



(Regd. Post)

Appeal No. : 12 of 2026
Registered on : 20.04.2026
Date of Order : 12.08.2026

In the matter of:

In the matter of: -

Appeal against the order dated 12.02.2026 passed by CGRF, DHBVN Gurugram in case No 4972/2025

Shri Sanjay Tyagi, Medawas, Sec-64, Gurugram, Haryana.

Appellant

Versus

1. The XEN/OP Divn., Badshahpur, DHBVN, Gurugram, Haryana
2. SDO/OP, Sub Division, Badshahpur, DHBVN, Gurugram, Haryana

Respondent

Before:

Shri Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Electricity Ombudsman

Present on behalf of Appellant:

Shri Sanjay Tyagi
Shri Saneev Chopra, Advocate

Present on behalf of Respondents:

Shri Sunil Saini, SDO
Shri Raghav Kakkar (advocate for respondent)

ORDER

- A.** Shri Sanjay Tyagi has filed an appeal against the order dated 12.02.2026 passed by CGRF, DHBVN, Gurugram in case no. 4972 of 2025. The appellant has submitted as under: -

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

1. That I, Sanjay Tyagi, wish to state that I am a resident of Medawas village, which falls under the jurisdiction of Badshahpur Subdivision, DHBVN, Gurugram and my consumer account no. is 8569612070.
2. That immediate cause of action to bring the matter before your hon'ble court has arisen from a very recent impugned order passed by Ld. CGRF (Corporate Level) at Gurugram which has been passed on the basis of assumptions and misinterpretations and is liable to be set aside in the interest of justice.
3. That the Ld. CGRF Gurugram order, referred to in the above para, is dated 12.02.2026 in case no. 4972 of 2025, which has been received by me on 16.03.2026 vide memo no. 465/CGRF/GGM. (copy of impugned order is attached as Annexure C-1). Therefore, I am within the permissible 30 days to come before your hon'ble Court to seek justice.
4. That the necessity to go before Ld. CGRF arose because a highly inflated electricity bill had been served upon me by Badshahpur subdivision, DHBVN, Gurugram. This bill was for Rs. 595788/- wherein the old reading had been shown as 16865 on 21.10.2023 and the new reading shown was 112201 on 09.10.2025 i.e. a

consumption of 95336 units for 719 days. Copy of my complaint before CGRF is attached as Annexeure C-2.

5. That because the amount in dispute was Rs. 595788/- i.e. more than Rs. 3 lacs, jurisdiction of the matter of dispute lied before the Corporate Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (Corporate-CGRF) Gurugram and hence the application / complaint was submitted before Ld. CGRF Gurugram.

MATTER OF DISPUTE

The matter, which I placed before the Ld. CGRF Gurugram is reproduced hereunder for kind reference and record, Sir:

1. That I have one no. running electricity connection in my name Sanjay Tyagi at my property in village Medawas, Gurugram
2. That my consumer account number is 8569612070 under Non- Domestic category and lies under the jurisdiction of Badshahpur Subdivision, DHBVN, Gurugram.
3. That I have been getting my electricity bills regularly and I have been paying them regularly within the due date of payment
4. To elaborate it further, details of my previous bills is given as under for ready reference:
 - i) Bill payable in May 2024 – Rs. 39562.00 (Paid)
 - ii) Bill payable in July 2024 – 5063.08 (Paid)
 - iii) Bill payable in September 2024 – 3820.04 (Paid)
 - iv) Bill payable in November 2024 – 4572.74 (Paid)
 - v) Bill payable in February 2025 – Rs. 12700.58 (Paid)
 - vi) Bill payable in April 2025 – Rs. 16476.38 (Paid)
 - vii) Period 4th May 2025 to 7th July 2025 – Rs. 5163.56 (Paid)
(Old Reading 35804; New Reading 36211)
 - viii) Period 7th July 2025 to 28th August 2025 – Rs. 15577.67 (Paid)
(Old Reading 36211; New Reading 37211)
 - ix) Period 4th May 2025 to 7th July 2025 – Rs. 5163.56 (Paid)
(Old Reading 35804; New Reading 36211)
 - x) Period 24th October 2023 to 9th October 2025 Rs.
595788/- (2 years) – Matter of dispute
(Old Reading 16865; New Reading 112201)
5. That my consumer account number 8569612070 under Non-Domestic category is more than 3 years old and there has never been any dispute, whatsoever, and I have been paying my all the bills regularly
6. That detail of release of my connection are attached here at Annexure C- 3 which shows the date of release of connection and also the Initial Reading (IR) of 13387 in the “meter” on dated 20.07.2022
7. That by their own record, the reading in my meter as on 21.10.2023 was 16865.

8. That by their own record, the consumption recorded in the meter from 22.07.2022 to 21.10.2023 (455 days) was $16865 - 13387 = 3478$ units which means a daily consumption of 7.64 units per day
9. That by their own record, as per data in the Meter Reading Data sheet obtained from the respondent subdivision (Annexed as Annexure C-4) a bill of Rs. 95788/- has been raised on the basis of Old Reading of 16865 recorded on 21.10.2023 and the new reading of 112201 recorded on 09.10.2025 i.e. a consumption of 95336 units for a period of 719 days
10. That by raising the last bill for Rs. 595788/-, the respondent subdivision has tried to say that their meter reader did not take reading from October 2023 to October 2025, that the bills raised by them during 2 years were fictitious and that a consumption of 95336 units has been recorded in 719 days, as per verification by their checking team on 09.09.2025 (copy of checking report is attached at Annexure C-5)
11. That by saying so, the contention of subdivision basically was that I consumed 133 units per day from 21.10.2023 to 09.10.2025 which is possible only if a load of 5.52 kW runs continuously for 24 hours a day for 719 days whereas by their own record, my consumption was only 7.64 units per day during the preceding one year from 20.07.2022 to 21.10.2023, as explained in para "8" above, connected load having remained the same
12. That my above said electricity connection is only for my small office which I seldom use and that too during the day only
13. That only a lighting fixture and a fan are installed and a submersible pump for water etc. for office use
14. That in my meter, an MDI of only 5 kW has been recorded, which can be seen in the monthly bills served upon me, including in the last bill for Rs. 595788/-
15. That the respondent subdivision has failed to realize that it is an NDS connection only for my office use, which remains closed most of the times and which has only bare minimum electrical gadgets
16. That the checking report, in which the actual reading has been verified as 112176 kWh, does not show any other connected load except a submersible pump. Only the sanctioned load of 10 kW has been mentioned there. Even the running load at the time of checking has not been recorded, which could have been easily recorded by the checking team
17. That going by respondents' own Sales Circulars, even if it is assumed that a load of 5 kW has run continuously, which otherwise also is not correct by any means, a maximum consumption which can get recorded in an office is $5 \text{ kW} \times 12 \text{ hours per day} \times 25 \text{ days in a month} \times 0.9 \text{ p.f.} \times 24 \text{ months} = 32400$ units which is almost 1/3rd of the consumption of 95336 units shown by the respondent subdivision in the last bill
18. That the respondent subdivision while raising the bill has ignored the facts which I have explained above

19. That there has been a defect / error which seems to have occurred in the meter but which the respondent subdivision has failed to notice and accept
20. That the subdivision is in knowledge of the mistake / error which has occurred in the meter but still they have not taken cognizance of the same and instead have found an easy way to raise the bill for such inflated / unjustified / impossible consumption
21. In light of the facts explained above, it is requested that respondent Badshahpur subdivision of DHBVN may kindly be directed to correct the bill in light of the facts explained above in the application on the basis of average consumption data from 20.07.2022 to 21.10.2023, which is available in their record
22. That DHBVN may be directed to issue the corrected bill so that the matter gets cleared and till such time the corrected bill is issued, the connection may not be disconnected

REPLY BY THE SUBDIVISION

23. Reply was submitted by the respondent Subdivision Badshahpur before the Ld. Forum vide memo no. 2782 dated 08.10.2025. A perusal of the reply of the subdivision revealed that the contents of reply were totally vague, incorrect, inconclusive, not based upon logical reasoning and hence denied. It seemed that the subdivision had not even gone through the contents of my complaint but only submitted the reply in a hurry without considering any merits of the case.
24. In my rejoinder to the Reply, I again brought out the facts of the case wherein I explained at length that the consumption as shown in my last bill was not practically possible (Copy of my reply is placed as Annexure C-6)
25. The subdivision again submitted a reply and the meter data on the basis of which I again submitted a rejoinder (copy placed as Annexure C-7), the contents of which are reproduced below for ready reference:
26. I am not a technical person but still I have tried to go through and scrutinize the data provided by the respondent subdivision to the best of my understanding
27. Before going further to submit my understanding, I respectfully wish to submit that there has been only a submersible pump which has been in use since beginning of the connection and there is no reason as to how an MDI of 23 kW can be recorded
28. The checking report of the subdivision on the basis of which the demand has been raised also mentions only a submersible pump at the site at the time of checking
29. In the letter memo no. 3090 dated 22.12.2025, an MDI of 23.58 kW has been reported and a table has been given to show the day wise consumption. From 02.12.2024 to 30.01.2025 i.e. for 59 days, a per day consumption of 304 units has been shown which means that a load of 25.50 kW has run continuously for 12 hours, which is neither practically possible nor it has been supported by any other data provided by the subdivision. Going by the data given in the table, it is clearly evident that meter seems to have either gone defective or jumped from May 2024 onwards and the consumption has increased exponentially i.e. from 159 units per day to 278 units per day to 304 units per day.

30. Another issue raised in the above referred letter of subdivision is that an ALM has reported that this very connection supply has been used by me in the construction of Banquet Hall nearby. It is clarified in this regard that supply of this connection has never been used in the construction of Banquet Hall. The Banquet Hall has been constructed solely with the pre-fabricated technology without any actual construction at site. All the material was brought to site pre- fabricated and only assembling was done at site through nuts and bolts. Moreover, had I been using the supply of this connection for Banquet Hall, I should have been booked there and then only. To raise the issue now by the respondents is only an afterthought just to justify their reply
31. In a laboratory test report of 202 pages, which has been submitted by the respondents with a copy to me, the data available is from 01.01.2025 to 01.12.2025 and therefore, nothing can be commented upon the consumption data for the period prior to January
32. For the One-year data given in the report, except for the period from 01.01.2025 to 01.02.2025, wherein the consumption recorded is 8130 units, the consumption per month thereafter has been very less which justifies that only submersible pump has been running
33. In the 202-page report submitted by the subdivision, time-slot wise consumption has been given. To the best of my ability to analyze and scrutinize, I submit as under:
- There are 8 (eight) time slots in the reading data
- Slot 1 22.00 hrs. to 05.30 hrs.
 - Slot 2 05.30 hrs. to 08.00 hrs.
 - Slot 3 08.00 hrs. to 17.30 hrs.
 - Slot 4 17.30 hrs. to 18.00 hrs.
 - Slot 5 18.00 hrs. to 18.30 hrs.
 - Slot 6 18.30 hrs. to 19.00 hrs.
 - Slot 7 19.00 hrs. to 21.00 hrs.
 - Slot 8 21.00 hrs. to 22.00 hrs.
34. Going by the slot wise data given in the report, as given for History 11 & 12, the maximum load which has been shown as running is from 22.00 hrs. to 08.00 hrs. which means only night hours. It is clear from the above data that some fault seems to have occurred in the meter because there is no reason for 25 kW load to run during night hours because there is no activity in the night hours except that the submersible pump runs for a few minutes every morning
35. Another thing which needs to be pointed out here is that in the months of December 2024 and January 2025 (59 days), a consumption of 304 units per day has been shown as recorded in the meter. This means a continuous running load of 15.20 kW round the clock which otherwise is also not possible and that too during night hours only.
36. The lab report itself proves that the meter seems to have gone defective somewhere or has jumped due to some system fault
37. Another observation from the lab report is that cumulative kVAh reading on 17.05.2024 was 42292.131 whereas cumulative kVAh on 06.05.2025 was 18209.964

which means a consumption of 75918 units in 350 days or 217 units per day continuously for 350 days

38. A consumption of 217 units per day can get recorded only if a load of 18 kW runs continuously for 12 hours a day for 350 days and that too during night hours only, which is practically not possible.
39. Rather the lab report submitted by subdivision has proved beyond doubt that the meter had gone defective and recorded absurdly high consumption during night hour slots
40. The subdivision has also not said anything about MDI of only 5 kVA recorded in the checking report. If the MDI recorded even now is 5 kVA, then how can an MDI of 23 kVA has been shown in the lab report. This further proves that the meter had gone defective and needs to be taken on record by the respondents
41. In light of the submissions made above, it is requested that the charging done and demanded from me may kindly be withdrawn
42. The above submissions are bonafide and true to my understanding of the subject and the data provided by the respondents
43. Thus, all the facts were placed before the Ld. CGRF and I also explained the matter technically, so far as possible, but the Ld. CGRF passed the impugned order without considering the facts on merit. The CGRF in its impugned order dated 12.02.2026 has relied more on assumptions and presumptions rather than on the technical facts which are available on record. The concluding para of the impugned order is reproduced as under for ready reference:

“The complainant submitted the response during the hearing and contested that:

- i. That MDI can't be 23 kW against a submersible pump
- ii. Complainant contested that the consumption has doubled, it is not practically feasible
- iii. Regarding DHBVN contention that supply was being used for construction of banquet hall, the complainant admitted that banquet hall has been constructed with pre-fabricated technology without any actual construction at site. The complainant also stated that how could consumption was come in only evening and night hours, he also stated that this much consumption only comes when the load runs only for longer duration of night hours. He also challenged the MDI of 23 kW as shown in Lab report. During hearing on 06.02.2026 both the parties were present and arguments were held. Based on above facts and data submitted by both the parties, the Forum is o the view that recorded consumption in meter as observed by DHBVN and in M&T Lab report is correct, thus the consumer is liable to pay the billed amount. The consumer contention that such reading cannot come on Submersible pump load has been overruled with the fact that DHBVN has provided M&T Lab report showing the consumption in meter. The DHBVN also stated that supply was used in construction of banquet hall, the above fact is being corroborated by the fact that banquet hall connection was released on

27.12.2024 and during the construction of banquet hall, no temporary connection was taken by consumer and after 27.12.2024, the consumption of disputed connection question dropped significantly. Hence the amount of Rs. 5,95,788/- charged by the Nigam vide SDO letter memo no. 2782 dated 08.12.2025 has been noted by the Forum is rightly chargeable and therefore the consumer is directed to pay the same. XEN Operation Badshahpur is directed to get the investigation done regarding wrong reading taken by MRBD and take appropriate action so that such types of deficiencies do not occur leading to grievance of consumers”

44. It is evident from above that the Ld. CGRF only presumed, without any material fact at site that the connection of the complainant was used for construction of banquet hall. Without any basis and without any corroborative evidence and despite the fact that M&T report shows the consumption only during late night hours, how could Ld. CGRF presume that the construction activities were continuing during late night hours only and that there was no construction during the day time.
45. In the SDO reply dated 22.12.2025, it is stated in one of the paras that “the area LM has reported that the supply from this meter was being used by the consumer for construction purposes of a Banquet Hall, whose independent connection was subsequently released on 27.12.2024 with sanctioned load of 498 kW, bearing account no. 8637820303.
46. The above contention of DHBVN is totally unacceptable on the following grounds:
- i) If the LM or the JE or any other staff had actually noticed the misuse of my connection for construction of Banquet Hall, why the matter was not brought on record and why the case of unauthorized use or sale of power had not been booked. It is only an afterthought just to make their point and to justify their wrong billing
 - ii) The Banquet Hall in question, which has been referred to by the DHBVN as also by the Ld. CGRF does not belong to me. The Banquet Hall has been constructed by M/S TG Banquet LLP, Sector 64, village Medawas, Gurugram which is partnership firm with many partners. Also, that the developer M/S TG Banquet LLP formally issued contract to a construction company to construct the Banquet Hall wherein to arrange electricity for construction purpose was the sole responsibility of the contractor through their own DG sets without any connection from the local distribution company.
 - iii) Under the above facts, to presume that my connection was used for construction of the Banquet Hall is totally incorrect and without any basis.
47. In light of the facts explained above, it is submitted that DHBVN has failed to accept that their meter actually got defective or jumped and that to justify their wrong billing, they have come up with excuses like the connection was used for construction of Banquet Hall. Therefore, the Ld. CGRF order dated 12.02.2026 is totally based upon presumptions and false reporting by DHBVN and is thus liable to be set aside by your hon'ble Court.

PRAYER

In view of the foregoing, it is most humbly prayed that:

- i) That the present application / complaint may kindly be allowed and impugned order dated 12.02.2026 passed by the Ld. CGRF Gurugram may be set aside
 - ii) That the complaint be accepted and the respondents be directed to overhaul the bills of petitioner based upon the factual consumption available on record before and after the meter defect / jump as per instructions of the Nigam
 - iii) To withdraw the amount of Rs. 5,95,788/- which has been put in the bill on defective meter and its reading
 - iv) That till such time the bills get corrected, the respondents may be directed not to disconnect the supply on the basis of non-payment of incorrect bills.
- B.** The appeal was registered on 20.04.2026 as an appeal No. 12 of 2026 and accordingly, notice of motion to the Appellant and the Respondents was issued for hearing the matter on 20.05.2026.
- C.** The present appeal was heard on 20.05.2026 through Video Conferencing. Sh. Sanjay Tyagi, Appellant, appeared in person through VC. The Respondents were represented by their counsel Sh. Raghav Kakkar and Sh. Shiv Pratap Thakur.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND & ISSUE IN DISPUTE

The Appellant has challenged the order dated 12.02.2026 passed by the Corporate Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF), DHBVN, Gurugram in Case No. 4972 of 2025, whereby his complaint against a highly inflated electricity bill of ₹5,95,788/- (for the period 24.10.2023 to 09.10.2025) in respect of Consumer Account No. 8569612070 (NDS category) was rejected.

The core grievance is the abrupt and abnormally high consumption of 95,336 units recorded in the Landis+Gyr make 3-Phase Whole Current meter bearing Serial No. 8299610, despite the sanctioned load being only 10 kW and historically consistent low consumption pattern (average ~7.64 units per day in the preceding period).

It is noted that the demand is based primarily on the checking report vide LL-1 No. 25/26373 dated 09.09.2025, wherein MDI has not been recorded. However, the report of SDO, M&T Lab states that the meter accuracy is within permissible limits.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE OMBUDSMAN

The Appellant has expressed strong dissatisfaction with the impugned order of the CGRF.

Learned counsel for the Respondents submitted that they have been recently engaged and sought time to file a detailed reply.

The forum takes cognizance of the Suo Motu Order dated 12.12.2022 passed by the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission in Case No. HERC/PRO-69 of 2020, wherein serious concerns were expressed regarding defective/inferior quality meters

supplied by certain firms, including M/s Landis+Gyr Ltd., Kolkata, which was blacklisted for three years on account of supplying inferior quality meters.

In the instant case, the meter in question is of Landis+Gyr make. There is a prima facie need to examine whether the meter in question forms part of the lot(s) supplied during the period when inferior quality meters were supplied by the said firm, and whether any manufacturing defect, tampering, or technical fault exists, particularly in view of the unusually high MDI recorded vis-à-vis the sanctioned load and connected load as came forth in the appeal of appellant and order of CGRF, Gurugram.

DIRECTIONS

In view of the above, the following directions are issued:

I. To the Respondents (DHBVN):

- a. The XEN/M&P and SE/M&P, DHBVN shall furnish their detailed comments/report regarding the meter in question, including analysis of the load survey report, tamper data, and event logs.
- b. The Respondents shall specifically examine and submit whether the meter bearing Sr. No. 8299610 was procured as part of the lot(s) supplied by M/s Landis+Gyr during the period when the firm was found supplying inferior quality meters, as referred in the HERC Suo Motu Order dated 12.12.2022.
- c. The Respondents shall file an undertaking clarifying the above position.
- d. A comprehensive reply to the appeal, along with the above reports and analysis, shall be filed at least 7 days prior to the next date of hearing, with a copy served simultaneously upon the Appellant.

II. To the Appellant:

The Appellant is directed to deposit 40% of the disputed amount with the Respondents within 10 days from the date of this order and submit proof of deposit (copy of receipt/challan) to this office as well as to the Respondents, in terms of Regulation 3.18(iii) of the Electricity Ombudsman Regulations, 2020 (as amended).

NEXT DATE OF HEARING

The matter is now posted for 08.06.2026.

D. On 05.06.2026, counsel of respondent SDO has submitted reply, which is as under:

1. That, the present Reply is being filed by SDO Operation, S/U S/D, Badshahpur, Gurugram (the “**Respondent No. 1**”), and XEN Operation, Badshahpur Division, Gurugram (the “**Respondent No. 2**”) having office at New Palam Vihar Sub-Division, Gurugram, (collectively the “**Respondents**”) to the Appeal filed before the Electricity Ombudsman Haryana, Panchkula bearing Appeal No. /2026 (the “**Appeal**”).
2. That, it is respectfully submitted that no averments, statements, submissions, grounds, contentions, or allegations made by the Appellant in the Appeal shall be

admitted or deemed to be admitted for reason of non-traverse or otherwise save and except these are expressly admitted herein.

3. That, it is respectfully submitted that the present Appeal cannot be allowed in favour of the Appellant hereto (reasons for which are explained in detail hereunder) as the Appeal in itself, is devoid of any substance and merit and is made with the mala-fide intention to mislead, misguide and misrepresent this Hon'ble Ombudsman.
4. That, the Hon'ble Ombudsman vide interim Order dated May 20, 2026, had directed the Respondents to provide comments clearly stating therein whether the meter with Sr. No. 8299610 (Make Landis+Gyr) installed at the premises of the Appellant is from the defective lot or not. That, in compliance of the said Order, the Respondents have prepared the report which is annexed hereto and marked as **Annexure R-1**. The relevant extract of the report is reproduced hereunder:

"Upon analysis of the meter data comments received from the SDO M&T Lab. Gurugram are reproduced as under-

- a. *It has been observed that the meter was recording energy consumption commensurate with the load being drawn/observed at the relevant time No abnormality suggestive of meter malfunction is evident from the available load survey, tamper and event log records, specifically for the disputed period ie. from 24.10.2023 to 09.10 2025. Further, the accuracy of the meter was re-checked and the same was found to be within the permissible limits as prescribed under the applicable standards/specifications It is also pertinent to mention that the accuracy of the subject meter had been checked earlier as well and was found to be within permissible limits at that time. The same had already been intimated to the concerned office vide this office Memo No 39/M&T Lab File-2 dated 08.01.2026.*
- b. *As per the available record it is informed that the subject cited meter was not found to have any relevance to the category/lot of meters referred to in the aforesaid HERC Suo Motu Order*
- c. *The information provided by this office is true and based on the available record and the meter data.*

Therefore in view of the observation pointed out by the M&T Lab DHBVN Gurugram and record / data available, it is observed that there is not any abnormality as far as concerned of working of Meter. The data and report of SDO M&T Lab, DHBVN, Gurugram is also attached for reference and submitted for kind consideration for submission."

5. That, the impugned order dated February 12, 2026 passed by the Company Grievance Redressal Forum ("**CGRF**") vide Case No. bearing 4972 of 2025 is a well-reasoned, legally sound and just order passed after due consideration of all the submissions made by both parties, the M&T Lab report, the checking report and other material on record. The appellant is merely aggrieved of a lawful and correct order and the present appeal is an abuse of the process of law. The relevant extract of the Impugned Order is reproduced hereunder:

"...Based on above facts and data submitted by both the parties, the Forum is of the view that recorded consumption in meter as observed by DHBVN and in M&T Lab report is correct, thus the consumer is liable to pay the billed amount. The consumer contention that such reading cannot come on Submersible pump load has been overruled with the fact that, DHBVN has provided the M&T Lab report showing the consumption in meter. The DHBVN also stated that supply was used in construction of banquet hall, the above fact is being corroborated by the fact that banquet hall connection was released on 27.12.2024 and during the construction of banquet hall no temporary connection was taken by consumer and after 27.12.2024 the consumption of disputed connection question dropped significantly. Hence the amount of Rs. 5,95,788/- charged by Nigam vide SDO letter Memo no. 2782 dated: 08.12.2025 has been noted

by Forum is rightly chargeable and therefore the consumer is directed to pay the same. XEN/Op. Badshahpur i s directed to get the investigation done regarding wrong reading taken by MRBD and take appropriate action, so that such types of deficiencies do not occur leading to grievance of consumers.”

6. The relief sought by the Appellant is reproduced is as hereunder:

“i) That the present application / complaint may kindly be allowed and impugned order dated 12.02.2026 passed by the Ld. CGRF Gurugram may be set aside

(ii) That the complaint be accepted and the respondents be directed t o overhaul the bills o f petitioner based upon the factual consumption available on record before and after the meter defect / jump as per instructions of the Nigam.

(iii)To withdraw the amount of Rs. 5,95,788/- which has been put in the bill on defective meter and its reading

(iv)That till such time the bills get corrected, the respondents may be directed not to disconnect the supply on the basis of non-payment of incorrect bills.”

7. That, the Appellant's primary contention that the meter is "defective" or has "jumped" is wholly unsustainable in view of the M&T Lab report dated vide memo No. 988/M&T Lab File-2 dated December 19, 2025 wherein as per the M&T Lab report, the actual meter reading was 35207 kWh on dated September 12, 2023. The load consumption details are mentioned hereunder:

Old Reading Date	New Reading Date	Bill Period (Days)	Old Reading	New Reading	Difference	Per Day Consumption
22.07.2022	10.05.2023	292	13387	18662	5275	18.10
10.05.2023	30.06.2023	51	18662	23573	4911	96.30
30.06.2023	12.09.2023	74	23573	35207	11634	157.20
12.09.2023	17.05.2024	248	35207	40028	4821	19.40
17.05.2024	27.05.2024	10	40028	41624	1596	159.60
27.05.2024	02.12.2024	189	41624	94185	52561	278.10
02.12.2024	30.01.2025	59	94185	112126	17941	304.10
30.01.2025	12.05.2025	102	112126	112158	32	0.30
12.05.2025	11.12.2025	213	112158	112209	51	0.20
22.07.2022	11.12.2025	1238	13387	112209	98822	79.82

8. That, it is admitted fact that the meter was changed in the name of the Appellant on July 22, 2022. However, the independent connection for the banquet hall was released on December 27, 2024 with a sanctioned load of 498kw bearing account no. 8637820303. It is humbly submitted that the Appellant kept using the electricity from the meter installed in his premises as he did not take temporary connection during the construction of the banquet hall. A copy of the Bill issued for the banquet hall is annexed hereto and marked as **Annexure R-2**.

9. That, the Appellant’s contention that the Banquet Hall was constructed using “pre-fabricated technology without any actual construction at site” is a self-serving statement made to deny unauthorized use of the electricity connection. Even the installation and assembly of pre-fabricated structures, along with electrical, interior, plumbing, and road/surface works, necessarily require substantial power supply. Moreover, the Appellant’s own admission that the Banquet Hall exists near his premises and was constructed without any formal electricity connection during the construction period, further substantiates the case of the respondents.

10. That, in the matter of *Sunil Kumar Punia vs UHBVN, Appeal No. 17 of 2023*, this Hon’ble Commission has held that the Respondents are entitled to recover the dues

pending due to the error in meter reading on the part of the reading agency. The relevant extract of the Order dated May 19, 2023 is reproduced hereunder:

“After examining the reply of the Respondent SDO and Xen. Received through S.E. (OP) Circle, UHBVN, Jhajjar the record available on the file and hearing both the parties, the Forum has observed that consumer meter was packed by LL-1 No. 0814625 on dated 05.03.2022 and sent to M&T Lab, Rohtak for retrieval of data. As per M&P Report, 34854 KWH reading was visible but past data could not be recovered. The same was sent to AVON Meter Pvt. Ltd. Derabassi Firm for data retrieval but the data could not be retrieved. As per SDO’s reply meter was of three phase and was replaced with a single phase meter on 25.03.2022. The bill code was changed from Defective to O.K. in the month of 12/2019. After punching the reading i.e. 8135 and after that bills were made on a minimum basis for months together indicating that the reading has not been taken by the Meter Reading Agency. The average consumption of consumer from 12/2019 to 02/2022 is $(34854-18130)/14 = 1175$ units and average consumption from 12/2017 to 10/2019 is $(18130-7710)/12 = 867$ units which is greater than 800 units and no slab benefit becomes payable to the consumer. From all the above, it shows that reading has not been taken correctly by the Meter Reader due to which the bills have not been issued correctly as per reading of the meter. The Forum feels that this is a case of accumulation of reading and directs SDO/Respondent to recover the amount from the consumer in installments as per Clause 6.10.4 and 6.10.5 of Sales Circular No. 02/2020 on consumer’s request without surcharge.

A copy of the Order dated May 19, 2023 is annexed hereto and marked as **Annexure R-3.**

11. Accordingly, the account of the Appellant was overhauled for the period 21.10.2023 to 09.10.2025 (719 days) and a bill of Rs. 7,50,353/- (Seven lakhs Fifty Thousand Three Hundred Fifty-Three Only) was generated, which after adjustment of Rs. 1,74,809/- already paid by the Appellant, the final payable amount of Rs. 5,95,788/- (Five Lakh Ninety-Five Thousand Seven Hundred Eighty-Eight) was raised against the Appellant bearing A/c no. 8569612070 having a sanctioned load of 5 KW under NDS Load category.
12. That, the Appellant has contended that the Appellant is being erroneously charged for 112176 KWH and 118228 KVAH from October 21, 2023 to October 09, 2025 which was found connected in addition to the main supply after the checking team of the Respondents inspected the premises of the Appellant prepared a Checking Report LL-1 No. 25/26373 dated September 9, 2025.
13. That, the Appellant has raised the secondary objection that the CGRF relied on the Banquet Hall issue "without any material fact or corroborative evidence" is incorrect. The CGRF relied upon the LM's on-ground report, the exponential spike in consumption from May 2024, the sharp and significant drop in consumption of the disputed connection after the Banquet Hall's independent connection was released on December 27, 2024. These are material facts on record and constitute sufficient corroborative evidence.
14. That, the objections raised by the Appellant are false and baseless and are specifically denied on the basis of following facts and objections:

THE APPELLANT CANNOT ESCAPE THE LIABILITY TO PAY THE ELECTRICITY DUES FOR THE UNITS CONSUMED UNDER THE NDS CATEGORY AS FOUND IN THE INSPECTION REPORT

15. That, the Appellant has raised baseless contention that the Respondents cannot recover the pending electricity dues from the Appellant according to the Impugned order dated February 12, 2026 based on the M&T Lab report and Checking Report LL-1 No. 25/26373 dated September 9, 2025, whereby, it was found that 95336 units consumed for the billing period from 21.10.2023 to 09.10.2025 (i.e 719 days). A copy of M&T Lab report is annexed hereto and marked as **Annexure R-4**.
16. That, the CGRF order is fully justified in the facts and circumstances of the case. The Appellant was duly served with a bill of Rs. 5,95,788/- for the billing period from 21.10.2023 to 09.10.2025 (i.e., 719 days), reflecting a consumption of 95,336 units on the basis of actual meter reading of 1,12,201 recorded on 09.09.2025 against the old reading of 16,865 recorded on 21.10.2023. This bill has been generated strictly as per the rules and the meter reading data available on record.
17. That, the respondents specifically deny the Appellant's allegation that the bill is "inflated" or "fictitious." The bill in question has been generated on the basis of actual physical meter readings verified by the checking team as well as by the M&T Laboratory. The meter was sent to the M&T Lab for independent testing vide Memo No. 3138 dated 31.12.2025, and as per the M&T Lab report vide Memo No. 39/M&T Lab File-2 dated 08.01.2026, the meter was found to be working within permissible limits and also site visit by area JE dated January 1, 2026. The accuracy of the meter having been scientifically verified, the bill raised on the basis of the meter reading is legally and factually correct.

THE FAILURE OF MRBD TO TAKE TIMELY READINGS DOES NOT INVALIDATE THE ACTUAL CONSUMPTION RECORDED IN THE METER

18. That, the Appellant's contention that the MRBD (Meter Reading Agency) had not taken readings from October 2023 to October 2025 is a fact which the Respondents have themselves placed on record. The account was overhauled for the period 21.10.2023 to 09.10.2025 (719 days) and a bill of Rs. 7,50,353/- was generated, which after adjustment of Rs. 1,74,809/- already paid (towards fictitious/average bills raised during this period), the final payable amount of Rs. 5,95,788/- was determined. This overhaul was done strictly in compliance with the applicable DHBVN rules and procedures.
19. That, the Respondents have already issued a letter dated December 02, 2025 bearing office memo no 2634 whereby the Respondents have called upon the MRBD agency for providing the names of the MRBD staff responsible for the collecting the incorrect reading so that FIR may be lodged against them. The relevant extract of the letter is reproduced hereunder:

"In this connection, it is again intimated that the subject-cited consumer has lodged a complaint before the CRF regarding an inflated bill due to incorrect reading taken by the MRBD staff. The reading recorded by the MRBD staff on 28.08.2025 was 37211 KWH, whereas during site checking vide LL-1 No. 25/26373 dated 09.09.2025, the meter reading was found to be 112176 KWH, resulting in a bill amounting to Rs. 5,95,788 /-.

You are, therefore, requested to provide the name of the responsible MRBD staff so that an FIR may be lodged against him. You are also directed to instruct your MRBD staff not to repeat such discrepancies in future, failing which penalty will be deducted as per the terms of your work order.”

A copy of the letter dated December 02, 2025 is annexed hereto and marked as **Annexure R-5**.

20. Therefore, the amount of Rs 5,95,88/- charged by Respondent vide letter Memo no 2782 dated 08.12.2025 has been rightly issued on the basis of the Checking Report made by the Respondent.

PRAYER:

In the light of the aforementioned facts and objections this Hon'ble Commission may be please to:

- a) Dismiss the present Appeal as it is devoid of any merit and has been filed only to usurp the public money.
- b) Pass any Order as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the interest of justice.

- E.** The present appeal was heard on 08.06.2026 through Video Conferencing. The Appellant appeared in person through VC. The Respondents were represented by the SDO (Operation), Badshahpur, XEN/M&P Gurugram (Sh. Rahul Sangwan) and their counsel.

Learned counsel for the Respondents informed the Forum that in compliance with the directions contained in the interim order dated 20.05.2026, the data of the meter bearing Serial No. 8299610 (Make: Landis+Gyr) has been analysed by the office of XEN/M&P, and the requisite reply along with reports has already been filed.

During the course of arguments, the Forum observed that the Respondents were unable to satisfactorily explain the reasons for the prolonged duration of certain tamper events recorded in the meter data, particularly the R-Phase and Y-Phase Missing Potential events.

Accordingly, the Forum directed the Respondents to:

1. Share the complete .fng file of the subject meter with this office and the Appellant.
2. Coordinate with the representative of M/s Landis+Gyr for a detailed technical analysis of the load survey data, tamper events, and event logs.
3. Submit a specific report clarifying the reasons for the long-duration tamper events and confirming the proper functioning/working of the meter based on analysis of the .fng file and other raw data.

The Appellant submitted that his rejoinder to the reply filed by the Respondents is under preparation through his advocate and shall be filed within the next seven days.

In view of the above, the following directions are issued:

A. To the Respondents (DHBVN):

- a. The XEN/M&P, Gurugram shall forthwith share the complete .fng file of Meter Sr. No. 8299610 with this office as well as with the Appellant.
- b. The Respondents shall arrange for a technical representative of M/s Landis+Gyr to analyse the load survey data, tamper events (especially the prolonged Missing Potential events), and event logs, and submit a detailed report explaining the working of the meter and the reasons for the recorded events.
- c. A comprehensive report in compliance with the above, along with the analysis from the manufacturer, shall be filed by the Respondents on or before 27.06.2026, with a copy served simultaneously upon the Appellant.

B. To the Appellant:

The Appellant may file his rejoinder, if any, to the reply already filed by the Respondents, on or before 27.06.2026.

The matter is now posted for 30.06.2026 at 12:00 Noon through Video Conferencing. This date is fixed as the final opportunity for hearing. All concerned functionaries of the Respondents, including the representative of M/s Landis+Gyr (if required), shall remain present through VC. No further adjournment shall be granted.

All parties are directed to come fully prepared with their arguments and counter-arguments on the next date.

This order is passed in the interest of justice to ensure complete technical scrutiny of the meter data and to afford adequate opportunity to both parties.

- F.** On 26.06.2026, Xen/M&P Division, DHBVN, Gurugram has submitted Complete Meter Data in Compliance with the Interim Order dated 08.06.2026 passed in Appeal No. 12 of 2026 by the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman in Appeal No. 12 of 2026 which is as under:-

Kindly refer to the Interim Order dated 08.06.2026 passed in the above-captioned appeal, whereby the Respondents were directed to furnish the complete meter data, including the .fng file, in respect of Meter Serial No. 8299610 (Make: Landis+Gyr) for detailed technical analysis. In compliance with the aforesaid directions, it is respectfully submitted that the complete meter data available in the meter, comprising the .fng file/ .2ng file and PDF data, is enclosed herewith for the kind perusal of the Hon'ble Forum.

It is further submitted that the complete raw meter data was also forwarded to the authorized representative of M/s Landis+Gyr, Mr. Vivek Kumar, through e-mail at vivek.kumar@landisgyr.com on 08.06.2026 and memo no. Ch- 143/Sohna Division/DRG-4 dated 26.06.2026, with a request to carry out a detailed technical analysis of the load survey data, tamper events (including Missing Potential events),

event logs and other relevant parameters, in terms of the directions contained in the Interim Order.

However, the detailed technical analysis/report from M/s Landis+Gyr is still awaited. The same shall be submitted before the Hon'ble Forum immediately upon its receipt.

This submission is made for the kind information of the Hon'ble Forum and for placing the same on record.

- G.** The present appeal was heard on 30.06.2026 at 16:00 hours through Video Conferencing. The Appellant appeared in person through VC. The Respondents were represented by their counsel and the concerned officers of DHBVN.

At the outset, the Appellant was queried regarding the status of the rejoinder to the reply filed by the Respondents. The Appellant submitted that due to the hospitalization of his counsel, the rejoinder could not be filed within the stipulated time and requested an extension of seven days for filing the same.

The Forum then examined the status of compliance with the directions issued vide interim order dated 08.06.2026, particularly with respect to the technical analysis of the meter bearing Serial No. 8299610 (Make: Landis+Gyr). Reference was made to the communications issued by the office of XEN/M&P, Gurugram vide Memo Nos. Ch. 143/Sohna Division/DRG-4 dated 26.06.2026 and Ch. 144/Sohna Division/DRG dated 26.06.2026.

After due consideration and hearing the parties, the following directions are issued:

A. To the Respondents (DHBVN):

- a. The M&P Wing, DHBVN shall immediately follow up with the authorized technical representative of M/s Landis+Gyr, Sector-62, Noida for a comprehensive technical analysis of the complete .fng file, load survey data, tamper events (especially the prolonged R-Phase and Y-Phase Missing Potential events), and event logs of Meter Serial No. 8299610.
- b. The Respondents shall obtain and submit a detailed final analysis report from M/s Landis+Gyr confirming the proper functioning/working of the meter and providing specific clarification regarding the reasons for the recorded long-duration tamper events.
- c. The Respondents shall simultaneously share a copy of their own internal analysis report regarding the working of the subject meter with this office as well as with the Appellant.
- d. All the above reports shall be filed on record expeditiously and in any case well before the next date of hearing so as to enable this Forum to take a final view in the matter.

B. To the Appellant:

The Appellant is granted time to file his rejoinder, if any, to the reply already filed by the Respondents, on or before 07.07.2026, with a copy served simultaneously upon the Respondents.

The matter is now adjourned to 16.07.2026 at 11:00 A.M. through Video Conferencing. This is fixed as a final opportunity for hearing. All concerned functionaries of the Respondents, including the technical representative of M/s Landis+Gyr (if required), shall remain present through VC. No further adjournment shall be granted.

Both parties are directed to come fully prepared with their claims, counter-claims, and supporting evidence (duly authenticated) on the next date so that the matter attains finality.

This order is passed in the interest of justice to ensure complete and thorough technical scrutiny of the meter data and to provide adequate opportunity to both sides.

H. The present appeal was heard on 16.07.2026 through Video Conferencing. Both the parties were present during the hearing.

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Appellant sought a short extension of five days for filing the rejoinder to the reply of the Respondents, citing a medical emergency in the family. In the interest of justice, the request was granted. However, the Forum expressed strong displeasure at the repeated delays on the part of the Appellant in meeting procedural timelines, as evident from the record and previous interim orders. Such delays have unnecessarily protracted the proceedings.

The Forum also reviewed compliance with earlier directions, particularly those issued vide interim orders dated 20.05.2026, 08.06.2026, and 30.06.2026. Reference was made to the reply filed by the office of XEN/M&P, DHBVN, Gurugram (Memo No. Ch-137/Sohna Division/DRG-4 dated 02.06.2026), which states that:

- The meter (Sr. No. 8299610, Make: Landis+Gyr) is recording consumption commensurate with the load drawn.
- No abnormality suggestive of malfunction is evident from the load survey, tamper, and event log data.
- The meter accuracy has been verified and found within permissible limits.
- The meter does not belong to the blacklisted/supply-defective lot referenced in the HERC Suo Motu Order dated 12.12.2022 in Case No. HERC/PRO-69 of 2020.

Despite the above, the Forum noted with regret the continued inability of the M&P Wing (including the M&T Lab) to obtain and submit a comprehensive technical

analysis report from the manufacturer, M/s Landis+Gyr, as specifically directed earlier.

Directions

In view of the above observations and in the interest of justice, the following directions are issued:

I. To the Respondents (DHBVN):

- a. The M&P Wing, DHBVN shall immediately depute a senior officer to personally coordinate with the authorized representative of M/s Landis+Gyr and obtain the detailed technical analysis report covering the complete .fng/.2ng files, load survey data, tamper events (particularly prolonged Missing Potential events), and event logs of Meter Sr. No. 8299610.
- b. The report must specifically address the working/performance of the meter and provide technical clarification on the recorded long-duration tamper events.
- c. The said report, along with any internal analysis, shall be filed on record expeditiously and in any case before the next date of hearing, with a copy served simultaneously upon the Appellant.

II. To the Appellant:

The Appellant shall deposit 40% of the disputed amount (₹5,95,788/-) with the Respondents under Regulation 3.18(iii) of the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (as amended), and submit proof of deposit to this office as well as to the Respondents on or before the next date of hearing.

The matter is now posted for 30.07.2026 at 11:00 A.M. through Video Conferencing. This is fixed as the final opportunity for hearing. Both parties, including the SDO (Operation), Badshahpur, and a senior representative from the M&P Wing, shall remain present either in person or through VC. The Appellant may file his rejoinder (if not already filed) within the granted time. No further adjournment shall be granted.

Both parties are directed to come fully prepared with their final submissions, evidence, and arguments so that the matter attains finality.

This order is passed in the interest of justice to ensure thorough technical scrutiny of the meter data while balancing the rights of the consumer and the licensee.

- I. On 24.07.2026, Xen/M&P Division, DHBVN, Gurugram has submitted analysis report in respect of Meter Sr. No. 8299610 in compliance with the directions issued by the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana in Appeal No. 12/2026 titled Sh.

Sanjay Tyagi Vs. DHBVN in reference to Interim Order dated 30.06.2026 which is as under:-.

Kindly refer to the Interim Orders dated 30.06.2026 and 16.07.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana in the above-captioned appeal.

In compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman, whereby the M&P Wing, DHBVN was directed to pursue M/s Landis+Gyr for submission of the analysis report in respect of the above-mentioned meter, the matter was followed up by this office both telephonically as well as through written communications vide Memo No. Ch-151/DRG-4 dated 15.07.2026, Ch-145/Sohna Divn/DRG-4 dated 06.07.2026 and Ch-143/Sohna Divn/DRG-4 dated 26.06.2026, enclosed as Annexure-1, 2 & 3.

However, despite the above follow-up, M/s Landis+Gyr did not submit the analysis report till date. Instead, the firm informed through an email dated 15.07.2026, received from Sh. Vivek (Representative, M/s Landis+Gyr), that the analysis report could only be furnished after receipt of the physical meter for examination.

Accordingly, this office directed SDO OP Sub-Division, Badshahpur for sending meters to the firm vide this office memo no Ch-152/Drg-4 dated 16.07.2026 (Annexure-4) being ultimate custodian of the meter. As per the direction of the undersigned, Sh. Kanval Deep, JE was deputed by SDO OP Badshahpur for sending meter to the firm vide his office memo no. 2185 dated 21.07.2026 (Annexure-5). The firm has also confirmed the receipt of the meter through email and informed that the analysis report would be submitted at the earliest (copy of email at Annexure-6.) However, even after the lapse of 3 days, no analysis report has been received from the firm till date. Still this office has again requested the firm for early submission of the analysis report vide memo no. Ch-154/Sohna Divn/DRG-4 dated 24.07.2026.

Meanwhile, in compliance with the directions contained in the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman's Interim Orders dated 30.06.2026 and 16.07.2026, an independent technical analysis based on the available downloaded meter data has been carried out by the M&P Wing.

The same is being submitted herewith for your kind consideration please.

1. In regard of working of meter, it is respectfully submitted before the Hon'ble Forum that the accuracy of the meter checked in M&T Lab and found working within permissible limits. Further, It has also been observed that the subject meter was recording energy consumption commensurate with the load being drawn during the relevant period. As per the consumption data of the previous one year i.e. from 01-01-2025 to 19-12-2025 available in the meter memory, the energy consumption recorded during the relevant period was 8196.3 kWh and 8416 kVAh (copy enclosed

as Annexure-4). Further, the Maximum Demand (MDI) recorded was 26.14 kW / 26.46 kVA on 11.01.2025, whereas during the preceding billing cycle the MDI was observed on 23.56 kW / 23.99 kVA on 18.12.2024. The relevant MDI Data is enclosed as Annexure-5.

2. In regard of the recorded tamper events, particularly R & Y Phase Missing Potential events, along with the Event Log Data, it is humbly submitted that the possibility of occurring such events may be due to the supply failure from the source or other field conditions. Therefore, on the basis of the downloaded meter data only, this office is not in a position to ascertain the exact reason for the occurrence of these events. However, no conclusive evidence indicating any meter abnormality could be established from the available Tamper Data or Event Log Records.

Therefore, in view of the above findings, it is respectfully submitted that no abnormality has been established in the functioning of the aforesaid Meter. This is submitted for your kind information please.

- J.** On 29.07.2026, Xen/M&P Division, DHBVN, Gurugram has submitted reply received from M/s Landis+Gyr regarding Technical Analysis of Meter Serial No. 8299610 in compliance with the directions issued by the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana in Appeal No-12/2026 titled Sh. Sanjay Tyagi Vs DHBVN which is as under:-

Kindly refer to the subject cited above.

In compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman, this office had requested M/s Landis+Gyr to furnish the detailed technical analysis report along with the complete available meter data in respect of Meter Serial No. 8299610.

In response, the firm has furnished its reply through e-mail along with the available meter data. The relevant findings/observations of the firm, as communicated in its e-mail, are reproduced below verbatim:

"The meter data download and analysis were carried out using internal diagnostic tools. All recorded parameters, captured values, and event logs available in the meter were found to be normal and consistent with expected meter operation. Following the data analysis, the meter was powered and monitored for several days under both single-phase and three-phase mains supply conditions to identify any abnormal behavior. Based on our observations, the meter operated as expected, and no malfunction was detected. The meter accuracy was also verified, and all measured error values were found to be within the defined acceptable limits. With reference to your request, we would like to inform you that the meter under references an old supply meter and is not covered under warranty. Furthermore, please note that our manufacturing plant has been closed, and we are currently providing support only for meters that are under warranty. Therefore, we regret to inform you that we are unable to provide any further service, repair, replacement, or technical support for this meter. "

A copy of the firm's e-mail reply along with the available meter data received from the firm is enclosed herewith for kind reference and record. This is submitted for kind information, please

- K.** On 30.07.2026, appellant has submitted rejoinder to the reply file by the respondent which is as under:-

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

1. That at the outset all the contentions, adverts and statements made by the Respondents in the replies are denied and nothing therein shall be deemed as admitted by the Petitioner, by reason of non-traverse or otherwise, unless specifically admitted hereinafter. It is submitted that the replies filed by Respondents is nothing but a misuse of the process of law and is devoid of any merits and is therefore liable to be dismissed.
2. That the Petitioner reserves the right to file additional evidence, including, but not limited to, additional documents and witnesses as well as the expert opinion, should the same become inevitable at any stage of the proceedings and/or arising out of the further submissions made by the respondents.

INTRODUCTORY SUBMISSION

3. The Petitioner most respectfully submits this detailed rejoinder to the reply filed by Respondent No. 1 on dated 01.06.2026. The dispute in the present case emanates from the impugned order passed by Ld. CGRF (Corporate Level) at Gurugram which has been passed on the basis of assumptions, misconceptions and misinterpretations and is liable to be set aside in the interest of justice
4. Despite complete facts having come on record before the Ld. CGRF, the order not only lacks application of mind but also complete disregard of facts and figures submitted by the Petitioner. The Ld. CGRF completely failed to realize that how could such a high consumption be recorded just by running of a submersible pump, that too for only a few hours during the day. The Ld. CGRF also failed to realize that court orders must be based upon reasoning and not just on the basis of assumptions and presumptions.
5. The Respondent's reply is replete with factual inaccuracies, misinterpretations of law, and deliberate obfuscation of contractual and regulatory provisions. The Petitioners refute the same in detail as under:

PRELIMINARY SUBMISSIONS AND MAINTAINABILITY OF THE PETITION

6. That the Ld. CGRF Gurugram order, referred to in the above para, is dated 12.02.2026 in case no. 4972 of 2025. Necessity to go before Ld. CGRF had arisen because a highly inflated electricity bill had been served upon me by Badshahpur subdivision, DHBVN, Gurugram. This bill was for Rs. 595788/- wherein the old reading had been shown as 16865 on 21.10.2023 and the

new reading shown was 112201 on 09.10.2025 i.e. a consumption of 95336 units for 719 days i.e. 133 units per day

MATTER OF DISPUTE RAISED BEFORE LD. CGRF (CORPORATE)
(For Ready Reference)

The matter, which I had placed before the Ld. CGRF Gurugram is reproduced hereunder for kind reference and record, Sir:

1. That I have one no. running electricity connection in my name Sanjay Tyagi at my property in village Medawas, Gurugram
2. That my consumer account number is 8569612070 under Non-Domestic category and lies under the jurisdiction of Badshahpur Subdivision, DHBVN, Gurugram.
3. That I have been getting my electricity bills regularly and I have been paying them regularly within the due date of payment
4. To elaborate it further, details of my previous bills is given as under for ready reference:
 - i) Bill payable in May 2024 – Rs. 39562.00 (Paid)
 - ii) Bill payable in July 2024 – 5063.08 (Paid)
 - iii) Bill payable in September 2024 – 3820.04 (Paid)
 - iv) Bill payable in November 2024 – 4572.74 (Paid)
 - v) Bill payable in February 2025 – Rs. 12700.58 (Paid)
 - vi) Bill payable in April 2025 – Rs. 16476.38 (Paid)
 - vii) Period 4th May 2025 to 7th July 2025 – Rs. 5163.56 (Paid)
(Old Reading 35804; New Reading 36211)
 - viii) Period 7th July 2025 to 28th August 2025 – Rs. 15577.67 (Paid)
(Old Reading 36211; New Reading 37211)
 - ix) Period 4th May 2025 to 7th July 2025 – Rs. 5163.56 (Paid)
(Old Reading 35804; New Reading 36211)
 - x) Period 24th October 2023 to 9th October 2025 – Rs. 595788/- (2 years) –
Matter of dispute
(Old Reading 16865; New Reading 112201)
5. That my consumer account number 8569612070 under Non-Domestic category is more than 3 years old and there has never been any dispute, whatsoever, and I have been paying my all the bills regularly
6. That detail of release of my connection are attached here at Annexure C- 3 which shows the date of release of connection and also the Initial Reading (IR) of 13387 in the “meter” on dated 20.07.2022
7. That by their own record, the reading in my meter as on 21.10.2023 was 16865
8. That by their own record, the consumption recorded in the meter from 22.07.2022 to 21.10.2023 (455 days) was $16865 - 13387 = 3478$ units which means a daily consumption of 7.64 units per day
9. That by their own record, as per data in the Meter Reading Data sheet obtained from the respondent subdivision (Annexed as Annexure C-4) a bill of Rs. 595788/- has been raised on the basis of Old Reading of 16865 recorded on 21.10.2023 and the new reading of 112201 recorded on 09.10.2025 i.e. a consumption of 95336 units for a period of 719 days
10. That by raising the last bill for Rs. 595788/-, the respondent subdivision has tried to say that their meter reader did not take reading from October 2023 to October

2025, that the bills raised by them during 2 years were fictitious and that a consumption of 95336 units has been recorded in 719 days, as per verification by their checking team on 09.09.2025 (copy of checking report is attached at Annexure C-5)

11. That by saying so, the contention of subdivision basically was that I consumed 133 units per day from 21.10.2023 to 09.10.2025 which is possible only if a load of 5.52 kW runs continuously for 24 hours a day for 719 days whereas by their own record, my consumption was only 7.64 units per day during the preceding one year from 20.07.2022 to 21.10.2023, as explained in para "8" above, connected load having remained the same
12. That my above said electricity connection is only for my small office which I seldom use and that too during the day only
13. That only a lighting fixture and a fan are installed and a submersible pump for water etc. for office use
14. That in my meter, an MDI of only 5 kW has been recorded, which can be seen in the monthly bills served upon me, including in the last bill for Rs. 595788/-
15. That the respondent subdivision has failed to realize that it is an NDS connection only for my office use, which remains closed most of the times and which has only bare minimum electrical gadgets
16. That the checking report, in which the actual reading has been verified as 112176 kWh, does not show any other connected load except a submersible pump. Only the sanctioned load of 10 kW has been mentioned there. Even the running load at the time of checking has not been recorded, which could have been easily recorded by the checking team
17. That going by respondents' own Sales Circulars, even if it is assumed that a load of 5 kW has run continuously, which otherwise also is not correct by any means, a maximum consumption which can get recorded in an office is $5 \text{ kW} \times 12 \text{ hours per day} \times 25 \text{ days in a month} \times 0.9 \text{ p.f.} \times 24 \text{ months} = 32400 \text{ units}$ which is almost 1/3rd of the consumption of 95336 units shown by the respondent subdivision in the last bill
18. That the respondent subdivision while raising the bill has ignored the facts which I have explained above
19. That there has been a defect / error which seems to have occurred in the meter but which the respondent subdivision has failed to notice and accept
20. That the subdivision is in knowledge of the mistake / error which has occurred in the meter but still they have not taken cognizance of the same and instead have found an easy way to raise the bill for such inflated / unjustified / impossible consumption
21. In light of the facts explained above, it is requested that respondent Badshahpur subdivision of DHBVN may kindly be directed to correct the bill in light of the facts explained above in the application on the basis of average consumption data from 20.07.2022 to 21.10.2023, which is available in their record
22. That DHBVN may be directed to issue the corrected bill so that the matter gets cleared and till such time the corrected bill is issued, the connection may not be disconnected

PARA WISE REPLY TO THE RESPONDENTS' REPLY DATED 01.06.2026

1. Contents of para no. 1 are a matter of record. No comments
2. Contents of para no. 2 are customary. No comments
3. Contents of para no. 3 are totally wrong, misleading, misconceived and hence denied. The Petition is bonafide and contains detailed facts and figures on the basis of which prayer has been made. The petition is maintainable and deserves a fair treatment and an order based upon merits.
4. Contents of para no. 4 are totally wrong, misleading and hence denied. The Respondents do not seem to have understood the directions given by the Ld. Ombudsman. On one hand, they themselves have listed the directions given in the order and on the other, have not replied to any of those. The clear directions of the hon'ble Ombudsman were "whether the meter with sr. no. 8299610 (Make Landis+Gyr) installed at the premises of the Appellant is from the defective lot or not." But the reply filed by the Respondents contains every other irrelevant contents except the specific reply to the query raised by the hon'ble Ombudsman. The most vital information regarding healthiness of the L&G meter has not been filed as yet. The detail, which the Respondents have given in the para are the same which they had placed before the hon'ble CGRF. But the submissions made by the Petitioner have not been touched upon.
5. Contents of para no. 5 are totally baseless, vague, misleading, wrong and hence denied. A cogent reading of CGRF order would reveal that the order has been passed based upon assumptions and presumptions. The submissions made by the Petitioner and the consumption pattern shown by the meter data have been ignored by the Ld. CGRF. In a laboratory test report of 202 pages, which had been submitted by the respondents with a copy to me, the data available is from 01.01.2025 to 01.12.2025 and therefore, nothing can be commented upon the consumption data for the period prior to January 2025. For the One-year data given in the report, except for the period from 01.01.2025 to 01.02.2025, wherein the consumption recorded is 8130 units, the consumption per month thereafter has been very less which justifies that only submersible pump has been running. In the 202-page report submitted by the subdivision, time-slot wise consumption has been given. To the best of my ability to analyze and scrutinize, I submit as under:

There are 8 (eight) time slots in the reading data

Slot 1 22.00 hrs. to 05.30 hrs.
Slot 2 05.30 hrs. to 08.00 hrs.
Slot 3 08.00 hrs. to 17.30 hrs.
Slot 4 17.30 hrs. to 18.00 hrs.
Slot 5 18.00 hrs. to 18.30 hrs.
Slot 6 18.30 hrs. to 19.00 hrs.
Slot 7 19.00 hrs. to 21.00 hrs.
Slot 8 21.00 hrs. to 22.00 hrs.

Going by the slot wise data given in the report, as given for History 11 & 12, the maximum load which has been shown as running is from 22.00 hrs. to 08.00 hrs. which means only night hours. It is clear from the above data that some serious

fault seems to have occurred in the meter because there is no reason for 25 kW load to run continuously during night hours because there is no activity in the night hours except that the submersible pump runs for a few minutes every morning. The Respondents have not replied to the above facts raised by Petitioner. It may also be seen from the reproduced order of Ld. CGRF in the para that “the DHBVN also stated that supply was used in construction of banquet hall”. This is the funniest part of the impugned order> The Ld. CGRF has totally and blatantly ignored to note that DHBVN did not place any such record or checking report on record which could prove that the supply of connection was being used for construction of banquet hall. This is just an assumption and presumption, which has been relied upon by the Ld. CGRF and therefore, the impugned order is not at all a reasoned order and is liable to be set aside in the first instance. How could Ld. CGRF relate the nearby banquet hall construction to the present connection of Petitioner is absolutely questionable and absurd. If there has been any checking carried out to prove their point, the Respondents should place the same on record. It is an established principle of justice that orders must not be passed on the basis of assumptions or presumptions

6. Contents of para 6 are a matter of record. No comments.
7. Contents of para no. 7 are totally baseless, wrong, concocted and hence denied. Going by the consumption data submitted by the Respondents in their reply, it is clearly evident that some fault seems to have occurred in the meter somewhere in the month of May 2024. From their own data, it can be seen that meter reading as on 17.05.2024 was 41624 which suddenly jumped to 94185 on 27.05.2024 i.e. just a consumption of 52561 units in just 10 days. But the Respondents instead of accepting the fault in the meter have just adopted a vindictive attitude and are bent upon to justify the excess billing, which has happened due to some defect in the meter.
8. Contents of para no. 8 are blatantly wrong, misleading, baseless and hence denied. Here again, the Respondents have tried to link the defective meter consumption with the illegal use of connection for construction of a Banquet Hall nearby. The Respondents again have tried to malign the Petitioner by saying that the connection was being used for construction of banquet hall. Had it been so, even if accepted hypothetically, is there any checking report of the Respondents on record to prove their claim. Just by hypothetically assuming something without any proof thereof amounts to highhandedness on the part of Respondents. If there is any proof of such an assumption or assertion, let it be placed on record by the Respondents.
9. Contents of the para no. 9 are totally vague, baseless, wrong and hence denied. There is no doubt that a banquet hall exists nearby but to assume or presume that the construction of banquet hall took electricity from the present connection of Petitioner is totally wrong on the part of Respondents. The present connection belongs to the Petitioner whereas the Banquet Hall nearby belongs to some company and therefore to assume that I would have provided electricity from my meter is not only ridiculous but also mischievous on the part of Respondents. If the Respondents have anything to prove on record, let them place the proof before the hon'ble Ombudsman

10. Contents of para 10 are totally irrelevant, not connected to the present case and hence denied in totality. The contents of para of Respondents' reply refer to some decision of Hon'ble Commission which is regarding taking of wrong reading by the meter reading agency. It may kindly be appreciated that the present matter does not involve any wrong or irregular meter reading but it is a case of meter having gone defective. Even the meter reading downloaded by the M&P wing of Respondents prove that the meter reading jumped from 17.05.2024 to 27.05.2024. It is their own data but has not been properly understood by the Respondents themselves. Despite being a highly technical department, they have failed to analyze their own data.
11. Contents of the para no. 11 are totally irrelevant and totally illogical. The bill has been raised on the basis of defective meter against which this petition is all about. The Respondents have just tried again to justify their wrong doing. The Respondents need to understand that the meter had gone defective somewhere in May 2024 after which the abnormally high consumptions, and that too in the late night hours, got recorded in the meter. Instead of analyzing the facts put by the petitioner in a positive manner, the Respondents have just tried to justify whatever they have done, totally disregarding the jump in the meter, which is also evident from their own record
12. Contents of para no. 12 are totally wrong, misleading and hence denied. In the checking report, referred to in the Respondents' reply, the maximum load found connected was only 5 kW. It is by their own record that the maximum load never exceeded 5 kW whereas in the meter data supplied by the Respondents, the load MDI also seems to have jumped along with the meter reading.
13. Contents of para no. 13 are also misleading and absolutely flimsy. The Ld. CGRF has relied on Lineman's report, which is not at all available in the record. If there is any such report in writing, let it be placed on record so that it can be argued upon. In the absence of any such report on record, it is not possible to comment upon except that the Ld. CGRF decided the matter without anything on record.
14. Contents of para no. 14 are wrong, misconceived, misleading, baseless and hence denied. The contents of Petition are bonafide and based upon the facts. It is wrong on the part of Respondents to say that the Petition is malafide
15. Contents of para no. 15 are wrong, baseless, misleading and hence denied. The Petitioner has never refused to pay the bills and has always been paying in time. It is only the absurd and inflated bill on the basis of defective meter that the Petitioner has objected to. The meter data provided by Respondents proves itself that the meter jumped in around May 2024, which the Respondents have failed to understand and accept. By their own record, a consumption of 95336 units has been recorded in 719 units which means a consumption of 133 units per day. It roughly means running of around 14 kW for 10 hours a day continuously for 2 ½ years. This is despite the fact that only a submersible pump is installed for water purpose only. Apart from this, their own record shows that the electricity was consumed during late night hours, which again proves that some defect had got developed in the meter

16. Contents of para no. 16 are totally wrong, baseless, misleading and hence denied. The CGRF order, as also demonstrated in the above paras, is based upon a LM report which does not exist, based upon an assumption that the supply was used for construction of banquet hall, again of which there is nothing to prove on record. The CGRF order is based on assumptions and presumptions only and is therefore liable to be set aside
17. Contents of para no. 17 are wrong, baseless, misleading and hence denied. The bill is indeed inflated and based upon a meter reading which went defective in May 2024. Their own meter reading data proves that the meter reading jumped but the Respondents are not receptive to even the facts on record. It is again reiterated that the Petitioner never refused to pay the bills which are correct. It is only the inflated bill which the Petitioner has objected to. Also, as soon as the bill is corrected, the dispute will come to an end.
18. Contents of para no. 18 are wrong, misleading and hence denied. It has amply been proved beyond doubt that the Ld. CGRF passed the order merely on assumptions and presumptions, on LM's report which is not on record, use of electricity by Banquet Hall, again of which there is no record whereas the actual record available has been ignored. The checking report of Respondents clearly show that the maximum load recorded was 5 kw which has been ignored by the Ld. CGRF.
19. Contents of para no. 19 are just an internal communication between the Respondents and the Meter Reading agency and therefore the Petitioner has nothing to comment upon. It is also not understood that when the meter data provided by the Respondents proves that the meter had jumped, it is definitely not a case of wrong readings taken by the meter reading agency. And, if at all the meter reading agency was delinquent and had not been taking the correct readings, then how many other consumers are there of whom the meter reading agency has not taken the correct reading, may also be placed on record. It is not correct to say that the meter reading agency did not take the correct reading of the present meter only. The Respondents must come out with a list of other such consumers also, where the meter reading agency did not take correct readings.
20. Contents of para no. 20 are absolutely wrong, baseless and hence denied. The inflated bill is not payable. Even though the full amount raised has been paid by the Petitioner, under protest, to avoid levy of surcharge every month, the amount so levied needs to be withdrawn and a corrected bill needs to be issued.

The above contentions of DHBVN are totally unacceptable on the following grounds:

- i) If the LM or the JE or any other staff had actually noticed the misuse of my connection for construction of Banquet Hall, why the matter was not brought on record and why the case of unauthorized use or sale of power had not been booked. It is only an afterthought just to make their point and to justify their wrong billing
- ii) The Banquet Hall in question, which has been referred to by the DHBVN as also by the Ld. CGRF does not belong to me. The Banquet Hall has been constructed by M/S TG Banquet LLP, Sector 64, village Medawas, Gurugram

which is partnership firm with many partners. Also, that the developer M/S TG Banquet LLP formally issued contract to a construction company to construct the Banquet Hall wherein to arrange electricity for construction purpose was the sole responsibility of the contractor through their own DG sets without any connection from the local distribution company.

- iii) Under the above facts, to presume that my connection was used for construction of the Banquet Hall is totally incorrect and without any basis.
- iv) In light of the facts explained above, it is submitted that DHBVN has failed to accept that their meter actually got defective or jumped and that to justify their wrong billing, they have come up with excuses like the connection was used for construction of Banquet Hall. Therefore, the Ld. CGRF order dated 12.02.2026 is totally based upon presumptions and false reporting by DHBVN and is thus liable to be set aside by your hon'ble Court.

PRAYER

In view of the foregoing, it is most humbly prayed that:

- (i) That the present application / complaint may kindly be allowed and impugned order dated 12.02.2026 passed by the Ld. CGRF Gurugram may be set aside
- (ii) That the complaint be accepted and the respondents be directed to overhaul the bills of petitioner based upon the factual consumption available on record before and after the meter defect / jump as per instructions of the Nigam
- (iii) To withdraw the amount of Rs. 5,95,788/- which has been put in the bill on defective meter and its reading
- (iv) That till such time the bills get corrected, the respondents may be directed not to disconnect the supply on the basis of non-payment of incorrect bills.

- L.** The present appeal was heard on 30.07.2026 through Video Conferencing. Both the parties were present during the hearing. At the commencement of the hearing, the Appellant informed that the rejoinder, as undertaken on the previous date of hearing, would be filed during the course of the day. The counsel for the Respondents expressed concern that repeated extensions for filing the rejoinder could lead to indefinite prolongation of the proceedings.

The Forum noted that, pursuant to the directions issued vide earlier interim orders (particularly those dated 20.05.2026, 08.06.2026 and 30.06.2026), the necessary technical exercise has already been independently carried out. The M&P Wing of DHBVN has examined the load survey data, tamper events (including prolonged Missing Potential events), and event logs of Meter Serial No. 8299610 (Make: Landis+Gyr). The complete meter data (including .2ng/.fng files and PDF reports) was also shared with the manufacturer, M/s Landis+Gyr. The firm has since furnished its response stating, *inter alia*, that the recorded parameters, captured values and event logs were found to be normal and consistent with expected meter

operation; that the meter was tested under single-phase and three-phase supply conditions and no malfunction was detected; and that the accuracy of the meter was verified and found within the defined acceptable limits. The firm further informed that the meter is an old-supply meter not covered under warranty and that, in view of the closure of its manufacturing plant, further service or detailed technical support is not available.

After a brief pause sought by the counsel for the Appellant, the hearing resumed. The counsel for the Appellant submitted that a detailed technical rejoinder had been prepared and would be shared with the Forum and the Respondents within 20–30 minutes. The counsel for the Respondents objected, contending that the request at this advanced stage appeared calculated to further delay the matter, that the Forum had already obtained independent reports from the M&P Wing and the manufacturer, and that granting further time would prejudice the Respondents by leaving them with inadequate opportunity to respond.

Having regard to the principles of natural justice and the need to ensure that both parties are afforded a fair opportunity to place their respective cases on record, the Forum considered it appropriate to take the rejoinder of the Appellant on record. At the same time, the Forum is constrained to observe that the repeated inability of the Appellant and his counsel to file the rejoinder within the timelines earlier fixed has contributed to avoidable delay in the disposal of the appeal. Such conduct is not conducive to the efficient functioning of a quasi-judicial forum constituted under the Electricity Act, 2003, and is viewed with disapproval.

In the interest of justice and with a view to bringing the matter to a logical conclusion without further protraction, the following directions are issued:

(A) To the Appellant: The rejoinder, as undertaken to be filed today, shall be placed on record forthwith, with a copy simultaneously served upon the Respondents.

(B) To the Respondents (DHBVN): The Respondents shall file their reply/comments to the rejoinder of the Appellant on or before 08.08.2026, with a copy served simultaneously upon the Appellant. No further extension shall be granted.

It is made clear that, save and except the reply of the Respondents to the Appellant's rejoinder as directed above, no further pleadings, documents or submissions from either side shall be entertained. The matter has already suffered delay attributable, in substantial measure, to the Appellant's side. The case shall be decided on the basis of the material already on record, the rejoinder now being filed, and the reply of the Respondents thereto.

The decision in the appeal is reserved. The final order shall be pronounced after consideration of the rejoinder and the Respondents' reply, in accordance with law.

Both parties are directed to ensure strict compliance with the above directions. Failure to adhere to the timeline fixed for the Respondents' reply shall not further delay the pronouncement of the final order.

This order is passed in the interest of justice, to balance the right of the Appellant to place his detailed submissions on record with the equally important requirement of expeditious and fair disposal of the appeal.

- M.** No subsequent reply was received from the respondent upto 11.08.2026 thus this forum considered the facts placed on file itself to arrive to decision in the matter.

Decision

1. Factual Background

- 1.1 The present appeal arises out of the order dated 12.02.2026 passed by the Corporate Grievance Redressal Forum, DHBVN, Gurugram in Case No. 4972/2025, whereby the complaint of the Appellant challenging the electricity bill amounting to ₹5,95,788/- (pertaining to the period 24.10.2023 to 09.10.2025) raised against Consumer Account No. 8569612070 (NDS category) was rejected.
- 1.2 The core grievance of the Appellant is that the Landis+Gyr make 3-Phase Whole Current Meter Bearing Serial No. 8299610 recorded an abnormally high consumption of 95,336 units during the disputed period, resulting in an inflated demand. The Appellant contends that the sanctioned load is only 10 kW, that historical consumption was consistently low (average approximately 7.64 units per day in the preceding period), and that the meter was erratic/defective. Reliance is also placed on the checking report vide LL-1 No. 25/26373 dated 09.09.2025 (wherein MDI is stated not to have been recorded) and on the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission's Suo Motu Order dated 12.12.2022 in Case No. HERC/PRO-69 of 2020, which had expressed serious concerns regarding supply of inferior quality meters by certain manufacturers, including M/s Landis+Gyr.
- 1.3 The Respondents maintain that the meter accuracy was verified and found within permissible limits, that the recorded consumption is commensurate with the load drawn, and that no manufacturing defect, tampering, or malfunction attributable to the meter is established.

2. Proceedings before this Forum

- 2.1 The appeal was registered on 20.04.2026. Interim orders were passed on 20.05.2026, 08.06.2026, 30.06.2026, 16.07.2026 and 30.07.2026, directing the Respondents to place on record complete meter data (including load survey, tamper events and event logs), .fng/.2ng files, technical analysis by the M&P wing, and an independent analysis by the manufacturer M/s Landis+Gyr. The Appellant was directed to deposit 40% of the disputed amount in terms of Regulation 3.18(iii) of the Haryana Electricity Ombudsman Regulations, 2020 (as amended).
- 2.2 In compliance, the Executive Engineer/M&P Division, DHBVN, Gurugram submitted detailed reports (including Memo Nos. Ch-137/Sohna Division/DRG-4 dated 02.06.2026, Ch-144/Sohna Division/DRG-4 dated 26.06.2026, Ch-155/Sohna Division/DRG-4 dated 24.07.2026 and Ch-160/Sohna Division/DRG-

4 dated 29.07.2026). Complete meter data, load survey reports, tamper reports and event logs were placed on record. The raw data was also forwarded to the authorised representative of M/s Landis+Gyr for independent technical analysis.

- 2.3 M/s Landis+Gyr examined the downloaded data using internal diagnostic tools, powered and monitored the meter under single-phase and three-phase supply conditions, and verified accuracy. Their findings were communicated to the Respondents and placed before this Forum.
- 2.4 Both parties were afforded repeated opportunities to file replies, rejoinders and additional submissions. The Appellant's counsel advanced calculations and arguments questioning the meter's accuracy. The Respondents relied upon the concurrent findings of the M&T Lab, the M&P wing and the manufacturer.

3. Analysis and Findings

- 3.1 This Forum has carefully examined the entire record, including the CGRF order, the load survey data, tamper reports, event logs, instantaneous parameters, billing history, name-plate particulars, the reports of the Executive Engineer/M&P, Gurugram, and the independent analysis furnished by M/s Landis+Gyr.
- 3.2 The meter in question (Serial No. 8299610, Make: Landis+Gyr, Model E250-WCM, 3P-4W, Current Rating 3×10-60 A, Year of Manufacture 2018, Firmware Version 400) was subjected to detailed scrutiny. The M&T Lab, Gurugram reported that:
- (a) energy consumption recorded by the meter was commensurate with the load drawn during the relevant period;
 - (b) no abnormality suggestive of meter malfunction is evident from the load survey, tamper and event log records for the disputed period 24.10.2023 to 09.10.2025;
 - (c) accuracy of the meter, when re-checked, was within permissible limits prescribed under the applicable standards; and (d) the meter does not belong to the category/lot of meters referred to in the HERC Suo Motu Order dated 12.12.2022.
- 3.3 The independent analysis by M/s Landis+Gyr confirms that all recorded parameters, captured values and event logs are normal and consistent with expected meter operation. The meter, when powered and monitored under both single-phase and three-phase conditions, operated as expected with no malfunction detected. Accuracy verification showed all measured error values within defined acceptable limits. The manufacturer has, however, clarified that the meter is an old-supply meter, out of warranty, that their manufacturing plant has been closed, and that further service, repair or technical support cannot be extended.
- 3.4 The high number of recorded tamper events (including Missing Potential, CT Open, Power Off, Neutral Disturbance, etc.) has been examined. Concurrent findings of

the M&P wing and the manufacturer establish that these events are consistent with the operational environment and do not indicate any inherent defect rendering the energy registration unreliable. Load survey data further corroborates that energy registration corresponded to the prevailing load conditions.

- 3.5 The Appellant's calculations and contentions questioning accuracy, though earnestly advanced, stand superseded by the concurrent technical findings of the M&T Lab, the M&P wing of DHBVN and the independent manufacturer analysis. No material has been placed on record to establish that the meter formed part of any defective lot identified in the HERC Suo Motu proceedings or that any manufacturing defect or systematic malfunction existed during the disputed period.
- 3.6 Under the Electricity Act, 2003 and the Haryana Electricity Supply Code (as amended from time to time), the burden of proving meter defectiveness, once accuracy has been verified within permissible limits and supporting diagnostic data is consistent as has been observed from report of M&P wing, M&T lab and last from the report of manufacturer i.e. Landis+Gyr, rests upon the consumer. In the present case, that burden has not been discharged.
- 3.7 The Appellant has submitted that the entire bill amount (as determined under the CGRF order) has been deposited. The Respondents are directed to verify the same from their records.

4. Order

- 4.1 In view of the foregoing analysis, this Forum holds that the Landis+Gyr meter Serial No. 8299610 correctly recorded the energy consumption during the relevant period. The demand raised on the basis of the recorded consumption does not suffer from any infirmity attributable to meter malfunction.
- 4.2 The appeal is accordingly dismissed. The order of the CGRF, DHBVN, Gurugram dated 12.02.2026 in Case No. 4972/2025 is upheld.
- 4.3 Since the manufacturer has categorically stated that the meter is out of warranty and no further support is available, the Respondents shall, within thirty days from the date of this order, remove the existing meter (Serial No. 8299610) and install a new meter of appropriate capacity at the Appellant's premises in accordance with the applicable Supply Code and departmental instructions. The removed meter shall be preserved for a reasonable period should any further reference become necessary.
- 4.4 The deposit already made by the Appellant shall be adjusted against the outstanding dues. Any excess or shortfall shall be settled in accordance with law.
- 4.5 This Forum places on record its appreciation of the detailed technical analysis carried out by the Executive Engineer/M&P Division, DHBVN, Gurugram and the

cooperation extended by M/s Landis+Gyr in furnishing an independent assessment..

The instant appeal is disposed of accordingly.

Both the parties to bear their own costs. File may be consigned to record.

Given under my hand on 12th August 2026.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Kumar Khanna)

Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana

Dated:12.08.2026

CC:

Memo No.1912-1921/HERC/Appeal No. 12/2026

Dated: 13.08.2026

To

1. Shri Sanjay Tyagi, Medawas, Sec-64, Gurugram, Haryana (Email sanjaytyagi222@gmail.com)
2. The Managing Director, DHBVN, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar, Haryana – 125005 (Email md@dhbvn.org.in).
3. Legal Remembrancer, Haryana Power Utilities, Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6, Panchkula, Haryana - 134109 (Email lr@hvpn.org.in).
4. The Chief Engineer Operation, DHBVN, Shakur Basti, Opposite Punjab Bagh Power Substation, Rohtak Road, Delhi - 110035 (Email ceopdelhi@dhbvn.org.in).
5. The SE/OP, Circle, Gurugram-II, DHBVN, Gurugram HVPNL Complex, Near Police Line, Mehrauli Road, Gurugram-122001 (Email seop2gurugram@dhbvn.org.in)
6. Superintending Engineer, M&P Circle, Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar, Haryana-125005 (Email: semp@dhbvn.org.in).
7. The XEN/OP, Divn., Badshahpur, DHBVN, Sohna Road, Power Colony, Sector-68, Gurugram, Haryana - 122101 (Email xenopbadshahpur@dhbvn.org.in)
8. Executive Engineer, M&P Division, Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited, Mehrauli-Gurgaon Road (Opposite Sector-14), Gurugram, Haryana – 122001. (Email xenmpggn@dhbvn.org.in)
9. SDO/OP, Sub Division, Badshahpur, DHBVN, Badshahpur Sohna Road, Power Colony, Sector-68, Gurugram, Haryana - 122101 (Email sdoopbadshahpur@dhbvn.org.in)