BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, HARYANA
Bays No. 33-36, Ground Floor, Sector–4, Panchkula-134109
Telephone No. 0172-2572299
Website: https://herc.gov.in/Ombudsman/Ombudsman.aspx#
E-mail: eo.herc@nic.in

(Regd. Post)

Appeal No.	**:**	**2 of 2025**
Registered on	**:**	**29.01.2026**
Date of Order	**:**	**07.07.2026**

In the matter of:

Appeal against the order dated 05.12.2025 passed by CGRF, UHBVN Panchkula in case No 48 of 2025

M/s Maangali Cotex Pvt. Ltd. of Israna **Appellant**

Versus

1. The XEN/OP Sub Urban Division, UHBVN, Panipat and Samalkha
2. SDO/OP, Sub Division, UHBVN, Samalkha and Israna

Respondent

Before:
Shri Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Electricity Ombudsman

Present on behalf of Appellant:
Shri Vijay Gupta

Present on behalf of Respondents:
Shri Mahender Singh Dhiman, Xen/Samalkha
Shri Naresh Yadav, SDO/OP, Sub-Division, Samalkha
Shri Naresh, Commercial Assistant, O/o SDO/OP, Samalkha

ORDER

A. M/s Maangali Cotex Pvt. Ltd. of Israna has filed an appeal against the order dated 05.12.2025 passed by CGRF, UHBVNL, Panchkula in case no. 48 of 2025. The appellant has submitted as under: -

उपरोक्त विषय के सन्दर्भ मे मै निर्देशक श्री श्याम कोटस्पीन, समालखा आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि मैने बिल ठीक करवाने बारे एक शिकायत CGRF Cell Panchkula मे दिनांक 12.03.2025 को की थी जिसका निवारण CGRF Cell Panchkula आर्डर दिनांक 05.12.2025 को 9 माह बीत जाने के बाद किया गया है।

उक्त आर्डर के उपरान्त एस०डी०ओ, समालखा ने भी संदर्भित पत्र के माध्यम से बकाया राशि जोकि कुल लगभग 3746433 रुपये बतायी है जिसमे से मै अग्रिम राशि के तौर पर 1800000.00 रुपये भर चुका हूं तथा अभी भी 1946433.00 की देनदारी आर्डर के अनुसार बकाया बतायी है।

माननीय महोदय CGRF Cell Panchkula के द्वारा जारी किया गया आर्डर पूर्ण रुप से विभागीय नियम एंव सेल्स नियमावली को दर किनार करके एंव मेरे द्वारा बार बार की गई अपील को मदेनजर ना करते हुये जारी किया गया है जिससे मै पूर्ण रुप से असंतुष्ट हूं।

अतः आपसे हाथ जोडकर निवेदित है कि पुरे केस को दोबारा चैक करवाकर मेरी निम्नलिखित अपील को पुनः विचार करके मेरे साथ न्याय किया जाये।

1. एस०डी०ओ० कार्यालय के द्वारा हमारी फर्म के अलग अलग समय पर गलत बिल जारी किये गये, तथा मुझे लगातार हैरैसमैन्ट किया गया जोकि निगम के नियमानुसार गलत है। अभी भी जारी की गई सीट मे फाईनल बिल 9982122 से घटाकर 3746433 किया गया है, जिसे देखकर प्रथम दृष्टया प्रतीत होता है कि विभाग के अधिकारियो ने जान बुझकर मुझे पिछले लगभग 4 साल से मुझे प्रताडित किया है। मेरी किसी भी तरह की गलती ना होते हुये भी मुझे अलग अलग तरीको से प्रताडित किया जिसके कारण मुझे कोर्ट कार्यवाही का भी सामना करना पड़ा।
2. एस०डी०ओ० कार्यालय के द्वारा मेरी जबरन वसूली 129472 रुपये वापिस किये गये है परन्तु वर्ष 2017 से अभी तक कोई ब्याज नही दिया गया है ।
3. एस0डी0ओ0 कार्यालय के द्वारा हाफ मार्जिन न0 68 व 69 - 05/2019 का पैसा रुपये 3224099 मेरे द्वारा जमा करवा दिया गया था परन्तु बावजुद उसके मेरे खाते में लगभग 1773954 रुपये दोबारा हाफमार्जिन न० 68 व 69 के नाम पर 01/2020 मे चार्ज किया जा चुका है। इस बारे हाफमार्जिन न0 68 व 69 के फाईनल अमाउंट बाबत तत्कालीन एस०डी०ओ० के द्वारा कोर्ट मे एफिडिविट जमा करवाया गया था जिसकी प्रति साथ संलग्न है। एक ही हाफ मार्जिन का पैसा विभाग 05/2019 में 32.24 लाख एंव 01/2020 मे 17.74 लाख मेरे खाते मे डाल चुका है तथा इस बारे शपथ पत्र माननीय न्यायालय में जमा करवा चुका है,बावजुद इसके 26.69 लाख जबरन 06/2024 मे कनैक्शन काटने के 4 साल बाद खाते मे चार्ज कर दिये जोकि सरासर अन्याय की इन्तहा है। विभाग के नियम सर्कुलर 03/2004 एंव 39/2013 के अनुसार इस तरह की जबरन वसुली का बिल से हटाया जाये, विभाग द्वारा जमा एफिडिवट की प्रति भी साथ संलग्न है।
4. एस0डी0ओ0 कार्यालय के द्वारा बिल मे 265128 रुपये 06/2025 जोकि पी०डी०सी०ओ० के चार साल बाद मे चार्ज किये गये जबकि विभाग के नियम सर्कुलर 03/2004 एंव 39/2013 के अनुसार एंव इलैक्टिसिटी एक्ट के तहत यह पैसा चार्ज नही किया जा सकता । अतः इस तरह की जबरन वसुली को मेरे बिल से हटाया जाये।
5. एस0डी0ओ0 कार्यालय के द्वारा जमा की गई कैलकुलेशन सीट मे पाईन्ट न० 4 पर 57092 रुपये कनैक्शन कटने के चार साल बाद 07/2024 मे चार्ज किये गये है जोकि विभाग के नियम सर्कुलर 03/2004 एंव 39/2013 के अनुसार गलत ढंग से चार्ज किये गये है अतः इनको मेरे बिल से घटाया जाये।
6. एस0डी0ओ0 कार्यालय के द्वारा पी०डी०सी०ओ० एंव CGRF Cell Panchkula के आर्डर के बाद भी लगभग 4.50 लाख सरचार्ज लगाया गया है जोकि विभाग के नियम सर्कुलर 03/2004 एंव 39/2013 के अनुसार गलत ढंग से चार्ज किये गये है अतः इनको मेरे बिल से घटाया जाये।

एस०डी०ओ० कार्यालय के द्वारा जमा की गई कैलकुलेशन सीट मे पाईन्ट न0 5,7,8,10,11,13 से 17 तक रुपये 6016277-00 का बिल रिफन्ड स्वीकार किया गया है जोकि पूर्ण रुप से साक्षी है कि मेरे खिलाफ विभागीय कार्यालय ने किस हद तक अन्यायपूर्ण रवैया इख्तियार किया गया है। जिससे स्पष्ट रुप से प्रतीत होता है कि विभागीय गलत कार्यवाही के कारण ही मेरा कनैक्शन डिफाल्ट पर पंहुचा तथा मेरे बिजनेस को करोडो रुपये के नुकसान से गुजरना पड़ा। मैने अपना बकाया बिल कुल रुपये 1946433.00 रुपये रसीद न0 122755907 दिनांक 05.01.2026 के द्वारा सी०जी०आर० एफ के आदेश की अनुपालन मे आपत्ति के साथ जमा करवा दिया है

अतः आपसे निवेदन है कि बिल मे जोडी गई उपरोक्त राशियो के मेरे बिल से हटवाया जाये तथा मेरे द्वारा वहन किये गये हैरसमैन्ट एंव बिजनेस लॉस जोकि लगभग 4-5 करोड है कि क्षतिपुर्ति हेतु 50 लाख की शीश भी दिलवाई जाये तथा मेरा बिजली का कनैक्शन शीघ्रतिशीघ्र चालु करवाया जावे।

मै सदा आपका आभारी रहूंगा

B. The appeal was registered on 29.01.2026 as an appeal No. 2 of 2026 and accordingly, notice of motion to the Appellant and the Respondents was issued for hearing the matter on 24.02.2026.

C. On 21.02.2026, Respondent SDO/OP Sub Division, Israna has submitted reply which is as under:-

In the subject cited connection, it is intimated that there is no any dispute regarding defaulting amount pertains to this office is pending, however the amount transferred from Samalkha Sub Division, and also the case was defended by SDO(OP) Sub Division UHBVN Samalkha. As per representation of complainant, a notice no 3749 dated 12.10.2021 was served to consumer regarding recovery of defaulting amount Rs 3035563/- of account no 3543011000 which was running in Samalkha Sub Division and was disconnected. But no satisfactory reply was received. Meanwhile a letter having memo no 481 dated 08.12.2021(revised final bill) received from SDO (OP) UHBVN Samalkha for amount pending Rs 4421108/- (except Court Case amount Rs 2425105/-). Bill was also preaudited by audit team i.e. IAP-15 (Copy attached). Also a letter memo no Ch-78/F-571 dated 08.12.2021 received from the office of The XEN SJU Divn UHBVN Panipat to transfer the amount Rs 4421108/- in the account existing in the Israna Sub Division. Hence same amount charged in the account no 1196846491 in the name of M/s Maanjali Cotex. After transfer of amount complainant file a CWP in the Hon'ble High Court vide CWP no-26130 of 2021. The CWP was decided by Hon'ble High Court against the complainant with cost on dated 15.10.2024. But the complainant did not pay the amount, hence connection has been disconnected. A letter also received from SDO (OP) UHBVN Samalkha vide memo no 14149 dated 24.01.2025 to recover the amount Rs 4203705/- from M/s Maajali Cotex. Same amount has been also charged in the account of M/s Maanjali Cotex. Hence it is stated that amount charged in the account of M/s Maanjali is correct as per Nigam's Instructions. Now the connection has been disconnected already vide PDCO No 5188404642 on dated 22.11.2024 on defaulting amount 11191944/-. It is also mentioned here that complainant already filed an appeal in HERC vide Appeal No 5/2025 on 29.01.2022, next date of hearing is 25.03.2025 on the same matter. So it is requested that complaint may please be filed.

This is for your kind information and further necessary action please.

D. On 23.02.2026, respondent SDO/OP Sub Division, Samalkha has submitted reply which is as under:

"निवेदक द्वारा CGRF ऑडर **05.12.2025** के खिलाफ जो अपील दर्ज कराई गई है वह निराधार गलत है, उपभोक्ता द्वारा समय समय पर बिजली बोर्ड के नियमों को ताक पर रखते हुए अपने अनुसार बिजली बोर्ड के खाते मे R.T.G.S के माध्यम से पैसे जमा करवाये परंतु विभाग मे सूचना सही समय पर नही दी जिसके कारण बिल गलत बन गए उपभोक्ता द्वारा रसीद देने पर बिल ठीक कर दिए गए |

उपभोक्ता द्वारा कम्प्लैन्ट No-**UH/CGRF-48/2025 दिनांक-12.03.2025** को दायर की गई जिसका जवाब उपभोक्ता फोरम मे समय पर दायर किया गया जिसकी फाइनल सुनवाई **12.11.2025 को थी तथा 05.12.2025** ऑर्डर पारित किया गया जिसमे उपभोक्ता द्वारा **3181973/-रुपए 16.05.2025** बिजली बोर्ड को पेय दिखाए गए ऑर्डर की कॉपी साथ सलग्न है जो उपभोक्ता के खाते मे दर्शाता है |

अपील मे दायर सूचना का पॉइंट वाइज़ जवाब इस प्रकार से है--

Point-01. उपभोक्ता का बिजली कनेक्शन **16.08.2021** को बिल न भरने के कारण **16.08.2021** को PDCO कर दिया गया उस समय उपभोक्ता का बकाया राशि **7713049/-रुपए** थी जिसका पूरा विवरण उपभोक्ता फोरम के सामने प्रस्तुत किया गया जिसकी कॉपी साथ सलग्न है |

Point-02. उपभोक्ता द्वारा जो आरोप लगाया गया है वह गलत है उपभोक्ता के बिल मे जो **129472/-** रुपए बतौर **M.TAX** वसूले गए थे वह वापिस कर दिए गए है ब्याज इस लिए नही दे सकते क्योंकि निगम द्वारा यह राशि नगरपालिका के खाते मे जमा करवा दी गई थी |

Point-03. उपभोक्ता के खाते मे ऑडिट टीम द्वारा कम चार्जिंग होने के कारण उजागर किया गया जो की SDO द्वारा खाते मे डाले गए उपभोक्ता फोरम द्वारा जांच मे **12.21** लाख रुपए ज्यादा चार्ज मिले वह घटा दिए गए |

Point-04. SDO कार्यालय द्वारा बिल मे **265128/-** रुपए 06/2025 मे डाले गए जोकि लाइन losses के आधार पर डाले गए थे जोकि उपभोक्ता फोरम के अनुसार भी सही पाए गए |

Point-05. उपभोक्ता के खाते मे **07/2024** मे चार्ज की गई राशि नवंबर तथा दिसंबर/2020 मे दो बार घटा दी गई थी, इसलिए चार्ज की गई, जोकि उपभोक्ता फोरम मे भी यह सही पाई गई |

Point-06. उपभोक्ता फोरम के द्वारा **3181973/-** देय राशि मे से **12.35** लाख रुपए बतौर ब्याज वसूली घटाने के आदेश भी दिए गए उसी के आधार पर बकाया राशि **1946433/-** उपभोक्ता द्वारा जमा कर दिए गए जोकि सही पाए गए |

निगम के द्वारा उपभोक्ता फोरम की पालन करते हुए उपभोक्ता का खाता सही कर दिया गया है | यह सूचना आपके आगामी कार्यवाही हेतु प्रेषित है |

E. The hearing in this matter was held on 13.03.2026 as scheduled. Both the parties were present during hearing. The Appellant (M/s Maanjali Cotex Pvt. Ltd.) and the Respondents (represented by SDO (OP) Samalkha/Israna) were heard at length.

During the hearing:

1. The Appellant submitted that he had not received the written reply filed by the Respondents. A copy of the same was handed over to him during the hearing itself. The Appellant expressed dissatisfaction with the contents of the reply and the audited calculation sheet placed on record by the Respondents.
2. The Respondents produced the audited calculation sheet (duly signed by the special audit team) on the basis of which the CGRF passed the order dated 05.12.2025. The Appellant stated that he has already deposited the net payable amount of ₹19,46,433/- as per the CGRF order (receipt No. 122755907 dated 05.01.2026) and the Respondents concurred with the same.
3. The Appellant raised serious objections to the charging of amounts arising out of Half Margin Nos. 68 (dated 24.04.2019) and 69 (dated 25.04.2019). He submitted that the Nigam itself had, in its reply before the CGRF, admitted that these half margins were found incorrect upon subsequent evaluation. He further contended that the internal audit party raised the half margins, revised them the very next day, and later declared them incorrect, yet the Appellant was made to face coercive recovery actions and prolonged harassment.
4. The Appellant also pointed out inconsistency in the demand figures communicated by the Respondents at different stages (initially around ₹30 lakhs and later enhanced).
5. The Respondents defended the calculations by stating that the entire account was overhauled from the date of connection till disconnection strictly in compliance with the CGRF directions and that the final amount has been verified by the special audit team.

After hearing both parties and perusing the record, the following clear and specific directions are issued in the interest of justice and to enable a complete and fair adjudication of the appeal:

Directions to the Appellant, file a detailed written statement containing:

a) A chronological sequence of events from the date of release of connection of M/s Shyam Cot Spin (Account No. 3543011000) till disconnection and subsequent transfer of liability to the Appellant's account (Account No. 1196846491).

b) Specific points of dissatisfaction/grievance with each action of the Respondents, including but not limited to the raising, revision, and subsequent declaration of Half Margin Nos. 68 & 69 as incorrect. b) The statement shall be supported by an affidavit affirming that all facts stated are true to the best of the Appellant's knowledge and that no material fact has been concealed.

Directions to the Respondents (UHBVN / SDO (OP) Samalkha & Israna):

a) File a detailed para-wise written reply addressing every point raised by the Appellant in his statement (to be filed in compliance with direction (a) above).

b) Specifically explain, with supporting documents:

- The exact circumstances and reasons under which Half Margin Nos. 68 (24.04.2019) and 69 (25.04.2019) were raised by the audit party and later declared incorrect / not sustainable.
- Furnish a copy of the reply submitted before the CGRF wherein it was admitted that these half margins were found incorrect. c) File a separate affidavit (sworn by an officer not below the rank of XEN) clearly stating:
- Whether Sales Circular Nos. 03/2004 and 39/2013 (or any successor instructions) are applicable on and after 24.09.2019 and till date.
- The applicability of the aforesaid circulars vis-à-vis the Haryana Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2014 (as amended from time to time) and any overriding effect, if any.
- Confirm that the final audited calculation sheet placed before this office is correct and no further manipulation has been carried out. d) The reply and affidavit shall be filed without concealing any fact and shall be supported by all relevant records, including the original half margin registers, audit reports, MT-1 reports, SC&AR entries, and court orders.

Timelines (strictly to be adhered to):

- Both parties shall comply with the above directions and exchange copies of their respective statements/replies within 21 days from the date of issuance of this order (i.e., on or before 03.04.2026).
- The Appellant shall file his rejoinder, if any, within 30 days from the date of issuance of this order (i.e., on or before 12.04.2026).

It is made clear that any failure to comply with the timelines or to file the required affidavits shall be viewed seriously and may invite adverse inference. Both parties are directed to cooperate fully and furnish complete information without any concealment.

The matter is schedule for further hearing on 16.04.2026.

F. On 10.04.2026, Xen/OP Samalkha has submitted reply which is as under:-

"In subject cited matter an interim order has been passed on dated-13.03.2026 that both the parties shall ensure compliance with the directions issued in the order by the stipulated timelines. Accordingly, on behalf of respondents (UHBVN/SDO OP Samalkha & Israna).it is stated that: -

Point-A SDO OP Sub Division, UHBVN, Samalkha letter against Memo. No. 15 Dated 27.10.2021 is available on the record (Copy attached). The amount mentioned in the letter bearing Memo. No. 40/Kapil Jaglan Dated 08.12.2021 was issued by XEN (OP) Sub Urban Divn. Panipat in which final amount was intimated as Rs. 6846213/- instead of Rs. 5783733/- (copy is attached calculation for ready reference and record). Then again against Memo. No. 78/AR-571 Dated 08.12.2021 the total amount of Rs. 6846213/- comes out as Rs. 4421108/- + Rs. 2425105/- as court case amounting to Rs. 1773959/- with surcharge was already going on in the Hon'ble Distt. Lower Court, Panipat so that disputed amount was not considered against total pending amount of RS. 6846213/-. The said Court case was decided against the complainant on CS-94-2020 D.O.D. = 31.10.2022. After ascertaining the amount charged through Half Margin and calculating the outstanding dues, the total amount of Rs. 9982122/- was shown as outstanding. Thereafter, on getting of direction from Corporate CGRF, UHBVN, Panchkula the record was thoroughly examined again through Revenue Staff as well as staff of the Sub-Division a amount of Rs. 8624813/- was intimated to the Forum as outstanding against the complainant with copy to the complainant side by side on which rejoinder was furnished and this reply thereon is being submitted. After taking exhaustive steps and minutely going through the record and getting pre-audited the whole account from the Revenue Wing (IAP) from the very beginning (i.e. from the date of dispute date of disconnection has arisen) to date has been carried out and the same is appended herewith in the tabulated form which is quite explicit vide which the total amount outstanding as on disconnection comes out to the tune of Rs. 3181973/- after excluding the amount of Rs. 18,00,000/- deposit by the consumer on dated 09.05.2025 vide receipt No. 109348905 in the account of Shree Maa Angeli.

1. So far as Municipal Tax for the period 11/2017 to 08/2018 and the meter rent against concerned, thereafter rent amount & M Tax adjustment has been adjusted in the account of the consumer. The M. Tax amount also tune of Rs. 123472/- & meter rent Rs. 6000/- was adjusted in detail sheet.
2. Regarding this point it is submitted that the amount through Half Margin No. 68 and 69 was charged to the complainant and the complainant had deposited Rs. 3224099/- with the Nigam in six installments as per Hon'ble Court orders and the amount charged through Half Margin No. 68, 69 amounting to Rs. 1773954/- was not paid by the complainant and the Court Case filed by the

consumer was also decided against him in 12/2022 (copy attached for ready reference). So the amount charged through Half Margin No. 68 and 69, which was less charged, was again added in the outstanding amount making sundry no. 300/409 Dated 8.2.2023 amounting to Rs. 2669703/-.

3. The amount of ACD as well as interest thereon has been adjusted as per detail attached herewith which is quite explicit.
4. On checking of record, it has been found that amount to the tune of Rs. 265128/- is chargeable to the complainant on account of line losses instead of amount to the tune of Rs. 1062480/- (Copy attached).
5. The detail of deposit of amount of Rs. 10,00,000/-in the month of 09/2018 has been received in the Nigam's account and amount to the tune of Rs. 1709139/- (1000000 + 709139) is being adjusted in the account of the complainant along with interest as per norms of the Nigam from the date of making of payment with the Nigam.
6. :-

A) Half Margin No. 69 Dated 25-04-2019 was checked and amount charged was checked by Audit team in which amount to the tune of Rs. 383609/- stands charged on higher side which has also been adjusted in the account of the complainant.
B) The Hon'ble Court has ordered for making payment of outstanding dues of Rs. 3224099/- in six installments and no other relief regarding interest was accorded in the said Court's order. Hence on this account, no other amount is adjustable. The above is submitted for further necessary action please.

As per interim order dated 03.04.2025. Consumer has deposited Rs. 18,00,000/- in Nigam's account. Keeping all aspects/ points raised by complaint and Sub Divisional record, the account of consumer was pre-audited by SO/Revenue party. Now as per calculation sheet of Sub Division the total amount Rs. 3181973/- is pending total payable by the consumer after excluding the amount of Rs. 18,00,000/- deposit by the consumer on dated 09.05.2025 vide receipt No. 109348905 in the account of Shree Manjali.

Further it is intimated that a sum of Rs- 12.35 lakh, has been deducted as surcharge levied on the pending bills as per verbal direction given by Honorable CGRF Forum and Rs-1946433/- was paid by the consumer after satisfaction on dated 05.12.2026.

This is for your kind information and taking further N/A please."

G. On 15.04.2026, Xen/OP Division, Samalkha has submitted reply which is as under:-

निवेदक द्वारा CGRF ऑर्डर 05.12.2025 के खिलाफ माननीय The Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana में जो अपील दर्ज कराई गई है वह निराधार गलत है, श्रीमान जी इस संदर्भ में आप के संज्ञान में लाया जाता है की उपभोक्ता द्वारा समय-समय पर उ० ह० बि० वि० नि० के बिल जमा करने से संबंधित नियमों की पालना ना करते हुए अपनी सुविधा के अनुसार उप मण्डल कार्यालय उ० ह० बि० वि० नि० समालखा के बैंक खाते मे R.T.G.S के माध्यम से पैसे जमा करवाये परंतु जमा राशि की सूचना सही समय पर विभाग मे नही दी व् विभाग के बैंक खाते मे उपभोक्ता द्वारा जमा राशि के साथ बिजली बिल खाता संख्या का विवरण ना होने की वजह से राशि उपभोक्ता के बिजली बिल खाते मे समायोजित नही की जा सकती थी! जिसके कारण बिल मे जमा राशि नही घटाई गई गलत परंतु जब उपभोक्ता द्वारा राशि जमा रसीद कार्यालय मे जमाकरने पर बिल ठीक कर दिए गए ।

उपभोक्ता द्वारा कम्प्लैन्ट NO-UH/CGRE-48/2025 दिनांक-12.03.2025 को दायर की गई जिसका जवाब उपभोक्ता फोरम मे समयपर दायर किया गया जिसकी अंतिम सुनवाई दिनांक-12.11.2025 को की गई और 05.12.2025 आदेश पारित किया गया जिसमे उपभोक्ता द्वारा 31,81,973/-रुपए देय राशि विभागमे जमाकरने के आदेश की कॉपी साथ सलग्न है जो उपभोक्ता के खाते मे दर्शाता है ।

अपील मे दायर सूचना का पॉइंट वाइज़ जवाब इस प्रकार से है--

Point-01.

उपभोक्ता द्वारा बिजली बिल का भुगतान नही करने के कारण दिनांक 16.08.2021 को PDCO कर दिया गया। उस समय उपभोक्ता की बकाया राशि 77,13,049/- रुपए थी जिसका पूरा विवरण उपभोक्ता फोरम के सामने प्रस्तुत किया जा चुका है । जिसकी कॉपी साथ सलग्न है तथा उपभोक्ता को उपमंडल कार्यालय समालखा द्वारा कभी भी प्रताड़ित नही किया गया है ! इसलिए प्रार्थी द्वारा लगाया गया आरोप निराधार है ।

Point-02.

उपभोक्ता द्वारा जो आरोप लगाया गया है वह गलत है उपभोक्ता के बिल मे जो 129472/- रुपए बतौर M.TAX वसूले गए थे वह वापिस कर दिए गए है ब्याज इस लिए नही दे सकते क्योंकि निगम द्वारा यह राशि नगरपालिका के खाते मे जमा करवा दी गई थी व इस राशि पर ब्याज देने का कोई प्रावधान नही है ।

Point-03.

उपभोक्ता के खाते मे ऑडिट टीम द्वारा जब ऑडिट की गई तो पाया गया की हाफ मार्जिन नंबर 68 और 69 जो चार्ज किए गए थे उस समय उपमण्डल कार्यालय समालखा द्वारा हाफ मार्जिन की राशि उपभोक्ता के खाते मे कम चार्ज की गईथी जिसके बाद जांच कर के उपभोक्ता के खाते मे पूर्णराशि को दोबारा चार्ज कर लिया गया।

Point-04.

उपमण्डल कार्यालय समालखा द्वारा बिजली बिल मे 2,65,128/- रुपए दिनांक 06/2025 मेलाइन losses के आधार पर डाले गए थे जोकि उपभोक्ता फोरम के अनुसार भी सही पाए गए ।

Point-05.

उपभोक्ता के खाते मे दिनांक 07/2024 मे 57092/- रुपए चार्ज किए गए जो की उपभोक्ता के खाते मेनबंवर तथा दिसंबर/2020 मे दो बार गलती से घटा दी गई थी, इसलिए यह राशि एक बार कीचार्ज की गई, जोकि उपभोक्ता फोरम द्वारा भी यह सही पाई गई ।

Point-06.

उपभोक्ता फोरम के द्वारा रुपए 31,81,973/- देय राशि मे से उपभोक्ता फोरम द्वारा 12.35 लाख रुपए बतौर ब्याज वसूली को घटाने के आदेश दिए गए जिसकी पालना करते हुए 19,46,433/-की बकाया राशि उपभोक्ता सेजमा करा लिए गए तथा मामले का निवारण कर दिया गया।

श्रीमान जी उपरोक्त सभी विवरण आप के संज्ञान मे लाया जाता है जो की निगम के द्वारा उपभोक्ता फोरम के आदेश की पालन करते हुए व विभाग के नियमानुसार यह खाता सही कर दिया गया है । यह सूचना आपके आगामी कार्यवाही हेतु प्रेषित है ।

H. On 15.04.2026, appellant has submitted as under:-

In respect of subjected matter Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman has directed to appellant to file a written statement containing:

1. A chronological sequence of events from the date of release of connection of M/s Shyam Cot Spin (Account No. 3543011000) till disconnection and subsequent transfer of liability to the Appellant's Account (Account No. 1196846491).
2. Specific points of dissatisfaction/grievance with each action of the Respondents, including but not limited to the raising, revision, and subsequent declaration of Half Margin Nos. 68 & 69 as incorrect. The statement should be supported by an affidavit affirming that all facts stated are true to the best of the Appellant's knowledge and that no material facts has been connected.

In purview of above point wise details is as under:

PART-1 (Sequence of events)

In prima facie I (Appellant) has submitted my all dues bills on proper manner and timely up to 03/2019, there is no pendency on the part of my firm upto 03/2019. In the month of 04/2019 SDO (OP Sub- Division, UHBVN Samalkha) has charged Rs. 3224099.00 in my account without any previous notice against the Half margin No. 68 & 69 raised by Internal Audit Party-15 O/o Chief Auditor, UHBVN Rohtak.

Aggrieved by the action of SDO, I have filed a court case against UHBVN for the arbitrarily action and court has directed to submit the ibid amount of HM 68 & 69 in six installments; I have submitted the said amount in 6 installment to Nigam but SDO has again charged Rs. 1773954.00 on account of amount of Half Margin No. 68 & 69 in month of 01/2020 i.e. immediate completion of period of 6 months allowed by the Hon'ble Court without justifying any ground.

Further against the injustice and invalid ground, I have again approached to Hon'ble Court and concerned SDO has submitted his final reply to court in shape of affidavit that difference related to the HM No. 68 & 69 is final and only Rs. 1773954.00 left out due to wrong calculation and adjustment. Court has allowed and amount posted to my account after the decision of court.

In the meantime I have submitted request to SDO to made a correct bill of my account as multiple amount deposited by me was not adjusted into account but every time SDO has intimated to me different amount of pendency and not corrected my bill upto the decision announced by Hon'ble CGRF Panchkula on dated 12.03.2025 and taken a span of more than 5 years to identify the problem in bills and arbitrarily disconnect the supply of my premises. Inaction of SDO Op UHBVN Samalkha causes to me business loss, mental agony and high financial burden of banks and clients which badly affects my social and metal healthcare.

The final bill was rectified but surprisingly I have shown that Rs. 2669703.00 again posted into my account after PDCO in month of 06/2024 on the account of HM 68 &69 at their own level; whereas no ground of charging left out, no order passed by concerned Chief Auditor, UHBVN Rohtak i.e. competent authority to decide the HM's cases. In final bill multiple amounts charged i.e. against the nigam instruction, and no orders obtained from higher authorities for the same. A single bill correction of mine resolved in more than 5 years which causes to me loss of multiple crores and crush my wisdom & faith into justice.

PART-II (Points of dissatisfaction)

1. The final amount of bills raised by the SDO Op multiple times with different amounts each time, a long span of more than 5 years has been taken to rectify the bills only for the sake of mental agony, injustice to me and to curse my peace of living.
2. SDO op has refunded Rs. 123472.00 in final bill on account of wrong M.Tax but no interest has been allowed.
3. Half Margin issued by the Chief Auditor, UHBVN Rohtak (IAP-15) through HM No. 68 dt. 24.04.2019 & 69 dt. 25.04.2019, Rs. 3224099 was charged in month 04/2019 but subsequently Rs. 1773954.00 again charged for

the same ground in month of 01/2020 and a closure affidavit submitted by the SDO to Hon'ble Court. Despite of all these Rs. 2669703.00 again charged in final settlement on a/c of H.M. 68 & 69 without getting any approval of competent authority arbitrarily by SDO in month of 06/2024 after elapsing of more than 4 years i.e. against the settlement submitted into court room and totally against the Nigam Instructions.

The amount also placed into my account in contrary to the court orders and bypassing the nigam instructions 03/2004 and 39/2013 that is clearly elaborate that:

Under the provisions of Section-56 of the Electricity Act-2003, following amendments are made in the existing rules, regulations and terms & conditions of the supply with immediate effect

(i) Any consumer who fails to pay any charges of electricity or any sum other than a charges for electricity due from him, a clear fifteen days notice in writing, to such consumer will be given before disconnecting the supply.

(ii) The notice of the disconnection on non-payment of bills will be printed on the bill forms, except that against earlier notice of seven days under section –24 of Indian electricity Act-1910, would be modified to provide for 15 days notice under section –56 of electricity Act-2003. The modified notice is attached as Annexure –'A'.

(iii) However the supply of electricity to the consumer should not be disconnected in case where consumer deposits any of the following amounts, whichever is less, under protest, pending disposal of any dispute between him and the Nigam.

(a) Amount equal to sum claimed from him

(b) The electricity charges due from the consumer for each month calculated on the basis of average charge paid by him during the preceeding six months.

(iv) The bills of Domestic and Non-Domestic Consumers are currently prepared by the Billing Agencies on pre-printed bill forms. The Billing Agencies are being directed to get the new bill forms printed with a modified notice of 15 days for disconnection with effect from 10.12.2003. Till the implementation of these instructions by the billing agencies, the modified notice be ink-stamped on the bills before distribution to the consumers on the existing stationery.

(v) The bills of all other category of Consumers are currently prepared by the field offices manually on pre-printed bill forms, till the new bill books with the modified notice printed on them are received, the existing bill books printed with 7 days notice may be used after ink-stamping them with the modified notice of 15 days.

(vi) The arrears of electricity charges should be regularly and continuously indicated in the bills. It may be clarified that under the new act that no sum due from any connected consumer, shall be recoverable after a 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.

(vii) Any amount of arrears assessed in respect of any consumer, which could not be recovered being assessed after two years, when they became first due, will be the liability of the officers / officials responsible for delay.

(viii) The amended provisions for recovery of arrears will be applicable for the arrears, which will be due for payment from the date of enforcement of the Act i.e. 10.12.2003 onwards. All the arrears due to be recovered from the consumers prior to 10.12.2003 will be recovered by the Nigam as per earlier instructions.

(ix) In case of disconnected consumers, the existing provisions for recovery of electricity dues would continue to apply.

4. SDO op has charged Rs. 265128.00 on account of line losses in final bill and incorporated the charges after elapsing of more than 4 years in a inappropriate manner which is in contrary to the Section 56 of Electricity Act-2003 and clear cut violation of Sales Circular No. 03/2004 & 39/2013.
5. SDO op has charged Rs. 57092.00 on account of HM related to FY 2019-20 in final bill and incorporated the charges after elapsing of more than 4 years in a inappropriate manner which is in contrary to the Section 56 of Electricity Act-2003 and clear cut violation of Sales Circular No. 03/2004 & 39/2013.
6. Rs. 4.50 Lacs of surcharge not removed from the final bill settlement made by the SDO Op, even after the decision announced by the CGRF Cell Panchkula that also needs to be take away from the my final bills.

In view of the above facts and circumstances, it is once again humbly requested that the unjust charges mentioned at Sr. No. 1 to 6 may kindly be withdrawn from my bill. Further, considering the severe financial loss and mental agony suffered by me due to the arbitrary and negligent actions of the concerned officials, I request that suitable compensation may also be granted to restore my dignity and goodwill in society and restore my electricity connection immediately to stop the exploitation of my rights by UHBVN Officers.
An early and sympathetic action in this matter shall be highly appreciated.

I. The hearing in this matter was held on 16.04.2026 as scheduled. Both the parties were present. The Appellant (M/s Maangali Cotex Pvt. Ltd.) and the Respondents (represented by XEN(OP) Division, UHBVN, Samalkha) were heard at length.

During the hearing:

1. The Appellant submitted that the amounts arising out of Half Margin Nos. 68 (dated 24.04.2019) and 69 (dated 25.04.2019) cannot be charged by the Nigam in the year 2024 and requested the Appellant to file specific observations in terms of the directions contained in the earlier interim order dated 13.03.2026.
2. The written replies filed by both the Appellant and the Respondents in compliance with the interim order dated 13.03.2026 were taken on record. It was, however, noted that the replies have been filed independently by the parties without exchanging copies with each other. Consequently, effective arguments could not be advanced and the matter was adjourned for further hearing.
3. While examining the contents of the replies and the record, the following prima facie observations have emerged which require thorough verification and investigation in the interest of justice:

   a) The Appellant has been depositing dues through RTGS without obtaining prior permission for part payment, which prima facie appears to be in violation of the prevailing instructions of the Nigam.

   b) Half Margin No. 68 dated 24.04.2019 records extension of load from 700 kW to 1250 kW vide A&A No. P21-1118-113 dated 28.11.2018 (DOC 06.06.2018). The Multiplication Factor (MF) was required to be applied as 20 instead of 5. An amount of ₹34,31,553/- was worked out as recoverable, out of which ₹5,44,751/- is stated to have been charged vide SCR No. 420/374.

   c) Half Margin No. 69 dated 25.04.2019 (issued the very next day) records reduction of load from 1250 kVA back to 700 kVA on the same A&A No. P21-1118-113 dated 28.11.2018. The MF was again kept at 5 instead of the required 20. An amount of ₹44,53,307/- was worked out as recoverable, against which ₹32,24,099/- is stated to have been charged earlier vide SCR No. 416/374.

   d) A subsequent sundry charge of ₹26,69,703/- has been raised on the same account.

   e) The audited calculation sheet reveals that the MF of Account No. 3543011000 was changed from 20 to 5 during the period December 2018 to April 2019 (after having been correctly applied as 20 in the bills of August and September 2018). This change requires thorough scrutiny.

In view of the above, and to ensure complete, fair and transparent adjudication of the appeal, the following clear and specific directions are issued:

Directions to the Respondents (UHBVN / XEN(OP) Division, Samalkha):

a) The XEN(OP) Division, UHBVN, Samalkha shall conduct a thorough and independent investigation into the entire matter covering the period from the date of submission of A&A Form No. P21-1118-113 dated 28.11.2018 till the date of PDCO. The investigation shall specifically examine:

i) Any malpractice, irregularity or misconduct in the raising, revision and subsequent charging of Half Margin Nos. 68 & 69;

ii) Reasons for non-updation of the correct Multiplication Factor (MF) after the MCO/checking carried out by the M&P Wing;

iii) How extension of load (700 kW to 1250 kW) and subsequent reduction of load (1250 kW to 700 kW) could be effected on the same A&A application No. P21-1118-113 dated 28.11.2018 and whether the same was in accordance with the prevailing Sales Circulars and instructions regarding online load sanctioning through the portal;

iv) Responsibility of the Commercial Assistant and the then SDO(OP) for correct billing of the Large Supply (LS) consumer and the circumstances leading to the change of MF from 20 to 5 (as reflected in the audited calculation sheet);

v) Compliance with the directions and order passed by the CGRF in the matter.

b) The investigation shall be got conducted separately through:

- The office of the Chief Auditor, UHBVN, Panchkula; and
- The office of the Chief Billing Officer (CBO), UHBVN, Panchkula.

c) To ensure complete transparency, impartiality and to rule out any bias, the audit party shall be constituted by the office of the Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Rohtak. All officers/officials of the Panipat Circle and all officers/officials who were posted in Samalkha Sub-Division/Division during the period in question shall be expressly excluded from the audit team.

d) The investigation report shall contain a complete factual matrix with a chronological timeline, supported by all relevant documents (A&A form, MCO/MT-1 register, M&P checking reports, load sanction orders, billing records, half margin registers, SCR entries, court orders, etc.).

Directions to both parties:

Both the Appellant and the Respondents shall exchange copies of their respective replies filed in compliance with the earlier interim order dated 13.03.2026 within 7 days from the date of issuance of this order.

Timelines (strictly to be adhered to):

- The investigation report along with all supporting documents shall be filed by the Respondents on or before 15.05.2026.

- The Appellant may file his rejoinder, if any, within 10 days of receipt of the investigation report.

It is made clear that any failure to comply with the above directions or to file the required report/affidavit shall be viewed seriously and may invite adverse inference. Both parties are directed to cooperate fully and furnish complete information without any concealment.

The matter is schedule for further hearing on 18.05.2026."

J. On 28.04.2026 Chief Engineer/OP, UHBVN, Rohtak has constituted a committed vide office order no. 128 dated 28.04.2026 which is as under:-

"A committee comprising following officers are hereby constituted to investigate/audit the matter of M/s. Maa Anjali Cotex Pvt. Ltd., Israna as per directions in Appeal No. 02/2026 by Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana:

1. Sh. Rajiv Dhillon XEN SU-II Division, Karnal – **Chairman**
2. Sh. K.S. Dalal XEN CBO UHBVN Panchkula- **Member**
3. Sh. Pardeep Rohilla SO, IAP-17, Israna – **Member**
4. Sh. Manish SDO OP S/Divn., UHBVN Bhalaut- **Member Secy.**

Next date of hearing in this case is 18.05.2026, so, the committee will submit his report to this office within ten days positively."

K. On 15.05.2026, XEN/Samalkha has submitted investigation report as per direction of Electricity Ombudsman in appeal no. 2 of 2026 which is as under:-

A) As per fact's and finding & record submitted by the office of SDO (OP) S/Divn Samalkha it is revealed that the connected load was reduced by the consumer through A&A No- P21-1118-113 dated- 28.11.2018 from 1250 kw to 700 kw. The M&P also submitted his report 05.12.2018 vide MT1 No-925. The MF remained *20 due to not changing the CT & PT and reading recorded KWH-301744.4 & KVAH-304293.4 MDI-21.52 kw (copy of M&P report attached), The then C.A/ledger keeper sent Advise No- 71 in AMR billing cell for reduction the load from 1200kw to 700kw with MF *5 instead of *20. Due to this wrong bill was issued from dated-01.11.2018 to 01.04.2019.

Accordingly RAP/IAP-15 issued half margin no-69 dated-25.04.2019 for amounting to Rs-44,53,307/-. During scrutiny of the half margin it is found that PLEC charges found wrong calculated by audit party i.e Rs 4,55,533/- instead of 71,923/-. The excess amount Rs-3,83,610/- found adjusted in the consumer account as per auditing sheet produced to CGRF.

i) The then working CA/Ledger Keeper of LS category i.e: Sh. Sukhdev LDC has charged partially amount Rs-32,24,099/- vide SCA&R No- 404/374 during the month of 05/2019 billing cycle & difference amount Rs-12,29,208/- vide SCA&R No-421/374 during billing cycle of Jan-2020

Simultaneously half margin No-68 dated-24.04.2019 was also found issued by the audit party for the period-30.04.2018 to 01.08.2018. Due to wrong advice sent to the AMR billing cycle by the then CA/Ledger keeper at the time of EOL from 499 to 1250 kwh after showing wrong A&A i.e: P21-1118-113 dated-28.11.2018 DOC-06.06.2018 instead of A&A No-P21-418-38 dated-04.04.2018 D.O-06.06.2018 for amounting to Rs.34,34,553. Wrong bill was issued for MF*5 instead of 20.

A sum of Rs-5,44,751 found charged vide SCA&R No-420/374 instead of Rs-34,34,553 in the billing cycle of Jan-2020. After scrutiny of the document it is found that a sum of Rs-23,76,843/ were chargeable from consumer against half margin No-68 dated-24.04.2019. Therefore the ledger keeper charged less amount from the consumer deliberately.

ii) MCO was not found effected during the prescribed period of E.O.L and the R.O.L found effected through SJO No-17/997 dated- 22.05.2018 issued in the name of Rajesh Rawal JE (effect date- 06.06.2018) & M&P checking report M&P No-990 dated-06.06.2018. Advise not sent timely by the then ledger keeper sh. Sukhdev LDC & R.O.L on dated-05.12.2018 vide M&T No-925 but advise wrongly sent for MF*5 instead of *20 by the then ledger keeper.

iii) The EOL & ROL were effected on different dates & in different A&A.

1. EOL-A&A -P21-418-38 dated-04.04.2018 from 499 to 1250 kw
2. ROL vide A&A No-P21-1118-1132 dated-28.11.2018 from 1250 to 700 kw which is shown wrongly in half margin by audit party P21-1118-113.

4. Responsibility:

1. Sh. Raja Ram UDC

(i) The official is found responsible for not changing MF from 5 to 20 of M/S Shree Shyam cot spin on increasing the extension of load from 499 kw to 1250 kw.

(ii) The official is found responsible for changing the MF from 20 to 5 of M/S Shree Shyam cot spin on reducing the load from 1250 kw to 499 kw whereas the CT has been not found changed at the consumer end.

(iii) The official is found responsible for not charging the complete 68 no. half margin amount i.e. 34,31,553/ whereas charged partially 544751/- without any specific reason.

2. Sh. Sukhdev, LDC:

(i) The official is found responsible for not charging the complete 69 no. half margin amount i.e. 4453307/-, whereas charged partially 3224099/- without any specific reason.

(ii) The official is found responsible for not charging the complete 68 no. half margin amount i.e. 3431553/-whereas charged partially 544751/- without any specific reason.

3. Sh. Mukesh Goel, UDC (Now D/Acctt working under (OP) Divn. UHBVN, Naraingarh):

The official is found responsible for revising the half margin no. 68, 69 & sundry item no. 300/409A during 02/2023 and charged Rs. 2669703/- without any specific reason.

4. Sh. Himmat Singh, SDO:

The officer is found responsible for revising the half margin no. 68, 69 & sundry item no. 300/409A during 02/2023 and charged Rs. 2669703/- without any specific reason.

5. Sh. Vikash Bansal, SDO:

(i) The officer is found responsible for not charging the complete 69 no. half margin amount i.e. 4453307/- whereas charged partially 3224099/- without any specific reason.

(ii) The officer is found responsible for not charging the complete 68 no. half margin amount i.e. 3431553/-whereas charged partially 544751/- without any specific reason.

The compliance has been made found as per the direction and order passed by the CGRF in the matter.

L. On 28.05.2026, Chairman-cum-Xen, Sub Urban Divn. No. II, UHBVN, Karnal has submitted a request for grant of additional 15 days time for detailed investigation in appeal no. 2 of 2026.

M. On 11.06.2026, Chief Engineer/OP, UHBVN, Rohtak has submitted investigation report of Committee in compliance of interim order dated 16.04.2026 which is as under:-

In compliance to Office Order No. 128 dated 28.04.2026 issued by the office of Chief Engineer/OP, UHBVN, Rohtak, a committee comprising the undersigned officers was constituted to investigate/audit the matter of M/s Maangali Cotex Pvt. Ltd., Israna, in pursuance of directions issued by the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana in Appeal No. 02 of 2026.

Committee Members:

1. Sh. Rajiv Dhillon, XEN SU-II Division, Karnal - Chairman
2. Sh. K.S. Dalal, XEN CBO, UHBVN Panchkula - Member
3. Sh. Pardeep Rohilla, SO, IAP-17, Israna - Member
4. Sh. Manish, SDO OP Sub Division, UHBVN Bhalaut - Member Secretary

The committee examined the available record including A&A documents, billing data, M&P checking reports, Half Margin notices, sundry charge records, MT-1 checking reports, and other relevant documents pertaining to Account No. 3543011000 of M/s Shyam Cotspin under the office of SDO Op Sub Division, UHBVN Samalkha.

The following observations emerged during the course of investigation:

Part-I (Chronological Sequences)

A. EOL (Extension of Load)- HM 68 dated 24.04.2019

1. That the consumer was initially applied for extension of load (EOL) from 499 KW/KVA to 1250 KW/KVA vide application no. P21-418-38 dated 04.04.2018 and connection and SCO (Service Connection Order) issued by the SDO Op vide SCO No. 997/17 dated 22.05.2018.
2. Further M&P has visited on dated 06.06.2018 before extension of load and report submitted and remarked that *"Visited the premises as per message from SDO OP Samalkha and as per direction from Xen M&P Karnal for EOL from 499KW to 1250KW and 499KVA to 1250 KVA vide SCO No. 997/17 dated 22.05.2018. Accuracy of the meter checked and found working within limit. MCB handed over to SDO Op Samalkha for replacement for CTs of load matching capacity and intimate to this office and take step as per Nigam instructions."*
   Reading at the time of visit are =250570.90 KWH & 252566.20 KVAH with MFx5

3. M&P has 2nd time has visited on dated 28.07.2018 after extension of load and report submitted and remarked that *"Visited the premises as per email message from SDO OP Samalkha and Xen M&P Karnal for resealing of connection after replacement of CTs on EOL vide SCO No. 997/17 dated 22.05.2018 by Op Staff itself. Accuracy of the meter checked and found within limit. MF be read as Rx20 (Twenty). Sanction load in energy bill is 499KW and CD 499KVA and MF is Rx5 (Five) but actual MF is Rx20 (Twenty) & load is 1250 KW & CD 1250 KVA. SDO Op is requested to take step as per Nigam Instructions."*

   Reading at the time of visit are =266580.90 KWH & 268770.40 KVAH with MFx20

4. Revenue Audit Party IAP-15, Samalkha was raised a half margin no. 68 dated 24.04.2019 for Rs. 3431553.00 because MF was not updated in CCB from 5 to 20 from the date of EOL- 06.06.2018 to 01.08.2018 (57 days). HM issued by the audit party by taking average of units for the ibid period because *M&P* dated 06.06.2018 was not available at that time to Sub Division (as stated to committee by the auditor).
5. SDO Op Sub Division, UHBVN Samalkha (Vatan Sedha) & Asstt. Field (Sukdev, LDC) has reviewed the Half Margin and partially Charged Rs. 544751.00 against HM Rs. 3441553.00 through SC&AR No. 420/374 and HM submitted to Audit team

by stating the reason that CT 100/5 was installed at site after handover the system to op staff but no any documentary evidence provided for exact change of CTs at site. Audit Team IAP-15, Samalkha Incharge (Nisha Chauhan) also accepted the HM on the ground stated by the Op Sub Division. The exact calculation of amount Rs. 544751.00 made from the M&P report dated 28.07.2018 (2nd visit for resealing) because no any other M&P available at SDO office at that time (as stated by Asstt. Field, Sukhdev LDC to the committee), whereas the connection already been running on operation seals on dated 28.07.2018 as per M&P Report. No load survey data are available to the office during the visit of committee for ibid period.

6. After that consumer account got PDCO in 08/2021, a sundry no. 300/409 amounting to Rs. 2669703.00 was made by Asstt. Field (Mukesh, LDC) on 08.02.2023 by quoting the reason that *"A sum of Rs. 2669703.00 is hereby adjusted by officially wrongly charge half margin (68 & 69) and also not charge the full amount of Half Margin."* While examine the matter no any sufficient reason has been stated by the official to committee for charging the amount and only stated that HM not fully charged to consumer by previous officials, so the rest amount was charged by him to consumer.

Committee Purview (HM 68-EOL)

Committee has examined the all documents, sequences and available record with SDO Op Sub Division, UHBVN Samalkha in purview of Nigam instructions and find out that SCO dated 22.05.2018 signed by the JE on dated 06.06.2018 after implementation SCO/EOL. As per record available EOL allowed to consumer against application no. P21-418-38 dated 04.04.2018 on the same day when the M&P visited; as its the routine practice under M&P Wing. CT/PT of the consumer already been passed by M&T Lab on dated 28.05.2018 and same was installed on site immediately after visit of M&P on dated 06.06.2018 and following amount is found chargeable to consumer: -

Half Margin No. 68 dated 24.04.2019 as per MT1 No. 990 dt. 06.06.2018					
MF Changed from 5 to 20					
	Old Reading as per MT-1, 06.06.2018	**New Reading upto 01.08.2018**	**Diff. of Reading**	**Diff. of MF**	**Recoverable Units**
Kwh	250571	270099	19528	15	292920
Kvah	252566	272322	19756	15	296340
	SOP	1970661			
	FSA	108380			
	ED	29292			
	FC	228139			
	PLEC	40371			
	G.Total	**2376843.00**			

	-Already Charged	544751.00			
	Balance	**1832092.00**			

Above amount rightly Charged to consumer during the settlement of bills in front of CGRF Cell, committee observed that the matter handled by Op Sub Division, Samalkha in an unprofessional manner and needs to fix the responsibility of following officer/officials.

Responsibility

Name of Official	**Office**	**Responsible For**
Raja Ram, UDC (Asstt. Field),	**OP Sub Division Samalkha**	For not updating the MF on Ledger report during the period 06.06.18 to 01.08.18, even after report issued by M&P for change of MF from 5 to 20 and also failed to recover the differences of SOP
Vikash Bansal, SDO,	**OP Sub Division Samalkha**	Supervisory fails for not updating the MF on Ledger report during the period 06.06.18 to 01.08.18, even after report issued by M&P for change of MF from 5 to 20 and also failed to recover the differences of SOP
Sukhdev, LDC (Asstt. Field),	**OP Sub Division Samalkha**	For partially charging of Rs. 544751.00 against a HM - 3431553.00 without considering the M&P Report & without any genuine ground that leads to financial loss to nigam.
(Vatan Sedha, SDO,	**OP Sub Division Samalkha**	For partially charging of Rs. 544751.00 against a HM - 3431553.00 without considering the M&P Report & without any genuine ground that leads to financial loss to nigam.
Mukesh Goel, UDC (Asstt. Field),	**OP Sub Division Samalkha**	For charging Rs. 2669703.00 to consumer without any justified ground after 3 years of PDCO in 02/2023.
Himmat Singh, SDO,	**OP Sub Division Samalkha**	For charging Rs. 2669703.00 to consumer without any justified ground after 3 years of PDCO in 02/2023.
Nisha Chauhan, RA, Chief Auditor,	**UHBVN Rohtak**	1. For preparing HM on average basis without considering the m&P Report. 2. For accepting the HM charging Rs. 544751.00 against a HM 3431553.00 without any justified ground that leads loss to nigam.

B. ROL (Reduction of Load)- HM 69 dated 25.04.2019

1. That the consumer was applied for reduction of load (ROL) from 1250 KW/KVA to 700 KW/KVA vide application no. P21-1118-113 dated 28.11.2018 and M&P has visited on dated 05.12.2018 ROL allowed by M&P report submitted and remarked that *"Visited the premises as per email message from SDO OP Samalkha vide memo no. Spl-1 dt. 03.12.2018 for reduction of load from existing load to 700 KW and 700 Kva vide SJO NO. 81/2964 dt. 03.12.2018. Accuracy of the meter checked and found working within limit. MF be remain is as same i.e. Rx20 (Twenty). SDO Op is requested to take step as per Nigam instructions."*
Reading at the time of visit are =301744.40 KWH & 304293.40 KVAH with MFx20.

2. Further load was reduced from 1250KW/KVA to 700KW/KVA and MF remains same as previous but Sh. Raja Ram, UDC (Incharge Revenue Section, Asstt. Field) has sent wrong advice to billing section MF got changed from MFx20 to MFx5 w.e.f. 01.11.2018 and remain effective as MFx5 during the period 01.11.2018 to 01.04.2019 instead of MFx20.
3. Revenue Audit Party IAP-15, Samalkha was raised a half margin no. 69 dated 25.04.2019 for Rs. 4453307.00 because MF was reduced in CCB from 20 to 5 during the period- 01.11.2018 to 01.04.2019 (151 days). HM issued by the audit party on the basis of M&P Report and office record.
4. SDO Op Sub Division, UHBVN Samalkha (Vatan Sedha) & Asstt. Field (Sukdev, LDC) has reviewed the Half Margin and Charged HM Rs. 3224099.00 through SC&AR No. 404/374 & Rs. 1229208.00 Charged through SC&AR No. 421/374. Full amount of HM was charged. At later stage noticed that PLEC charged in HM was wrong & amount of PLEC revised by SDO OP Samalkha from 455533 to 71923 and excess charging of Rs. 383610 adjusted to consumer account during the bill correction sheet submitted to CGRF Cell.

Committee Purview (HM 69-ROL)

Committee has examined the all documents, sequences and available record with SDO Op Sub Division, UHBVN Samalkha in purview of Nigam instructions and find out that ROL allowed to consumer against application no. P21-1118-113 dated 28.11.2018. No any discrepancy noticed in the HM 69 dated 25.04.2019 and amount rightly charged to consumer. Advice sent to billing agency from MFx20 to MFx5 during the period 01.11.2018 to 01.04.2019 deliberately without any justified ground and needs to fix the responsibility of concerned.

Responsibility

Name of Official	Office	Responsible for
Raja Ram, UDC (Asstt. Field),	**OP Sub Division Samalkha**	For sending wrong advice for changing MFx20 to MFx5 without any justified ground that leads to Financial loss to Nigam amounting to Rs. 44.53 Lacs.
Vikash Bansal, SDO,	**OP Sub Division Samalkha**	Supervisory fails for sending wrong advice for changing MFx20 to MFx5 without any justified ground that leads to Financial loss to Nigam amounting to Rs. 44.53 Lacs.
Mukesh Goel, UDC (Asstt. Field),	**OP Sub Division Samalkha**	For charging Rs. 2669703.00 to consumer without any justified ground after 3 years of PDCO in 02/2023.
Himmat Singh, SDO,	**OP Sub Division Samalkha**	For charging Rs. 2669703.00 to consumer without any justified ground after 3 years of PDCO in 02/2023.

In view of the above, the committee respectfully submits conclusions that based on the findings of the Committee and the available record, it is evident that the discrepancies in billing and MF application arose primarily due to procedural lapses, incorrect updation of MF in the billing system, and improper handling of Half Margin cases at the field level, for which responsibility has already been identified against the concerned officials by the Committee. The investigation further establishes that the recoverable amount pertaining to HM No. 68 and HM No. 69 was assessed strictly in accordance with the applicable Nigam instructions, M&P reports, and audit observations, and the revised recoveries were rightly affected against the consumer account and refundable as per CGRF Orders are settled in the consumer accounts and detail calculation of all the recoverable & refundable is attached for ready reference. Therefore, the action taken by UHBVN in the matter stands duly justified and in consonance with the applicable regulations and audit provisions. The report is accordingly submitted for kind consideration, with a request that the findings of the Committee may kindly be taken on record for final adjudication of the matter.

The report along with supporting documents is submitted herewith for further necessary action/compliance before the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana.

N. The hearing was held on 11.06.2026 as rescheduled.

1. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

1.1 In compliance with the Interim Order dated 16.04.2026 passed by this Authority, a duly constituted Committee was set up vide Office Order No. 128 dated 28.04.2026 to impartially investigate the disputed billing/charging issues raised in the present appeal, with the express mandate to submit its report by 15.05.2026.

1.2 The Chairman of the said Committee, who is also the XEN/OP, Sub-Urban Divn. No. 2, UHBVN, Rohtak, vide Memo No. Ch-80/XEN/CBO/EP-495 dated 28.05.2026, has sought an additional period of 15 days for completion of the investigation and submission of the report. The request having been found bonafide and supported by reasons, the same was acceded to, and the hearing fixed accordingly was held today as scheduled.

2. PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY

2.1 At the very outset, the Appellant was specifically asked whether the report of the Committee constituted under Office Order No. 128 dated 28.04.2026 had been duly supplied to him. The Appellant confirmed in unambiguous terms that he is in receipt of the copy of the said Committee Report.

2.2 The Appellant was thereafter enquired whether he stands satisfied with the findings of the Committee. The Appellant expressed his dissatisfaction and invited the attention of this Authority to the portion of the Report titled "Responsibility in respect of Half Margin No. 68-EOL", wherein responsibility has been fastened upon Sh. Mukesh Goyal, Assistant Field) and Sh. Himmat Singh, SDO. With reference to the said finding, the Appellant called upon the Respondents to explain the basis and justification for charging an amount of ₹26,69,703/- on account of PDCO No. 2 of 2023, levied/raised after a lapse of nearly three years from the date of the underlying event.

2.3 The Respondent SDO and the Commercial Assistant present, though they endeavoured to explain the charging to the best of their knowledge, the explanation tendered failed to satisfy the Appellant.

2.4 The attention of the Appellant was thereafter invited towards the concluding paragraph of the Committee Report, wherein the Committee has recorded a finding to the effect that the charging made by the Department, which formed the subject matter of the CGRF order dated 05.12.2025, stands to be in order.

2.5 The Appellant, in response, placed on record a copy of the affidavit dated 09.09.2022 filed by Sh. Chand Kumar, the then SDO/OP, Sub-Division, Samalkha, and invited the attention of this Authority to Para No. 1 thereof, wherein it has been categorically deposed on oath that an amount of ₹17,73,959/- stood as arrear against the Appellant as on that date.

2.6 After detailed deliberations, the Appellant fairly conceded that the Nigam may be permitted to file a fresh affidavit through the XEN/OP, Samalkha, clarifying:

(a) Whether the amount of ₹17,73,959/- as deposed in the affidavit dated 09.09.2022 was the final crystallised liability as on that date; and

(b) The specific circumstances, basis and methodology by which the said figure has subsequently been enhanced/escalated to a substantially higher value, as has emerged during the proceedings before the CGRF and in the present appeal.

3. CORE GRIEVANCE OF THE APPELLANT

3.1 The fundamental and recurring grievance pressed by the Appellant before this Authority on 11.06.2026 is that the Nigam has failed to maintain any consistent, certain or sustainable stand in deriving the amount allegedly recoverable from the Appellant, even when the matter was sub-judice before competent forums of law.

3.2 The Appellant has contended that the ledger maintained by the office of the SDO concerned, even after the pre-audit carried out in compliance with the CGRF order and the directions issued in the present appeal, reflects amounts which have varied from time to time, apparently being derived at the whims and discretion of officers/officials posted in the Sub-Division and the Audit Wing. This contention finds prima facie corroboration from the responsibility fixed against various officers/officials in the Report of the Committee constituted under Office Order No. 128 dated 28.04.2026.

3.3 The Appellant has further submitted that on account of the aforesaid inconsistent stand of the Nigam, the Appellant has been constrained to face protracted litigation, has suffered grave mental agony and harassment, and the very survival of his business has been adversely affected.

4. DIRECTIONS

In view of the foregoing, and in order to bring the matter to a logical conclusion in a transparent and judicially sustainable manner, the following directions are issued:

4.1 Directions to the Respondents (XEN/OP, Sub-Urban Division, UHBVN, Samalkha):

The XEN/OP, Sub-Urban Division, UHBVN, Samalkha shall file a detailed, para-wise reply in the shape of an affidavit duly notarised, addressing each of the following issues seriatim and with documentary support:

(i) Whether the amount of ₹17,73,959/- as deposed by Sh. Chand Kumar, the then SDO/OP, Sub-Division, Samalkha in his affidavit dated 09.09.2022 represented the final and crystallised arrear outstanding against the Appellant as on that date;

(ii) The specific facts, events, audit objections, half margins and/or sales circulars under which the said figure has been subsequently revised/enhanced to the amount presently being claimed from the Appellant, supported by a chronological reconciliation statement explaining each addition/deletion;

(iii) The reasons, basis and authority under which the Department has charged an amount of ₹26,69,703/- in respect of PDCO No. 2 of 2023 after the expiry of nearly three years, with specific reference to the applicable Sales Circulars, Haryana Electricity Supply Code/Regulations and the limitation, if any, prescribed thereunder;

(iv) The reasons for the fluctuating and deviating stand of the Nigam at various stages of the proceedings, including instances where sundry charges of particular amounts were first levied and subsequently withdrawn, in light of the findings recorded in the Report of the Committee constituted under Office Order No. 128 dated 28.04.2026;

(v) The manner in which the Nigam proposes to compensate the Appellant for the mental agony, harassment and business loss occasioned to him on account of being driven from forum to forum, including the CGRF and this Authority, as a consequence of the inconsistent stand of the Department; and

(vi) Inasmuch as the Committee Report has itself proposed fixation of responsibility against certain officers/officials, the Respondent shall place on record the proportionate quantum of penalty/recovery worked out against each such delinquent officer/official, duly approved by the Competent Authority of the Nigam, including officers/officials of the Sub-Division and the Audit Wing, so that the Appellant may, to that extent, be reasonably indemnified for the harassment suffered.

4.2 Direction qua Restoration of Electricity Connection:

The Appellant has also prayed for restoration of his electricity connection(verbally during the hearing itself which is not part of appeal). The final order after in respect of appeal no 02/2026 will enable to determine the quantum of dues in respect of the account No.3543011000) in name of m/s Shyam Cotspin and this will help respondents to also arrive at a final figure in respect of their book of accounts, if there is any further settlement in any other connection in name of appellant such as M/s Managli Cotex Ltd etc as well)). The Appellant is, however, at liberty to submit a separate application before the Competent Authority of the Nigam for restoration/release of connection, and the Competent Authority shall consider and process the said application strictly in accordance with the prevailing Sales Circulars, instructions and guidelines of the Nigam in vogue, after completion of all requisite paper formalities, and pass appropriate orders thereon expeditiously.

5. TIMELINES (strictly to be adhered to)

5.1 The Respondents shall file the affidavit/reply, as directed in Para 4.1 above, within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of issuance of this order.

5.2 A copy of the said reply/affidavit shall be supplied to the Appellant not less rejoinder, if any, and to address arguments effectively on the date of the final hearing.

5.3 Sufficient and reasonable opportunity having already been granted to both the parties as well as to the duly constituted Committee to investigate the matter impartially and transparently and to submit its report, no further adjournment shall ordinarily be granted, and the matter shall be heard finally and disposed of on 02.07.2026.

6. Any failure on the part of the Respondents to comply with the present directions within the stipulated time frame shall entitle this Authority to draw an adverse inference and to proceed to decide the appeal ex-parte on the basis of the material already available on record.

7. The list of officers/officials against whom responsibility has been fastened in the Committee Report shall be expressly taken note of at the time of final disposal, and appropriate observations/directions shall be incorporated in the final order to be passed in Appeal No. 2 of 2026.

The matter shall accordingly stand listed for final hearing on 02.07.2026.

O. On 26.06.2026, Xen/OP, Samalkha has submitted compliance of the interim order dated 11.06.2026 which is as under:-

1. That the present reply is being filed on the basis of the official record available with the respondents, the ledger account, departmental documents, the report of the Committee constituted pursuant to the orders of this Hon'ble Authority, and the subsequent reconciled calculation sheets prepared in respect of the account under dispute.

PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS/PRELIMINARY SUBMISSIONS:-

1. That the present appeal is misconceived to the extent it seeks to dispute duly maintained billing/accounting entries without properly dislodging the departmental record, the ledger account and the subsequent reconciled statement of outstanding amount.
2. That the appellant has not approached this Hon'ble Authority with complete and correct facts insofar as the final reconciled outstanding amount, the adjustment entries and the committee findings are concerned.
3. That the answering respondents are not admitting any averment of the appeal unless the same is specifically admitted herein. All allegations contrary to the official record are specifically denied.

4. That the appellant preferred the present appeal against the order dated 05.12.2025 passed by the learned CGRF, UHBVN Panchkula in Case No. 48 of 2025.
5. That during pendency of the present appeal, this Hon'ble Authority was pleased to pass an interim order dated 16.04.2026, whereby a Committee was directed to be constituted for investigation into the disputed billing/charging issues raised in the appeal.
6. That in compliance of the said order, a duly constituted Committee was set up vide Office Order No. 128 dated 28.04.2026 for impartial investigation into the disputed billing/charging issues involved in the present matter. The concerned committee examined the relevant record and submitted its report before this Hon'ble Authority, and thereafter this Hon'ble Authority passed a further interim order dated 11.06.2026 recording the proceedings of the day and the objections raised by the appellant to the portion of the Committee Report relating to responsibility.
7. That the answering respondents submit that the account of the appellant/consumer has to be examined on the basis of the official ledger, statement of account, adjustment entries, reconciled calculation sheets, and the Committee Report, and not on the basis of any isolated earlier figure or incomplete extract of record. That any difference between an earlier affidavit/statement and the final reconciled amount is attributable to subsequent audit adjustments, additions/deletions in the ledger, scrutiny of the account, and reconciliation of the outstanding amount, and not to any mala fide or deliberate concealment.

FACTS OF THE CASE AS PER RESPONDENTS' RECORD:-

1. That the electricity connection/industrial account in question pertains to the appellant concern and the same was being maintained in the office record of the respondent Nigam. As per the departmental record available and relied upon by the answering respondents, the electricity connection in question was released on 04.09.2017. The said connection remained operative up to 16.08.2021, whereafter the connection was closed and the meter was removed from the site of the appellant/consumer.
2. That at the time of closure of the connection/firm account, an amount of Rs. 77,13,049/- was reflected as outstanding in the account. Thereafter, on detailed scrutiny and reconciliation of the account, two bills amounting to Rs. 10,22,452/- were adjusted/minus from the aforesaid amount. After giving effect to the aforesaid adjustment, the final outstanding recoverable amount from the appellant/consumer account came to Rs. 67,44,040/-. It is correct that at an earlier point of time, while filing an affidavit before the authority, the amount then reflected in the ledger against the complainant/appellant was Rs. 17,73,959/-. However, the said affidavit was not intended to be the final crystallized statement of arrears, as the account was thereafter subjected to further reconciliation, audit adjustments, correction entries and ledger scrutiny. The final outstanding amount, as stated above, is duly

supported by the reconciled ledger account, calculation sheet and departmental record, which are being relied upon by the respondents.

3. That the appellant is not entitled to any relief merely on the basis of disputing the outstanding amount unless the reconciled record, the adjustment entries and the departmental calculation sheets are shown to be incorrect by cogent material.
4. That the appellant has failed to disclose the complete factual position regarding closure of connection, the billing record, the adjustments subsequently carried out and the Committee findings.
5. That the appellant appears to have raised objection with regard to the variation between the amount reflected in the earlier affidavit and the amount subsequently claimed by the Nigam. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the earlier affidavit reflected the then available ledger position and was not the final crystallized statement of arrears. Thereafter, on account of reconciliation, addition/deletion entries, audit corrections and adjustment of bills, the account was revised and the final outstanding amount was worked out at Rs. 67,44,040/-. Therefore, there is no illegality in the respondents placing reliance upon the final reconciled record instead of the earlier provisional / incomplete figure.

In compliance of the interim order dated 11.06.2026, and with reference to the issues arising from the Committee Report, the respondents submit the following reply:-

Reply on Directions Clause No. 4:-

(i) That in reply to Query/Clause No. (i), it is respectfully submitted that the affidavit filed earlier by the concerned SDO was not the final and crystallized statement of arrears outstanding against the appellant. At the time of filing of the said affidavit, the amount reflected in the ledger against the complainant/appellant was Rs. 17,73,959/-. However, subsequently, many additions/deletions, correction entries, audit adjustments and reconciliations took place in the ledger and statement of account. Consequently, the outstanding amount underwent revision and a revised calculation sheet / audited statement was prepared. Therefore, the earlier affidavit cannot be treated as the final conclusive figure, and the same has to be read with the subsequent reconciled account. A copy of the audited / reconciled calculation sheet is annexed herewith for the kind perusal and consideration of this Hon'ble Authority.

(ii) That in reply to Query/Clause No. (ii), it is submitted that the electricity connection in question was released to the appellant/complainant on 02.05.2017. It is further submitted that the said connection was closed on 16.08.2021 and the meter was removed from the site of the complainant/appellant. At the time of closure of the firm / account, an amount of Rs. 77,13,049/- was shown as outstanding. Thereafter, upon scrutiny of the record, two bills amounting to Rs. 10,22,452/- were adjusted/minus from the said outstanding amount. Accordingly, the final outstanding amount recoverable from the appellant came to Rs. 67,44,040/-. The detailed statement of account, ledger entries and calculation sheet in support of the above amount are annexed herewith.

(iii) That in reply to Query/Clause No. (iii), it is submitted that the relevant Annexure-C / responsibility related material has already been produced / is being produced before this Hon'ble Authority. It is submitted that the said Annexure-C / relevant statement was prepared by Sh. Mukesh Goel, UDC, who at the relevant time was working as Commercial Accountant. As per the Committee report and the record examined during the proceedings, the said official was also found responsible to the extent recorded in the Committee report in relation to the discrepancy / amount under dispute. The respondents respectfully submit that the Committee report and Annexure-C may kindly be read as part of the present reply.

(iv) That in reply to Query/Clause No. (iv), it is submitted that at the relevant time, when the account in question was being dealt with and PDCO / billing related proceedings were undertaken, several officers/officials dealing with the matter were subsequently transferred. The present incumbents are therefore filing the present reply strictly on the basis of the available official record, ledger, calculation sheet and Committee findings. It is submitted that the respondents are fully prepared to comply with all lawful directions and instructions of this Hon'ble Authority and for proper adjudication of the matter, the respondents are annexing the relevant calculation sheet / statement of account / ledger extract with the present reply.

(v) That in reply to Query/Clause No. (v), it is submitted that the answering respondents have produced and are producing before this Hon'ble Authority all available relevant record relating to the account of the complainant/appellant. The respondents have placed / are placing on record the ledger details, statement of account, Committee report, revised calculation sheet and other material available in the departmental record. It is further submitted that if any person / officer / employee is found responsible on the basis of the Committee report or on the basis of departmental scrutiny, appropriate action shall be initiated / recommended / taken against such officer(s)/official(s) by the competent authority in accordance with law, rules and departmental instructions. The respondent Nigam shall remain bound by the order of this Hon'ble Authority and shall comply with such lawful directions as may be issued by this Hon'ble Authority in accordance with law.

(vi) That in reply to Query/Clause No. (vi), it is submitted that as per the report of the Committee, the officers/officials found responsible are liable to be reported / referred to the concerned higher competent authority for appropriate action. Upon receipt of the necessary approval / instructions / orders from the competent authority, departmental action / legal action, as permissible under the service rules and law, shall be taken against the concerned officials. It is further submitted that the respondent Nigam shall bear and comply with such liability / directions, if any, as may ultimately be imposed by this Hon'ble Authority in accordance with law in the present case.

4.2. Reply to Restoration of Electricity Connection:

In reply to this para it is submitted that the respondents have acted bona fide and have not intentionally concealed any material fact from this Hon'ble Authority. The variation between the earlier affidavit and the final reconciled outstanding amount is the result of subsequent reconciliation and audit adjustment and not of any mala fide act. The final amount of Rs. 67,44,040/- has been arrived at only after taking into account the relevant adjustments and the available official record. As such the appellant is not entitled to any relief contrary to the official reconciled record and the present appeal deserves to be dismissed, except to the extent this Hon'ble Authority may issue any further directions regarding scrutiny of record or departmental action.

PRAYER

It is, therefore, prayed that in view of above mentioned facts and submissions made hereinabove the appeal of the appellant being devoid of merit may kindly be dismissed with costs.

It is further requested to hold that the final outstanding amount is liable to be considered on the basis of the reconciled and revised departmental record and calculation sheets produced by the respondents;

Pass any other order which this Hon'ble Authority may deem just and proper in the interest of justice.

P. On 03.07.2026, respondent SDO has submitted reply in appeal no. 2 of 2026 which is as under:-

"Please refer to subject cited matter, in this regard, it is submitted that this office has revised the bill of M/s Shyam Cot Spin Samlkha bearing account number 3543011000 and after adjustment of excess amount the current bill of the consumer is zero now. This is for your kind information and further consideration please."

Decision

1. Brief Facts & Proceedings

The present appeal has been filed against the order dated 05.12.2025 passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (CGRF), UHBVN, Panchkula, in Complaint No. 48/2025. The core grievances relate to repeated billing errors, incorrect adjustments under Half Margin Nos. 68 & 69, levy of surcharges/line losses after prolonged delays, double/multiple charging of the same amounts, and resultant disconnection of supply, causing substantial financial hardship and business loss to the Appellant.

Pursuant to interim directions, a detailed inquiry was conducted by a committee constituted by the Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Rohtak, vide Office Order No. 128 dated 28.04.2026. The committee submitted its report dated 09.06.2026 identifying specific billing lapses on the part of certain officials.

2. Findings of the Ombudsman

After careful consideration of the pleadings, documents on record, billing history, audit reports, affidavits filed before the Civil Court, the committee's inquiry report, and submissions made during the hearing, the following is observed:

- There were admitted irregularities in billing, particularly in handling load extension/reduction, metering multiplication factor (MF), and adjustment of Half Margins. These lapses violated the principles of accurate, transparent, and timely billing.
- The prolonged uncertainty and multiple revisions caused undue harassment to the Appellant, which is not in consonance with the consumer-centric mandate of the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2014 (as amended).
- The Nigam is entitled to recover legitimate dues, but such recovery must follow due process, including proper notice and opportunity of hearing, as envisaged under Section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with the Supply Code.

3. Directions

In exercise of powers under the Electricity Act, 2003, and the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2014, the following directions are issued:

A. Compensation on Account of Administrative Lapses A sum of Rs. 5,000/- per head is imposed as cost on each delinquent officer/official identified in the committee report dated 09.06.2026. The total amount collected shall be credited to the Appellant's consumer account within 25 days from the date of this order through cheque by the XEN (Operation), Samalkha.

In case of delay beyond 25 days, the Nigam shall pay interest at the prevailing SBI Fixed Deposit rate on the delayed amount till actual credit. The Nigam may recover the said cost from the salaries of the concerned officials as per its internal rules.

B. Disciplinary Action The Respondents shall complete departmental disciplinary proceedings against the erring officials/officers as per Nigam instructions and Haryana Civil Services Rules and submit a compliance report within 60 days.

C. Release of New Connection The earlier connection stands permanently disconnected (PDCO). The Appellant is advised to submit a fresh application for a new electricity connection. Upon receipt of a complete application (in accordance with Regulation 4.4 of the Haryana Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2014, including the 5th Amendment), the Respondents shall process and release the connection strictly within the timelines prescribed in Regulation 4.4.7 subject to technical feasibility, payment of admissible charges, and compliance with other statutory requirements. Undue delay shall be viewed seriously.

D. The respondent SDO/OP, Sub Division Samalkha vide his letter bearing memo no. 22332 dated 03.07.2026 has informed that after the revision of the bill of M/s Shyam Cot Spin, Samalkha bearing account no. 3543011000 and after adjustment of the excess amount the current bill of consumer is zero.

E. General Directions

- All future billing shall be done with due diligence and in strict compliance with the Supply Code.
- The Nigam shall strengthen internal controls to prevent recurrence of billing errors.

The instant appeal stands disposed of with the above directions and costs.

File may be consigned to record.

Given under my hand on 07.07.2026.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Kumar Khanna)
Dated:07.07.2026 **Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana**

CC:

Memo No.1280-1289/EO/HERC/Appeal No. 2/2026 Dated:07.07.2026
To

1. M/s Maangali Cotex Pvt. Ltd. of Israna (email guptaankit188@gmail.com)
2. The Managing Director, Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited, Vidyut Sadan, IP No.: 3&4, Sector-14, Panchkula (Email md@uhbvn.org.in).
3. Legal Remembrancer, Haryana Power Utilities, Shakti Bhawan, Sector- 6, Panchkula (Email lr@hvpn.org.in).
4. The Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Rohtak, 4th Floor Rajiv Gandhi Vidyut Bhawan near Medical Mor Delhi Road, Rohtak (email ceoprohtak@uhbvn.org.in)
5. The SE (Operations), Panipat, 132 KV Sub Station, Gohana, Road Panipat (Email seoppanipat@uhbvn.org.in)
6. The XEN/OP Sub Urban Division, UHBVN, Panipat, Near Jattal Road Railway Fatak, Panipat (Email xenopsupanipat@uhbvn.org.in)
7. XEN (Operations), Samalkha, UHBVN, Near Jangra Dharamshala, Officers Colony, Samalkha (Email xenopsamalkha@uhbvn.org.in)
8. SDO/OP, Sub Division, UHBVN, Samalkha, 132 KV Sub Station, G.T. Road, Samalkha (Email sdoopsamalkha@uhbvn.org.in)
9. SDO/OP, Sub Division, UHBVN, Israna, 132 KV Sub Station, Gohana Road, Israna (Email sdoopisrana@uhbvn.org.in)