in the Reply must be ignored and struck off record;
- (d) That the reduction of arrears of approximately Rs 7.66 lacs in bill of January 2019 corresponds to ED amount of approximately Rs 7.71 lacs. The minor difference between the two is due to LPSC adjustments and the Respondent is now trying to reverse a valid credit;
- (e) That the ledger is unreliable and the impugned demand of Rs 5.71 lacs is based upon corrupted ledger. With regard to disputed arrears of Rs 5,71,412/- in impugned Demand Notice, it is stated by the Respondent that it is due to “less carry forward” attributable to data migration from HCL to SAP, which is incorrect. The reduction in arrears in January 2019 corresponds to ED amount and the Respondent is now attempting to reverse a valid credit given in year 2019.

(12) Additional Submissions:

- (a) That during the pendency of the proceedings, the Respondent has issued fresh Demand Notice dated 23.01.2026 (**Annexure C-Addl-1**) which includes amounts against section 126 which is sub-judice before the Hon’ble High Court and against Electricity Duty (ED) and the Forum has jurisdiction to only adjudicate upon Rs 5,71,412/- which is a pure billing dispute;
- (b) That there is estoppel on the Respondent with regard to raising Notice for balance amount of Rs 39 lacs;
- (c) That the adjudication by the Forum be restricted solely to the impugned demand of Rs 5,71,412/- and to quash this demand as being time barred.

Respondent:

- (13) That the Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 for Rs 5,71,412/- is lawful, based upon findings of Special Audit where discrepancy arising from 'less carry forward' of arrears from bill of December 2018 to January 2019 which occurred during the migration of data from old HCL software to new SAP ISU platform. This is a bona-fide technical and accounting error the rectification of which is legally permissible and necessary;
- (14) That the Complainant's calculation sheet (**Annexure C8**) is based upon assessment Notice dated 01.09.2015 under section 126 which is not part of the demand notice dated 25.06.2025;
- (15) That the Complainant is attempting to unjustly enrich itself at the expense of public utility due to bona-fide accounting and technical error on its part. The Complainant has consumed electricity for which payment has not been made. The Complainant being a commercial entity is expected to maintain proper accounts and exercise due diligence in verifying its electricity bills. The fact that the Complainant continued to benefit from the under billing without bringing it into the knowledge of the Respondent demonstrates lack of bona-fide on its part;
- (16) That in response to the complaint and the calculation sheet annexed (**Annexure C8**), the Respondent undertook a comprehensive re-examination of the Complainant's entire account for the period from FY2014 to 2020 which unearthed discrepancies and mistakes in Complainant's accounts which previously remained undiscovered;
- (17) On rectifying the mistakes the total recoverable from the Complainant stands revised to Rs 44,71,845.10 as detailed in reconciliation statement (**Annexure R1**);
- (18) That the Complainant is attempting to enrich itself at the expense of public utility while it has used electricity for which it has not made

--//--
Member

--Sd--
Chairperson

payment due to bona-fide accounting and technical error. Allowing the Complainant to evade this liability would be contrary to law and equity causing loss to the public exchequer;

- (19) That the Complainant's reliance on Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 is legally untenable and misinterpretation of law where Hon'ble Supreme Court has clarified the legal position;
- (20) That at the time of initiation of proceedings before the Forum, amount involved under litigation was Rs 5,71,412/-, however after correct reassessment the amount now stands at Rs 44,71,845.10;
- (21) **Prayer:** That keeping in view the facts and circumstances, the instant complaint be dismissed and Respondent be granted liberty to recover the outstanding amount in accordance with Annexure R2.

ORDER

- (22) Forum has examined the relevant provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, various relevant Regulations framed by the HP Electricity Regulatory Commission (or the HPERC) including the HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013 and the HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 and amendments thereto notified by the HPERC and the law settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court. 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;
- (23) From examination of complaint, Forum at the outset finds that the Complainant has wrongly depicted its detailed analysis / calculation sheet to have been placed at **Annexure C8**, which Forum finds to in fact be at **Annexure C7**;
- (24) In the said analysis/calculation sheet (**Annexure C7**) which is from September 2015 to September 2020 (5 years), the Complainant has depicted an excess of Rs 1,95,836/- refundable by the Respondent;

--//--
Member

--Sd--
Chairperson

- (25) Forum observes that the Complainant during the course of the complaint also placed on record copy of the Order dated 14.03.2019 (**Annexure C8**) passed by the Ld Commissioner, Shimla Division, Shimla, in an Appeal preferred by the Complainant against assessment made by the Respondent for unauthorized use of electricity under Section 126 / 127 of the Electricity Act, 2003 along with copy of CWP No 6594 of 2021 (**Annexure C9**) filed by the Complainant before the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh, which is still pending before the Hon'ble Court;
- (26) Forum further observes that in the Respondent's Reply, it has countered the ibid analysis / calculation sheet (**Annexure C7**) by bringing in detailed reconciliation statement (**Annexure R1**) which depicts Rs 44,71,845.10 additionally payable by the Complainant for the period from FY 2014 to 2020. This **Annexure R1** also includes the impugned amount of Rs 5,71,412/- raised in Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025;
- (27) Subsequently, the Respondent has also raised a revised Demand Notice dated 23.01.2026 upon the Complainant and during the final hearing placed it on record along with copy of computer generated ledger from January 2014 to January 2018 and certain electricity bills from March 2018 to May 2018;
- (28) It is the Complainant's contention that the Respondent has wrongly enlarged the scope of the dispute / disputed amount. It has also countered on various grounds that this reconciliation statement of Rs 44,71,845.10 (**Annexure R1**) includes certain amounts which pertain to section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003 which matter is sub-judice before the Hon'ble High Court and are beyond the jurisdiction of this Forum to adjudicate while this amount also includes in it amounts against Electricity Duty (ED);
- (29) Forum observes that the Complainant has also made additional written submissions during the final hearing in the matter, wherein it

- has opposed the subsequent Demand Notice dated 23.01.2026 raised by the Respondent upon it on grounds of estoppel and jurisdiction;
- (30) Forum observes that when the Complainant's original dispute was against the impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025, then it itself had enlarged the scope of the dispute by introducing the analysis / calculation sheet (**Annexure C7**) into the dispute which depicted from September 2015 to September 2020 (5 years) an excess of Rs 1,95,836/- refundable by the Respondent and this prompted the Respondent to reconcile the accounts pertaining to the Complainant and correspondingly introduce into the dispute a reconciliation statement (**Annexure R1**) with an amount of Rs 44,71,845.10 payable by the Complainant for the period from FY 2014 to 2020, further enhancing the scope of the dispute;
- (31) In the final hearing held in the matter, the parties agreed to limit the scope of the dispute only to the said impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 and with regard to other contentions arising from analysis / calculation sheet (**Annexure C7**) of Complainant or detailed reconciliation statement (**Annexure R1**) of the Respondent, parties agreed to raise separate grievances before appropriate authority;
- (32) Forum observes that the Complainant in the additional submissions made by it, has also prayed to restrict the adjudication to only the impugned demand of Rs 5,71,412/- raised in Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025;
- (33) In view of afore stated agreement arrived between parties during the final hearing and the ibid prayer of the Complainant, Forum herein, restricts and limits its adjudication to only the impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**). Forum decides to not interfere in ibid Annexure C7 and Annexure R1. Forum thus decides to ignore the contentions of the Complainant with regard to refund of Rs 1,95,836/- at the behest of analysis / calculation sheet

--//--

Member

--Sd--

Chairperson

(**Annexure C7**). At the same time Forum also decides to ignore the reconciliation statement (**Annexure R1**) containing the revised demand of Rs 44,71,845.10 which was later raised by the Respondent upon the Complainant vide Notice dated 23.01.2026. Accordingly, the parties are left to raise their respective contentions in this regard before the appropriate authority;

- (34) Forum hereinafter now proceeds to adjudicate the matter only with regard to the impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**)-
- (35) Forum observes that when issue on Section 126 / 127 of the Electricity Act has already come before it, then before it proceeds in the matter, Forum is inclined to see whether the impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) is or is not in terms of Section 126 / 127 of the Electricity Act, 2003-
- (36) From examination of complaint, Forum observes that the Respondent has attributed the impugned demand of Rs 5,71,412/- to less carry forward of arrears from December 2018 to January 2019 due to migration of data from one computer application system to another resulting in billing error on its part, while the Complainant has not raised any objection with regard to the impugned demand being covered under Section 126 / 127 of the Act while at the same time attributing the said impugned demand to some Electricity Duty credit given to it in the year 2019;
- (37) In wake of either party not attributing the impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) to be in terms of Section 126 / 127 of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Forum safely concludes that the impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) is not in terms of proceedings under Section 126 / 127 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and accordingly holds that it can proceed in the matter-
- (38) Forum observes that the Complainant is aggrieved by the monetary Demand of Rs 5,71,412/- raised upon it by the Respondent vide

--//--
Member

--Sd--
Chairperson

Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) which as per the Complainant has been raised upon it by the Respondent as sundry in electricity bill dated 09.07.2025 (**Annexure C1**) and which as per the Respondent has been raised towards a previous less carry forward in the electricity bill of January 2019;

- (39) Forum further observes that the Complainant has stated in its complaint that the levy is factually unjustified for a number of reasons including such being barred by Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and that it stems from accounting error by the Respondent and corresponds to ED amount;
- (40) During the final hearing in the matter, the Complainant opposed the impugned Demand Notice on grounds of such being wrongly calculated by the Respondent while at the same time also raising argument that its dispute can arise only from the electricity bills raised to it and not from the ledger of the Respondent, which was an internal document of the Respondent and that it is unreliable;
- (41) Copy of the said ledger was placed on record by the Respondent at the time of final hearing;
- (42) Forum still further observes that the Respondent has stated on record that the amount against the impugned demand was because of less carry forward of arrears from December 2018 to January 2019 due to migration of data from one computer application system to another resulting in billing error on its part. During the final hearing, the Respondent informed that the same was identified by it from the ledger pertaining to the period from April 2018 to December 2018;
- (43) With regard to the said ledger, Forum is not inclined to agree with the ibid argument on the ledger given by the Complainant. Forum is of the considered opinion that when a ledger consolidates the previous month accounts in terms of billing, payments, sundries and arrears, closing and opening balances, and thereafter an electricity bill is raised for a subsequent month, then it is not open for the

--//--
Member

--Sd--
Chairperson

Complainant to simply argue that it's dispute arises only from the electricity bills and that the ledger is unreliable. Forum from examination of the electricity bills finds that these do not factor in payments and accordingly the ledger becomes the running account of the Complainant containing all details. Respondent is well within its right to raise a demand at a later stage towards any error which comes into its knowledge at that later date and such error may be identified by the Respondent on detailed scrutiny of the ledger, as has been done in the instant matter;

- (44) However, in the matter, when Complainant has contended that the demand is due to an accounting error, Forum holds that it is not inclined to interfere in the accounting behind the electricity billing which runs into several years. Parties are accordingly left to mutually reconcile the accounts;
- (45) Further, Forum has also examined the ledger for the month of December 2018, placed on record by the Respondent, which reflects a closing balance of Rs 39,69,356/-. Forum has correspondingly also examined the electricity bill for Jan 2019 which reflects an arrear of Rs 33,97,944/-. Forum finds that the difference between the two is Rs 5,71,412/- which clearly is the impugned demand raised by the Respondent. Forum accordingly rejects the contention of the Complainant that the impugned amount corresponds to ED amount, and which was overlooked in the electricity bill for January 2019;
- (46) In view of foregoing, Forum does not find any infirmity in the monetary Demand of Rs 5,71,412/- raised upon the Complainant by the Respondent vide Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) and the impugned demand is accordingly upheld;
- (47) Forum now proceeds to check for legality of the demand based upon Section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003, as has been raised in the complaint–

- (48) Contention of the Complainant is that the impugned demand is barred by limitation under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003, Forum now proceeds to understand whether the impugned demand dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) is hit by limitation under Section 56(2) of the Act or not. Forum thus feels it necessary and expedient to refer to this Section of the Act before it delves further into the issue of limitation raised in the complaint / matter;
- (49) Forum observes that apart from the ibid reliance of the Complainant upon Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Complainant has not raised any other legal basis to counter the impugned demand;
- (50) For the sake of convenience, the provisions of said provision of the Act are reproduced as follows:-

“56 Disconnection of supply in default of payment.—

....

....

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no sum due from any consumer, under this section shall be recoverable after the period of two years from the date when such sum became first due unless such sum has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrear of charges for electricity supplied and the licensee shall not cut off the supply of the electricity.”

- (51) Forum finds that apart from the ibid contention of limitation under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, the Complainant has only raised contention of procedural violation of clause 5.2.5(b) of the Supply Code with respect to the impugned demand and apart from these it has not raised any other legal basis including that for any wrong implementation of Tariffs by the Respondent;
- (52) In the said final hearing conducted by the Forum, the Respondent had pointed out that the decisions by the Hon’ble Apex Court with regard to Section 56(2) of the Act do not in any way come to the rescue of the Complainant because such allows for a past period left out amount to be raised as demand in the future and that limitation under the said Section of the Act starts from the date the said demand is raised. Forum now proceeds to discuss these-

--//--

Member

--Sd--

Chairperson

- (53) After examining the record and facts in the matter, coupled with provisions of Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 reproduced ibid, Regulations / Code notified by the Ld HPERC and as pointed out by the Respondent, the settled position of law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court in judgments passed on 18.02.2020 and on 05.10.2021, in matters titled as Assistant Engineer (D1) Ajmer Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd and Anr Vs Rahamutullah Khan alias Rahamjula in Civil Appeal No 1672/2020 and M/s Prem Cottex Vs Uttar Haryana Vijli Vitran Ltd in Civil Appeal No7235 of 2009 respectively, Forum holds that the issue of recovery of past dues of arrears by the electricity Distribution Company (or Discom) can be decided by the Forum, such no more being res-integra;
- (54) Forum observes that in ibid Hon'ble Apex Court Judgment passed on 18.02.2020, while interpreting Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003, it has been held that Section 56(2) does not put any limitation for raising the past dues or arrears, if not discovered earlier due to any mistake. Liability to pay arises on consumption of electricity and obligation to pay when bill is raised. Electricity charges would become first due only when bill / demand is raised by the licensee to the consumer quantifying therein the charges to be paid. Accordingly, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held in clear terms that limitation starts from the date the bill/ demand is raised which is when the sum becomes first due and it is from this date that the period of limitation of 2 years as provided in section 56(2) of the Electricity Act shall start. Again Court has made it abundantly clear that it is from this date that the sum has to be continuously shown as recoverable as arrears during the limitation period. As a consequence, in addition to the date electricity is consumed, the liability to pay electricity charges is also created when meter reading is recorded or when meter is found defective or theft of electricity is detected and obligation to pay when Bill or Demand is raised;

--//--
Member

--Sd--
Chairperson

- (55) Further in the ibid Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed on 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, it has also been held in the said Judgment, that 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;
- (56) Now returning to the instant complaint before the Forum –
- (57) From settled law, it becomes clear to the Forum that while the consumer / Complainant herein uses electricity being a good, the distribution licensee / Respondent herein 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 Tariff Orders passed in pursuance to Regulations notified under the Electricity Act, 2003. Thereafter, these tariffs / charges are applied to the goods purchased being the electricity supplied by the Respondent and consumed by the Complainant / consumer and thereafter an electricity bill or monetary demand is raised upon the consumer;
- (58) Further, this Forum is of the considered opinion that the Respondent HPSEBL being a distribution licensee and a regulated public utility 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.

--//--
Member

--Sd--
Chairperson

Accordingly, the consumer at the determined tariffs / charges is bound to pay for the electricity supplied to it, such 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 either result in permanent financial loss to the distribution licensee or with the burdening of this utility's loss upon other consumers. Both of these eventualities are bad and against the spirit of the statute governing the electricity sector, which undoubtedly is applicable to the impugned demand;

- (59) Forum is also of the considered opinion that any accounting / billing error or even any short recording / non-recording / incorrect recording of actual consumption of a consumer in the prevalent systems of the distribution licensee / utility, results in financial loss to the utility and free ride to a consumer, which cannot be allowed by the Forum. A consumer is liable to not cause loss to the utility in any manner while at the same time is also incumbent upon it to make payments towards the full metered electricity supplied to it for the simple reason that electricity/energy to that extent has actually been consumed by it. Here, the consumer is the Complainant and the monies involved are not that of the Complainant/ individuals but that of a regulated entity, being a Company. No one, including the Complainant, is entitled to adversely use the deficiencies in a system to its advantage in any manner, such as to cause loss in any way to a public utility. Not allowing such loss to be recovered likely results in malpractices and connivances which are detrimental to the system;
- (60) Having gone through the instant case and having heard the matter in detail, 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 and Tariff Orders. Respondent had missed to raise correct electricity bills/ statutory amounts in the past i.e billing in January 2019 with regard to a bill component of December 2018, which went unnoticed for some time. This eventually resulted in the raising of impugned sundry / past arrears / dues by the Respondent during a valid limitation period, which is now recoverable from the Complainant. When there was mistake or bona-fide error by the Respondent HPSEBL in past i.e billing during December 2018 to January 2019, which was later noticed by the Respondent and impugned demand raised upon the Complainant only for the shortfall in unbilled amount in the past, then no illegality of limitation can be observed by the Forum in impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) for Rs 5,71,412/-;

- (61) In the instant complaint, Forum observes that the impugned Demand Notice (**Annexure C2**) for Rs 5,71,412/- has been raised by the Respondent on 25.06.2025 when error was detected by it. Forum finds the contention of limitation on the anvil of Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, as raised by the Complainant to be untenable and unsustainable. Question of validity of the impugned Demand as raised by the Complainant does not arise. Forum accordingly rejects the contention raised by the Complainant;
- (62) Forum concludes that it does not find any illegality of limitation in the impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) for Rs 5,71,412/-. The impugned demand has been raised in June 2025 and at the time of filing the complaint, this demand is well within the period of 2 years as specified in Section 56(2) of the Act and not barred by limitation period of 2 years specified therein and because the bar of limitation does not exist therefore so does the condition to show arrears as continuous recoverable also does not. This impugned demand as past period dues are found by the Forum to be

in accordance with the Electricity Act, 2003 and the law settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court as referred in paras supra;

- (63) Forum accordingly holds that in accordance with the settled law, this impugned Demand Notice is well within the period of 2 years and not hit by limitation under the said Section 56(2);
- (64) On the contention of procedural violation of clause 5.2.5(b) of the Supply Code, as raised by the Complainant, Forum has gone through this code and holds that any shortcoming in procedure, cannot invalidate a statutory demand and accordingly rejects the contention of the Complainant;
- (65) In view of the foregoing settled position of law coupled with the facts of the complaint, Forum holds that it is not inclined to interfere with the impugned Demand Notice dated 25.06.2025 (**Annexure C2**) which is upheld. Consequently, the electricity bill dated 09.07.2025 (**Annexure C1**) is also upheld;

On aforesaid terms the complaint is disposed as '**Dismissed**'.

Parties are left to bear their own costs.

Order is announced before the parties present today on 24.02.2026 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.

Date: 24.02.2026
Shimla

--/--
Pankaj Kumar
(Member)

--Sd--
Tushar Gupta
(Chairperson)

--/--
Member

--Sd--
Chairperson