CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM, SHIMLA

Complaint No 3157/202506/17

M/s Goyal Furnace

Vs

H.P. 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 Goyal Furnace, Plot No 168, 179, Industrial Area, Phase-III, Sansarpur Terrace, District Kangra, H.P;

(2) Complainant bearing Consumer ID 200012000044 is a Large Industrial Power Supply (LIPS) category consumer of Respondent HPSEBL;

(3) In the matter, Complainant was already being supplied electricity at 11kV from 66/11 kV Substation Sansarpur Terrace by the Respondent. Subsequently, Complainant sought enhancement of connected load from existing 3549.43 kW to 10000 kW and contract demand from 3700 kVA to 10000 kVA ie. additional connected load of 6450.57 kW and contract demand of 6300 kVA respectively;

(4) The said load enhancement was proposed to be supplied at 66 kV from the said Substation at Sansarpur Terrace. For this, pursuant to code 3.2.2 of the HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 and amendments thereto, demand of Rs 12.60 lacs on account of advance cost share towards Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) was raised by the Respondent vide Demand Notice dated 06.12.2022 (**Annexure RA1**). This demand was raised by the Respondent at the normative rate of Rs 200/kVA specified under para 16.6.4 of the Tariff Order for FY2022-23 dated 29.03.2022 passed by the Ld HP Electricity Regulatory Commission (or the HPERC). On deposit of same, Power Availability Certificate (PAC) dated 24.12.2022 (**Annexure C1**) was issued by the Respondent. This demand as stated, was paid by the Complainant vide receipt dated 08.12.2022 (**Annexure C2**);

(5) Thereafter, after the Complainant applied for load / load sanction through online mode on 28.05.2025, the Respondent once again

CGRF Shimla

raised another demand of Rs.1,44,90,000/- towards the said IDC, vide Demand Notice dated 17.06.2025 (**Annexure C6**). In respect of this demand, the IDC provisions contained in para 13.6.4 of the Tariff Order dated 28.03.2025 passed by the Ld HPERC for FY2025-26 are applicable, wherein rates as specified in Order passed by the Ld HPERC on 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**) have been retained;

(6) Complainant's main grievance is in terms of action of Respondent to raise upon it the said additional demand of Rs.1,44,90,000/- towards the said IDC, raised vide Demand Notice dated 17.06.2025 (**Annexure C6**).

COMPLAINANT –

(7) That on an Application made by it, Respondent issued Power Availability Certificate (PAC) dated 24.12.2022 (**Annexure C1**) with validity period of 3 years for the enhancement of connected load by additional 6450.57 kW from 3549.43 kW / enhancement of contract demand by additional 6300 kVA from 3700 kVA;

(8) That the said PAC was issued by the Respondent after deposit of advance cost share at the rate of Rs 200 per kVA towards IDC amounting to Rs 12,60,000/- by the Complainant vide Receipt (**Annexure C2**);

(9) That as per condition 20 of PAC the supply from Sansarpur Terrace was subject to load availability from BBMB Pong. Before issuance of the said PAC it was told to the Complainant that the entire plant was to be set up by the Complainant and that the HPSEBL can constrain the load as and when required. Letter by Special Secretary BBMB is dated 18.10.2022 (**Annexure C3**);

(10) That it is common prudence that if development work is done by the company itself, then amount to be charged by the Respondent is to be adjusted or waived accordingly. However, Respondent charged for terminal equipment vide demand notice dated 19.07.2023 (**Annexure C4**) and Rs 25.75 lacs was deposited by the Complainant vide cheque dated 25.07.2023 (**Annexure C5**);

CGRF Shimla

(11) That the Respondent raised upon it additional demand of Rs 1,44,90,000/- towards Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) vide Demand Notice dated 17.06.2025 (**Annexure C6**). Vide Respondent letter dated 18.06.2025 (**Annexure C7**), the load would be released only after the deposit of the said amount;

(12) That vide HPERC Order dated 05.06.2024 (**Annexure C8**), demand notices issued for IDC prior to this Order shall be considered final and no adjustment recovery shall be made;

(13) That after erection of plant within the validity period of the PAC, Complainant wrote letter dated 21.04.2025 (**Annexure C9**) to the Assistant Executive Engineer, Sub Division Dehra for providing supply. Further Assistant Engineer submitted testing fee detail vide letter dated 21.04.2025 (**Annexure C10**). The reason for this submission is that load could have been enhanced or load enhancement application submitted only after the plant was erected by the Complainant. Thus the Demand Notice dated 17.06.2025 (**Annexure C6**) for IDC is not only bad but illegal;

(14) That being aggrieved and dissatisfied by impugned Demand Notice dated 17.06.2025 (**Annexure C6**) and Respondent letter dated 18.06.2025 (**Annexure C7**), Complainant lays challenge to these;

(15) That perusal of above stated facts depict that the impugned acts of the Respondent are arbitrary, harsh, unjust, unfair and liable to be set aside with respect to additional demand raised qua IDC which is also contrary to the principles of legitimate expectations;

(16) That legitimate expectation arises due to IDC already having been paid for development done by Complainant itself, Rs 25.75 lac paid qua terminal equipment, it was expected that load would now be released which is stopped due to Annexure C6 and Annexure C7;

(17) **Rejoinder:-** (Complainant has in general argued and rebutted the Reply submitted by the Respondent) - That as per Respondent, it had submitted Application for enhancement of load through on line mode on 28.05.2025 which was sanctioned by the Respondent on 13.06.2025. The delay in submission is caused due to condition 7 of

CGRF Shimla

the PAC and because the construction / erection of the infrastructure development work and the substation work has been done on self-responsibility basis on directions by the Respondent and thus submission of application for load could not be done before completion of works, while the Respondents had themselves issued letter on 29.07.2023 for deposit of Rs 25.75 lacs towards terminal equipment. Further, the demand raised is at Rs 200/kVA on normative basis as per regulation 5(2) and not regulation 5(3) or regulation 7 of the HPERC Recovery Regulations 2012. The replying Respondents have wrongly tried to create distinction between the advance cost share and the development charges whereas the initial demand raised is not advance but entire IDC as per clause 16.6.4 of the Tariff Order. Thus the issuance of subsequent demand notice is against Order dated 05.06.2024 passed by the Regulatory Commission, where demand notices issued prior to this Order were to be considered final.

(18) **Prayer:** That the Demand Notice dated 17.06.2025 (**Annexure C6**) for Rs.1,44,90,000/- and the letter dated 18.06.2025 (**Annexure C7**) be set aside and the Respondent be restrained from stopping the release of sanctioned load and from levying any penalty.

RESPONDENT –

(19) That in accordance with HP Electricity Supply Code (Fourth Amendment) Regulations, 2020 (**Annexure RA-2 Colly**) and HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations (**Annexure RA-3 Colly**), 2012, Demand Notice (**Annexure RA-1**) was issued for the deposit of advance cost share towards IDC @ Rs 200/kVA for the grant of PAC. Pursuant thereto, PAC was issued on 24.12.2022 (**Annexure C1**);

(20) That the Complainant after completion of all works, submitted Application for enhancement of load through on line mode on 28.05.2025, which was sanctioned by the Respondent on 13.06.2025. Accordingly as per clause 3.2.6 of the HP Electricity Supply Code (First Amendment) Regulations, 2014, Demand Notice (**Annexure**

CGRF Shimla

C6) was issued for Rs 2,63,97,000 comprising therein final IDC amount of Rs 1,44,90,000/- along with Security Deposit;

(21) That vide HPERC Order dated 05.06.2024 (**Annexure C8**), rates as per para 21(v)(b) shall be applicable from date of Order to 31.03.2025 and that all demand notices issued shall be considered final and no adjustment recovery shall be made;

(22) That the Complainant has misconstrued the distinction between Advance Cost Share and IDC. The Advance cost share which is provisional, is leviable as per clause 3.2.2. of the Supply Code, 2009 and is subject to final adjustment as per clause 3.2.6 of the Supply Code once applicant submits final application for release of final connection / load and this advance cost share is different from final IDC payable under the Recovery of Expenditure Regulations;

(23) That in respect of the Complainant, the Respondent has already sought clarification (**Annexure RA-4**) regarding the issue of IDC which is presently under consideration before the HPERC;

(24) That Forum in complaint No 1515/202403/04 decided on 13.03.2024 (**Annexure RA-6**), has held that it does not fall within its jurisdiction or authority to interpret Tariff Orders issued by the Hon'ble HPERC and the present matter also pertains to interpretation of Tariff Order and thus present complaint may be held as non-maintainable before this Forum;

(25) That because the Complainant has submitted load extension application on 28.05.2025, thus final demand notice has been issued on 17.06.2025 (**Annexure C6**) which is mandatory for the consumer to pay as per revised rates which are applicable to the present case;

(26) That the actions of the Respondent are fully in compliance with applicable laws and the Demand Notice in question is lawfully issued;

(27) **Prayer:** That the complaint be dismissed and Complainant be directed to deposit outstanding amount of Rs 2,63,97,000/- along with interest and within a time period.

CGRF Shimla

ORDER

(28) Forum has examined the relevant provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, various relevant Regulations and respective amendments framed and notified by the HP Electricity Regulatory Commission (or the HPERC) including relevant provisions of HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013, HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012 or the HPERC RoE Regulations, HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 (or the Supply Code), various Tariff Orders / Orders passed by the Ld HPERC along with record as facts and pleadings of the parties. Forum has heard the parties at length. The considered opinion of the Forum has been gathered after considering the fair facts, evidences and correspondence placed on record and arguments adduced by both the parties;

(29) At the outset, on facts, Forum observes that after Demand Notice for Rs 12.60 lacs towards providing Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC), was raised by the Respondent on 06.12.2022 (**Annexure RA1**) which is also stated to be paid by the Complainant on 08.12.2022, the Power Availability Certificate (PAC) with validity of 3 years was issued by the Respondent on 24.12.2022 (**Annexure C1**). At serial No 2 of this Demand Notice it is mentioned that the said Rs 12.6 lacs is the advance cost share towards normative IDC @ Rs 200/kVA. In para 14 it is mentioned that the Supply of load can be made available at at 66 kV from 66/11 kV Substation Sansarpur Terrace and at Sr No 6 it is mentioned that entire cost of feeder along with bay and associated terminal equipment at both ends and the metering arrangement shall have to be borne by the Complainant while also mentioning that the Complainant shall have to bear IDC other than for service lines as per HPERC RoE Regulations;

(30) In accordance with another Demand Notice dated 19.07.2023 (**Annexure C4**) raised by the Electrical System wing of the Respondent, another Rs 25.75 lacs was demanded by the Respondent for providing terminal equipment at 66kV Substation Sansarpur Terrace and at Complainant’s factory premises. In this Demand

CGRF Shimla

Notice it has also been mentioned that the work for providing terminal equipment at 66kV Substation Sansarpur Terrace and at Complainant's factory premises along with 66 kV Transmission line from 66kV Substation Sansarpur Terrace to Complainant's factory premises is to be done by the Complainant on self-execution basis. This Demand is stated to be deposited by the Complainant vide cheque dated 25.07.2023 (**Annexure C5**);

(31) Thereafter, the Complainant executed the work and informed the Respondent of the same vide its letter dated 16.04.2025 (**Annexure C9**) also requesting therein for testing and sealing. Pursuant to this letter, communication was exchanged between Respondent's offices (**Annexure C10**);

(32) As per Respondent, the Complainant after completion of all works submitted the Application for enhancement of load through on line mode on 28.05.2025. Thereafter, another Demand Notice dated (**Annexure C6**) was raised by the Respondent for Rs 2,63,97,000/- comprising therein final IDC amount of Rs 1,44,90,000/- along with Security Deposit. This amount of Rs 1,44,90,000/- towards IDC was raised by the Respondent as per code 3.2.6 of the HP Electricity Supply Code (First Amendment) Regulations, 2014 and after adjusting the amount already received;

(33) Complainant being aggrieved by the said additional demand of Rs.1,44,90,000/-, towards IDC, raised vide said Demand Notice dated 17.06.2025 (**Annexure C6**), has impugned the same only to extent of IDC contained therein. During the hearing stage, the Complainant submitted that there is no challenge by it to demand notice dated 19.07.2023 (**Annexure C4**) for Rs 25.75 lacs and that it only lays challenge and impugns herein the said demand of Rs.1,44,90,000/-;

(34) On the statement of the Complainant that after erection of plant within the validity period of the PAC, the Complainant wrote letter dated 21.04.2025 (**Annexure C9**) to the Respondent for providing supply, Forum finds this letter to not be in terms of providing supply of load but instead to be in terms of only a request to the Respondent

CGRF Shimla

to issue Note for testing and sealing of meters. Forum finds from Reply by the Respondent that the request for supply was made by the Complainant only on 28.05.2025. In any case Forum observes that request for supply of load cannot be by way of a mere letter but has to be by way of Application and by completion of codal formalities as mandated by the HPERC in the Supply Code;

(35) However, it is still the argument of the Complainant that it is common prudence that if development work is done by the company itself, then amount to be charged by the Respondent is to be adjusted or waived accordingly;

(36) During the hearing stage it was submitted by the Respondent to the Forum that the normative recovery of IDC is towards the infrastructure development in accordance with regulation 5 of the HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012, while the charges for works done for Service Line and for additional load is in terms of provisions of regulation 4 and regulation 7 while the works done on self-execution basis in respect of said service lines is in terms of regulation 17 for which the demand notice dated 19.07.2023 (**Annexure C4**) for Rs 25.75 lacs has been raised by the Respondent;

(37) On the other hand, vide Demand Notice dated 06.12.2022 (**Annexure RA1**), Respondent has demanded amount towards advance cost share for Infrastructure development in accordance with code 3.2.2 of the Supply Code and amendments thereto and vide Demand Notice dated 17.06.2025 (**Annexure C6**), it has demanded final amount towards IDC in accordance with HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012;

(38) Forum observes that because the Respondent has relied upon regulation 5 of the HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012 (or the RoE Regulations, 2012) **(Annexure RA3 Colly)** and code 3.2.2 of the HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 **(Annexure RA-2 Colly)** and amendments thereto to make out its case for recovery of Infrastructure Development Charges

CGRF Shimla

(IDC) from the Complainant, thus Forum finds it necessary and expedient to foremost delve upon these Regulations / Codes -

(39) On perusal of sub-regulation 5(2) of the ibid RoE Regulations, 2012 **(Annexure RA-11)**, Forum finds that this regulation mandates the Commission to approve the normative rates of Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) to be recovered by the Respondent Distribution Licensee under Section 46 of the Electricity Act, 2003. Forum finds that the Ld HPERC accordingly approves the said normative IDC rates by way of Orders that may be passed by it from time to time;

(40) Forum from perusal of Supply Code, 2009 and amendments thereto, further finds that code 3.2.2 specifies the rate of Rs 1000 per kVA to be paid as advance towards the said IDC charges at the time of application for grant of Power Availability Certificate (PAC) by the consumer, which in terms of fourth Amendment dated 03.07.2020 shall not exceed the amount recoverable under the provisions of RoE Regulations, 2012;

(41) Forum from examination of the instant complaint finds that when Demand Notice dated 24.12.2022 (**Annexure C1**) was originally raised by the Respondent upon the Complainant at the time of application for PAC, at that time normative rate of IDC of Rs 200/kVA specified under para 16.6.4 of the Tariff Order for FY2022-23 dated 29.03.2022 passed by the Ld HPERC, was applicable;

(42) Further, Forum observes that in the matter at the time of Application for supply of load by the Complainant, the IDC provisions applicable are as contained in para 13.6.4 under section 13.6 in the Tariff Order dated 28.03.2025 passed by the Ld HPERC for FY2025-26, which reads as follows:-

<u>Quote</u>

13.6 Infrastructure Development Charges

13.6.1 *The Commission has notified HPERC (Recovery of Expenditure for supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012 vide Notification No. HPERC/419 dated 18.5.2012 which has been published in the Rajpatra, HP on 23rd May 2012.*

13.6.2 *HPSEBL has proposed an increase of 1.33% in Infrastructure Development Charges (IDC) to the Commission. The Commission vide Order dated 5th June*

CGRF Shimla

2024 in Petition No. 22/2024 has enhance the IDC from 5th June 2024, on the request of the Petitioner. The HPSEBL has not provided any justification or supporting data to substantiate the present request for enhancement.

13.6.3 *Thus, in the absence of a clear rationale, the Commission finds no reason to approve the proposed hike of 1.33%. It is important to ensure fair and transparent tariff structures that balance the interests of both consumers and utilities. Without adequate justification, increasing IDC may lead to an undue financial burden on consumers without demonstrating any corresponding benefits or necessity for the hike.*

13.6.4 *The Commission, therefore, intends to retain the existing Infrastructure Development Charges at their current levels. Further, the Petitioner is directed to submit proposal in future accompanied with detailed justification, including cost analysis, infrastructure development plans, and a clear demonstration of necessity.*

UnQuote

(43) With regard to ibid para 13.6.4, Forum observes that the rates of IDC have been retained by the Ld HPERC at the levels as specified in the Order on IDC passed by the Ld Commission, on 05.06.2024 (**Annexure P5**). On perusal of this Order Forum finds that the specified ibid IDC rate of Rs 200/kVA was revised. Para 21 of this Order specifies the rates as follows –

Quote

21.

....

....

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

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

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

......

……

Un-Quote

(44) Forum after examination of Code/ Regulations finds that that Service Line and Infrastructure Development are separate and the Complainant has made expenditure against the Service line / associated equipment which is in terms of the Regulations notified by

CGRF Shimla

the HPERC. Thus, Forum rejects the argument of the Complainant that it is common prudence that if development work is done by the company itself, then amount to be charged by the Respondent is to be adjusted or waived accordingly. Forum holds that the amount charged against this Service line / associated equipment is neither adjustable nor liable to be waived. Complainant has simply failed to distinguish between provisions on Service Line/ associated equipment contained in regulation 4, regulation 7 and regulation 17 of the RoE Regulations, 2012 and between the normative IDC separately recoverable from it under the provisions of regulation 5 of the said Regulations. The said Service Line/ associated equipment erected by Complainant on self-execution basis has been done by incurring the cost directly, which if had been erected by the Respondent, would still be separately recoverable from the Complainant under provisions of regulation 4. Forum finds that the said arguments made by Complainant are not in conformity with the provisions of Regulations and accordingly rejects these. Forum holds that the Complainant is bound to pay IDC charges separately apart from what it may have incurred directly on self-execution of service line/ associated equipment or that which may have been charged separately by the Respondent for works pertaining to Service lines;

(45) Now returning to the issue of IDC that has been raised by the Complainant that IDC cannot be recovered twice by the Respondent. From examination of Reply given by the Respondent, Forum finds that it is the case of the Respondent that because demand dated 06.12.2022 (**Annexure RA1**) was the advance IDC for PAC at the time of Application for PAC by the Complainant the same is recoverable under provisions of code 3.2.2 of Supply Code whereas final demand of Rs.1,44,90,000/- for IDC raised vide Demand Notice dated 17.06.2025 is under provisions of code 3.2.6 of Supply Code and is recoverable only after the Application for supply of load is made by the Complainant and that this Application for supply of load has been done by the Complainant through online mode only on 28.05.2025. ie after Tariff Order dated 28.03.2025 was passed by the

CGRF Shimla

Ld HPERC for FY2025-26 and thus final IDC is recoverable as per this Order;

(46) In view of foregoing discussion, Forum finds that the present matter is caught between the rates of IDC specified in HPERC Tariff Order dated 29.03.2022 for FY 2022-23 as applicable for advance IDC demand dated 06.12.2022 (**Annexure RA1**) which has been raised by the Respondent pursuant to code 3.2.2 of the Supply Code at the time of Application for PAC made by the Complainant and between the provisions on IDC specified in HPERC Tariff Order dated 28.03.2025 for FY2025-26 being applicable for final demand of IDC dated 06.12.2022 (**Annexure RA1**) raised pursuant to code 3.2.6 of the Supply Code at the time of Application made by the Complainant to the Respondent for supply of load;

(47) Forum further finds that while in respect of a demand raised for IDC at the time of Application for PAC and that raised for IDC at the time of Application for supply of load when done during the applicability of single Order passed by the Ld HPERC, then difficulty may not arise to decide the matter;

(48) However as arising in the instant matter, when one demand is made for IDC under ibid code 3.2.2 of the Supply Code at the time of Application for PAC on 06.12.2022 and another demand is made for IDC under code 3.2.6 of the Supply Code at the time of Application for supply of load on 17.06.2025 and both these demands arise during the applicability of two different Orders passed by the Ld HPERC on 29.03.2022 and 28.03.2025 respectively, then Forum finds that difficulty certainly arises for passing any Order by the Forum because the Forum is unable to find any provision in the Regulations / Codes notified by the HPERC and in the Orders passed by the Forum which may address such an eventuality and the decision of the Forum is necessarily governed by the provisions of the statute;

(49) In view of the aforementioned difficulty which has arisen before the Forum in the instant matter, Forum finds that it is unable to pass

CGRF Shimla

Orders in the matter. Accordingly, the Complainant is given liberty to approach the HP Electricity Regulatory Commission in the matter.

On aforesaid terms the complaint is **Dismissed** and accordingly disposed.

Parties are left to bear their own costs.

Order is announced before the parties present today on 03.09.2025 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: 03.09.2025
Shimla

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

CGRF Shimla

CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI, SHIMLA-9.

Complaint No.: - 3157/202506/17
Date of Receipt: - 24.06.2025
Quorum: - Er. Tushar Gupta, Chairman
Er. Vikas Gupta, Member

In ref:-

M/s Goyal Furnace, Plot NO. 168,179, **Complainant**
Industrial Area. Phase-III,
Sansarpur Terrance, District Kangra, HP

V/s.

HPSEBL & Others. **Respondents**

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

2. The Superintending Engineer,
Operation Circle Kangra,
HP State Electricity Board Ltd,. Kangra, HP

3. The Sr. Executive Engineer,
Electrical Division,
HPSEBL, Dehra, Disstt. Dehra Kangra (HP).

4. The Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Sub-Division
HPSEBL, Sansarpur
Kangra (H.P.)

Respondents

Final hearing: - 25.07.2025.

Counsels:-

Complainant 1. Sh. Atharv Sharma Advocate

Respondent 1. Sh. Rajesh Kashyap, Advocate

2. Sh. Kamlesh Saklani, U.S. Law

Date of Decision: -03.09.2025

Notice

Registered

CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI SHIMLA-171009.
No. CGRF/Complaint No. 3157/202506/17 **Dated:-**

M/s Goyal Furnace, Plot NO. 168,179, **Complainant**
Industrial Area. Phase-III,
Sansarpur Terrance, District Kangra, HP

V/s.

HPSEBL & Others. **Respondents**

Complaint No. 3157/202506/17

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

2. The Superintending Engineer,
Operation Circle Kangra,
HP State Electricity Board Ltd,. Kangra, HP

3. The Sr. Executive Engineer,
Electrical Division,
HPSEBL, Dehra, Disstt. Dehra Kangra (HP).

4. The Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Sub-Division
HPSEBL, Sansarpur
Kangra (H.P.) **Respondents**

The Certified copy of final order dated 03.09.2025 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.