

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM, SHIMLA

Complaint No 1213/202508/28

Sh Nidhesh Gupta

Vs

Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd and Ors

BRIEF FACTS OF CASE–

- (1) Complaint is filed under Regulations 17 of the HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013 by Sh Nidhesh Gupta, S/o Sh JL Gupta, R/o Village Chhankar, Post Office Janedghat, Sub-Tehsil Junga, District Shimla, HP;
- (2) Complainant bearing Consumer ID 200009000696 is a two-part Commercial Supply (CS) category electricity consumer of Respondent HPSEBL, availing electricity supply at 11 kV and having connected load of 86.3 kW with permanent contract demand of 87 kVA and temporary contract demand of 43.5 kVA;
- (3) Briefly, the Complainant is before this Forum being aggrieved by the action of Respondent to raise upon it impugned sundry amount for Rs 5,89,027.67 in electricity bill dated 05.07.2025 (**Annexure C5**) due to alleged wrong application of Multiplication Factor (MF) in the past from March 2021 to May 2023 by Respondent;
- (4) The Complainant is also aggrieved by the action of the Respondent to bill it at Commercial rates from July 2023.

COMPLAINANT –

- (5) That after receiving the necessary certificate from the department of Horticulture, Government of HP, it was provided electricity connection in March, 2021;
- (6) That it was making the regular payments of electricity bills. However, from June- 2023 it began receiving bills at higher rate against which it made online complaint to Respondent vide Docket No C1000064753 dated 20.11.2023 (**Annexure C2 / Annexure C3**) which was not attended by the Respondent. However, it continued to make payments against electricity bills;
- (7) That in July 2025, the Respondent raised wrong and illegal sundry charges amounting to Rs 5,89,627.67 in the electricity bill dated

05.07.2025 (**Annexure C5**) against which it sought clarification on 12.07.2025, which was replied by the Respondent on 29.07.2025 (**Annexure C6**) and was in terms of wrong application of Multiplication Factor (MF) for commercial usage from March 2021 to May 2023;

- (8) That any demand for arrears raised in July 2025 is contrary to Limitation Act and Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act and cannot be recovered beyond period of limitation;
- (9) Also that the opposite party is recovering charges at commercial rates which is contrary to the fact that it is using the premises for residence also and is entitled to be charged for domestic usage from July 2023 and because of the fact that the horticulture project has yet not started due to lack of grant of necessary approval;
- (10) **Prayer:** to quash of illegal, arbitrary, and time barred arrears amounting to Rs.5,89,027.67/- with further directions to Respondent to charge domestic rates from July 2023 till commencement of project and further to adjust the difference in future demands as per actual consumption and further to accept bills on account of contract demand and consumption on domestic rates;
- (11) **In Rejoinder:**
 - (a) That in accordance with Limitation Act, 1963, no demand for period in excess of 3 years can be raised and therefore no demand could be raised prior to August 2022 and accordingly demand for the period from March 2021 to May 2023 is time barred;
 - (b) That Respondent's reliance on Section 17(1)(c) of Limitation Act, 1963 has no application in the present case, in regard to which reference be made to Judgements passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in matters titled *Saranpal Kaur Anand v. Praduman Singh Chandhok*, (2022) 8 SCC 401 and to *Mahabir Kishore v. State of M.P.*, (1989) 4 SCC 1;

- (c) Apart from above, it is also entitled to relief against electricity connection for commercial purposes where permission for horticulture (floriculture) use has only been granted on 08.09.2025 and it is impermissible to apply said higher rate. In this regard reference be made to Judgements passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in matters titled *Lloyd Electric & Engg.. Ltd. v. State of H.P. (2016), 1 SCC 560* and to *Central Warehousing Corpn. v. Adani Ports & Special Economic Zone Ltd., (2022) 15 SCC 110*;
- (d) That the reliance of the Respondent on H.P. Electricity Supply Code (Sixth Amendment) 2025 is wrong because this has come into effect on 01.04.2025 and thus the amendment is prospective in nature and does not have retrospective application;
- (e) That the contention sought to be raised by the Respondent while relying on Judgements passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in matters titled *Assistant Engineer (D1) Ajmer Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd and Anr. V. Rahamutullah Khan alias Rahamjulla (2020) 4SCC 650* and on *M/s Prem Cottex v. Uttar Haryana Vijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. & Ors (2021) 20 SCC 200* is incorrect;
- (f) That similarly the reliance placed by the Respondent on Judgements passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in matters titled *Sesh Nath Singh & Anr. V. Baidyabati Sheoraphull Cooperative Bank Ltd (2021) 7 SCC 313* and on *Panchu Gopal Bose v. Board of Trustees for Port of Calcutta (1993) 4 SCC 338* is also wrong in context of said Section 17.

RESPONDENT –

- (12) That the meter of the Complainant was replaced in the month of May, 2023 due to communication failure and defect in the said meter. The copy of the Meter Change Order (MCO) dated 26.05.2023 is at **Annexure RA1**;

- (13) That its action to raise the sundry charges amounting to Rs 5,89,627.67 in the electricity bill dated 05.07.2025 (**Annexure C5**) is in accordance with HP Electricity Supply Code (Sixth Amendment), 2025 (**Annexure RA2**);
- (14) That during internal Audit conducted in March- 2025 for the audit period of April 2023 to March 2024, the defect of short consumption due to wrong application of Multiplication Factor (MF) was detected to the tune of Rs.5,89,027.67. Copy of Audit Report is at **Annexure RA4**. The MF had erroneously been recorded as 1 instead of correct MF of 1000;
- (15) That the demand raised by it is in accordance with H.P. Electricity Supply Code (Sixth Amendment) 2025;
- (16) That the demand as raised by it is statutory in nature and the Complainant cannot evade payment once bona-fide mistake of wrong MF was detected and it as a distribution licensee has every right to recover past dues once bona-fide mistake is detected as has been settled in Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgments passed in matters titled *Assistant Engineer (D1) Ajmer Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd and Anr. V. Rahamutullah Khan alias Rahamjulla (2020) 4SCC 650* and *M/s Prem Cottex v. Uttar Haryana Vijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. & Ors (2021) 20 SCC 200*;
- (17) That the bar of limitation is not attracted in present case as per Section 17(1)(c) of the Limitation Act, 1963 and in accordance with Hon'ble Supreme Court in matters titled *Sesh Nath Singh & Anr. V. Baidyabati Sheoraphull Cooperative Bank Ltd (2021) 7 SCC 313* and on *Panchu Gopal Bose v. Board of Trustees for Port of Calcutta (1993) 4 SCC 338*. Accordingly Complainant's contention is misconceived;
- (18) That in view of its above submissions, the complaint be dismissed.

ORDER

- (19) Forum has examined the relevant provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, various relevant Regulations and respective amendments framed and notified by the HP Electricity Regulatory Commission (or

the HPERC) including relevant provisions of HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013, 2012, HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 and amendments thereto, Tariff 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 fair facts, evidences and correspondence placed on record and arguments adduced by both the parties;

- (20) At the outset, Forum observes from examination of record that impugned sundry has been raised by the Respondent upon the Complainant in electricity bill dated 05.07.2025 (**Annexure C5**) on account of short assessment of the metered consumption in Complainant's billing carried out for the past period from March 2021 to May 2023 (26 months). This short assessment was pointed out in the Respondent's Audit conducted in March 2025 due to wrong application of MF of 1 instead of 1000 to the Complainant's meter reading / consumption existing during the said past period;
- (21) It is understood by the Forum that Multiplication Factor (MF) is a condition of metering / meter reading / billing and that wrong application of this MF causes error in recorded consumption of a consumer. When the applied MF is less than the correct MF such results in consumer being billed for less electricity supplied by the Respondent / consumed by the Complainant as against the actual. In the instant matter, such is the condition arising in the past from March 2021 to May 2023 but which came into the Respondent's knowledge only at a later date in March 2025, resulting in Respondent raising upon the Complainant dues of past arrears as sundry charge in electricity bill dated 05.07.2025 (**Annexure C5**), which has been impugned by the Complainant;
- (22) In the hearing conducted in the matter, the Complainant specifically admitted to have made electricity consumption during the said past period from March 2021 to May 2023 (26 months) and in no way denied that the said electricity was not supplied to it by the

Respondent, for which the impugned sundry has been raised by the Respondent;

- (23) Forum also observes that there is no challenge to the validity of MF of 1000 instead of 1 by the Complainant, as being wrong in any way nor has it disputed the accuracy of the impugned sundry amount. Forum further observes that the Complainant has also not raised any issue of mala-fide against the Respondent to raise the said impugned sundry based on MF of 1000;
- (24) The Complainant while citing the provisions of Limitation Act, 1963, the Electricity Act, 2003 and the judgements passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court, has simply contended that when it is the mistake of the Respondent to not apply the correct MF, then the action of the Respondent to raise the impugned demand by application of MF of 1000 instead of 1 at a later stage, is against the Limitation Act, 1963, against Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the law settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court in context of the relevant Section of said Limitation Act;
- (25) On the other hand, the Respondent while relying on H.P. Electricity Supply Code (Sixth Amendment) 2025 and while citing Judgements passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court, has defended its action to raise the impugned sundry for past period arrears arising from application of correct MF of 1000 instead of wrong MF of 1 and stated on record that it is its right to recover past period dues in accordance with section 56 of the Act and that the impugned demand raised by it is statutory in nature and thus the Complainant cannot evade payment once bona-fide mistake of wrong MF has been detected;
- (26) Forum finds that in the matter, the parties to make out their respective case have placed reliance on Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. Thus Forum finds it expedient to refer to this Section of the Act before it delves further into the matter. For the sake of convenience it herein after reproduces the provisions of said provision of the Act –

“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.”

- (27) After examining the record and facts in the matter, coupled with provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 reproduced *ibid*, Regulations / Code notified by the Ld HPERC, Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC and 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 not being *res-integra*;
- (28) 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 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;

- (29) 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;
- (30) Now returning to the instant matter before the Forum –
- (31) It is therefore clear from settled law that while the consumer uses electricity being a good, the distribution licensee charges for this electricity / good at the specified tariffs/ charges of electricity, which in the State of Himachal Pradesh are determined by the Ld HP Electricity Regulatory Commission (HPERC) vide 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 a consumer and thereafter an electricity bill or monetary demand is raised upon the consumer;
- (32) 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. 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 incidentally is undoubtedly applicable in the instant matter;

- (33) Forum is also of the considered opinion that short recording or non-recording or 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. 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;
- (34) 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. When there was mistake or bona-fide error by the Respondent HPSEBL in not applying the correct multiplication factor (MF) of 1000 to the metered consumption of the Complainant during the past period from March 2021 to May 2023 (26 months), however, on this error being later noticed and pointed by the Audit

(**Annexure RA-4**), the Respondent raised the impugned sundry demand upon the Complainant only for the shortfall in electricity consumption which remained unrecorded and unbilled in the past. Respondent thus missed to raise correct electricity bills/ statutory amounts in the said past period, which went unnoticed for some time. Non-application of correct MF of 1000 has caused error in recorded consumption in the past and resulted in the Complainant being billed for less electricity consumed as against its actual electricity consumption which was more by a factor of 1000. This eventually resulted in raising of impugned sundry / past arrears / dues by the Respondent during a valid limitation period, which is now recoverable from the Complainant;

- (35) Forum concludes that when the Respondent in the past had erred in not fully charging for this electricity / good at the specified tariffs/ charges of electricity, the action of the Respondent to raise demand upon the Complainant, of impugned sundry charges as past period dues / arrears amounting to Rs 5,89,627.67 in the electricity bill dated 05.07.2025 (**Annexure C5**), is certainly not wrong in any way. The said impugned sundry charges raised by the Respondent 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. The impugned demand has been raised in July 2025 and the same 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 here because the bar of limitation does not exist therefore so does the condition to show arrears as continuous recoverable also does not;
- (36) Forum further observes that it is not correct of the Complainant to raise contention that the MF error was in the knowledge of the Respondent because it was regularly paying electricity bills or that the past period arrears arising from the said error were beyond the period of 2 years and therefore the demand is barred by limitation period of 2 years. It is not open for the Complainant to raise such contention

having consumed electricity in the past for which payment made by it at that time is actually 1/1000th of that actually due. Forum holds such contention to be misplaced and against the statute and is thus rejected;

- (37) Forum further concludes that by charging for the actual electricity consumption made by the Complainant based on correct MF and at Ld HPERC determined Tariffs, it cannot be held that the impugned demand is illegal. The Respondent is liable to recover ex post facto for the shortfall of statutory charge not billed earlier, which the Complainant is liable to pay towards the consumption of goods done by it, as has been held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in judgments referred in paras supra, if not paid earlier and accordingly the Forum does not find any illegality in the impugned demand for sundry amounting to Rs 5,89,627.67 in the electricity bill dated 05.07.2025 (**Annexure C5**);
- (38) Forum now proceeds to delve into other citations of the Hon'ble Apex Court, referred to by the parties in their respective pleadings –
- (39) Forum observes that the Complainant has relied upon Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgments passed in matters titled **(1) *Saranpal Kaur Anand v. Praduman Singh Chandhok*, (2022) 8 SCC 401**, **(2) *Mahabir Kishore v. State of M.P.*, (1989) 4 SCC 1**, **(3) *Lloyd Electric & Engg.. Ltd. v. State of H.P.* (2016), 1 SCC 560** and **(4) *Central Warehousing Corpn. v. Adani Ports & Special Economic Zone Ltd.*, (2022) 15 SCC 110**, while the Respondent has relied upon Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgments passed in matters titled **(5) *Sesh Nath Singh & Anr. V. Baidyabati Sheoraphull Cooperative Bank Ltd* (2021) 7 SCC 313** and on **(6) *Panchu Gopal Bose v. Board of Trustees for Port of Calcutta* (1993) 4 SCC 338**.
- (40) Forum after going through the ibid Hon'ble Apex Court Judgments cited by both the parties, finds that the judgments at Sr No **(1), (2) (5)** and **(6)** above, are in terms of the Limitation Act, 1963 and may be applicable to matters where Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 ceases to be applicable. However, because in the instant matter the said Section 56(2) is applicable, as has been held by the Forum in

paras Supra, hence Forum holds that the Limitation Act is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the instant matter and accordingly these Judgments are distinguishable and not applicable in the instant matter;

- (41) Now coming to the Complainant's contention with regard to it being wrongly charged commercial tariff while it is entitled to domestic tariff from July 2023 and in respect of which it had made online complaint to Respondent vide Docket No C1000064753 dated 20.11.2023 (**Annexure C2 / Annexure C3**), which was not attended by the Respondent –
- (42) Forum observes that the ibid contention raised by the Complainant to be charged domestic tariff and not Commercial tariff for whatever reasons made out by it, such contention has necessarily to be based upon the provisions of Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC, which the Forum finds as missing on part of Complainant. The Complainant has to appreciate the fact that the Respondent is not a general store/shop but is a regulated distribution licensee / public utility Company under the Electricity Act, 2003 and its functioning cannot be expected to be arbitrary. The Complainant, based upon Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC, has no-where shown in its complaint as to how is the domestic consumer tariff applicable to it, especially when it is a two part consumer as per its supply voltage, load, contract demand and usage, while the domestic category tariff is applicable to only single part category consumers. Therefore, Forum is of the opinion that the complaints made to Respondent vide Docket No C1000064753 dated 20.11.2023 (**Annexure C2 / Annexure C3**) and thereafter is apparently wrong and ill conceived. However still, Forum observes that when the matter pertains to Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC, then it is not for it to interpret the Tariff Orders vis-à-vis their applicability to the Complainant, the jurisdiction of which lies with the Ld HPERC. Accordingly, in the event the Complainant is aggrieved by wrong application of tariff by the

Respondent, then the Complainant in this regard is at liberty to approach the appropriate Authority under the Electricity Act, 2003;

- (43) Forum finds that the judgments cited at Sr No (3) and (4) in para supra relied upon by the Complainant to make out its case in favour of domestic tariff, are in terms of Government Policy and not in terms of the Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HPERC in pursuance to the Regulations and the Electricity Act, 2003 and further holds that these judgments are again distinguishable and not applicable in the context of instant matter;
- (44) In view of foregoing, no illegality is observed in the impugned sundry of Rs 5,89,627.67 raised upon the Complainant by the Respondent in the electricity bill dated 05.07.2025 (**Annexure C5**). This impugned demand being a legal one is upheld;
- (45) Complainant is accordingly directed to pay in full the ibid impugned sundry of Rs 5,89,627.67 within a period of 10 days from this Order;
- (46) On non-payment of the said ibid sundry, the Respondent shall be at liberty to take action as per statute governing the electricity sector.
- (47) Any stay granted in the matter is accordingly vacated in view of foregoing observations, holdings, findings and discussions by the Forum.

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 26.11.2025 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: 26.11.2025

Shimla

--Sd--

**Vikas Gupta
(Member)**

--Sd--

**Tushar Gupta
(Chairperson)**

**CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI,
SHIMLA-9.**

Complaint No.:- 1213/202508/28
Date of Admission:- **26.08.2025**
Quorum: - **Er. Tushar Gupta, Chairman**
Er. Vikas Gupta, Member

In ref:-

Sh. Nidesh Gupta S/o Sh. J.L Gupta
R/o Village Chhankr P.O Janedghat
Sub-Tehsil Junga Distt. Shimla-171218

Complainant

V/s.

HPSEBL & Others.

Respondents

1. The Executive Director (Pers.),
HPSEBL, Vidyut Bhawan,
Shimla-171004.
2. Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Sub-Division HPSEBL,
Junga, Distt. Shimla HP

Respondents

Final hearing:- 28.10.2025.

Counsels:-

Complainant 1. Sh. Shubham verma Advocate

Respondent 1. Sh. Kamlesh Saklani, U.S. Law

2. Er. Yashwant Singh A.E

Date of Decision:-26.11.2025

Notice

Registered

CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI
SHIMLA-171009.

No. CGRF/Complaint No. 1213/202508/28

Dated:-

Sh. Nidesh Gupta S/o Sh. J.L Gupta
R/o Village Chhankr P.O Janedghat
Sub-Tehsil Junga Distt. Shimla-171218

Complainant

V/s.

HPSEBL & Others.

Respondents

Complaint No. 1213/202508/28

1. The Executive Director (Pers.),
HPSEBL, Vidyut Bhawan,
Shimla-171004.
2. Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Sub-Division HPSEBL,
Junga, Distt. Shimla HP

Respondents

The Certified copy of final order dated 26.11.2025 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.