

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM, SHIMLA

Complaint No 1413/202310/32

M/s Kailash Chand (LR College)

Vs

Himachal Pradesh 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 Kailash Chand (LR College), Village Jabli (Kyar) PO Oachghat, Tehsil & Distt. Solan;
- (2) Complainant is a Commercial Supply (CS-Two part) Consumer bearing Consumer ID 100009003601 and the Respondent HPSEB Ltd is a distribution licensee;
- (3) Complainant had earlier filed complaint No 1413/1/23/09 where-in this Forum had passed Orders on 05.09.2023 (**Annexure C4**) and had partially allowed the complaint;
- (4) By way of the instant complaint, the Complainant has laid challenge to revised Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023 (**Annexure C6**) served upon the Complainant by the Respondent pursuant to final Orders passed by this Forum on 05.09.2023 (**Annexure C4**). The Complainant while raising challenge to the said Demand Notice has alleged that revised demand is against the directions of the Forum imparted in Order dated 05.09.2023;
- (5) The Complainant has also laid challenge to the charging of a surcharge amount of Rs 4,85,908/= in the ibid demand dated 22.09.2023 (**Annexure C6**);
- (6) The action of the Respondent to raise ibid surcharge of Rs 4,85,908/= in revised Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023 which has been raised pursuant to Orders passed by the Forum on 05.09.2024, has led to a

fresh cause of action for the Complainant resulting in the instant grievance before the Forum.

COMPLAINANT –

- (7) That the respondent issued electricity bill dated 16.09.2023, with an included arrear amount of Rs 32,26,723.11 (**Annexure C7**). This amount comprises a non-Electricity Duty or SoP amount of Rs 31,62,992.34 and an ED amount of Rs 63,730.77;
- (8) That on 22.09.2023, the respondent issued Demand Notice (**Annexure C6**) for Rs 35,57,630/= plus surcharge of Rs 4,85,908/=, total amounting to Rs 40,43,538/= . The break-up of charges is at **Annexure C5**;
- (9) That on 01.10.2023, the respondent issued another Notice to the Complainant for the payment of arrears (**Annexure C8**);
- (10) That on 16.10.2023, the Complainant raised objection to the said Demand Notice (**Annexure C9**);
- (11) That in revised Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023 (**Annexure C6**) raised by the respondent pursuant to final Orders passed by this Forum on 05.09.2023 (**Annexure C4**), the respondent has demanded amount of Rs 35,57,630/= plus surcharge of Rs 4,85,908/=, total amounting to Rs 40,43,538/= . The calculation sheet / break-up of charges is at **Annexure C5**;
- (12) That there is no MRI data / tamper status report supported by the respondent to the complainant/consumer which demonstrate the phase missing event since June 2018 onwards and as such, the overhauling of consumer account for alleged phase missing since June 2018 to October 2022 is erroneous and unsustainable. The alleged overhauling of account of consumer/complainant for entire period commencing from March 2016 to October 2022 is absolutely

erroneous, unjustified, arbitrary and as such overhauling of consumer complainant account for Rs 32,76,344/- vide Notice dated 01.10.2023 and bill dated 17.10.2023 for arrears of Rs 32,72,670.49 deserves to be quashed and set aside

- (13) That the said revised Demand Notice (**Annexure C6**) and the charging of a surcharge amount of Rs 4,85,908/= in this demand, is against the directions issued to the Respondent in the ibid final Orders passed by the Forum on 05.09.2023 (**Annexure C4**);
- (14) Complainant has prayed for the following reliefs:-
- a) An Order declaring the alleged overhauling of account of complainant/consumer for the entire period from March 2016 to October 2022 for Rs 35,57,630/= as wrong, illegal, arbitrary, unjustified and against the directions issued by the Forum in terms of Order dated 05.09.2023 passed in complaint number 1413/1/23/09.
 - b) An Order declaring Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023, bill dated 17.10.2023 and surcharge amount of Rs 4,85,908/= in the Demand Notice as wrong, illegal, arbitrary, unjustified and against the directions issued by the Forum in terms of Order dated 05.09.2023 passed in complaint number 1413/1/23/09.

RESPONDENT –

- (15) That the complaint is not maintainable in the eyes of law, that there exists no cause of action and that the demand notice raised by the Respondent is perfectly valid and legal in the eyes of law;
- (16) That the demand notice for phase missing, duly substantiated by the data retrieved from the system (**Annexure R-1 (Colly)**), wherein the human interference is totally negligible, if seen by Forum, then

Forum will come to the inescapable conclusion that demand is perfectly valid;

- (17) That the Tamper Report (**Annexure R2**) for the month of 12/2022 has been supplied to the Complainant along with the revised Demand Notice and it is being proved that 'Y' phase voltage and 'B' phase voltage remained missing for 2405 days and 1382 days respectively. The calculation for unbilled amount has been done on the basis of voltage missing totally based on MRI record;
- (18) That the Complainant consumer is trying to hide facts and evidence and avoiding the attention of Forum so that the main evidence which is the tamper report can be hidden. If **Annexure R2** is seen it is very clear for how many days 'Y' phase voltage and 'B' phase voltage remained missing;
- (19) That the Complainant has also raised question on Demand Notice dated 01.02.2023 and surcharge amount which has been revised vide demand Notice No 519-22 dated 22.09.2023 as per Orders passed by the Forum on 11.09.2023 (**Annexure A-3**) and surcharge amount of Rs 4,85,905/- has been calculated on basis of revised demand Notice and as per tariff if consumer is not depositing the energy bills and approached the Forum, surcharge @ 1.5% is calculated per month;
- (20) That the complaint be dismissed with heavy cost.

ORDER

- (21) This Forum has examined the complaint No 1413/1/23/09 previously filed by the Complainant and gone through the final Orders passed by this Forum on 05.09.2023 (**Annexure C4**) in the said complaint;
- (22) The Forum has also examined the relevant provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, various Tariff Orders passed by the Ld HP Electricity Regulatory Commission (or the HPERC), relevant

Regulations framed by the HPERC including relevant provisions of HPERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013, HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009 notified by the HPERC, amendments thereto and record as facts along with pleadings of the parties. This Forum has heard the parties at length. The considered opinion of the Forum has been gathered after considering the fair facts, evidences and pleadings placed on record and arguments adduced by both the parties;

- (23) Forum observes that the Complainant has laid challenge to revised Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023 (**Annexure C6**) raised by the Respondent pursuant to final Orders passed by this Forum on 05.09.2023 (**Annexure C4**). In the said Demand Notice the Respondent has demanded amount of Rs 35,57,630/= plus surcharge of Rs 4,85,908/=, total amounting to Rs 40,43,538/=. The calculation sheet / break-up of charges is at **Annexure C5**. The Complainant while raising challenge to the said Demand Notice (**Annexure C6**) has alleged that revised monetary demand for the period from March 2016 to October 2022 for Rs 35,57,630/= is wrong and against the directions of the Forum imparted in Order dated 05.09.2023 (**Annexure C4**) in complaint number 1413/1/23/09. The Complainant has also laid challenge to the charging of a surcharge amount of Rs 4,85,908/= in the ibid demand;
- (24) Complainant has contended that there is no MRI data / tamper status report supported by the Respondent to the complainant/consumer which may demonstrate the phase missing event since June 2018 onwards and thus the Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023 and the overhauling of consumer account for alleged phase missing since June 2018 to October 2022 is erroneous and unsustainable and that the alleged overhauling of account of consumer/complainant for

entire period commencing from March 2016 to October 2022 is absolutely erroneous and that this is against the directions of the Forum passed in its Order dated 05.09.2023 (**Annexure C4**).

- (25) Simply speaking one of the contentions of Complainant is that because the Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023 / overhauling of Complainant account is not supported with MRI data / tamper status for phase missing, thus it is erroneous in view of the directions passed by the Forum in its Order dated 05.09.2023 and seen from another angle then there is non-implementation of the final Orders passed by the Forum dated 05.09.2023 and the second contention is that of surcharge amount of Rs 4,85,908/= having wrongly been added in the Demand Notice stage;
- (26) At the outset, to conclusively settle the matter, the Forum observes that the following issues shall require determination:-
- (a) **Issue No -1:** Whether, the grievance raised in the instant complaint for wrong/ erroneous overhauling of Complainant's account for the period from March 2016 to March 2022, as alleged by the Complainant, is settled once revised Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023 is served by the Respondent upon the Complainant based on Forum's Orders dated 05.09.2023 or whether the instant complaint is one of non-implementation of the directions passed by the Forum on 05.09.2023 in complaint number 1413/1/23/09;
- (b) **Issue No -2:** Whether the Respondent is justified in adding surcharge amount of Rs 4,85,905/- in the revised Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023.
- (27) The Forum now proceeds to determine each of the Issues framed supra:-

- (28) **Issue No -1:** At the outset, in the matter of grievance raised and relief sought by the Complainant for declaring the alleged overhauling of account of complainant/consumer for the entire period from March 2016 to October 2022 for Rs 35,57,630/= and bill dated 16.10.2023 as wrong, illegal, arbitrary, unjustified and against the directions given by the Forum in terms of Order dated 05.09.2023 passed in complaint number 1413/1/23/09, Forum observes that the Complainant on one hand has alleged erroneous/ wrong overhauling of its account not supported with MRI data / tamper status and on the other hand Complainant has alleged non-implementation of the directions given to the Respondent in the ibid final Orders passed by the Forum on 05.09.2023 (**Annexure C4**);
- (29) In an earlier filed complaint No 1413/1/23/09 by the same Complainant, Forum from examination of final Order passed by the Forum on 05.09.2023 (**Annexure C4**) finds that the Forum while disposing of the ibid complaint had partially allowed the complaint and had inter-alia held as follows: –

Quote

.....
.....

- (46) **Issue No 3:** *Once the Issues No 1 and 2 framed supra stand decided, Forum further observes from record that while the Complainant has stated that the monetary demand raised by the Respondent HPSEBL is wrong, illegal, unjustified, arbitrary and against the provisions of HP Electricity Supply Code, 2009, and prayed before this Forum for directions to the Respondent to make the revised calculations of alleged less recorded consumption of energy for the period March, 2015 onwards, if permissible or warranted on the basis of Meter Reading Instrument (or MRI) based event-wise-tamper status of existing meter, it has in fact accepted the underlying metering error but has disputed the flat basis of calculation of the consequential monetary demand. The directions sought by the Complainant are simply that the monetary demand be based upon the MRI data and may not be determined on flat basis;*
- (47) *The Forum now proceeds to look into the aspect as raised by the Complainant of any flat basis of overhauling of account by the Respondent in wake of the established defective metering--*
- (48) *Even at the time of arguments in the matter, the Complainant was not averse to any monetary demand due to metering error but had opposed the raising of a monetary demand on flat basis by the Respondent without it considering the actual duration or*

actual period of existence of the metering error in the period from March 2015 to October 2022.

- (49) In the instant case 'Y' phase is alleged to be missing from March 2015 to October 2022 and 'B' Phase missing from Jan 2019 to October 2022;
- (50) After examining the MRI record, the Forum prima-facie observes that the overhauling of Complainant account (Annexure C1 / Annexure C5 Colly) due to defective metering has not been done strictly in conformation with the MRI data, if applied, for the entire period of defective metering from March 2015 to October 2022. For instance –
- (51) Firstly, the MRI data placed on record, is found by the Forum to not be for each day of the period from March 2015 to October 2022 for which the overhauling of Complainant account is done by the Respondent;
- (52) Secondly, the 'Tamper Reports' of the MRI data placed on record by Respondent are found by the Forum to only depict voltage failure events of phases for certain durations on certain days during the said period from March 2015 to October 2022. The case of the Respondent can only be supported, when these reports depict the phase voltage failures for all the days of the period of defective metering from March 2015 to October 2022;
- (53) Thirdly, the Forum does not find the MRI data to continuously depict phase failure from the original date in March 2015 to October 2022. This is observed by the Forum to not exist continuously but to exist continually during this period;
- (54) Fourthly, the condition when only 'Y' phase is observed by the Forum to be continuously missing is from January 2017. Similarly, the condition, when both 'Y' and 'B' phases are observed to be missing continuously, is only from August 2020;
- (55) Therefore, in the instant complaint, it becomes amply clear that the Respondent has adopted a flat basis for overhauling the account of the Complainant due to defective metering in the past. Accordingly, the Forum is in agreement with the contention of the Complainant on this count and holds that because the Respondent has relied upon the MRI data to evidence defective metering and to consequentially raise a monetary claim against the Complainant, thus a flat basis cannot be adopted by the Respondent to estimate the differential consumption due to defective metering in the past and to overhaul the account of the Complainant. The estimation of differential consumption not previously billed due to metering error and the consequential overhauling of Complainant account has thus to be done by the Respondent strictly in accordance with the MRI data for each day of the period from March 2015 to October 2022 and accordingly the Complainant is entitled to a correct overhauled account. **Issue No 3** is accordingly decided in favor of the Complainant and against the Respondent;
- (56) In view of foregoing discussion, the Respondent No 3 is directed to correct the impugned monetary demand dated 06.12.2022 (Annexure- C5 Colly), further raised as sundry in bill dated 18.01.2023 (Annexure C-6) and further raised through demand dated 01.02.2023 (Annexure C-7) respectively, by overhauling the account of arrears of the Complainant only for the days the defective metering actually existed and from the date the defective metering first arose in March 2015 and up to the date the issue of defective metering existed in October 2022. The Respondent is further directed to support this overhauled account with the MRI data for each day for which arrears are determined by the Respondent. It is made clear that no arrears shall be projected by the Respondent to the Complainant for the days for which such is not supported with the MRI data;
- (57) The Respondent No 2 is further directed to validate the ibid corrected monetary demand / overhauled account framed by the Respondent No 3. Thereafter, the Respondent is directed to raise a fresh Demand Notice to the Complainant within a period of 15 days from this Order, along with revised overhauled account for each day of the period from March 2015 to October 2022 and duly supported by MRI data for each day. The Complainant shall pay this revised monetary demand within a period of 15 days from the date of issue of the ibid fresh Demand Notice;

(58) *In view of foregoing, no illegality is observed by the Forum in the monetary demand raised by the Respondent. The Forum however, holds the impugned monetary demand for 43,01,696/- raised by the Respondent vide demand notice on 06.12.2022 (Annexure- C5 Colly), vide sundry in bill on 18.01.2023 (Annexure C-6) and vide demand notice on 01.02.2023 (Annexure C-7), to have been 'determined incorrectly' and accordingly sets these aside with directions to the Respondent to correctly determine the same and raise fresh / revised demand notice as Ordered in paras supra.*

*On aforesaid terms, the complaint is **partially allowed** and is disposed accordingly.*

.....
.....

Un-Quote ;

- (30) Forum also finds from examination of the complaint number 1413/1/23/09 filed by the same complainant that the ibid Orders dated 05.09.2024 were passed by the Forum in terms of the relief that was sought by the Complainant;
- (31) Forum finds that the relief sought in the instant complaint by the same Complainant for erroneous overhauling is clearly one which requires the Forum to re-visit, re-examine and re-address the issue of overhauling of Complainant consumers account which has already been done by the Forum in its Orders passed on 05.09.2024 (**Annexure C4**). Matter of overhauling of Complainant account for the period March 2015 to October 2022 between the same parties, has already been dealt and deliberated in detail by the Forum in its said Orders and sufficient directions passed. The period of dispute in the instant complaint is from March 2016 to October 2022 which the Forum finds to be well within the period of dispute of previously settled grievance which was from March 2015 to October 2022. This fact becomes evident on examination of the pleadings in complaint number 1413/1/23/09 vis-à-vis the instant complaint filed by the same Complainant and also from the Forum's Order dated 05.09.2023;
- (32) On the alleged erroneous/ wrong overhauling of its account not supported with MRI data / tamper status Forum on examining the

complaint and Reply filed by the Respondent, observes that there exists MRI data / Tamper Report to support the revised monetary demand raised by the Respondent on 22.09.2023 (**Annexure C6**). **Annexure R2** which is a Tamper Report of the meter MRI (meter reading instrument) data which depicts that the 'Y' phase voltage failure is of 2405 days, 23 hours and 20 minutes (i.e approximately 6 years, 7 months and 6 days) and the 'B' phase voltage failure is of 1382 days and 34 minutes (i.e approximately 3 years, 9 months and 17 days. This fact is clearly evidenced by the said Report (**Annexure R2**). The Respondent has accordingly raised the revised demand (**Annexure C6 / Annexure C7**);

- (33) It thus becomes clear to the Forum that it cannot be said that the Respondent has not complied with the directions passed by the Forum in its Order dated 05.09.2023, though such compliance may not be exactly as was intended by the Forum. The Respondent has raised the monetary Demand on 22.09.2023 (**Annexure C6**) based on **Annexure R2** which is in-fact the MRI data. It is undisputed that there was consumption of electricity by the Complainant during the disputed period. Pursuant to the fact that there was defective metering during the period of dispute and that during this period there existed vacuum of actual metering data and less recording of consumption, the Forum does not find fault in the assumption adopted by the Respondent based on **Annexure R2**, being MRI data, for working out short assessment in the past based on which monetary demand dated 22.09.2023 has been raised for the disputed period. Forum concludes that any monetary demand that may be raised for this period based on **Annexure R2**, being MRI data, as a reasonable assumption, cannot be rejected though this may be in variance to the directions passed by the Forum in its previous Order dated 05.09.2024. So as to prevent

endless litigation in the matter on non-implementation of Orders passed by the Forum on 05.09.2023, the directions passed by the Forum in its Order dated 05.09.2023 stand modified to this extent that **Annexure R2** can be relied upon by the Respondent to raise the corrected demand;

- (34) In view of foregoing, no illegality is observed in the monetary demand dated 22.09.2023 (**Annexure C6**) raised by the Respondent which the Forum upholds for an amount of Rs 35,57,630/= only and this amount is excluding the surcharge part which shall be dealt in later part of this Order. Forum holds and concludes that the Complainant is liable to pay this amount after adjusting for amounts already paid;
- (35) However, seen from another angle, if it is the grievance of the Complainant of non-implementation of Forum's Orders dated 05.09.2023, Forum after perusal of the regulation 28 read with sub-regulation 33(1) (e) of these Regulations, 2013, finds that Representation by consumer / Complainant for non-implementation of Orders passed by the Forum, does not lie with the Forum and thus it is not vested with authority under these Regulations to decide and pass Orders on the non-implementation of its final Order dated 05.09.2023 passed in complaint number 1413/1/23/09. The Complainant is at liberty to raise its grievance of non-implementation of Forum's Orders dated 05.09.2023 before the appropriate authority under the said sub-regulation 33(1)(f) of HPERC (CGRF and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2013, such not being maintainable before this Forum. Forum concludes that nothing further survives in the matter for determination by the Forum.
- (36) On aforesaid terms, **Issue No -1** is disposed.

- (37) **Issue No -2:** The only issue thus remaining for determination by this Forum, resolves down to determining whether the Respondent is justified in raising the surcharge in the Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023 (**Annexure C6**) for Rs 4,85,908/=;
- (38) The ibid stated action of the Respondent to raise surcharge of Rs 4,85,908/= in Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023 pursuant to final Orders passed by this Forum on 05.09.2023, has led to a fresh cause of action for the Complainant;
- (39) The Forum observes that the surcharge in question is the late payment surcharge (or the LPS). Forum, from perusal of Tariff Order passed by the Ld HPERC on 31.03.2023, finds the following definition of Late Payment Surcharge –
- “Late Payment Surcharge (LPS): Surcharge for late payment shall be levied at the rate of 1.5% per month or part thereof, on the outstanding amount excluding electricity duty / taxes for all the Consumer categories”*
- (40) On bare perusal of the ibid provision of Late Payment Surcharge (LPS), the Forum observes that the LPS is payable on the outstanding amount, implying thereby that LPS shall be chargeable by the distribution licensee in a subsequent bill for non-payment of an unpaid amount of current bill;
- (41) The Forum observes that in the present matter, the revised Demand Notice was issued on 22.09.2023 (**Annexure C6**). Surprisingly this Demand Notice was raised by the Respondent only after the bill dated 16.09.2023 (**Annexure C7**) was issued. Forum is of the considered opinion that this methodology adopted by the Respondent is adverse of the usual practice in case of recovery of arrears, wherein firstly the Demand Notice is issued to the consumer allowing time to consumer to raise objection and allowing the consumer time to agitate the arrears or to make payment, followed by a bill with the arrear amount

included, and only after its non-payment is the said LPS leviable in the subsequent bills;

- (42) The action by the Respondent to include an additional amount over and above that which may become due pursuant to Orders passed by the Forum on 05.09.2023 is clearly violative of the process of natural justice. It does not give time to the consumer to agitate its grievance before an appropriate authority for the violation of its rights, while at the same time wrongly assuming words in the Forum's Order dated 05.09.2023 and giving effect to such words thus exposing the consumer to un-warranted threat of disconnection of its electricity supply. Such a practice cannot garner the support of this Forum;
- (43) Further-more, this approach adopted by the Respondent has resulted in a fresh cause of action over an already settled matter on 05.09.2023. Late payment surcharge was not the case of the Respondent before this Forum in the original complaint No 1413/1/23/09 which was decided on 05.09.2023 and the Respondent could not have created a new cause of action after the decision was passed by the Forum on 05.09.2023. To have raised this surcharge after the specified days for payment in a subsequent Bill would be a different matter altogether. Accordingly, this action of the Respondent to include the Late payment Surcharge in Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023 and in Bill dated 16.09.2023 is set aside. The Respondent is stopped from recovering this at the stage of the Demand Notice dated 22.09.2023. This surcharge can be included in the bill to be raised and if not paid then recovered in subsequent bill.
- (44) **Issue No-2** is accordingly decided in favor of the Complainant and against the Respondent;
- (45) In view of foregoing, the impugned monetary demand dated 22.09.2023 (**Annexure C6**) stands modified to the extent that arrears

of Rs 35,57,630/= only is recoverable while surcharge amount of Rs 4,85,905/- included therein is not recoverable;

- (46) Accordingly, the Respondent is directed to raise the amount of Rs 35,57,630/= only as arrears without the surcharge component in the next bill. The Complainant shall pay the complete bill in accordance with the dates specified therein. On non-payment of the bill, late payment surcharge amount shall automatically become recoverable on the part not paid if any, including the arrears part while at the same time giving the Respondent liberty to take further action in accordance with the extant laws.

On aforesaid terms, the complaint is **partly allowed** and is disposed accordingly.

Parties are left to bear their own costs.

Order is announced before the parties present today on 24.09.2024 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: 24.09.2024

Place: Shimla

--Sd--

**Anil Sharma
(Member)**

--Sd--

**Tushar Gupta
(Chairperson)**

**CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI,
SHIMLA**

Complaint No.: - 1413/202310/32

Date of Admission:- 30.10.2023

**Quorum: - Er. Tushar Gupta, Chairman
Sh. Anil Kumar Sharma Member**

In ref:-

M/s Kailash Chand (LR College),
Village Jabli, (Kyar) P.O. Oachghat,
Tehsil and District Solan (HP).

Complainant

V/s.
HPSEBL & Others.

Respondents

1. The Executive Director (Pers.),
HPSEBL, Vidyut Bhawan,
Shimla-171004.
2. The Sr. Executive Engineer,
Electrical Division HPSEBL,
Solan, Distt. Solan (HP).
3. The Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Sub-Division-III HPSEBL Kot,
Solan Distt. Solan (HP).

Respondents

Final hearing:- 24.09.2024.

Counsels:-

Complainant 1. Sh. O.C. Sharma, Advocate

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

Date of Decision: -24.09.2024.

Notice

Registered

CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM AT KASUMPTI SHIMLA-171009.

No. CGRF/Complaint No. 1413/202310/32 **Dated:-**

M/s Kailash Chand (LR College),
Village Jabli, (Kyar) P.O. Oachghat,
Tehsil and District Solan (HP).

Complainant

V/s.

HPSEBL & Others.

Respondents

Complaint No. 1413/202310/32

1. The Executive Director (Pers.),
HPSEBL, Vidyut Bhawan,
Shimla-171004.
2. The Sr. Executive Engineer,
Electrical Division HPSEBL,
Solan, Distt. Solan (HP).
3. The Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Sub-Division-III HPSEBL Kot,
Solan Distt. Solan (HP).

Respondents

The Certified copy of final order dated 24.09.2024 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.

Sd/-

Secretary,
Consumers Grievances Redressal Forum,
HPSEBL, Kasumpti Shimla-9.