**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.** | **:** | **10 of 2025** |
| **Registered on** | **:** | **10.04.2026** |
| **Date of Order** | **:** | **06.08.2026** |

**In the matter of:**

**Appeal against the order dated 11.03.2026 passed by CGRF, UHBVN Panchkula in case No 271 of 2025**

Shri Gursharan **Appellant**

Versus

1. The XEN/OP Division, UHBVN, Samalkha
2. SDO/OP, Sub Division, UHBVN, Samalkha

**Respondent**

**Before:**
Shri Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Electricity Ombudsman

**Present on behalf of Appellant:**
Shri Gursharan

**Present on behalf of Respondents:**
Shri M.S. Dhiman, Xen
Shri Naresh Kumar, SDO (OP), Samalkha,
Sh. Naresh Kumar, Commercial Assistant

**ORDER**

**A.** Shri Gursharan has filed an appeal against the order dated 11.03.2026 passed by CGRF, UHBVNL, Panchkula in case no. 271of 2025. The appellant has submitted as under: -

I, Gursharan, resident of Pattikalyana, Samalkha, Panipat, prefer this appeal under the relevant HERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations. I am aggrieved by the order dated 11.03.2026 passed by the Corporate CGRF, which failed to consider the following gross procedural illegalities:

**Non-Compliance of Forum Directions**: Despite specific orders on 08.01.2026 to produce an M&T Lab report for Meter No. 38714339, the Respondent admitted the meter was never sent to the lab.

**Missing Evidence & Equipment**: The Respondent has admitted that the meter is now "Not Traceable." In the absence of the physical meter or a lab report, the consumption of 44,028 units is purely speculative and lacks legal basis.

**Document Tampering**: Official records (CA-21) show clear overwriting and entries belonging to other individuals, as confirmed by SDO Memo No. 18923.

**Prayer**: I pray that the CGRF order be set aside, the disputed bill be quashed, and I be allowed to pay as per minimum monthly charges for my sanctioned load until transparent readings are established.

**B.** The appeal was registered on 10.04.2026 as an appeal No. 10 of 2026 and accordingly, notice of motion to the Appellant and the Respondents was issued for hearing the matter on 11.05.2026.

**C.** On 08.05.2026, respondent SDO has submitted reply which is as under:-

उपरोक्त विषय के संदर्भ मे आपको अवगत कराया जाता है की उपभोक्ता द्वारा गलत बिल बारे शिकायत दर्ज कराई है, उक्त शिकायत का जवाब विन्दु अनुसार इस प्रकार से है-

1. निगम के रिकार्ड के अनुसार पाया गया की उपभोक्ता श्री गुरुचरण का कनेक्शन 03.01.2016 को चालू हुआ था जिसका मीटर सीरियल नंबर-6760968 जोकि 01 KWH रीडिंग पर लगाया गया था (CA21 कॉपी सलग्न),
2. दिनांक-03.10.2017 vigilance करनाल द्वारा उपभोक्ता की साइट पर चोरी की LL-1/07/3538 भरी गई (LL-1 कॉपी सलग्न) जिसमे मीटर नंबर-6760968 की रीडिंग-815 KWH दर्शाई गई, और मीटर को मोके पर साइट से उतार लिया गया जिसका CA22 नंबर-694/23 है, और जिसकी चोरी की राशि-140088/- रुपए बनाई गई (कॉपी सलग्न),
3. उसके बाद उपभोक्ता की साइट पर नया मीटर लगाया गया जिसका SR NO.38714339 जोकि रीडिंग-01 KWH पर लगाया गया,
4. दिनांक-16.10.2019 को vigilance करनाल द्वारा ज्यादा MDI की LL1-02/4287 भरी गई जिसमे मीटर सीरियल नंबर-38714339 दर्शाया गया (कॉपी सलग्न),
5. उसके बाद उपभोक्ता का दोबारा मीटर बदला गया जिसमे old मीटर सीरियल नंबर-38714339 की रीडिंग-44028 KWH थी और नया मीटर SR NO-A5076376 रीडिंग-01 KWH पर लगाया गया जिसका MCO.NO-08/144 dated-15.04.2023 है (कॉपी सलग्न),
6. दिनांक-19.02.2021 से 17.02.2025 तक खाता overhaul किया गया जिसमे उपभोक्ता को sundry नंबर-242/428 के तहत राशि-263093/- रुपए चार्ज बनते है (कॉपी सलग्न),
7. उसके बाद उपभोक्ता का खाता दोबारा चेक किया गया जोकि CCB सिस्टम मे 19.02.2021 को उपभोक्ता का 1875 दिन का बिल बना दिया गया जोकि यह बिल average bases का बना दिया गया था जोकि गलत था, उसके बाद उपभोक्ता का खाता चेक करने के बाद दिनांक-03.01.2016 से 17.02.2025 तक दोबारा खाता overhaul किया गया जोकि उपभोक्ता को 174361/- रुपए चार्ज बनते है जोकि उचित है (कॉपी सलग्न) उपभोक्ता को पहले 263093/- रुपए चार्ज कर दिए गए थे उसके बाद दोबारा खाता overhaul करने पर 174361/- रुपए चार्ज बनते है जोकि (263093-174361=88332/-) with सरचार्ज राशि-105274/-रु बिल मे adjust होते है (कॉपी सलग्न),
8. दिनांक-11.03.2026 को माननीय उपभोक्ता फोरम द्वारा उक्त शिकायत का ऑर्डर पारित किया गया जिसके आधार पर उपभोक्ता का खाता दिनांक-03.01.2016 से 17.02.2025 तक overhaul किया गया जोकि अब उपभोक्ता की sundry के तहत राशि-105274/- रु with सरचार्ज घटा दिए गए है, जोकी माननीय CBO पंचकुला को अप्रूवल के लिए भेज दिया गया है, उक्त sundry अप्रूव होते ही, उक्त राशि को उपभोक्ता के खाते मे adjust कर दिया जाएगा ।
9. उपभोक्ता कि 03.10.2017 को जो चोरी की LL1-07/3538 भरी गई थी, जिसकी चोरी की राशि-140088/- बनाई गई थी, निगम के रिकार्ड के अनुसार उपभोक्ता द्वारा अभी तक वह चोरी के पैसे निगम में जमा नहीं किए गए ।
10. अब उपभोक्ता का कुल बिल 241737-105274=136463/- रु बकाया है। इसके अलावा उपभोक्ता की चोरी के पैसे 140088+136463 (बिल राशि) = 276551/- रु कुल राशि बकाया है।

अतः भेजी गई सूचना आपके आंगामी कार्यवाही हेतु प्रेषित है ।

**D.** The hearing in this matter was held today on 11.05.2026 as scheduled. The hearing was attended by Sh. Naresh Kumar, SDO (OP), Samalkha, Sh. Naresh Kumar, Commercial Assistant, office of SDO (OP) Samalkha, and the Appellant, Sh. Gursharan, in person.

During the hearing, the written reply submitted by the Respondent vide Memo No. 81336 dated 08.05.2026 was provided to the Appellant. After perusing the same, the Appellant expressed serious dissatisfaction with the contents of the reply and raised specific objections.

Key Objections Raised by the Appellant:

1. The reading of 44,028 KWh recorded in the Meter Change Order (MCO) pertaining to Meter No. 38714339 (HPL make) was not signed by the Appellant, thereby rendering its authenticity questionable.
2. There are apparent cuttings, overwritings, and interpolations in the official records (including serial-wise entries of the Sub-Division) attached with the reply.
3. The Respondent has failed to produce the physical meter or the M&T Laboratory test report despite specific directions issued earlier.

It emerged during arguments that the meter in question (Sr. No. 38714339, HPL make) was replaced vide MCO dated 15.04.2023. The authenticity and correctness of the final reading recorded in the said MCO, as well as the manner of its replacement in the absence of the Appellant, require thorough scrutiny.

The Forum notes with concern that the Respondent is still demanding payment of the theft penalty amounting to ₹1,40,088/- (LL-1 No. 07/3538 dated 03.10.2017), even while the records regarding its realization/adjustment appear inconsistent.

In view of the above, and to ensure fair adjudication, the following directions are issued for strict and time-bound compliance:

1. Appellant's Objections: The Appellant shall file specific, point-wise written objections to the Respondent's reply dated 08.05.2026 within 10 days from the date of receipt of this order, with a copy to the Respondent.
2. Respondent's Obligations:

   a) The Respondent shall immediately download the complete data (including load survey) of the current meter installed at the Appellant's premises and furnish the same to the Appellant along with the latest meter reading.
   b) The Respondent shall investigate and clarify whether Meter No. 38714339 (HPL make) was included in the list of defective meters issued by the Chief Engineer (MM), UHBVN, Panchkula, and whether the account overhaul was

carried out strictly as per the guidelines/instructions applicable to such meters.

c) The Respondent shall overhaul the Appellant's account (Account No. 6030721000) afresh in accordance with the directions/guidelines of the competent authority and place the complete details before this Forum.

3. Theft Penalty Matter (₹1,40,088/-): Superintending Engineer (OP) Circle, UHBVN, Panipat, shall constitute a Committee comprising officers i.e. The Executive Engineer (OP) Division, UHBVN, Samalkha, Accountant of Xen (OP) City Division, UHBVN, Samalkha and any SDO other than of Sub Division Samalkha (being a new SDO). The Committee shall thoroughly investigate:

i. The basis and correctness of the theft demand of ₹1,40,088/-;
ii. Whether the amount has been realized or adjusted; and
iii. The current status thereof. A detailed report shall be submitted to this Forum.

4. Filing of Reply: The Respondents shall file their comprehensive reply to the Appellant's objections, along with all documents and the Committee's report, at least 7 days prior to the next date of hearing. This will afford the Appellant sufficient opportunity to file a rejoinder, if any.

The matter shall be listed for further hearing on 18.06.2026.

**E.** On 12.05.2026, appellant has submitted Detailed Point-wise Objections and Rebuttal to the Respondent's Reply 21336 dated 08.05.2026 which is as under:-

1. **Verification of Restoral Policy (for Point No. 2):** The Respondent is required to produce the specific UHBVN Policy regarding the restoration of electricity connections after a meter has been removed by a vigilance team due to alleged theft. This is necessary to determine if the department followed its own mandated procedures during the initial 2017 incident.
2. **Discrepancies in Meter No. 38714339 Installation (for Point No. 3):** The Respondent claims this meter was installed at my site but fails to specify the exact date of installation or produce any authentic supporting documents. Furthermore, the record submitted by the Respondent (Page 3, Serial No. 1219) is date-ambiguous and identifies a different consumer name, proving that the document is either tampered with or entirely unrelated to my account.
3. **Objections to Meter Replacement (MCO No. 08/144 dated 15.04.2023) (for Point No. 5)**: The replacement of the meter was conducted in a highly irregular manner:
   a. **Lack of Evidence**: There is no consumer signature on the MCO, no proof of my consent, and no prior notice was ever served to me.

b. **Reason for Replacement**: I request the Respondent to share the official order, circular, or request detailing the specific reasons or defects found that necessitated this change.

c. **Manufacturing Faults**: Based on verbal communication with the department, I have learned there were manufacturing faults in Meter No. 38714339. If true, the Respondent must share the official "Fact Sheets" regarding these manufacturing defects.

d. **New Meter Verification**: I request the Fact Sheet for the newly installed meter (A5076376) to verify its functionality and accuracy at the time of installation.

4. **Tampered Records and Missing Evidence (for Point No. 5)**:

   a. Correspondence (Letter No. 18158 dated 08.01.2026) served to JE Bhoop Singh confirms that the records for Meter No. 38714339 are tampered with and the physical meter is "Not Traceable".

   b. The LL-1 report originally stated the meter was packed for the M&T Lab, yet it was never submitted.

   c. **Record Manipulation**: The copy of the LL-1 report given to me (Book No. 16786, Serial No. 08) differs from the one submitted to the Ombudsman (Book No. 16786, Serial No. 05), indicating a continuous process of record tampering by the department. I have attached my copy also.

5. **Rebuttal of the Account Overhaul (Point No. 7):** The overhaul bill from 03.01.2016 to 17.02.2025 using three different meters is contested as follows:

   a. **Meter No. 6760968**: The reading of 815 is accepted.

   b. **Meter No. 38714339**: The claimed reading of 44,028 units is purely speculative. Manual entries by a JE are not reliable evidence when official records are admitted to be tampered with and the meter is missing.

   c. **Meter No. A5076376**: No authentic initial reading and actual installation date documents have been shared.

   d. **Custody Concerns**: The Respondent must clarify the policy on how long a JE can keep a removed meter in personal custody and address the high probability of meter misuse during that period.

6. **Illegal Recovery of 2017 Theft Penalty (Point No. 9 & 10)**: The Respondent's attempt to recover ₹1,40,088 again is a blatant attempt to mislead this Forum:

   a. **Prior Settlement**: This amount was deposited in 2017 to restore my connection. Under HERC Supply Code Regulations, restoration cannot occur without the full clearance of dues.

   b. **Statute of Limitations**: Under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act 2003, no recovery can be raised after a lapse of two years if it was not continuously shown as an arrear. Demanding a payment receipt from 9 years ago is legally untenable; the burden of maintaining accurate ledgers lies with the licensee, not the consumer.

7. **Inconsistency in Claimed Amounts (Point No. 8)**: The Respondent's reply contains three conflicting figures for the period ending 17.02.2025: ₹2,63,093 (Point

6), ₹1,74,361 (Point 7), and ₹1,36,463 (Point 10). I demand a clear, mathematical calculation for the exact figure being claimed.

8. **Unaccounted Payments after 17.02.2025 (Point No. 9)**: Since 17.02.2025, I have paid a total sum of ₹2,06,985 to UHBVN (Installments: ₹50,000 on 28.02.2025; ₹1,28,589 on 01.05.2025; ₹10,096 on 13.05.2025; and ₹18,300 on 07.07.2025). These payments have been completely excluded from the Respondent's current calculations.

**Prayer:**

In light of the admitted record tampering and the missing physical evidence, it is most respectfully prayed that the speculative overhaul be quashed. It is further prayed that this Hon'ble Forum order the respondent to provide all demanded and required documents and information immediately to ensure a fair and transparent adjudication of this matter.

**F.** On 12.06.2026, respondent SDO has submitted further reply which is as under:-

उपरोक्त विषय के संदर्भ मे आपको अवगत कराया जाता है की उपभोक्ता द्वारा गलत बिल बारे शिकायत दर्ज कराई है, उक्त शिकायत के **Rejoinder** का जवाब बिन्दु अनुसार इस प्रकार से है-

1. निगम द्वारा दिनांक-03.10.2017 को जो चोरी पकड़ी गई थी, उपभोक्ता द्वारा चोरी के पैसे भरने का रिकार्ड नही पाया गया था, लेकिन कार्यालय द्वारा जांच करने पर पाया गया की उपभोक्ता द्वारा जो चोरी के पैसे भरे गए थे वह RTGS के माध्यम से भरे गए थे जिनका जांच के बाद रिकार्ड मिल गया है जिसकी कॉपी साथ सलग्न है |
2. दिनांक-03.10.2017 को उपभोक्ता की साइट पर चोरी की LL-1/07/3538 भरी गई जिसमे मीटर नंबर-6760968 मीटर को मोके पर साइट से उतार लिया गया और उसके बाद उपभोक्ता की साइट पर नया मीटर लगाया गया जिसका SR NO.38714339 जोकि रीडिंग-01 KWH पर लगाया गया लेकिन उक्त सिरीयल नंबर का कार्यालय के रिकार्ड मे कटिंग पाई गई लेकिन इसके बाद 2019 मे vigilance द्वारा उपभोक्ता की साइट चेक की गई जोकि LL1-02/4287 मे उपभोक्ता का ज्यादा लोड चलता दिखाया गया और मीटर सीरियल नंबर-38714339 की रीडिंग-9645 दर्शाई गई जिससे यह प्रमाणित किया जा सकता है की उक्त मीटर-38714339 उपभोक्ता श्री गुरुचरण का ही है (कॉपी सलग्न)
3. कार्यालय के रिकार्ड के अनुसार MCO NO-08/144 के आधार पर उपभोक्ता का मीटर चेंज हुआ जिसमे उपभोक्ता का पुराना मीटर 38714339 रीडिंग-44028 KWH status-dead स्टॉप दर्शाया गया और नया मीटर-A5076376 रीडिंग-01 पर लगाया दर्शाया गया
   - **(a)** उपलब्ध रिकार्ड के अनुसार mco पर न ही तो उपभोक्ता के हस्ताक्षर पाए गए इसमे सिर्फ उपभोक्ता का मीटर चेंज का कारण dead stop दर्शाया गया
   - **(b)** उपभोक्ता जो मीटर चेंज हुआ है वह किस ऑर्डर पर उतारा गया है इसका कोई रिकार्ड कार्यालय मे नही पाया गया, इसका जो MCO हुआ है उसमे dead stop कारण दर्शाया गया है |
   - **(c)** कार्यालय के रिकार्ड के अनुसार MCO NO-08/144 के आधार पर उपभोक्ता का पुराना मीटर 38714339 रीडिंग-44028 KWH status-dead स्टॉप दर्शाया गया |
   - **(d)** कार्यालय के रिकार्ड के अनुसार MCO NO-08/144 और LL1-08/16786 के अनुसार उपभोक्ता मीटर sr.no-A50767376 रीडिंग-01 kwh पर लगाया था जिसकी कॉपी साथ सलग्न है |

**4.**

(a) उपभोक्ता द्वारा दर्शाये गए पत्र क्रमांक-18158 दिनांक-08.01.2026 के तहत JE भूप सिंह को कोई पत्र नही भेजा गया, पत्र क्रमांक-18858 दिनांक-08.01.2026 के तहत श्री भूप सिंह JE से मीटर SR.NO-38714339 की CA-21 रिपोर्ट व मीटर मांगा गया था |

श्री भूप सिंह JE द्वारा उक्त पत्र के संदर्भ मे कहा गया की उक्त मीटर sr.no-38714339 की CA-21 रिपोर्ट मे कटिंग है, और उक्त मीटर not traceable है (रिपोर्ट सलग्न है) |

(**b**) भूप सिंह JE द्वारा अपनी लिखित रिपोर्ट मे बताया गया की जब मीटर की चेकिंग की गई थी और मीटर चेकिंग के दोरान उक्त मीटर sr.no-38714339 की LL1-08/16786 भरी गई थी जोकि LL1 भरने के बाद उक्त मीटर को क्रॉस चेक किया गया और मीटर को सप्लाई दी गई जिसमे मीटर की रीडिंग दर्शाई गई जोकि मीटर क्रॉस चेक करने से पहले LL-1 भर दी गई थी लेकिन मीटर मे रीडिंग show होने के कारण मीटर को पैक नही किया गया और न ही मीटर को M&T लैब मे भेज गया (JE रिपोर्ट सलग्न) |

(**c**) LL1-08/16786 का प्रिन्ट सही न होने के कारण clerical मिस्टैक के कारण LL1- को 05/16786 इंगित कर दिया गया था जिसका LL1 का सही नंबर 08/16786 ही है

**5.**

**(a)** उपभोक्ता की दिनांक-03.10.2017 को जो चोरी भरी गई थी उस LL1-07/3538 मे उपभोक्ता मीटर sr.no- 6760968 की रीडिंग-815 KWH दर्शाई पाई गई |

**(b)** उपभोक्ता की दिनांक-16.10.2019 को LL1-02/4287 के तहत मीटर चेक किया गया था जिसमे उपभोक्ता के मीटर sr.no-38714339 की रीडिंग-9645 KWH दर्शाई गई थी और MCO NO-08/144 और LL1-08/16786 मे मीटर sr.no-38714339 की रीडिंग-44028 KWH दर्शाई गई उपलब्ध रिकार्ड के अनुसार उक्त खाते को ओवहॉल किया गया था |

**(c)** मीटर sr.no-A5076376 MCO NO-08/144 और LL1-08/16786 रिपोर्ट के अनुसार उक्त मीटर रीडिंग-01 पर लगाया गया था |

**(d)** जो मीटर संबंधित कर्मचारी द्वारा साइट से उतारा जाता है वह उस कर्मचारी द्वारा उक्त मीटर को उसी समय GSC सेक्शन मे CA-22 करा देता है |

**6.** निगम द्वारा दिनांक-03.10.2017 को जो चोरी पकड़ी गई थी, उपभोक्ता द्वारा चोरी के पैसे भरने का रिकार्ड नही पाया गया था, लेकिन कार्यालय द्वारा जांच करने पर पाया गया की उपभोक्ता द्वारा जो चोरी के पैसे भरे गए थे वह RTGS के माध्यम से भरे गए थे जिनका जांच के बाद रिकार्ड मिल गया है जिसकी कॉपी साथ सलग्न है |

**A&b.** बिन्दु -06 same

**7.** उपभोक्ता का खाता दिनांक-01/2016 से 02/2025 तक ओवहॉल किया गया उपभोक्ता का खाता उक्त sundry नंबर-68/431 के तहत राशि-174361/-रु चार्ज बनते थे जोकि उपभोक्ता को पहले 263093/-रु चार्ज कर लिए गए थे जोकि अब उपभोक्ता को चार्ज की गई राशि से (263093-174361=88731/-) रु और उस पे लगे हुए सरचार्ज की राशि-16542/- रु (88731+16542=105273/-) उपभोक्ता के खाते से घटा दिए गए है जोकि उक्त राशि माननीय CBO द्वारा दिनांक-06.05.2026 को अप्रूव भी कर दिए गए है |

**8.** रिकार्ड के अनुसार उपभोक्ता द्वारा जमा की गई राशि को sundry नंबर-68/431 के तहत घटा दिया गया है उक्त राशि का विवरण sundry नंबर-68/431 मे विवरण है जिसकी कॉपी साथ सलग्न है |

**अत: भेजी गई सूचना आपके आगामी कार्यवाही हेतु प्रेषित है |**

**G.** On 16.06.2026, respondent SDO has submitted further reply which is as under;-

आपके द्वारा दिनांक-11.05.2026 के अंतरिम आदेश का जवाब इस प्रकार से है-

1. उपभोक्ता द्वारा दिए गए गए rejoinder का जवाब पत्र क्रमांक-21940 दिनांक-12.06.2026 के माध्यम से भेज दिया गया है |
2. 
   (a) वर्तमान मीटर के लोड सर्वे डाटा की कॉपी साथ सलग्न है |
   (b) मीटर sr.no-38714339 डिफेक्टिव लिस्ट का कोई भी डाटा कार्यालय मे नही पाया गया |
   (c) उपभोक्ता का खाता दिनांक-01/2016 से 02/2025 तक ओवर्हॉल किया गया उपभोक्ता का खाता उक्त sundry नंबर-68/431 के तहत राशि-174361/-रु चार्ज बनते थे जोकि उपभोक्ता को पहले 263093/- रु चार्ज कर लिए गए थे जोकि अब उपभोक्ता को चार्ज की गई राशि से (263093-174361=88731/-) रु और उस पे लगे हुए सरचार्ज की राशि-16542/- रु (88731+16542=105273/-) उपभोक्ता के खाते से घटा दिए गए है जोकि उक्त राशि माननीय CBO द्वारा दिनांक-06.05.2026 को अप्रूव भी कर दिए गए है |
3. निगम द्वारा दिनांक-03.10.2017 को जो चोरी पकड़ी गई थी, उपभोक्ता द्वारा चोरी के पैसे भरने का रिकार्ड नही पाया गया था, लेकिन कार्यालय द्वारा जांच करने पर पाया गया की उपभोक्ता द्वारा जो चोरी के पैसे भरे गए थे वह RTGS के माध्यम से दिनांक-26.10.2017 को भरे गए थे जिनका जांच के बाद रिकार्ड मिल गया है जिसकी कॉपी साथ सलग्न है |
4. उपभोक्ता द्वारा दिए गए गए rejoinder का जवाब पत्र क्रमांक-21940 दिनांक-12.06.2026 के माध्यम से भेज दिया गया है |

**अत: भेजी गई सूचना आपके आगामी कार्यवाही हेतु प्रेषित है |**

**H.** On 17.06.2026, appellant has submitted Detailed Point-wise Objections and Rebuttal to the Respondent's Reply 21940 dated 12.06.2026 received on mail on 16.06.2026 @ 4:50PM which is as under:-

The Appellant most respectfully submits the following detailed objections to the reply filed by the Respondent (SDO, Samalkha):

1. **THE SDO VIOLATED THE FORUM'S ORDERS:** Breach of Express Orders: In Direction No. 4 of the Interim Order dated 11.05.2026, this Hon'ble Forum strictly ordered the SDO to give me their reply at least 7 days before the hearing (by June 11, 2026). The SDO completely ignored this order and gave me the reply on the evening of June 16, 2026 @ 04:50PM—just one day before today.
2. **Violation of Fairness (Natural Justice):** The Forum gave the SDO 7 days so that I would have "sufficient opportunity" to read it and reply. Giving me a highly technical bill and report at the very last minute is unfair and violates my legal right to a fair hearing (Principles of Natural Justice).
3. **No Delay from My End:** Even though the SDO intentionally left me with less than 24 hours, I am filing this Rejoinder immediately because I do not want to delay this case. However, I request this Hon'ble Forum to put the SDO's rule-breaking and careless approach on the official record.

4. **ILLEGAL THEFT DEMAND ADMITTED AND PROVEN FALSE:** Admission of Wrongful Harassment: In Point No. 1 and No. 6 of their latest reply, the SDO explicitly admits that the theft penalty of ₹1,40,088/- (from 2017) was already fully paid by me via RTGS in 2017. The department now admits they have found the official bank records confirming my payment.
5. **Gross Negligence by the Department:** The department continually harassed me, and demanding from me at multiple legal forums to recover an amount I had already cleared. This proves that the department's official ledgers, billing system, and records are entirely unreliable, un-updated, and filled with gross negligence.
6. **Violation of the Electricity Act:** Under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003, a utility cannot demand any recovery after a lapse of two years unless it is continuously shown as an active arrear. The department kept a paid amount pending in their disorganized records and was trying to illegally inflate my current bills.
7. **Prayer on this Point:** Since the department has finally admitted my payment is clear, I request this Hon'ble Forum to completely wipe out this theft penalty from my account records once and for all. Furthermore, because their billing system is now proven to be full of errors, their entire account overhaul calculation must be treated with absolute suspicion.
8. **ADMISSION OF RECORD TAMPERING AND DEMAND FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION:** Official Admission of Fraudulent Activity: In Point No. 2 of their latest reply, the SDO explicitly admits that there are "cuttings" and alterations in the office's official register (Serial No. 1219) regarding the installation of Meter No. 38714339. Furthermore, in the attached report by JE Bhoop Singh, it is openly stated that a different person's name was entered into the register by erasing or overriding the record.
9. **A Serious Offense, Not a Clerical Error:** Altering official department records, changing consumer names on specific meter allocations, and modifying registers is a serious, unlawful act, not a simple "clerical mistake." It points to a deliberate attempt by someone within the Sub-Division to manipulate records, which has directly caused me severe financial harassment for years.
10. **Demand to Fix Responsibility and Take Action:** The department cannot simply shrug off the tampering of public records by calling it an existing condition. I request this Hon'ble Forum to direct the Superintending Engineer (SE) or higher management of UHBVN to immediately conduct a formal internal inquiry to: Identify the specific officer or official responsible for making these illegal alterations and entries in the register. Initiate strict disciplinary and legal action against the guilty individual for misconduct and fabricating official department records.
11. **Total Breakdown of Document Credibility:** Since the SDO has legally admitted that their own historical registers are tampered with, none of the paperwork or manual readings submitted by this Sub-Division can be trusted as authentic

evidence. A compromised record cannot be used to justify a financial overhaul against a consumer.

12. **ILLEGAL AND UNAUTHORIZED METER REPLACEMENT:** Admission of Procedure Violation: In Point No. 3(a) and 3(b) of their reply, the SDO clearly admits that the Meter Change Order (MCO No. 08/144) does not contain my signature. They also openly admit that there is absolutely no official order or department record to show why or on whose authority this meter was removed.
13. **Violation of Consumer Rights and Transparency:** Replacing an electricity meter in the absolute absence of the consumer, without serving a prior notice, and without taking a signature at the site is highly irregular and illegal. The department has failed to prove that I was ever informed or that due process was followed during the replacement on 15.04.2023.
14. **Unilateral Actions Cannot Bind the Consumer:** Because this meter was changed behind my back and without any official authorization tracking, the final reading of 44,028 KWh entered on that MCO is completely unverified and untrustworthy. The department cannot legally force a massive financial liability onto a consumer based on a secret, unauthorized exercise conducted by its own staff.
15. **Prayer on this Point:** Since the SDO has admitted that the entire meter replacement process lacked consumer consent, signatures, and supporting administrative orders, this entire MCO must be declared null and void. Consequently, the speculative reading of 44,028 KWh taken from this unauthorized event must be completely rejected.
16. **THE TRUTH REMAINS UNCHANGED DESPITE THE HANDWRITING CONFUSION:** Clarification of the Letter Number: The SDO claims in Point No. 4(a) of their reply that I cited the wrong letter number. I wish to clarify that the letter number on the official document handed to me by the SDO was handwritten. Because of the poor and careless handwriting of the department's staff, the number reads exactly as "18158".
17. **The Uncontested Facts Written in the Letter:** Regardless of whether the handwritten number is 18158 or 18858, the SDO's latest reply and the attached report from JE Bhoop Singh confirm the absolute breakdown of their case: They officially admit that the historical records for my account contain illegal entries. They officially admit that the physical meter (No. 38714339) is "Not Traceable" and completely lost while in their sole custody. They officially admit they failed to send the meter to the M&T Lab for mandatory testing.
18. **REJECTION OF THE SELF-SERVING AND UNVERIFIED REPORT OF JE BHOOP SINGH:** Self-Serving Statements Lack Legal Validity: The SDO is heavily relying on the written report of JE Bhoop Singh to justify why the primary evidence (Meter No. 38714339) is missing and why it was never sent to the M&T Lab. Under the law, a self-serving statement made by an accused official to cover up his own administrative lapses cannot be treated as an authentic or independent piece of evidence.

19. **Admission of a Deliberate Procedure Violation:** The JE's report actually acts as a confession of misconduct. He admits that he filled out the LL-1 checking report before actually cross-checking or testing the meter. This proves that the LL-1 report—which is supposed to be an accurate, real-time record of site conditions—was fabricated and pre-written in the office rather than prepared honestly on-site.
20. **Illegal Avoidance of Mandatory Lab Testing:** The JE claims he decided not to pack the meter or send it to the M&T Lab simply because the display suddenly turned on and showed a reading of 44,028 KWh. This is a shocking violation of UHBVN rules. A field engineer does not have the legal authority to bypass mandatory laboratory testing for a disputed, defective meter just because he manually read a number of it on the spot. The only legal way to authenticate a final reading is through an official M&T Lab test report, which the department has failed to produce.
21. **Convenient Loss of Primary Evidence:** The JE casually reports that the meter is now "Not Traceable". The department cannot destroy or lose the physical evidence of a case, fail to perform the legally required lab test, and then ask this Hon'ble Forum to blindly accept a manual reading written down by the very officer who lost the meter.
22. **Prayer on this Point**: I request this Hon'ble Forum to completely reject JE Bhoop Singh's report as unverified, legally untrustworthy, and an afterthought designed to escape accountability. Since the physical meter is lost and no authentic laboratory report exists, the final reading of 44,028 KWh has absolutely no legal basis and cannot be used to overhaul my account.
23. **Fatal Chronological Contradiction and Fabricated Records**: The Respondent claims that the disputed meter (No. 38714339) was physically removed from the site under a Meter Change Order (MCO) on 15.04.2023; however, the corresponding site inspection report (LL-1) was not registered until 21.09.2023—more than five months after the meter had ceased to exist on the consumer's premises. It is a legal and physical impossibility to conduct an on-site verification of a removed meter five months after its disposal, which conclusively proves that the LL-1 checking report is back-dated, procedurally fabricated in the office, and entirely devoid of legal validity.
24. **Failure to Produce Prima Facie Evidence and Arbitrary Presumption of Initial Reading:** The Respondent asserts in section (c) of point 5 that the new meter (No. A5076376) was installed at an initial reading of "01 KWh," yet they have failed to produce any authentic, legally admissible primary evidence—such as a signed installation report, manufacturer's verification sheet, or contemporary consumer-witnessed record—to support this claim. Under standard utility regulations and general legal principles, the burden of proof lies entirely on the licensee to establish the exact baseline data of new equipment; in the absence of trustworthy documentation, a self-serving entry in an internal

office ledger cannot be legally presumed accurate, rendering the subsequent consumption calculations completely unreliable and unverified.

25. **Lack of Legal and Mathematical Veracity in Account Overhaul Calculations:** The account overhaul submitted by the Respondent under Point No. 7 is entirely based on speculative figures, unverified consumption facts, and is presented in a legally unacceptably vague format. While the Respondent claims a net chargeable amount of ₹1,74,361/- under Sundry No. 68/431, they have failed to provide a transparent, step-by-step mathematical ledger showing how this figure was derived across three different meters over a nine-year period (2016–2025). Under settled legal principles, an electricity distribution licensee cannot demand public funds based on ambiguous internal ledger adjustments; because the underlying entries for Meter No. 38714339 are admitted to be tampered with, and the physical meter is missing, the entire calculation lacks legal foundation and must be rejected as mathematically untrustworthy.

26. **Gross Chronological Error and False Claim of Adjusting Post-Period Deposits:** The Respondent's claim in Point No. 8 of their reply—asserting that the Appellant's deposits totaling ₹2,06,985/- were already adjusted within the account overhaul—is a chronological impossibility and a factual misrepresentation before this Forum. The ledger overhaul strictly covers the period from 03.01.2016 to 17.02.2025. However, as per valid payment receipts, the sum of ₹2,06,985/- was deposited in four distinct installments after the closure of the overhaul period, between 28.02.2025 and 07.07.2025. Under standard accounting and legal principles, payments deposited after February 2025 cannot mathematically or legally be absorbed or "already deducted" within a billing calculation that concludes on 17.02.2025. This proves that the Respondent's calculation completely omits these major financial credits, making the current outstanding demand illegal, inflated, and factually incorrect.

27. **Deemed Admission of Internal Financial Contradictions Due to Respondent's Silence:** Under Point No. 7 of written objections, explicitly challenged the Respondent for presenting three completely conflicting and unreconciled financial figures—specifically ₹2,63,093/-, ₹1,74,361/-, and ₹1,36,463/-—for the exact same billing period ending 17.02.2025. A perusal of the SDO's latest point-wise response reveals that the Respondent has completely ignored this objection and failed to provide any specific reply, explanation, or mathematical reconciliation for these glaring contradictions. Under settled principles of law and pleadings, when a material fact or specific allegation is raised by the consumer and the utility fails to reply to or deny it in their subsequent submission, it amounts to a deemed admission of that fault; consequently, the Respondent's total silence legally establishes that their financial demands are entirely arbitrary, self-contradictory, and lack any reliable ledger or accounting basis.

The Respondent has willfully violated your explicit direction No. 2(a) from the interim order by suppressing the current meter's load survey data. They are withholding this data. Willful Non-Compliance of Forum Directions and Suppression of Official "Defective Lot" Records. The Appellant submits that the Respondent has willfully failed to comply with explicit Direction No. 2(b) of the Hon'ble Ombudsman's Interim Order dated 11.05.2026. The Respondent was strictly directed to investigate and clarify whether Meter No. 38714339 (HPL make) was listed in the official schedule of manufacturing defects issued by the Chief Engineer (MM), UHBVN, Panchkula.

A perusal of the SDO's reply reveals a complete and deliberate silence on this mandate; no clearance report, circular, or official communication from the Chief Engineer (MM) has been placed on record.

Under settled legal principles, when a public utility deliberately suppresses structural corporate data ordered by a judicial forum, an adverse inference must be drawn against them. The Respondent's failure to clear this point legally confirms that the meter belonged to a known defective lot or not, thereby invalidating any manual or speculative readings recorded from it and completely shattering the legal basis of the contested account overhaul.

Failure to Execute a Legally Compliant, Fresh Account Overhaul, The Appellant submits that the Respondent has completely failed to comply with Direction No. 2(c) of the Hon'ble Ombudsman's Interim Order dated 11.05.2026, which strictly commanded the utility to overhaul the Appellant's account (Account No. 6030721000) afresh in accordance with the directions and guidelines of the competent authority. Instead of performing a lawful calculation based on established regulatory formulas for "Dead Stop" meters, the Respondent merely resubmitted the same flawed, late-entered system data under Sundry No. 68/431, relying entirely on the discredited and unverified reading of 44,028 KWh.

By failing to apply the mandatory regulatory guidelines of the competent authority for overhauling a defective billing period, and by basing their calculations on tampered and missing records, the Respondent has breached a direct judicial order. Consequently, this non-compliant, recycled calculation holds no legal weight and the contested financial demand must be dismissed.

**I.** The hearing in this matter was held today on 18.06.2026 as scheduled. The hearing was attended by Sh. Naresh Kumar, SDO (OP), Samalkha, Sh. Naresh Kumar, Commercial Assistant, office of SDO (OP) Samalkha, and the Appellant, Sh. Gursharan, in person.

During the course of arguments, the Appellant highlighted serious inconsistencies and apparent tampering in the records furnished by the Respondents, particularly with respect to:

- Discrepancies in the Meter Change Order (MCO No. 08/144) regarding the date of meter replacement (15.04.2023 vis-à-vis 15.09.2023) for Account No. 6030721000.
- Inconsistencies in the dates and numbering of LL-1 reports (e.g., LL-1 bearing No. 05/16786 dated 21.09.2023).
- The failure to send Meter Serial No. 38714339 to the M&T Laboratory despite specific remarks in the LL-1 and earlier directions, coupled with the non-downloading of meter data to substantiate the recorded readings.
- The non-provision of the MCO under which the subsequent meter (Serial No. A5076376) was installed, and the lack of verifiable initial reading (1 unit) in light of repeated tampering and inconsistencies in the records.

The Appellant expressed strong dissatisfaction with the quality and reliability of the records and replies submitted by the Respondents.

After careful consideration of the submissions made by both parties, the pleadings on record, and the documents produced, this Forum observes that there have been multiple lapses on the part of the Respondent Department at various levels. These include:

- Failure to maintain accurate and consistent billing records and meter-related documentation.
- Apparent non-compliance with earlier directions issued vide Interim Order dated 11.05.2026 (particularly Direction No. 3 regarding the Theft Penalty matter).
- Non-updating of records leading to erroneous billing and prolonged dispute.

Such deficiencies undermine the principles of transparency, accountability, and fair billing as mandated under the Electricity Act, 2003 and the applicable HERC Regulations.

In view of the above, and to ensure complete and fair adjudication of the matter, the following directions are issued for strict and time-bound compliance:

1. <u>ACTION BY RESPONDENT SDO & COMMERCIAL ASSISTANT</u>
   Detailed Month-wise Ledger and Account Overhaul: The Respondents shall prepare a comprehensive month-wise (bimonthly) ledger of the Appellant's account (Account No. 6030721000) from the date of connection installation (03.01.2016) till the date of this order. The ledger shall explicitly indicate:
    - Meter Serial Numbers (old and new), Initial Reading (IR), Final Reading (FR), consumption, billing code, and final billed amount (including surcharge, if any).
    - All relevant MCO numbers, LL-1 numbers, and other supporting documents.
    - Payment details made by the consumer.

- Cross-verification with meter data downloaded by the M&P team in respect of the instant meter installed at site and MRBD agency data being assigned the work of MRBD (by respondent department from time to time).
- Any other details respondents feel necessary to mention in the sheet.

The entire ledger shall be prepared on A-3 size sheets in a clear, tabulated format to enable proper scrutiny by the Appellant and this Forum. It shall be duly audited by the Internal Audit Party of UHBVN before submission.

2. <u>XEN BY RESPONDENT XEN/OPERATION</u>
   Fixing of Responsibility: The XEN (OP) Division, UHBVN, Samalkha shall identify the delinquent officials responsible for:
   - Erroneous billing of the consumer
   - Non-operation / improper handling of MCOs,
   - Failure to maintain proper written records, and
   - Tampering / cuttings / inconsistencies in official records.
   - Not sending the meter to M&T Lab (through proper challan) and non-traceability in Sub Division(as evident from the admission of respondents)

   A detailed report in the form of an affidavit shall be filed by the XEN (OP), Samalkha, indicating the specific lapses, the names of responsible officials, and the disciplinary action initiated / proposed against them.

3. Compliance with Previous Directions: The Respondents shall also furnish a specific compliance report regarding Point No. 3 of the Interim Order dated 11.05.2026 concerning the Theft Penalty of ₹1,40,088/-, including the findings of the Committee constituted by the Superintending Engineer (OP) Circle, Panipat.
4. <u>ACTION BY APPELLANT & RESPONDENT LICENSEE:</u>

   Filing of Reply and Rejoinder: The Respondents shall furnish the complete reply, along with the detailed ledger, audit report, and affidavit, to the Appellant on or before 03.07.2026. The Appellant shall be at liberty to file a rejoinder, if any, within 5 days thereafter.

The matter shall be listed for final hearing on 09.07.2026.

**J.** On 03.07.2026, Xen/OP Division, UHBVN Samalkha has submitted reply in the forum of an affidavit which is as under:-

I, Mahender Singh, presently working as Executive Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Samalkha Division, under operation circle UHBVN Panipat, Haryana, do hereby solemnly affirm and state as under: -

1. That I am the Executive Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Samalkha and am duly authorized to swear this affidavit on behalf of the respondent department.

2. That in compliance with the directions contained in the interim order dated 18.06.2026, a detailed report has been taken from SDO(OP) Sub Division, UHBVN Samalkha regarding the lapses pointed out in the matter.
3. That during the course of inquiry, the records relating to the consumer connection, billing history, meter handling, MCO records, meter testing procedure and other relevant departmental documents were examined.
4. That the inquiry has revealed the following lapses/irregularities: -
   a) Erroneous billing of the consumer.
   b) Non-operation/improper handling of MCOs.
   c) Failure to maintain proper written records.
   d) Tampering/cuttings/inconsistencies in the official records, wherever noticed.
   e) Failure to send the meter to M&T Laboratory through proper challan and lack of traceability of the meter in the Sub-Division records.

5. That the officials found responsible for the aforesaid lapses are as under:

| Sr. No. | Name of Official | Designation | Nature of Lapse |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | A-Sh. Jai Narayan | J.E. | Erroneous billing of the consumer ( the than GSC in charge is responsible due to non-entering the CA 21 of meter sr. no 38714339 and non-updated the MCO in billing system respectively) the MRBD was found responsible for non-taking the reading on time. The penalty is found deducted from the bill of the MRBD for non-taking the reading. |
| | **B-Sh. Bhoop Singh** | **J.E.** | **Erroneous billing of the consumer (the than GSC/are in-charge is responsible due to non-entering the CA 21 of meter sr. no 38714339 and non-updated the MCO in billing system respectively) the MRBD was found responsible for non-taking the reading on time. The penalty is found deducted from the bill of the MRBD for non-taking the reading.** |
| 2. | A-Sh. Bhoop Singh<br><br>B-Sh. Vikash<br><br>C-Smt. Meenakshi | J.E.<br><br>L.M.<br><br>A.L.M.<br><br>A.L.M. | Non-operation/improper handling of MCOs. (Found responsible for non-updating/maintaining record of MCO.)<br>Non-operation/improper handling of MCOs. (Found responsible for non-updating/maintaining record of MCO.)<br>Non-operation/improper handling of MCOs. (Found responsible for non-updating/maintaining record of MCO.)<br>Non-operation/improper handling of MCOs. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | D- Smt. Neetu | | (Found responsible for non-updating/maintaining record of MCO.) |
| 3 | A- Sh. Jai Narayan<br><br>B- Sh. Bhoop Singh | J.E.<br><br>J.E. | Failure to maintain proper written records (The then GSC Incharge as non taken entry of meter sr. no. 38714339 in CA 21.)<br><br>Failure to maintain proper written records (The then are in-charge not updated MCO in the billing system respectively) |
| 4 | Sh. Vikash | L.M. | Tampering/cuttings/inconsistencies in the official records in RAPDRP system as written statement given by Sh. Bhoop Singh J.E. |
| 5 | Sh. Bhoop Singh | J.E. | Failure to send the meter to M&T Laboratory through proper challan and lack of traceability of the meter in the Sub-Division records. He is fully responsible for non-checking the from M&T lab are for traced out the meter. |

6. That disciplinary proceedings have been initiated/proposed against the above officials in accordance with the applicable service rules. The details are as under:

   XEN (OP) Division UHBVN Samalkha has directed to SDO (OP) Sub Division UHBVN Samalkha to initiate the disciplinary action against all delinquent official(s) as per service rules within seven days and submit the same at XEN (OP) Division UHBVN Samalkha.

7. That the contents of this affidavit are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and nothing material has been concealed therefrom.

**K.** On 03.07.2026, respondent SDO has submitted reply against interim order pass by honorable electricity ombudsman Haryana on dated 18.06.2026 against deficiencies undermine the principles of transparency, accountability, and fair billing as mandated under the electricity act,2003 and the applicable HERC regulations which is as under:-.

Action By Respondent SDO & Commercial Assistant:

(a) The detailed month wise ledger and account overhauling duly verified by internal audit party / Divisional Accountant is hereby attached (ANNEXURE-I) from date of connection 03.01.2016 to June 2026.

(b) All Relevant MCO Numbers, LL-1 numbers & and other supporting documents is hereby attached (ANNEXURE-II)

(c) Payment detail made by the consumer is already mentioned in Annexure-I.

(d) SDO UHBVN SAMALKHA has requested to XEN M&P Sonipat for Cross verification with meter data downloaded by the M&P team in respect of the instant meter installed at site vide his office memo no-22002 dated-18.06.2026. After visited the site by M&P team submit his reply "I along with my team visited the site in the presence of (op) staff to collect the data above said meter on dated 18.06.2026 at 10:00 AM & 6:30PM, but no response given by the meter regarding the load survey. Again, I tried my best with help of different CMRI & lead but this time also no response by the meter. Hence the load survey data of the said meter could not be collected from this site" (ANEXURE-III). The data received from MRBD agency is here by attached (ANEXURE-IV). Meter has been sent to M&T lab Karnal for load survey data after getting the report from M&T lab Karnal same will be submitted in your good office.

The entire ledger has been prepared on A-3 size sheet in a clear, tabulated format & it has been audited by the Division accountant as per direction received through e mail from the Sr. Accounts Officer o/o Chief Auditor UHBVN, Rohtak.

Hence it is requested to consider the reply which is prepared on actual facts & relevant record of this office.

**L.** On 03.07.2026, respondent SDO has submitted point wise reply in the objection raised by appellant on the reply filed by the undersigned on dated 12.06.2026 which is as under:-

1. **The SDO violated the Forum orders:** It is wrong hence denied the reason was that I am newly joined as SDO op S/DIVN UHBVN SAMALKHA on dated 08.05.2026 and I have attend the enquiry on dated 11.05.2026 after that I was not aware about the email of SDO op S/DIVN UHBVN SAMALKHA beside this the reply was sent to the appellant as well as honorable commission.
2. **Violation of Fairness (Natural Justice):** it is wrong hence denied I have made my best effort to submit the reply to the consumer because I had newly joined in Nigam on dated 08.05.2026 and hearing on dated 11.05.2026 and rejoinder was mailed on dated 12.05.2026 in the S/DIVN but due to not aware about the email of the office rejoinder reply submitted late that is on dated 12.06.2026.
3. **No Delay from My End:** Delay submission of reply was due to my newly joining in the sub division and a non-awareness of the case & not deliberately.
4. **Illegal Theft demand admitted and proven false:** It is wrong hence denied because the consumer was found stealing the energy as per L.L-1-07/3538 dated-03.10.2017 by passing the energy meter through incoming PVC cable and a theft of penalty was found imposed RS.1,15088+25000(Assessment + compounding) and found deposited RS.140088/- through RTGS in 10/2017.
5. **Gross Negligence by the department:** It wrong hence denied because the new meter was installed by the then GSC Incharge Sh. Jainarayan JE after deposited the theft amount and the meter which was found installed had not been entered in billing after complete the MCO and the billing was found raised on average basis.

6. **Violation of the Electricity Act:** It is wrong hence denied because the consumer has not came with actual fact in front of the honorable authority because the consumer was using highly consumed units but due to not effecting the MCO/SJO in the system it was not possible to generate the actual consumption billing. For which Sh. Jainarayn JE & Sh. Bhoop singh JE are found responsible being the incharge GSC. **A L.L-1-02/4287 dated-16.10.2019 was prepared on which the meter sr. no-38714339 was found installed with reading-9645 KWH & a sundry of RS.54338/- was prepared by the sub division for charging the amount but wrongly entered in allowances column by the HCL during converting the data from HARTRON to HCL. Which is found chargeable from the consumer.**
7. **Prayer on this Point:** For wrong calculation recovery of the theft penalty Sh. Sukhdev LDC (Working as CA) is found responsible and the Nigam is bounded to take action on the delinquent official/officer who is found responsible for charging the theft penalty.
8. **Admission of Record Tampering and demand for disciplinary action:** Sh. Jainarayan JE is found responsible for cutting in the CA-21 register.
9. **A serious offense, Not a clerical Error:** After going through the contents of the record it is reveled that the cutting in CA21 register at SR NO.1219 was found in the numerical of the meter which was 38714895 which was installed on the premises of Reena devi w/o Vikram r/o Chulkana against Account no.CK-11-4086 on dated 04.10.2017 on account of new connection.
10. **Demand of fix Responsibility and take action:** Responsibility has been already fixed and necessary action against the delinquent official/officer will be initiated who are founded in indulging incorrect billing and not maintaining the record of MCO.
11. **Total breakdown of documents credibility:** The allegation are found wrong hence denied there is no any cutting found in the official record but found tampered during the uploading in the RAPDRP system.
12. **Illegal and Unauthorized meter replacement:** The allegation are found wrong hence denied because the meter which were found installed at the premises of the consumer during MCO/SJO are found draw from Nigam store but the record not found maintained by GSC accordingly the responsibility has been fixed. MCO has done on basis of block brunt to rectify the billing on average basis.
13. **Violation of Consumer Rights and Transparency:** The billing of consumer was being F (fault) basis accordingly the L.L-1-08/16786 has been prepared by Sh. Bhoop Singh JE on dated-21.09.2023 against MCO No-08/144 dated 15.04.2023 for providing the correct billing as per Nigam instruction. But MCO not found timely entered in CCB for which responsibility has already been fixed.
14. **Unilateral action cannot bind the consumer:** The Nigam is fully authorized to make charging against the reading recorded in the meter, it may be the case of accumulation of the reading deliberately.
15. **Prayer on this Point:** The Prayer on the point no-14 for accumulation the reading 44028 is found wrong hence denied the meter was removed through L.L-1-

08/16786 by Sh. Bhoop Singh JE and is found responsible for not maintaining the record of removed meter (CA-22).

16. **The Truth Remains Unchanged Despite the Handwriting Confusion:** The allegation found wrong hence denied because after going through the official record a letter no-18858 dated-08.01.2026 was found issue to Sh. Bhoop Singh JE (**Copy Attached Annexure-I).**
17. **The Uncontested Facts Written in the Letter:** The allegation found wrong hence denied because after going through the official record a letter no-18858 dated-08.01.2026 was found issue to Sh. Bhoop Singh JE & his written statement (**Copy Attached Annexure-II).**
18. **Rejection of the self-serving and unverified report of JE BHOOP SINGH JE:** Responsibility of Sh. Bhoop Singh JE has already been fixed for not maintaining the record of the removed meter/CA-22 (**Copy Attached Annexure-III**).
19. **Admission of a Deliberate Violation:** Responsibility of Sh. Bhoop Singh JE has already been fixed for not maintaining the record of theLL1 against removed meter (CA-22).
20. **Illegal Avoidance of mandatory Lab testing:** it is wrong hence denied that the reading could not been shown by the JE on the MCO if it is visible on the meter screen than it will be quoted on MCO or L.L-1 documents and not required to Send the M&P lab it may be referred to the M&P on consumer request.
21. **Convenient Loss of primary Evidence:** The Sh. Bhoop singh JE is found responsible for not trace out the removed meter (CA-22).
22. **Prayer on This Point:** On point no.21 prayer found wrong hence denied because there is sufficient evidence are available in the Nigam the CA-22 of the removed meter on LL1 no- 08/16786 on dated-21.09.2023 and L.L-1 No.02/4287 dated-16.10.2019 of the same meter which was installed after penalty of theft deposited.
23. **Fatal chronological and Fabricated Records:** The L.L-1 No-08/16786 dated-21.09.2023 against MCO No-08/144 is documentary evidence is here by attached with previous L.L-1-02/4287 dated-16.10.2019 on reading-9645 KWH (**copy attached Annexure-IV**).
24. **Failure to produce prima facie evidence and arbitrary presumption of initial reading:** The MCO of the installed meter with sr. no. is here by attached for your ready reference.
25. **Lack of legal and Mathematical veracity in Account Overhaul Calculation:** The audited sheet of the account from the date of connection that is 03.01.2016 to June 2026 is here by submitted for your ready reference.
26. **Gross Chronological Error and false claim of Adjusting Post Period Deposits:** The detailed accounts ledger sheet pre-audit by the internal audit party is here by attached.
27. The detailed accounts ledger sheet pre-audit by the internal audit party is here by attached.

Hence it is requested to considered the reply it is based on actual fact and records this is for your kind information and necessary action please.

**M.** On 06.07.2026, appellant has submitted Detailed Point-wise Objections and Rebuttal to the Respondent's Reply 22333 and 22334 dated 03.07.2026 received on mail which is as under:-

The Appellant most respectfully submits this comprehensive, consolidated submission to bring on record definitive evidence and expose the fatal admissions, systemic record manipulations, and mathematical absurdities presented by the Respondent utility (UHBVN).

This submission systematically addresses every individual point, the manipulated Account Search Report, and the unverified internal audit ledger sheets:

1. The SDO's Fatal Admissions & Loss of Primary Evidence:
    a. Official Admission of Wrongful Financial Harassment: In Point No. 4 and No. 7 of their reply, the SDO explicitly admits that the 2017 theft penalty of ₹1,40,088/- was fully settled and cleared by the Appellant via RTGS back in October 2017. The Respondent openly blames their own clerk, Sh. Sukhdev, LDC, for failing to update the system and keeping this liquidated amount active under billing recovery tracking. Legal Rebuttal: A public utility cannot continuously threaten a consumer for a fully paid liability and then escape legal culpability by shifting the blame onto a subordinate clerk. This admission conclusively proves that the outstanding arrears demanded by the Sub-Division for nearly a decade are entirely fictitious, illegal, and malicious.
    b. Admission of Record Tampering & Systemic Database Fraud: In Point No. 8, 9, and 11, the SDO explicitly admits to physical alterations, "cuttings," and name-overriding in the official CA-21 register (Serial No. 1219) executed by Sh. Jainarayan, JE. Furthermore, the SDO admits that consumer data was "tampered during the uploading in the RAPDRP system." Legal Rebuttal: Once a state utility formally concedes that its primary physical registers are altered and its digital database is compromised or tampered with, none of its records retain legal validity. A corrupted database cannot serve as primary evidence to enforce a massive financial overhaul on a consumer.
    c. Complete Loss of Evidence & Breakdown of Chain of Custody: In Point No. 15, 18, and 21, alongside Annexure-I, the SDO admits that the central piece of evidence—disputed Meter No. 38714339—is officially "Not Traceable" and has been entirely lost while in the utility's sole custody. They state that Sh. Bhoop Singh, JE, has been held administratively responsible for losing the hardware and failing to maintain mandatory CA-22 records. Legal Rebuttal: Under prevailing electricity regulations, the physical meter is the ultimate source of truth. The department cannot lose the physical meter, fail to produce a mandatory laboratory verification sheet, and then expect this

Hon'ble Forum to accept a manual, handwritten reading of 44,028 kWh scribbled by the very officer who lost the evidence.

d. Illegal Defiance of Mandatory M&T Lab Testing Guidelines: In Point No. 20, the SDO makes the legally flawed assertion that if a field engineer can visually read a number on a meter screen on-site, the department is entirely exempt from sending it to the M&T Lab for comprehensive testing. Legal Rebuttal: This assertion directly violates UHBVN billing guidelines and the Electricity Supply Code. A field Junior Engineer (JE) lacks the legal or technical authority to bypass mandatory laboratory testing for a disputed, defective meter. An unverified manual reading taken during an ex-post, un-witnessed exercise cannot create financial liability for a consumer.

e. Administrative Shifts and Ignorance Hold No Legal Weight: In Points 1, 2, and 3, the SDO requests leniency regarding the explicit violation of this Forum's timeline orders, claiming they "newly joined" the sub-division and were "not aware of the office email." However, the records show the officer took charge on 08.05.2026—more than a month prior to the filing deadline. Legal Rebuttal: Internal corporate transfers, administrative oversight, or an official's failure to check official communication channels cannot subvert the mandatory due process of law or deny the consumer their right to a fair, time-bound hearing under the Principles of Natural Justice.

2. Objections to Falsified Account Search Report & Fraudulent Site Data (Annexure-IV):

a. Fraudulent Location Tracking & Fabricated GPS Coordinates: The latitude and longitude coordinates logged in the official report for the connection's readings point to an entirely different geographical location. The Actual Fact: A simple digital verification of the GPS coordinates provided in the Respondent's report places the meter in Kharkhoda, Sonipat (28.87929,76.90961999999999) whereas the Appellant's actual connection is physically situated in Pattikalyana, Samalkha, Panipat (HR). Legal Invalidation: This geographical mismatch establishes deliberate data manipulation. The utility is attempting to bind the Appellant to energy consumption captured at an entirely different site, rendering the entire report legally untrustworthy.

b. Ex-Parte Technical Extractions: The data downloading process, system extractions, and meter readouts featured in Annexure-IV were conducted entirely behind the Appellant's back. Legal Invalidation: Performing critical technical extractions without prior mandatory notice to the consumer or the presence of an independent witness deprives the process of transparency and directly violates the Principles of Natural Justice.

3. Objections to SDO's Compliance Reply under Memo No. 22333:

a. Submission of False Statements Regarding Official Presence: The Respondent has submitted demonstrably false information to this Hon'ble Forum regarding the events of 18.06.2026. The official report claims that the

M&P team simultaneously visited the consumer's site on 18.06.2026 at 10:00 AM and 6:30 PM. The Actual Fact: The SDO and the Commercial Accountant (CA) were physically present before this Hon'ble Forum in Panchkula on that very day for a scheduled hearing. Legal Rebuttal: It is physically impossible for the officials to be present at a judicial hearing in Panchkula and simultaneously conduct site checking in Pattikalyana, Samalkha, Panipat (HR). Furthermore, by explicitly noting in the report that the meter gave "no response" to the load survey, the department has admitted that the current meter is also technically defective.

b. Absolute Non-Compliance with Forum Directions: This Hon'ble Forum issued explicit directions to the Respondent to produce a clear, bi-monthly billing ledger spanning from the date of connection (January 3, 2016) up to June 18, 2026, to fully reconcile the account. Legal Rebuttal: Instead of complying, the SDO merely resubmitted the old internal ledger filled with ambiguous, unverified entries. The submitted calculations completely ignore the regulatory formulas mandated for overhauling a defective period, constituting a severe case of non-compliance under the guise of formal compliance.

c. Complete Rejection of Self-Serving Internal Audit Sheets: The Respondent relies heavily on an internal "A-3 size sheet" ledger claimed to be pre-audited by the Division Accountant. Legal Rebuttal: This internal calculation is entirely self-serving and rests on the same corrupted data entries that have already been challenged. A utility cannot validate its own structural errors through an internal audit party when the baseline data itself is fraudulent.

d. Denial of Transparent Consumer Participation at M&T Lab: Meter No.: A5076376 removed on 03.07.2026 @ 14:32 having MCO: SrNo 29, Book No.: 1416 and LL1 Checking Report SrNo 02, Book No.: PNP/52 to download data from meter by M&T Lab, Karnal. The Appellant formally requested to accompany the meter to the M&T Lab in Karnal for the load survey verification, even offering to utilize his own personal vehicle at his own expense to ensure fair play. Legal Rebuttal: The utility denied this request and sent the equipment secretly behind the consumer's back. Testing conducted in complete isolation under these cloud-covered circumstances cannot be trusted as unbiased evidence.

4. Empirical Consumption Analysis & Mathematical Invalidation: The Respondent's arbitrary account overhaul completely collapses when contrasted with the verified, historical, multi-year consumption patterns of the connection. An empirical breakdown of the actual consumption phases reveals the stark mathematical impossibility of the utility's assumptions:

   a. Phase 1: (03.01.2016 to 03.10.2017 - 21 Months): Baseline period showing a total verified consumption of 815 units, translating to a consistent actual average of 40 units per month.

b. <u>Phase 2</u>: (03.10.2017 to 16.10.2019 - 24 Months): Post-theft dispute settlement period showing a total verified consumption of 9,645 units, establishing a clear average of 402 units per month.

c. <u>Phase 3</u>: (04.11.2025 to 03.07.2026 - 8 Months): Current operational period tracking actual final numbers (32,644 - 30,565=2079) showing a verified average of 260 units per month.

d. <u>Calcualtion of monitored 53 months</u>:

| Phase | From | To | Months | Units | Avg |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 03.01.2016 | 03.10.2017 | 21 | 815 | 40 |
| 2 | 03.10.2017 | 16.10.2019 | 24 | 9645 | 402 |
| 3 | 04.11.2025 | 03.07.2026 | 8 | 2079 | 260 |
| | | Total | 53 | 12539 | 237 |

e. <u>Consumer's Proposal for 126 Months (from Jan.2016 to Jun.2026)</u>: The consumer's clear proposal to UHBVN is that for the disputed period of 126 months, billing should be done at 237 units per month. This works out to a total of 29,862 units, and the consumer is ready to be charged for this quantity. This calculation should be treated as final instead of the utility's ambiguous and arbitrary calculation.

5. <u>Omission of Verified Consumer Payments against bills & Ledger Ambiguity</u>: The internal demand ledger submitted by the Respondent is riddled with gross structural ambiguity and unaccounted entries. A forensic trace of historical transaction logs has unearthed clear, explicit electronic payment records made by the Appellant through the official transaction portal that have been entirely wiped out or excluded including corresponding invoices from the Respondent's pre-audited ledger. These are known and caught transactions, there may be much more:

<table>
<tr><th>Transaction ID</th><th>Amount Deposited (₹) | | Payment</th><th>Date of Payment</th><th>Mode / Status</th></tr>
<tr><td>| **603072124498**</td><td>| **₹5,078.00**</td><td>| 18-07-2024 |</td><td>BNKD (Bank Direct / Cleared)</td></tr>
<tr><td>| **603072195509**</td><td>| **₹3,629.00**</td><td>| 16-09-2024 |</td><td>BNKD (Bank Direct / Cleared)</td></tr>
<tr><td>| **603072129983**</td><td>| **₹3,090.00**</td><td>| 09-11-2024 |</td><td>BNKD (Bank Direct / Cleared)</td></tr>
<tr><td>| **603072116506**</td><td>| **₹3,673.00**</td><td>| 13-01-2025 |</td><td>BNKD (Bank Direct / Cleared)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4"><u>Legal Invalidation</u>: It is a settled principle of revenue law that a demand ledger must be clean, transparent, and completely unambiguous before it can be enforced against a citizen.</td></tr>
</table>

6. <u>Fact-Specific Technical Absurdities & Timeline Contradictions</u>:

a. Blatant Manipulation of Meter Timelines and Ghost Installations: Meter No. 6760968: The utility's internal ledger claims this meter remained active on site until April 25, 2024. This is a physical impossibility. The utility's own Vigilance/LL-1 Checking Report (No. 07/3538) dated October 3, 2017, explicitly states that this meter was physically **removed** on October 3, 2017. Meter No. 38714339: The Respondent has completely failed to produce any valid primary evidence or an executed Meter Change Order (MCO) to substantiate this timeline, relying instead on a subsequent unreadable report (LL-1 No. 02/4287), dated: 16.10.2019 where they themselves mix up the removal dates between April 15, 2023, and September 21, 2023. Meter No. A5076376: The Respondent has completely failed to produce any valid primary evidence or an executed Meter Change Order (MCO) to substantiate this timeline also.

b. Unreadable Reports and Extortionate Demands (The ₹54,338 Claim): The Respondent is attempting to extort an additional ₹54,338/- based on a highly corrupted, illegible field report format (LL-1 No. 02/4287), dated: 16.10.2019. Upon close inspection, the handwritten figure on the original document actually reads ₹39,112/-, matching a historical invoice of October 2019 (from 15.01.2018 to 15.09.2019) that had already been resolved in the Appellant's favor. Arbitrarily inflating this figure on a purely hypothetical pro-rata office assumption is entirely illegal.

c. Technical Impossibility regarding Maximum Demand Indicator (MDI): The internal ledger entries show the Maximum Demand Indicator (MDI) varying wildly and erratically from 1.05 to an impossible 300. For a small commercial shop operating on a standard single-phase electricity meter, an MDI reading of 300 is a technical and physical impossibility. This factor alone proves that the data pulled by the billing agency is completely corrupted and manufactured.

d. Compounded Billing Anomalies and Administrative Negligence (The ₹39,112/- Discrepancy): The Respondent's reliance on the illegible field report (LL-1 No. 02/4287 dated 16.10.2019) exposes deep structural contradictions. During that specific inspection, the Appellant produced an official UHBVN invoice from October 2019 (covering 15.01.2018 to 15.09.2019) totaling ₹39,112/-. The Hardware Mismatch: This official bill explicitly printed Meter No. 6760968 as the active device, whereas Meter No. 38714339 was the actual, physical hardware installed at the site. The field authorities completely turned a blind eye to this critical mismatch. Failure to Execute Orders: Although senior authorities explicitly directed that the invoices be revised to reflect actual, real-time consumption, the UHBVN sub-divisional staff completely failed to execute these orders.

e. Systemic Failure vs. Consumer Liability: The department has failed to run any public awareness or consumer education campaigns regarding these complex administrative checkpoints. If the utility's own certified technical experts are prone to committing errors of this magnitude, an ordinary consumer cannot be penalized for the systemic failure, incompetence, and unexecuted internal orders of the department.

f. Complete Absence of Initial Reading and Base Data for Meter No. A5076376: The Respondent's reliance on the current billing cycle is completely unscientific and legally unsustainable due to a total lack of primary base records. No Initial Record: The Respondent utility has completely failed to produce the execution report, the official Meter Change Order (MCO), or any verified document establishing the initial/starting reading of Meter No. A5076376 at the time of its installation. Legal Invalidation: In electricity revenue law, a utility cannot raise financial demands or calculate consumption from a new meter without legally proving its starting point (0 or any initial index). Charging a consumer arbitrary consumption figures without establishing the baseline reading is a gross violation of the HERC Supply Code and constitutes pure financial guesswork.

7. Legal Principle of Reciprocal Justice: For a single historical infrastructure dispute in 2017, the consumer was penalized a massive sum of ₹1,40,088/-, which was fully and cleanly liquidated in good faith via RTGS. Now that the utility has been caught committing a dozens-long series of systemic record falsifications, register tampering, and database fraud, equity demands absolute reciprocity. A state-owned public utility cannot claim immunity from the same strict regulatory standards it applies to consumers.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**:

In light of the fatal admissions, verified record manipulations, physical database tampering, and unexecuted internal correction orders conceded by the Respondent utility, the Appellant most respectfully prays that this Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman may graciously be pleased to:

1. ALLOW THE APPEAL IN FULL and set aside the impugned order dated 11.03.2026 passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (CGRF), UHBVN Panchkula in Case No. 271 of 2025.
2. ORDER THE TOTAL REMOVAL OF FICTITIOUS ARREARS from the Appellant's account, confirming that the 2017 theft penalty of ₹1,40,088/- stands fully liquidated and settled as officially admitted by the SDO.
3. DIRECT THE RECONCILIATION OF THE ACCOUNT for the entire disputed period of 126 months using the empirical, multi-year historical average of 237 units per month (totaling 29,862 units), completely rejecting the utility's arbitrary and unverified internal calculations.
4. CREDIT ALL OMITTED PAYMENTS WITH INTEREST, specifically the documented bank-direct payments (BNKD) and cash deposits that were illegally excluded from the pre-audited ledger, along with any other unmapped digital transactions.
5. STRIKE DOWN ALL DEMANDS DERIVED FROM THE CORRUPTED DATABASE, ruling that since the Respondent has formally admitted to physical alterations in

the CA-21 register and systemic data tampering in the RAPDRP system, its billing ledger lacks legal validity and cannot be enforced against the consumer.

6. DECLARE THE DISPUTED READINGS NULL AND VOID due to the breakdown of the chain of custody, as the utility officially lost the primary hardware evidence (Meter No. 38714339) and bypassed mandatory M&T Laboratory testing guidelines.
7. ENFORCE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY against the Respondent utility for subjecting an ordinary consumer to nearly a decade of financial harassment due to internal clerical incompetence and the failure to execute their own senior management's billing revision orders.
8. Direct Higher Management of UHBVN to initiate strict disciplinary and legal action against delinquent officials for fabricating public records, submitting false presence statements, and causing severe administrative harassment to an innocent consumer.
9. Allow the Appellant to be physically present at the M&T Lab, Karnal, during any subsequent technical testing or data extraction of the current equipment to ensure a transparent trial.
10. AWARD EXEMPLARY COMPENSATION AND LITIGATION COSTS: Direct the Respondent utility to pay a sum of ₹10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten Lakh Only) or any appropriate amount deemed fit by this Hon'ble Forum, as exemplary compensation to the Appellant for enduring nearly a decade of continuous financial harassment, mental agony, and systemic institutional negligence, along with the actual costs incurred in pursuing this prolonged litigation.
11. PASS ANY OTHER ORDER(S) that this Hon'ble Forum may deem fit, just, and proper in the interest of equity, natural justice, and consumer protection.

**N.** On 06.07.2026 respondent SDO has submitted point wise reply in the objection raised by appellant on the reply filed by the undersigned on dated 06.07.2026 is as under.

1. **The SDO Fatal Admissions & Primary Evidence:**

**(a) Official Admission of wrongful Financial Harassment:** The allegations are wrong hence denied the allegation mentioned in the para are not reliable with the facts the SDO operation sub division SAMALKHA has express his view regarding penalty imposed on the consumer for theft of penalty as calculated & deposited by the consumer. The calculation mistake is falls on the employes who calculated the wrong amount as per Nigam instruction.

**(b) Admission of Record Tampering & Systemic Database Fraud:** The allegations are wrong hence denied as previously reply submitted by the SDO in the point no-8,9 & 11 regarding cutting in CA-21 register by the Sh. Jainarayan JE in the meter serial no which was released for new connection it may be clerical mistake.

**(c) Complete Loss of Evidence & Breakdown of chain of Custody:** The allegations are wrong hence denied as the reply submitted by the SDO in the point no-15,18 & 21 the meter serial no 38714339 was replaced on L.L-1 no-08/16786 against

MCO no-08/144 dated-15.04.2023 on final reading-44028 KWH and bill should be raised up to these reading.

**(d) Illegal Defiance Mandatory M&T Lab Testing Guidelines:** The allegations are wrong hence denied as per Nigam norms if the reading is visible on the meter screen, then there is no need to send the meter in the M&T lab for retreating the reading.

**(e) Administrative Shifts and Ignorance Hold No Legal Weight:** The allegations are wrong hence denied **i**t is clearly stated by the SDO in the office of SDO OP S/DIVN UHBVN SAMALKHA on dated-08.05.2026 and the reply of 1ST rejoinder has been submitted on dated-12.06.2026.

2. **Objections to Falsified Account Search Report & Fraudulent Site Data (Annexure-IV):**

**(a) Fraudulent Location Tracking & Fabricated GPS Coordinates:** The allegations are wrong hence denied the data of the consumer having account number-6030721000 in the name of Gurusharan has been submitted by the MRBD in which manual reading was feed bearing meter serial no-A5076376 which has tested from M&T Lab removed from the site of sh. Gurusharan village-Pattikaliyana.

**(b) Ex-Parte Technical Extractions:** The allegations are wrong hence denied a notice no-22327 dated-03.07.2026 has found issued to the consumer before removing and checking the meter from M&T lab as per direction of the ombudsman (HERC).

3. **Objection to SDO Compliance Reply under Memo No.22333:**

**(a) Submission of False Statements Regarding official Presence:** The allegation are wrong hence denied it is correct that SDO & CA was present in the office of Hon'ble forum in Panchkula but they directed to AEE M&P SONIPAT which was present in the field and they submitted their report that no response given by the meter regarding the load survey. On this report the meter sent to M&T Lab Karnal for retrieving the data through his Memo No-22328 dated-03.07.2026.

**(b) Absolute Non-Compliance with Forum Direction:** The commercial data regarding billing to the consumer submitted to the forum is correct and there is no manipulated data submitted.

**(c) Complete Rejection of self-serving internal Audit Sheets:** The consumer billing data has already been pre-audit by the divisional accountant who is fully authorized and competent for pre-auditing the as per Nigam norms.

**(d) Denial of Transparent Consumer Participation at M&T Lab:** The allegations false hence denied this is the procedure as adopted by Nigam and meter was packed in the presence of consumer and it is checked in the presence of area incharge and consumer.

4. **Empirical Consumption Analysis & Mathematical Invalidation:** The audited sheet of consumer account is self-explanatory for this para.

5. **Omission of Verified Consumer Payments against bills & Ledger Ambiguity:** As per this office record the payments made by the consumer are being account far if there is any lapses provide the proof.
6. **Fact-Specific Technical Absurdities & Timeline Contradictions:** The allegations are false hence denied the audited copy of ledger in which all the descriptions which are objected by the consumer are clearly shown like reading, consumption, load, current billing, sundry charges/allowances, bill paid amount, surcharge, balance.
7. **Legal Principle of Reciprocal Justice:** The allegations are false hence denied as per current status of the consumer account a sum of RS.254795/- is outstanding balance against the consumer for payment.

Further it is intimated that the consumer is not came forward in front of the Forum and consumer is defaulter of UHBVN for afore mentioned amount. The last payment date by the consumer is 07.07.2025. Hence it is requested to considered the reply it is based on actual fact and records this is for your kind information and necessary action please.

**O.** On 07.07.2026, appellant has submitted submission of additional rebuttal points by the appellant in respect of the meter load survey data (METER SR. NO. A5076376, A/C - 6030721000) which is as under:-

The Appellant most respectfully submits the following additional points of objection to supplement the Rejoinder dated 06.07.2026, specifically addressing the arbitrary, isolated testing of the meter and the technical invalidity of the extracted Load Survey Data:

1. **<u>Severe Violation of Natural Justice and Lack of Transparency in Testing</u>**:
    a. As explicitly detailed in the Rejoinder dated 06.07.2026, the Appellant had formally requested the Respondent utility to allow him to accompany the meter to the M&T Lab in Karnal for the load survey verification.
    b. The Appellant went to the extent of offering his own personal vehicle at his own expense to ensure fair play, transparency, and a corruption-free process.
    c. In absolute defiance of transparency, the Respondent utility rejected this reasonable request and secretly transported the equipment behind the Appellant's back.
    d. Testing conducted in complete isolation, under such opaque and highly questionable circumstances, cannot be recognized as unbiased or legally sustainable evidence.
2. **<u>Incompleteness and Total Lack of Meaningful Data in the Load Survey Report</u>**: A close technical and legal examination of the Load Survey Data extracted from Meter Sr. No. A5076376 (Account No. 6030721000) reveals that the report is fragmented, incomplete, and legally useless for any account reconciliation:

a. **Inconsistent Billing Profile Data**: The Billing Profile data is available only from 01.08.2025 to 03.07.2026, registering a reading change from 28443.9 to 32644.4. This reflects a consumption of 4,200 units over 11 months, establishing a modest monthly average of 388 units.
b. **Contradictory Daily Load Profile Data**: The Daily Load Profile data spans only from 24.12.2025 to 03.07.2026, with readings from 30945 to 32637. This shows a consumption of 1,600 units over 6 months, establishing a completely different monthly average of 267 units.
c. **Grossly Deficient Block Load Profile**: The critical Block Load Profile data—essential for tracking specific pattern variations—is abruptly restricted and available only from 18.04.2026 (00:30) to 03.07.2026 (17:00).
d. **Deficient Block Load Profile (Demand)**: Similarly, the Demand tracking data under the Block Load Profile is missing for almost the entire operational lifespan, showing up only for the brief window between 18.04.2026 (00:30) and 03.07.2026 (17:00).
e. **Unreliable and Corrupted Tamper Profile**: The Tamper Profile data is recorded in a completely random and chaotic sequence. Because the sequence lacks chronological logic, it is mathematically and technically impossible to compute any reliable calculation or draw any adverse inference against the consumer.

**P.** The hearing in this matter was held today i.e. on 09.07.2026 as scheduled. The Appellant attended in person and expressed deep dissatisfaction with the quality of the replies and actions taken by the Respondents in compliance with the earlier Interim Order dated 18.06.2026. The Respondents appeared through VC.

**Submissions and Arguments**

The Appellant highlighted several critical inconsistencies in the records furnished by the Respondents, including:

- Erroneous MDI readings in the prepared ledger (e.g., values such as 300.00, 19.72, 49.18, etc.), raising serious doubts about the reliability of meter readings and billing processes.
- Reliance on LL-1 reports (e.g., LL-1 No. 02/4287 dated 16.10.2019) while pointing out discrepancies in theft assessments and penalties (e.g., LL-1 No. 07/3538 dated 03.10.2017).
- Apparent clerical and procedural errors in ledger preparation, annexures (including incorrect latitude/longitude data), and failure to properly handle MCOs and meter data downloads.
- Non-compliance with directions regarding account overhauling, meter testing, and fixing responsibility for lapses.

The Respondents submitted that certain errors were clerical/technical in nature attributable to the erstwhile MRBD agency. They relied on vigilance wing LL-1 reports and stated that a detailed ledger had been prepared and audited. They sought additional time for full compliance.

**Observations**

This Forum has carefully considered the submissions, pleadings, documents on record (including the Interim Order dated 18.06.2026, replies dated 03.07.2026, rejoinders, and related annexures), and the applicable legal framework.

The Electricity Act, 2003, read with the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (as amended), and the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2014 (as amended from time to time), mandate transparent, accurate, and fair billing practices. Licensees are required to maintain proper metering, billing, and record-keeping systems. Persistent discrepancies in MCOs, LL-1 reports, meter data handling, and ledger preparation undermine consumer confidence and violate principles of natural justice and accountability.

It is evident that the Respondents have made partial efforts towards compliance with the directions issued on 18.06.2026 but have fallen short in several material aspects, including full verification of meter data, complete account overhauling based on actual consumption, and timely fixing of responsibility for identified delinquencies. Such lapses have prolonged the dispute.

**Directions**

In view of the above, and to facilitate a just and expeditious resolution, the following directions are issued for strict compliance:

1. **Account Overhauling:** The Respondents shall overhaul the Appellant's account (No. 6030721000) based on:
    - Actual consumption recorded in the meters installed after the theft incident (as per relevant LL-1 reports), till the readings recorded by the Vigilance team and thereafter on PYM basis.
    - Available downloaded meter data (including from meter Sr. No. A5076376).
    - Cross-verification with MRBD/M&P data, where available. The overhauling shall be carried out in consultation with the Internal Audit Party and shall be completed within **7 days** from the date of this order.
2. **Meeting and Final Ledger:** The Appellant, SDO (OP) Samalkha, Commercial Assistant, and a representative of the XEN (OP) Division shall hold a meeting in the office of the XEN (OP), Samalkha, within 7 days to reconcile records. A final, audited, month-wise ledger (on A-3 sheets, tabulated format) incorporating all payments,

MCOs, LL-1s, and supporting documents shall be prepared and shared with the Appellant and this Forum.

3. **Cost Imposition for Delinquency:** As per the identification of five delinquent officials in the reply of the XEN (OP), a cost of Rs. 3,000/- per official (total Rs. 15,000/-) is imposed for the lapses and non-compliance. This amount shall be credited to the Appellant's account within 7 days. The XEN (OP) shall ensure recovery from the concerned officials and report compliance.
4. **Further Compliance:** The Respondents shall file a detailed compliance affidavit addressing all pending points from the Interim Order dated 18.06.2026, including meter lab testing where required and responsibility fixing, within the stipulated time.

The matter shall be listed for hearing on 28.07.2026.

**Q.** On 17.07.2026, respondent SDO has submitted reply which is as under:-

उपरोक्त विषय के संदर्भ में आपको अवगत कराया जाता है कि आपके द्वारा दिनांक-09.07.2026 को खाता संख्या 6030721000 की प्री-ऑडिट, इंटरनल ऑडिट पार्टी से कराए जाने के आदेश प्रदान किए गए थे।

श्रीमान जी, आपके आदेशों की अनुपालना में इस कार्यालय द्वारा संबंधित प्राधिकारी को पत्र क्रमांक-22486 दिनांक-10.07.2026 को प्रेषित किया गया था । तत्पश्चात प्रकरण की शीघ्र कार्यवाही सुनिश्चित करने हेतु XEN OP DIVISION UHBVN SAMALKLHA के पत्र क्रमांक-20/CGRF/case/271/25 दिनांक-16.07.2025 के माध्यम से व पत्र क्रमांक-21/CGRF/case/271/25 दिनांक-16.07.2025 प्रथम अनुस्मारक (First Reminder) भी प्रेषित किया जा चुका है।

उक्त खाता संख्या की प्री-ऑडिट रिपोर्ट जैसे ही इंटरनल ऑडिट पार्टी द्वारा उपलब्ध कराई जाएगी, इस कार्यालय द्वारा तैयार की गई संबंधित शीट तत्काल आपके समक्ष प्रस्तुत कर दी जाएगी।

श्रीमान जी आपके आदेशनुसार कार्यालय द्वारा जो शीट तैयार की गई है दिनांक-17.07.2026 दिन शुक्रवार को 12:00 pm पर उपभोक्ता के साथ मीटिंग कर ली गई है |
अतः उक्त सूचना आपके संज्ञान एवं आवश्यक आगामी कार्यवाही हेतु सादर प्रेषित है।

**R.** On 17.07.2026, XEN/OP Division, Samalkha SDO has submitted Compliance of directions dated 09.07.2026 which is as under:-

With reference to the subject cited above, it is submitted that as per the directions issued by your good office on dated 09.07.2026, it was instructed to prepare a ledger sheet and to hold a meeting with the consumer to discuss the prepared sheet.

In compliance with the above directions, a meeting with the consumer was held on dated 17.07.2026 (Friday) at 12:00 PM in the office of XEN/OP Division, UHBVN, Samalkha. During the meeting, the prepared ledger sheet was discussed in detail with the consumer.

Further necessary action is being taken as per rules.

This is for your kind information and record please.

**S.** On 18.07.2026 appellant has submitted Update and Intimation regarding the Reconciliation Meeting held on 17.07.2026 in compliance with the Interim Order dated 09.07.2026 which is as under:-.

I, Gursharan, the Appellant in the aforementioned matter, most respectfully submit the following update for the kind information and record of this Honorable Forum:

1. In strict compliance with Directives No. 1 and 2 of the Interim Order dated 09.07.2026, a reconciliation meeting was convened on 17.07.2026 (Friday) at 12:00 PM at the office of the Executive Engineer (XEN) 'OP' Division, UHBVN, Samalkha.
2. During the meeting, detailed discussions were held between the Appellant and the Respondents regarding the multiple billing discrepancies, account overhauling, and the newly prepared ledger sheet.
3. Following these comprehensive discussions, the XEN (OP) observed that a formal Pre-Audit of the recalculated ledger sheet is necessary to ensure accuracy and finality.
4. Consequently, the office of the XEN (OP) requested an additional time period of one week to complete the Pre-Audit and finalize the audited ledger, as noted on the official communications dated 17.07.2026.
5. In the interim, the Appellant is actively reviewing the account ledger submitted by the Respondents to this Honorable Forum. Although the document's font size is exceptionally small, making it difficult to read, the Appellant is analyzing it with close scrutiny. Should any material discrepancies or meaningful findings be identified, the Appellant will submit a detailed written analysis to this Forum within one week.

**T.** On 20.07.2026, appellant has submitted a letter to Executive Engineer (XEN),Operation Division, UHBVN, Samalkha, Panipat with Strict Objections and Legal Framework for the Preparation of the Audited Month-Wise Ledger pursuant to the Hon'ble Ombudsman's Interim Order dated 09.07.2026 in Appeal No. 10 of 2026 and Urgent Request to schedule the Reconciliation Meeting again on or before 24.July.2026 which is as under:-

In reference to the one-week time requested by your office during our reconciliation process to produce an audited, law-abiding ledger, I am submitting this formal written representation to place on record the strict statutory boundaries and factual parameters within which this ledger must be regularized. An I request to schedule the Reconciliation Meeting again on or before 24.July.2026.

As noted by the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman in the Interim Order dated 09.07.2026, persistent discrepancies and clerical manipulations in UHBVN's records have severely undermined consumer confidence and violated the principles of natural justice. To ensure full compliance with the law, the upcoming ledger must fully resolve the following illegalities:

1. **Absolute Statutory Limit on Overhauling Window — Section 126(5)**:
   a. Your office has stated that the massive bills raised in 2025 are due to an "account overhaul" on an average basis stretching back nearly two years (from April 2023 onwards), and an alleged under-charging period from October 2019 to April 2023.
   b. **The Law**: Section 126(5) of the Electricity Act, 2003, if a consumer account must be overhauled because regular actual readings could not be registered—resulting in prolonged provisional average billing—the overhauling calculations are strictly capped at a maximum of 12 months preceding the date of inspection or rectification.
   c. **Application**: UHBVN's records are entirely contradictory—your own billing system states the meter was installed in May 2024, while a tampered MCO claims April 2023. Because the exact timeline is unverified and undocumented, your lookback window is legally restricted to a maximum of 12 months. Any attempt to back-bill or overhaul the account across a 2-year or 4-year duration is a direct violation of Section 126(5).
2. **Illegality of Reviving a 2019 Posting Error (LL-1/02/4287) and Data Migration Failures**:
   a. Your office has pointed to an internal dispute regarding an LL-1 report prepared on 16.10.2019 (LL-1/02/4287), where a sundry of Rs. 54,338/- was allegedly "wrongly entered into the allowances column" by HCL during the data conversion from HARTRON.
   b. **The Fact**: There is absolutely no provisional or final assessment order, nor any supporting documentation ever served to the consumer for this particular 2019 report.
   c. **The Law on Utility Errors**: Under standard electricity supply codes and Section 126(5), if a consumer account must be overhauled due to the utility's own software, staff, or calculation errors, the lookback and overhauling period cannot exceed a maximum of 12 months.
   d. **The Law on Recovery Limitations**: Furthermore, under Section 56(2), this 2019 amount became "due" over 6 years ago. Because it was never continuously carried forward as an active, disputed arrear on my monthly bills, it is completely time-barred. UHBVN cannot penalize a consumer today for an internal data-entry blunder committed by HCL/HARTRON staff in 2019.
   e. **Defiance of Authority Instructions**: During historical site checkings, senior authorities explicitly instructed the UHBVN Samalkha office that all future invoices must be generated strictly on the basis of actual readings. Your office's persistent failure to update the system and execute actual-reading billing is a direct breach of standard performance requirements under Section 57.
3. **Illegality of Retroactive Demands on Settled 2017 Matter (LL-1/07/3538)**:

a. Your office has also stated an intention to charge Rs. 46,298/- under the claim that the theft checking report LL-1/07/3538, dated 03.10.2017, was "under-charged" by the sub-division staff.

b. **The Fact of Full Settlement**: The penalty assessed under LL-1/07/3538 was explicitly finalized at Rs. 1,40,088, which was paid in full via RTGS in October 2017, resulting in the official restoration of the connection with a new meter.

c. **Violation of the Section 126(5) Overhauling Cap**: Under Section 126(5) of the Electricity Act, 2003, if a consumer account must be overhauled or recalculated because an item was supposedly under-charged due to utility staff errors, the lookback and overhauling calculations are strictly capped at a maximum of 12 months preceding the date of rectification. Pushing an overhauling calculation back by nearly 9 years is explicitly illegal.

d. **Absolute Statutory Bar under Section 56(2)**: Under Section 56(2), no sum can be recovered from a consumer after a period of two years from the date when it first became due. Since this matter was closed in 2017 and never carried forward as a running arrear on my regular monthly bills, UHBVN has entirely forfeited its right to claim any further sums arising from that inspection. A closed case from 2017 cannot be synthetically revived in a 2025/2026 ledger.

4. **Absolute Statutory Bar on Time-Barred Arrears — Section 56(2)**:

   a. Your office verbally asserted that the Sundry Charge of Rs. 2,58,333 raised in August 2025 pertains to an alleged under-charging from the period 17.10.2019 to 14.04.2023.

   b. **The Law**: Under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003, no sum due from a consumer can be recovered after a period of two years from the date when it first became due, unless it has been continuously shown as recoverable arrears in successive electricity bills.

   c. **Application**: Since I regularly paid all dynamic monthly bills from January 2016 through January 2025, this amount was never carried forward as a running arrear. Introducing a retroactive ledger entry in August 2025 for a period ending in April 2023 (more than 2 years and 4 months prior) is completely time-barred and must be expelled from the ledger.

5. **Immediate Removal of the "Ghost Meter" (No. 6760958) Fabrications**:

   a. The corporate ledger continues to baseline consumption against Meter No. 6760958, explicitly showing dummy readings up to May 2024.

   b. **The Fact**: This meter was penalized and physically uninstalled from the site following an inspection on 03.10.2017, with the full amount settled via RTGS.

6. **Technical Impossibility of MDI Data**:

   a. The ledger provided features arbitrary Maximum Demand Indicator (MDI) spikes ranging from 19.72 to 300.00 KWH. Such demands are physically impossible to register or sustain on a standard domestic single-phase meter. This further confirms that the data provided by the erstwhile MRBD agency is purely hypothetical and synthetically generated.

7. **Evidentiary Invalidation of Backdated and Tampered Records**:

a. Your office seeks to overhaul my account from 15.04.2023 to 17.02.2025 on an "average basis" using Meter No. A5076376. This overhaul rests on fundamentally corrupt documentation:

   i. **Contradictory Dates**: Bill No. 603079924192 states the meter was installed on 21.05.2024 (Initial Reading: 1), whereas the overwriting on MCO No. 08/144 claims it was installed on 15.04.2023 (Initial Reading: 1).

   ii. **Backdated SCR**: The Site Checking Report (LL1/08/16786) was prepared backdated on 21.09.2023 inside the UHBVN office, lacking any contemporary field validation or consumer signatures. The SDO office has already admitted to the forum that there was no valid administrative or operational order to change this meter.

b. **The Law**: Under Section 126 and the standard regulatory supply codes, checking reports must be executed on-site at the exact moment of physical removal/installation to carry evidentiary value. A tampered, unsigned MCO and a backdated report cannot serve as "authentic proof" of an overhaul calculation under the Act.

**<u>Conclusion</u>**:

Please take notice that the final audited month-wise ledger to be presented before the Ombudsman must be structured strictly on actual, verifiable consumption records in compliance with Direction No. 1 of the Interim Order. Any attempt to smuggle in time-barred sundry charges or fabricated average overhauls exceeding the statutory 12-month limit will be treated as deliberate non-compliance.

Furthermore, ensure that the cost of Rs. 15,000/- (Rs. 3,000/- per delinquent official) imposed by the Hon'ble Ombudsman for past administrative lapses is immediately credited to my account.

**U.** On 25.07.2026 appellant has submitted final rejoinder-cum-written argument with complete chronology, willful non-compliance of interim order dated 09.07.2026 till 25.07.2026, and prayer for final disposal on 28.07.2026 which is as under:-

**part-a: willful non-compliance of interim order dated 09.07.2026 By Xen (Op) Samalkha till 25.07.2026:**

1. **What was directed on 09.07.2026**: This Hon'ble Forum vide Interim Order dated 09.07.2026 (Memo 1365-71) issued 4 strict directions for compliance within 7 days:

   a. **Direction 1**: Overhaul account No.6030721000 based on actual consumption after theft incident as per LL-1, till vigilance readings and thereafter PYM basis, available authentic downloaded data including meter Sr No. A5076376, cross-verification with MRBD/M&P, in consultation with Internal Audit Party - to be completed within 7 days.

b. **Direction 2**: Meeting within 7 days in office of XEN (OP) Samalkha with Appellant, SDO, CA, XEN representative to reconcile - Final audited month-wise ledger on A-3 sheets, tabulated format, with all payments, MCOs, LL-1s, supporting documents - to be shared with Appellant and Forum.
c. **Direction 3**: Cost imposition - As per identification of five delinquent officials in reply of XEN, cost of Rs.3,000 per official total Rs.15,000 imposed for lapses - to be credited to Appellant's account within 7 days - XEN to ensure recovery and report compliance.
d. **Direction 4**: Detailed compliance affidavit addressing all pending points from Interim Order 18.06.2026, including meter lab testing and responsibility fixing.

2. **What happened on 17.07.2026**: In strict compliance, meeting was held on 17.07.2026 (Friday) at 12:00 PM at XEN (OP) Division, Samalkha, as recorded in XEN's own letter Memo No.22/CGRF/case/271/25 Dated 17/07/26. During meeting, prepared ledger sheet was discussed in detail. Following comprehensive discussions, XEN (OP) observed that formal Pre-Audit of recalculated ledger sheet is necessary. Consequently, XEN office requested additional one week to complete Pre-Audit and finalize audited ledger, as noted on official communication dated 17.07.2026. My handwritten note on same XEN letter: "Meeting Attended in XEN office. Time taken by XEN office for one more week for Pre-Audit. 17/07/26" with signature - proves extra time was taken by XEN, not by me.
3. **Non-Compliance Till 25.07.2026 - 8 Days After Meeting, 16 Days After Order**:
   a. One-week time expired on 24.07.2026.
   b. Till today 25.07.2026, I have received ZERO from XEN:
      i. NO final audited sheet ledger.
      ii. NO pre-audit report.
      iii. NO proof of credit of Rs.15,000 cost.
      iv. NO reply to my representation dated 20.07.2026 requesting meeting again on or before 24.07.2026.
   c. My Intimation dated 18.07.2026 to this Forum had clearly stated I am reviewing small-font ledger (submitted by SDO in this forum by mail) with scrutiny and will submit detailed analysis within one week - which I did on 20.07.2026.
4. **Pattern of Willful Default**: This is 2nd consecutive willful default:
   a. **First default**: SDO violated Direction No.4 of Interim Order 11.05.2026 which ordered reply at least 7 days before hearing (by 11.06.2026), but gave reply 21940 dated 12.06.2026 on 16.06.2026 @4:50 PM, just 1 day before hearing on 17.06.2026 - Recorded in order dated 18.06.2026.
   b. **Second default**: XEN violated Direction No.1,2,3,4 of Interim Order 09.07.2026 even after taking extra 1 week on 17.07.2026.

5. Under Principles of Natural Justice, when a licensee deliberately suppresses official records ordered by Forum, fails to produce audited ledger after taking extra time, and fails to credit cost imposed, adverse inference must be drawn.

**Part-B: CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS - A/C 6030721000:**

| Date | Event / Document | Legal Impact / Admission |
|---|---|---|
| **03.01.2016** | Date of Connection (DOC). Meter No. 6760968 installed with initial reading 01 KWH. Old A/c 2232301UPP213716 | Base date for 126-month calculation |
| **03.10.2017** | LL-1 No.07/3538 - Theft allegation. Meter 6760968 removed. Penalty Rs.1,15,088 + 25,000 = Rs.1,40,088. Paid via RTGS Oct 2017 | SDO Memo 22334 Point 4 admits payment cleared. Connection restored as per Supply Code |
| **Oct 2017 - Oct 2019** | No MCO entry in billing system. Billing continued on Meter 6760968 on average basis. CA-21 register cutting at Sr 1219 by JE Jainarayan | SDO Memo 22334 Point 5 & 8 admits: 'new meter installed by Jainarayan JE but not entered in billing' and 'cutting in CA-21' |
| **16.10.2019** | LL-1 No.02/4287 - Meter No.38714339 found reading 9645 KWH. Sundry Rs.54,338 prepared but wrongly entered in allowance column. But no authentic document produced for the Sundry. | SDO Point 6 & Ledger Row Dec 2019 admits: 'Wrongly entered in allowance column during HARTRON to HCL conversion vide SC&AR: 553/403' |
| **19.02.2021** | Bill No.60307046262 - 1875 days (5.1 years) period, Sundry Ref 21531SDO22323/00401 Rs.45,682.92 | Discussion Points 05.11.2025 - No breakdown provided till date. Violates 12-month cap Sec 126(5) |
| **21.09.2023 @ 11 AM** | LL-1 Checking Report Book 08 Sr 08 by JE Bhoop Singh - Claims display defective, meter packed in cardboard box for M&T Lab, Karnal. Original LL-1 says sent to lab. Later reply says never sent - Contradiction proves tampering. SDO Memo 18923 admits tampering | Original LL-1 says sent to lab, later reply says never sent. SDO Memo 18923 admits tampering. Chain of custody broken |
| **15.04.2023 (or 15.09.2023)** | MCO No.08/144 Book 144 - Claims old meter removed at 44028 units, new meter started at 01 unit. No consumer signature, no notice | Two dates in same MCO (15.04.23 and 15.09.23). No initial reading proof for A5076376. Violates Supply Code 15.1.1 - Void ab initio |
| **21.05.2024** | As per Bill No.603079924192 logic, Meter A5076376 | Ghost meter 6760968 still billed till 25.04.2024 as per ledger - Physical impossibility |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | actually started billing. Old 13891 to New 24032 | |
| **17.02.2025** | Bill No.603079924192 - 298 days, 24226.1 units, Net Payable Rs.1,73,553 - REVISED BILL, Adjustment - 14693.5 | First disputed bill. 298 days average accumulation |
| **28.02.2025 + 01.05.2025** | Payments under protest: Rs.50,000 + Rs.1,28,589 = Rs.1,78,589 28.02.2025 Rs.50,000 CASH - Receipt No.603072116040 01.05.2025 Rs.1,28,589 CCRD - TR108999987 - Receipt No.603072191954 | Reflected in ledger Row MAY 2025 PAID_TOT 178589. Paid under protest - Part of Rs.2,06,985 |
| **10.09.2025** | Unauthorized meter change found at site. Complaint filed to SDO, XEN, SE, CE - Account 6030721000, Old meter 6760968 replaced with A5076376 without intimation | Proves timely dispute raised. CC to SE, XEN, CE establishes knowledge |
| **24.08.2025** | Bill No.603070529974 - Rs.2,79,245 (Sundry 258333+4760=263093 - CURR_OP 12319.5, 54 days, 1834 units. Remarks: A/C overhauled 07/2021 to 02/2025 VIDE SC&AR: 240/428 | Second disputed bill. Overhaul of 3.5 years in one bill - Violates Sec 126(5) |
| **13.05.2025 + 07.07.2025** | Further payments under protest: Rs.10,096 + Rs.18,300 = Rs.28,396 13.05.2025 Rs.10,096 BNKD - Receipt No.603072150090 07.07.2025 Rs.18,300 BNKD - Receipt No.603072193480 Total under protest now Rs.2,06,985 (as per Rejoinder 12.05.2026) | Ledger Row JUN 2025 10096, AUG 2025 18300. Total 4 payments = 50000+128589+10096+18300 = 2,06,985 |
| **04.11.2025 & 05.11.2025** | Complaint to CGRF (15 pages) + Discussion Points - Questions 5 meter change dates, Bill vs MCO mismatch, 44028 derivation, missing lab report | Establishes consumer raised all technical objections before CGRF |
| **06.11.2025** | CGRF Complaint No.UH/CGRF-271/2025 admitted. Intimation dated 10.11.2025 | Jurisdiction accepted |
| **05.12.2025 / 23.12.2025** | SDO Replies Memo 18512 & 18672 - Incomplete data, refusal to give Oct 2017-Oct 2019 billing | Non-compliance of CGRF directions |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **08.01.2026** | Letter No.18158/18858 to JE Bhoop Singh - Fixing responsibility for tampering and not maintaining CA-22, meter not traceable | Official admission of loss of evidence. Chain of custody broken |
| **13.01.2026** | Memo No.18923 - Admits record tampered by some person, account changed CA-21 to CA-22, meter not traceable | Fatal admission - Primary evidence lost |
| **21.01.2026** | Memo No.19022 - Contradicts LL-1, says meter was working, not sent to M&T Lab, now not traceable | Violation of mandatory M&T Lab testing |
| **09.02.2026** | CGRF Final Hearing at Panipat - CA Naresh Kumar appears | No lab report produced despite direction dated 08.01.2026 |
| **11.03.2026** | CGRF Order - Directs sundry of 44028 units. | Non-speaking order, increases liability, ignores tampering, ignores Sec 56(2) |
| **26.03.2026 / 01.04.2026** | Appeal before Electricity Ombudsman + Undertaking | Appeal No.10 of 2026 |
| **10.04.2026** | Notice of Motion - Appeal registered, hearing 11.05.2026 | Ombudsman takes cognizance |
| **08.05.2026** | SDO Reply Memo 21336 - 3 conflicting figures: Rs.2,63,093, Rs.1,74,361, Rs.1,36,463 | Inconsistency proves arbitrary calculation |
| **12.05.2026** | Detailed Rebuttal by Appellant | Puts burden of proof on licensee |
| **03.07.2026** | SDO Reply Memo 22334 - Admits theft penalty paid, new meter not entered, HCL error, Sukhdev LDC & Jainarayan JE & Bhoop Singh JE responsible | Comprehensive admissions of systemic failure |
| **06.07.2026 / 07.07.2026** | Rejoinder 15 pages + Load Survey Analysis - GPS fraud Kharkhoda vs Pattikalyana, false presence Panchkula vs Samalkha, MDI 300 impossible, 237 units proposal based on 53 months = 12,539 units = 29,862 units for 126 months | Technical demolition of UHBVN data |
| **09.07.2026** | Interim Order by Ombudsman - Directives No.1 & 2 - Reconciliation meeting | Forum takes note of discrepancies. Cost Rs.15,000 imposed on 5 officials |
| **17.07.2026** | Reconciliation Meeting at XEN OP Samalkha Office 12 PM - XEN observes Pre-Audit | Delay tactic. Recorded in Intimation dated 18.07.2026 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | necessary, requests 1 week time | |
| **18.07.2026** | Intimation Regarding Meeting filed | Brings pre-audit request on record |
| **23.07.2026** | Forensic Ledger Analysis - ARR_TOTAL 0 from 2016-2025, sudden jump to huge amount | Proves Sec 56(2) time-bar and 9.5-year overhaul violating Sec 126(5) |
| **25.07.2026** | Willful Non-Compliance - No audited ledger, No pre-audit, No Rs.15,000 proof till date - 1 week expired on 24.07.2026 | To be placed on record on 28.07.2026 |
| | | |
| **28.07.2026 11 AM** | Final Hearing | - |

**Conclusion from Chronology**: The licensee has admitted (i) non-entry of MCO in billing, (ii) cutting in CA-21, (iii) data tampering during RAPDRP upload, (iv) wrong entry of Rs.54,338 in allowance, (v) loss of primary evidence Meter 38714339, (vi) failure to produce M&T, Lab report despite CGRF direction dated 08.01.2026. The ledger itself shows ARR_TOTAL was never continuously shown, attracting Section 56(2) bar. The overhaul from 01/2016 to 08/2025 (9.5 years) violates Section 126(5) 12-month cap. The consumer has paid Rs.4,68,226 as per ledger including Rs.2,06,985 under protest after Feb 2025.

**V.** On 27.07.2026, respondent SDO has submitted an affidavit in Appeal No. 10 of 2026 against the interim order Dated 09.07.2026 in case title as Shri. Gursharan Versus The XEN (OP) Divn. UHBVN Samalkha & SDO (OP) Sub Division UHBVN Samalkha which is as under:-

I, Naresh Kumar presently working Sub Divisional Officer (operation) Sub-Division UHBVN, Samalkha under XEN (operation) Division UHBVN Samalkha tehsil Samalkha, District Panipat, Haryana. Do hereby solemnly affirm and state as under: -

1. In strict compliance with directions no.1 & 2 interim order dated- 01.07.2026, a meeting was convened on dated-17.07.2026 (Friday) at 12:00 noon in the chamber of XEN OP Division Samalkha in presence of appellant Sh. Naresh Kumar, SDO OP S/DIVN UHBVN Samalkha, Commercial Assistant & Deputy Supdt. UHBVN Samalkha Division, during meeting the entire billing record from the date of connection to date discussed with the appellant & he agreed that he is satisfied up to 04/2023 billing.
2. That after examining the complete computer rise billing record by, overhauling the Account of the consumer issue & comparing of MCO & original MCO book, LL.1 reports the appellant was not satisfied. But appellant objected the period of billing since 2023 to 2025 which is on higher side. The SDO put up all relevant record which was taken from CCB and found matched with lab report for period of 08/2025 to 07/2026.

3. That after preparation of consumer ledger on A3 size paper, the respondent department forwarded the same for, carried out the independent audit to the office of the Chief Auditor UHBVN Panchkula. Pursuant there the office of the Chief Auditor UHBVN Panchkula deputed an audit team & on dated-23.07.2026 audit team carried out the pre-audit and verification of the said ledger and overhaul the consumer account which is reproduced here before the Hon'ble forum and to the appellant also (ANNEXURE-I).
4. That the annexure A3 size tabulated ledger has complete transparency as per standing instruction of the Nigam, which is pre-audited by the competent authority.
5. That in compliance with directive No.3 a sum of RS. 15000/- will be credited in the appellant account after making recovery from the delinquent officials (copy enclosed) (ANNEXURE-II).
6. That the respondent department has acted bona fide has made sincere efforts to comply with each and every direction issued by the Hon'ble Forum Ombudsman. There has been no deliberate omission, concernment, manipulation or non-compliance on the part of answering deponent.
7. Verification:

   I hereby verify that the contents of this affidavit are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and nothing material has been concealed therein.

**W.** The hearing in this matter was held on 28.07.2026 as scheduled. Both the parties were present during the hearing.

At the outset, the Respondents submitted that, in purported compliance with the directions contained in the Interim Order dated 09.07.2026, a calculation sheet had been prepared. According to the said sheet, a sum of ₹1,64,223/- was stated to be payable by the Appellant.

The Appellant immediately pointed out that the calculation sheet had been placed before him for the first time during the present hearing. He further stated that although certain issues had been discussed in the reconciliation meeting held on 17.07.2026 in the chamber of the XEN (OP), Samalkha, the final calculation sheet was being shared only now. The Respondents were accordingly directed to explain the calculation sheet in detail so that any remaining doubts of the Appellant could be clarified.

Upon a careful examination of the calculation sheet in the presence of both parties, this Forum observed material ambiguities. At certain places units of consumption had been adopted as the base, while at other places amounts had been taken as the base of calculation. The absence of a uniform, consistent methodology rendered the sheet unreliable for the purpose of determining the precise financial liability of the consumer.

It is well settled that billing and account overhauling must rest on transparent, verifiable and consistent parameters. The Electricity Act, 2003, read with the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the HERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020, mandate accurate and fair billing. Any calculation that mixes units and monetary figures without applying the applicable tariff from time to time fails to meet this statutory standard.

This Forum expresses its strong displeasure at the manner in which the pre-audit was conducted. Even after pre-audit, the calculation sheet lacked a uniform benchmark. Comparing "apples with apples" is a basic requirement of any audited financial exercise; the failure to do so reflects a casual approach that cannot be countenanced when the exercise has direct financial consequences for the consumer.

At the same time, this Forum places on record its appreciation of the sustained and sincere efforts made by the Appellant in bringing the various discrepancies to light and assisting the Forum in the adjudication of a long-pending dispute.

**Directions**

In the interest of justice and to ensure that the final determination of liability rests on a clear, transparent and legally sustainable foundation, the following directions are issued for strict compliance:

1. The Respondents shall re-prepare the entire calculation sheet strictly in monetary terms. The sheet shall apply the tariff rates as applicable from time to time for the relevant periods, clearly indicate the basis of each entry, and present a coherent month-wise (or billing-cycle-wise) account of the Appellant's Account No. 6030721000. Units alone shall not form the base of calculation; every figure must be translated into the corresponding monetary value under the then-prevailing tariff.
2. The revised calculation sheet shall be got audited by the competent official of the office of the Chief Auditor, UHBVN, and the consequential sundry shall be got approved from the Commercial Back Office (CBO) of UHBVN. The audited and approved calculation sheet shall be furnished to the Appellant as well as to this Forum within **two days** from the date of this order.
3. In compliance with Direction No. 3 of the Interim Order dated 09.07.2026, the Respondents shall hand over a cheque for ₹15,000/- (being the cost imposed for the identified delinquencies) to the Appellant within **two days**. A receipt of the same, together with a brief satisfaction letter from the Appellant acknowledging receipt, shall be placed on record.
4. A detailed compliance report covering the above directions shall be filed by the Respondents on or before **30.07.2026**.

The final order is reserved and shall be pronounced after receipt and examination of the compliance report.

The Respondents are put on notice that any further non-compliance or incomplete compliance may invite adverse consequences, including the drawing of appropriate adverse inference and such other orders as this Forum may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.

**X.** On 28.07.2026, appellant has submitted ledger which is as under:-

I, Gursharan A/C No. 6030721000, NDS 2.9 KW, Village Pattikalyana, Samalkha, Appellant in above appeal, respectfully submit as under:

1. That during today's hearing dated 28.07.2026, the Respondent SDO (OP) Samalkha has handed over to me the Final Ledger (A3 Size - 2 Pages). That I have verified the said ledger in detail. It covers complete period from DOC 03/01/2016 to 16.06.2026. As per calculation box of Page-2:
    a. Period 26.10.2017 to 16.10.2019: Consumption 9645 KWH (Avg 13.395833 per day)
    b. Period 17.10.2019 to 15.04.2023: 1368 days x 13.39583 = 18325 KWH, Total 27970.5 KWH
    c. Period 15.04.2023 to 16.06.2026: New Meter A5076376 consumption 0-32401 = 32401 units
    d. Total amount chargeable from 10/2017 to 06/2026: Rs 4,50,413.40
    e. Less: Already paid by Consumer: Rs 3,81,627/- (including all under-protest payments Rs 2,06,985/- and BNKD payments)
    f. Net Recoverable Amount @on 16.06.2026: Rs 68,786.40
2. That I fully agree with this Final Ledger and the Net Recoverable Amount of Rs 68,786.40 (Rupees Sixty Eight Thousand Seven Hundred Eighty Six and Forty Paise only) upto 16.06.2026. I have no further objection to the methodology adopted in this final ledger.
3. That I wish to place on record my heartfelt thanks to:
    a. This Hon'ble Forum of Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana for your judicious interim orders dated 18.06.2026 and 09.07.2026 and for directing the Respondents to prepare a transparent audited ledger. Your intervention and cost of Rs 15,000 imposed for past lapses has restored consumer confidence.
    b. SDO (OP) Samalkha Sh. Naresh Kumar ji, XEN (OP) Samalkha Division and their entire team including Commercial Assistant for their sincere efforts, bona-fide compliance and handing over final ledger today.

**PRAYER**:

It is therefore humbly prayed that:

1. My acceptance of Final Ledger with Net Recoverable Amount of Rs 68,786.40 upto 16.06.2026 may kindly be taken on record;
2. The Respondents may be directed to issue a fresh consolidated bill of Rs 68,786.40 and give adjustment of Rs 15,000 cost imposed vide order dated 09.07.2026;

**Y.** On 29.07.2026, appellant has submitted addendum application dated 28.07.2026 with sincere apology for calculation mistake which is as under:-

I humbly submit that in my application dated 28.07.2026 regarding acceptance of Final Ledger, there was a calculation mistake on my part, for which I feel very sorry.

While verifying the ledger yesterday, I had relied upon the calculation box on Page-2 of the ledger where total paid was mentioned as Rs. 3,81,627/-. I accepted the net recoverable amount of Rs. 68,786.40 on that basis.

On re-checking the entire ledger row-wise at home today, I found that one entry was missed in that calculation box, which was also missed by me yesterday.

The entry is Sr. No. 1 - Date 28-Dec-18 - Rs. 16,000/- (Row No. 17 in Ledger).

If this entry is included, the correct position emerges as under:

Total Amount chargeable from 26.10.2017 to 16.06.2026: Rs. 4,50,413.40

Less: Total Amount actually paid by me from 28.12.2018 to 07.07.2025 (Row 17 to Row 55): Rs. 3,97,627/-

Net Balance Payable: Rs. 52,786.40

I sincerely apologize for the inconvenience caused due to yesterday's wrong figure of Rs. 68,786.40 quoted by me.

I request you to kindly take the corrected figure of Rs. 52,786.40 on record. I still fully agree with the methodology and transparency of the Final Ledger. My heartfelt thanks to this Hon'ble Forum and to SDO (OP) Samalkha Sh. Naresh Kumar ji and his team remains as before.

Further, if the SDO feels that I am still confused on this point, I humbly request him to kindly clarify the same with reference to Row No. 17.

**Calculation Sheet:**

| Meter Number | From | To | Reading | Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 38714339 | 26-Oct-17 | 16-Oct-19 | 9645 | |
| 38714339 | 17-Oct-19 | 15-Apr-23 | 18325.5 | |
| Total | | | 27970.5 | ₹ 1,89,433.40 |
| | | | | |
| A5076376 | 15-Apr-23 | 16-Jun-26 | 32401 | ₹ 2,60,980.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| **Total Amount from 26/Oct/2017 to 16/Jun/2026** | | | **60371.5** | **₹ 4,50,413.40** |

| **Amount paid datewise** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Sr. No.** | **Date** | **Amount** | **Row in Ledger** |
| 1 | 28-Dec-18 | 16000 | 17 |
| 2 | 05-Nov-19 | 39112 | 22 |
| 3 | 02-Jul-21 | 58343 | 31 |
| 4 | 28-Aug-21 | 3467 | 32 |
| 5 | 30-Oct-21 | 3404 | 33 |
| 6 | 12-Jan-22 | 3891 | 34 |
| 7 | 21-Feb-22 | 2462 | 35 |
| 8 | 22-Apr-22 | 2913 | 36 |
| 9 | 17-Jun-22 | 3821 | 37 |
| 10 | 25-Aug-22 | 4373 | 38 |
| 11 | 31-Oct-22 | 4045 | 39 |
| 12 | 29-Dec-22 | 3880 | 40 |
| 13 | 25-Mar-23 | 5304 | 41 |
| 14 | 05-Apr-23 | 2672 | 42 |
| 15 | 04-Jul-23 | 4388 | 43 |
| 16 | 01-Sep-23 | 3324 | 44 |
| 17 | 02-Nov-23 | 3745 | 45 |
| 18 | 09-Jan-24 | 3494 | 46 |
| 19 | 28-Feb-24 | 3279 | 47 |
| 20 | 01-May-24 | 3255 | 48 |
| 21 | 18-Jul-24 | 5078 | 49 |
| 22 | 16-Sep-24 | 3629 | 50 |
| 23 | 10-Nov-24 | 3090 | 51 |
| 24 | 13-Jan-25 | 3673 | 52 |
| 25 | 01-May-25 | 178589 | 53 |
| 26 | 13-May-25 | 10096 | 54 |
| 27 | 07-Jul-25 | 18300 | 55 |
| **Total Paid** | | **₹ 3,97,627.00** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Payable** | **₹ 4,50,413.40** |
| **Paid** | **₹ 3,97,627.00** |
| **Balance** | **₹ 52,786.40** |

**PRAYER**:

It is therefore humbly prayed that my corrected net payable amount of Rs. 52,786.40 (instead of Rs. 68,786.40) may kindly be taken on record.

I once again express my sincere apology for yesterday's calculation mistake.

Thanking you with gratitude.

**Z.** On 30.07.2026, appellant has submitted final letter of full satisfaction after meeting with SDO/OP Samalkha on 30.07.2026 which is as under:-

I, Gursharan, Appellant, A/C No. 6030721000, respectfully submit as under:

1. **Meeting Dated 30.07.2026 & Ledger Clarification**: Today on 30.07.2026, I personally met with SDO (OP), Samalkha Sh. Naresh Kumar Ji in his UHBVN Office. He has very patiently cleared all my doubts related to Final Ledger. As explained, the abstract of Final Ledger is:
    a. Latest Invoice: June 2026
    b. Meter Number: A5076376
    c. Units Reading Upto: 32401
    d. Old Gross Amount as per CCB Portal: Rs 2,46,940/-
    e. After applying new prepared sundry (Total chargeable Rs 4,50,413.40 minus Total paid Rs 3,81,627/-), the New and Final Amount of this June 2026 Invoice will be Rs 68,786.40.
    f. I am fully satisfied with this ledger and methodology.
2. **No Liability Assurance by SDO**: SDO (OP) Samalkha Sh. Naresh Kumar Ji has also assured me today in his office, in presence of his staff that except Rs 68,786.40 till 16.06.2026, there is NO liability on my side towards UHBVN against my A/C No. 6030721000 upto 16.06.2026. My account is fully regularized upto 16.06.2026 after payment of Rs 68,786.40.
3. **Receipt of Cost Cheque of Rs 15,000/- - Compliance of Order dated 09.07.2026**:
    a. I am happy to inform this Hon'ble Forum that today on 30.07.2026, SDO (OP) Samalkha Sh. Naresh Kumar Ji has handed over to me Cheque of Rs 15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand Only) towards cost imposed by this Hon'ble Forum vide interim order dated 09.07.2026 (Rs 3,000 x 5 delinquent officials).
    b. Cheque Details: [Cheque No. 067946, Dated 28.Jul.2026, Bank State Bank of India, Drawn in favour of Gursharan].
    c. This shows full and bona-fide compliance of your order dated 09.07.2026 by SDO Samalkha. I am really thankful to SDO Sahib for prompt compliance.
4. **Meters Clarified Today**:
    a. Meter No. 6760968 - Original meter - DOC 03/01/2016, removed 03/10/2017 under LL-1 No. 07/3538.
    b. Meter No. 38714339 - Second meter - 26/10/2017 to 15/04/2023 - 27970.5 units.
    c. Meter No. A5076376 - 15/04/2023 onwards - Reading 32401 till 16/06/2026.
5. **Withdrawal of Addendum dated 29.07.2026**: With regard to my Addendum dated 29.07.2026 pointing out Rs 16,000 (Row 17 - 28-Dec-18), SDO Sahib clarified today that this amount is already duly accounted for in the calculation and final net recoverable remains Rs 68,786.40 and not Rs 52,786.40. I accept his clarification and hereby withdraw my Addendum dated 29.07.2026.
6. **Gratitude**: I express my heartfelt thanks to:

a. This Hon'ble Forum of Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana for your judicious orders which made this settlement possible from huge demand to Rs 68,786.40.
b. SDO (OP) Samalkha Sh. Naresh Kumar Ji, XEN (OP) Samalkha and entire team including Commercial Assistant for sincere efforts, and for explaining everything today and handing over cost cheque.

**AA.** On 03.08.2026, respondent SDO has submitted Compliance of interim order passed on dated-28.07.2026. by the Hon'ble Forum electricity ombudsman Haryana which is as under:-

In the best interest of justice, the strict compliance has been made by the respondent and ensure that,

1. The calculation sheet has been re-prepared strictly in monitory term after applying the applicable tariff from time to time for relevant period of account number-6030721000.
2. The revise calculation sheet has already been got pre-audited by the competent authority and the sundry of allowances has been approved from the commercial back office (CBO) of UHBVN. and submitted to the appellant also.
3. In compliance of with the direction no.03 of the interim order dated-09.07.2026 cheque number-067946 dated-30.07.2026 has been handed over to the appellant. The acknowledgment of the cheque received by the appellant is here by submitted with compliance of this order.
Therefore, the respondent is requested to finalize the case and pass an order as the appellant has submitted his written satisfaction letter in undersigned office.

**Decision**

1. The present appeal was preferred by the Appellant under the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (as amended) against the order dated 11.03.2026 of the Corporate CGRF, UHBVN, Panchkula. The grievance primarily related to disputed billing, alleged irregularities in meter replacement, non-availability of the physical meter (Sr. No. 38714339), claimed overhauling of the account spanning several years, recovery of an old theft penalty already settled, and procedural lapses in record maintenance and testing.
2. The matter was taken up on successive dates of hearing. Detailed interim orders were issued on 11.05.2026, 18.06.2026, 09.07.2026 and 28.07.2026. Through these orders, this Forum directed, inter alia:
   - overhauling of Account No. 6030721000 on the basis of available authentic data, actual consumption after the 2017 theft incident, vigilance readings and subsequent data (including from meter Sr. No. A5076376);
   - reconciliation meeting between the parties;
   - preparation of a transparent, month-wise audited ledger on A-3 sheets;

- imposition of cost of ₹15,000/- (₹3,000/- each on five identified delinquent officials) to be credited/paid to the Appellant; and
- compliance with principles of natural justice, Supply Code and HERC Regulations.

3. In compliance with the directions contained in the interim order dated 28.07.2026, the Respondents prepared a revised calculation sheet strictly in monetary terms, applying the tariff rates applicable from time to time. The sheet was subjected to the requisite verification/audit process. A final ledger covering the period from the date of connection (03.01.2016) up to 16.06.2026 was prepared and handed over to the Appellant.
4. As per the final ledger and the abstract placed on record:
    - Total amount chargeable for the relevant period worked out to ₹4,50,413.40;
    - Payments already made by the consumer (including amounts paid under protest after February 2025) totalled ₹3,81,627/-;
    - Net recoverable amount as on 16.06.2026 stood at **₹68,786.40**.
5. On 28.07.2026 and thereafter on 30.07.2026, the Appellant met the SDO (OP), Samalkha. After detailed clarification of the methodology, meter-wise consumption figures and accounting of all payments, the Appellant expressed full satisfaction with the final ledger and the net amount of ₹68,786.40. The Appellant has placed on record a formal letter of full satisfaction and an application for acceptance of the final ledger, withdrawing any residual objections (including an earlier addendum). The SDO has also confirmed that, upon payment of the said net amount, there remains no further liability on the Appellant's account up to 16.06.2026.
6. In compliance with Direction No. 3 of the interim order dated 09.07.2026 (reiterated on 28.07.2026), a cheque for ₹15,000/- (Cheque No. 067946 dated 28.07.2026 drawn on State Bank of India) has been handed over to the Appellant on 30.07.2026 towards the cost imposed for the identified administrative and procedural lapses. The Appellant has acknowledged receipt of the same.
7. This Forum has carefully examined the entire record, the successive interim orders, the replies and rejoinders of both parties, the final ledger, the satisfaction letter dated 30.07.2026 and the compliance reported by the Respondents. The protracted dispute arose largely from systemic deficiencies in record-keeping, non-entry of MCOs in the billing system, loss of primary evidence (meter Sr. No. 38714339), inconsistent documentation and delayed compliance with earlier directions of the CGRF and this Forum. At the same time, the sustained efforts of the Appellant in bringing the discrepancies to light, and the eventual bona-fide corrective exercise undertaken by the Respondents under the guidance of the XEN (OP), Samalkha, have enabled a transparent resolution.
8. In view of the mutual satisfaction recorded by the Appellant and the finalisation of the account on a transparent basis, no further adjudication on the disputed claims is warranted.

**Order**

(i) The final ledger prepared by the Respondents in compliance with the directions of this Forum is accepted. The net amount payable by the Appellant as on 16.06.2026 is determined as **₹68,786.40** (Rupees Sixty-Eight Thousand Seven Hundred Eighty-Six and Forty Paise only).

(ii) The Respondents shall issue a fresh consolidated bill for the said amount of ₹68,786.40 and shall recover the same from the Appellant in **two equal instalments**, in addition to the current energy charges, as a measure of relief for the prolonged harassment suffered by the consumer on account of the earlier irregularities.

(iii) The cost of ₹15,000/- already paid to the Appellant stands recorded as compliance of the order dated 09.07.2026. No further adjustment of this amount against the energy dues is required.

(iv) Upon payment of the net amount of ₹68,786.40 as directed above, the Appellant's account (No. 6030721000) shall stand fully regularised up to 16.06.2026, and no further claim on account of the earlier disputed overhauling, theft penalty (already settled in 2017), or related sundry charges for the said period shall survive.

(v) The Respondents are directed to ensure that in future all meter changes, MCOs, LL-1 reports, ledger entries and account overhauling exercises are carried out strictly in accordance with the Electricity Act, 2003, the HERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2014 (as amended), and the applicable circulars/instructions of UHBVN. The field staff shall maintain proper chain of custody of meters and records so that such prolonged consumer grievances do not recur.

(vi) The appeal is accordingly disposed of. Both parties shall bear their own costs.

(vii) A copy of this order be sent to the Managing Director, UHBVN, Panchkula; the Legal Remembrancer, Haryana Power Utilities; the Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Rohtak; the Superintending Engineer (OP), Panipat; and both Respondents for information and necessary compliance

File may be consigned to record.

Given under my hand on 6th August, 2026.

Sd/-
**(Rakesh Kumar Khanna)**
**Dated:06.08.2026** **Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana**

**CC:**
**Memo No.1838-1845/EO/HERC/Appeal No. 10/2026 Dated:07.08.2026**
To

1. Shri Gursharan, R/o Pattikalyana, Samalkha, Panipat (Email guru01in@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. XEN (Operations) Division, Samalkha, UHBVN, Near Jangra Dharamshala, Officers Colony, Samalkha (Email xenopsamalkha@uhbvn.org.in)
7. SDO/OP, Sub Division, UHBVN, Samalkha, 132 KV Sub Station, G.T. Road, Samalkha (Email sdoopsamalkha@uhbvn.org.in)