BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN
(For the State of Goa and Union Territories)
Under Section 42 (6) of the Electricity Act, 2003

3rd Floor, Plot No. 55-56, Udyog Vihar - Phase IV, Sector 18
Gurugram (Haryana) 122015,
Email ID: ombudsman.jercuts@gov.in
Phone No.:0124-4684708

Appeal No-267 of 2026

Date of Hearing: 13.07.2026, 20.07.2026, 27.07.2026
Mode: Videoconferencing
Date of Order: 28.07.2026

In the matter of
Mr. Harpal Singh,
SCO 701, Manimajra,
Chandigarh. ...Appellant

Versus

Executive Engineer,
CPDL, 'OP' Division-2,
Industrial Area Phase-II
Chandigarh. ...Respondent(s)

In the matter of Mr. Harpal Singh Versus Executive Engineer, CPDL, Chandigarh.

Present:

Appellant

1. Ld. Adv. Mr. Rohan Sachdev for Appellant Mr Harpal Singh.

Respondent(s)

1. Mr. Balbir Singh, Circle Head-II, CPDL Chandigarh,
2. Mr. Dhruv Shakuntlam, Sr. Executive Legal, CPDL Chandigarh
3. Mr. Chandan Dhar, Manager (Meters), CPDL, Chandigarh

ORDER

The present representation was filed on 20.06.2026 under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 35 and 36 of the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2024, (hereinafter referred to as the "JERC CGRF & Ombudsman Regulations, 2024"), challenging the order dated 17.03.2026 passed by the Learned Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as the "CGRF") in Case No.H-16/26 and other order dated 15.06.2026 whereby the Review Petition preferred by the Appellant came to be dismissed.

Upon scrutiny, and being satisfied that the representation fulfilled the requirements prescribed under the Regulations, the same was admitted and notice was issued on 23.06.2026. A copy of the representation was forwarded to the Respondent–Executive Engineer, CPDL, 'OP' Division-2, Industrial Area Phase-II Chandigarh calling upon them to submit their reply/comments.

The Executive Engineer, CPDL, 'OP' Division-2, Industrial Area Phase-II, Chandigarh. vide Email dated 17.07.2026 has filed the comments/ reply to the petition filed by the Appellant which is taken on record along with Load survey data, meter reading data, meter event log, inspection report and other supporting documents.

The Representation has been filed seeking setting aside of the aforesaid orders and the consequential short assessment raised by the Respondent Distribution Licensee on account of the alleged slow recording of the LTCT metering arrangement. The Appellant has prayed for appropriate reliefs, including quashing of the impugned assessment and such other consequential directions as this Authority may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

Since the Representation was not filed within the period prescribed under Regulation 36 of the JERC CGRF & Ombudsman Regulations, 2024, the Appellant has also filed an application seeking condonation of a delay of 18 days under Regulation 36(f) of the said Regulations. As the maintainability of the Representation depended upon the outcome of the said application, the same was taken up for consideration at the threshold before proceeding to examine the merits of the controversy.

Upon admission of the Representation, this Authority heard the learned representatives of both parties, called for the relevant technical and documentary records forming the basis of the impugned assessment, afforded adequate opportunity to the parties to place their respective pleadings and evidence on record and, thereafter, proceeded to hear the matter finally. The Representation is now being decided by this Authority by this common order.

A. APPLICATION FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY

Before adverting to the merits of the Representation, it is necessary to consider the Appellant's application seeking condonation of delay in filing the present Representation. The record reveals that the Learned Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Chandigarh (CGRF) passed the impugned final order on 17.03.2026, which was admittedly received by the Appellant on 20.03.2026. Instead of immediately invoking the appellate jurisdiction of this Authority, the Appellant elected to pursue the remedy of review before the Learned CGRF by filing a Review Petition challenging the said order. The Review Petition, however, came to be dismissed vide order dated 15.06.2026 on the ground that it had been filed beyond the prescribed period of limitation.

Thereafter, the Appellant instituted the present Representation challenging both the order dated 17.03.2026 passed by the Learned CGRF and the Review Order dated 15.06.2026, accompanied by an application under Regulation 36(f) of the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2024 seeking condonation of a delay of 18 days in filing the Representation.

Learned Counsel appearing for the Appellant submitted that the delay was neither deliberate nor intentional but occurred on account of bona fide circumstances. It was contended that, after receipt of the impugned order, the Appellant, acting on legal advice, bona fide pursued the remedy of review before the Learned CGRF with a genuine expectation that the grievance would be redressed at that stage. It was further submitted that some time was also consumed in collecting, verifying and compiling the relevant documents required for filing the present Representation and that the initial delay was, to some extent, occasioned due to the ill-health of the conducting counsel. Learned Counsel submitted that the delay is minimal, fully explained and deserves to be condoned in the interest of substantial justice. In support of the application, reliance was also placed upon certain judicial precedents governing the principles relating to condonation of delay.

The Respondent was afforded adequate opportunity to respond to the application seeking condonation of delay. While opposing the Representation on merits, no material was placed before this Authority to establish that the delay was deliberate, mala fide or attributable to any negligence on the part of the Appellant. Equally, no specific prejudice was shown to have been caused to the Respondent if the delay were to be condoned.

This Authority has carefully considered the application, the submissions advanced by the learned representatives of the parties and the material available on record.

Regulation 36(f) of the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2024 empowers the Ombudsman to entertain a Representation beyond the prescribed period of limitation upon being satisfied that sufficient cause has been shown for not preferring the Representation within the stipulated period.

In the present case, the delay involved is only 18 days. The explanation furnished by the Appellant indicates that, after receipt of the impugned order, the Appellant bona fide pursued the remedy of review before the Learned CGRF before approaching this Authority. The explanation further discloses that reasonable time was consumed in collecting and verifying the relevant records and documents necessary for filing the present Representation. There is nothing on record to indicate that the delay was deliberate, intentional or actuated by any mala fide consideration. On the contrary, the explanation appears to be bona fide and plausible.

This Authority further finds that the Respondent has failed to demonstrate any prejudice that would be occasioned by condonation of the delay. Refusal to condone a short delay of 18 days would have the effect of denying the Appellant an opportunity to have the dispute examined on its merits, whereas condonation of such delay would merely enable adjudication of the controversy in accordance with law. The discretionary power vested in this Authority under Regulation 36(f) is intended to advance the cause of substantial justice where sufficient cause has been satisfactorily established.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Authority is satisfied that the Appellant has shown sufficient cause within the meaning of Regulation 36(f) of the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2024 for not preferring the Representation within the prescribed period. The explanation offered is reasonable, bona fide and deserves acceptance.

Accordingly, the application seeking condonation of delay is allowed. The delay of 18 (eighteen) days in filing the present Representation is hereby condoned.

Consequently, the present Representation is held to be maintainable and is taken up for adjudication on merits.

B. SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Appellant assailed the impugned orders dated 17.03.2026 and 15.06.2026 primarily on the grounds that the Respondent Distribution Licensee has raised an arbitrary and legally unsustainable short assessment without establishing the factual and legal basis thereof. The principal submissions advanced on behalf of the Appellant are summarised hereunder:

Learned Counsel submitted that the inspection of the Appellant's premises conducted on 18.11.2025 was undertaken without any prior intimation to the Appellant. It was contended that after completion of the inspection, the inspecting officials merely informed the Appellant that the installed LTCT metering arrangement was recording consumption 28.51% slow on account of the R-Phase Current Transformer (CT) not functioning.

It was further submitted that the Appellant's representative had declined to sign the inspection report dated 18.11.2025 as the findings recorded therein were disputed. According to the Appellant, the inspection and the consequential proceedings do not inspire confidence and, therefore, cannot constitute a valid basis for raising the impugned assessment.

Learned Counsel submitted that on the basis of the aforesaid inspection, the Respondent initially raised a short assessment of Rs.2,89,931/-, which was subsequently revised to Rs.2,24,707/-. It was contended that the assessment has been raised mechanically without proper appreciation of the applicable statutory provisions and the relevant facts of the case. It was further argued that the Respondent has failed to establish the legal and technical basis for determining both the assessment period and the quantum of the alleged short billing. According to the Appellant, the assessment lacks adequate evidentiary support and is therefore liable to be set aside.

Learned Counsel submitted that the technical records, including the meter event logs, load survey data and other electronic records relied upon by the Respondent, were furnished to the Appellant only during the proceedings before this Authority. Consequently, the Appellant did not have an adequate opportunity to examine or analyse the said records at the stage when the assessment was made or during the proceedings before the Learned CGRF.

It was further submitted that the technical data supplied by the Respondent required expert explanation and interpretation. Accordingly, the Appellant requested this Authority to direct the Respondent Distribution Licensee to explain the meter event logs, load survey data and other technical records to enable the Appellant to effectively examine the correctness of the Respondent's conclusions.

Learned Counsel contended that the Learned CGRF failed to properly appreciate the factual and technical issues arising in the matter while affirming the Respondent's action. It was submitted that the findings recorded by the Learned CGRF are contrary to the material available on record and do not adequately deal with the objections raised by the Appellant regarding the inspection, the technical evidence and the consequential assessment.

On the aforesaid grounds, Learned Counsel prayed that the impugned order dated 17.03.2026 passed by the Learned Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Chandigarh and the Review Order dated 15.06.2026 be set aside. A further prayer was made for quashing the consequential short assessment raised by the Respondent Distribution Licensee together with all consequential demands and for grant of such other reliefs as this Authority may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

C. SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT

Shri Balbir Singh, Circle Head-II, Authorised Representative appearing on behalf of the Respondent Distribution Licensee, assisted by Mr. Chandan Dhar, Manager (Meters), and Mr. Dhruv Shakuntlam, Sr. Executive (Legal), opposed the Representation and supported the impugned orders passed by the Learned Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Chandigarh. The principal submissions advanced on behalf of the Respondent are summarised hereunder:

The Respondent submitted that the Learned CGRF, vide its order dated 17.03.2026, had directed the Distribution Licensee to restrict the retrospective short assessment to a maximum period of six months. It was contended that the said direction has been fully complied with by issuing a revised assessment dated 07.04.2026, restricting the assessment period from 03.06.2025 to 02.12.2025 and revising the assessed amount to Rs.2,08,717/-. According to the Respondent, the grievance of the Appellant already stands substantially redressed and, therefore, the present Representation is devoid of merit.

Learned Authorised Representative submitted that the electricity connection bearing Account No. 208/MA42/007010X is a commercial LTCT connection having a sanctioned load of 89.250 kW. The metering arrangement comprised a Secure make LTCT meter with external Current Transformers (CTs).

It was submitted that during a periodic inspection conducted on 18.11.2025, the metering arrangement was tested through a NABL-accredited mobile testing laboratory. According to the Respondent, the inspection and testing established that the R-phase external Current Transformer had become faulty, resulting in the meter recording approximately 28.51% less energy than the actual consumption. It was pointed out that while the line current in the R-phase was recorded at 12.25 Amperes, the secondary CT current and the corresponding meter display indicated 0.00 Amperes, thereby demonstrating under-recording of consumption.

The Respondent further submitted that the faulty Current Transformer was replaced on 02.12.2025, whereafter the account of the consumer was overhauled in accordance with the provisions of the Supply Code, 2018.

The Respondent denied the Appellant's allegation that the inspection proceedings were conducted behind his back or in violation of the prescribed procedure. It was submitted that the inspection was carried out in the presence of the Appellant and/or his authorised representative and that the inspection report as well as the meter testing report were prepared at the site. According to the Respondent, although the Appellant declined to sign the inspection documents, such refusal cannot invalidate the inspection or the technical findings recorded during the testing.

It was further submitted that the Distribution Licensee was fully empowered under Regulations 6.32, 6.34 and other relevant provisions of the Supply Code, 2018 to undertake periodic inspection and testing of the metering arrangement. According to the Respondent, no prior notice to the consumer was required for carrying out such statutory inspections, particularly where the objective was to verify the accuracy of the metering system.

Learned Authorised Representative submitted that the short assessment was raised strictly in accordance with Regulation 6.39 of the Supply Code, 2018 after the metering arrangement was found to be recording 28.51% slow. It was contended that the initial assessment of Rs.2,89,931/- was reconsidered upon the representation submitted by the Appellant and was subsequently revised to Rs.2,24,707/-. Thereafter, in compliance with the directions of the Learned CGRF, the assessment was further restricted to the statutory period of six months and recalculated at Rs.2,08,717/-.

The Respondent submitted that Regulation 6.39 permits retrospective billing adjustments for a maximum period of six months preceding detection of the defect. According to the Respondent, once the metering arrangement was scientifically established to be recording less consumption, the Distribution Licensee was under a statutory obligation to recover the charges corresponding to the unrecorded energy in accordance with the methodology prescribed under the Supply Code, 2018.

The Respondent further contended that the interpretation sought to be placed by the Appellant upon the expression "or from the date of last testing, whichever is later" is erroneous and contrary to the object of Regulation 6.39. It was submitted that acceptance of the Appellant's interpretation would defeat the statutory scheme governing retrospective adjustment in cases where the metering arrangement is subsequently found to be recording less consumption than the actual energy supplied.

The Respondent denied that the impugned assessment had been raised without affording an opportunity of hearing to the Appellant. It was submitted that after issuance of the initial assessment, the Appellant submitted a representation seeking waiver of the charges, which was duly considered by the Distribution Licensee. Upon such consideration, the assessment amount was reduced from Rs.2,89,931/- to Rs.2,24,707/-. According to the Respondent, the said exercise demonstrates that the Appellant's objections were duly considered before the assessment attained finality.

Learned Authorised Representative further submitted that both the Learned CGRF and the Distribution Licensee have correctly applied the provisions of Regulation 6.39 of the Supply Code, 2018 and have acted consistently with the principles laid down by this Authority in Appeal No. 255 of 2025 (Upjeet Singh v. Chandigarh Power Distribution Limited) while restricting the retrospective assessment to six months.

On the basis of the aforesaid submissions, the Respondent prayed that the Representation be dismissed, the orders dated 17.03.2026 and 15.06.2026 passed by the Learned Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Chandigarh be upheld, and the revised short assessment issued by the Distribution Licensee pursuant to the said orders be sustained.

D. Rejoinder to the Respondent's Reply

In rejoinder to the written reply filed by the Respondent Distribution Licensee, Learned Counsel for the Appellant denied the allegations and contentions raised therein and reiterated that the impugned assessment, as well as the orders passed by the Learned CGRF, are contrary to the provisions of the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission for the State of Goa and Union Territories (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2018 (hereinafter referred to as the "Supply Code, 2018"), besides being violative of the principles of natural justice.

Learned Counsel submitted that the present Representation is directed against the legality and correctness of the impugned orders and the consequential short assessment, and not against the implementation of the said orders by the Respondent. It was contended that the grievance of the Appellant does not stand redressed merely because the Respondent claims to have complied with the impugned orders.

Referring to the inspection conducted on 18.11.2025, Learned Counsel reiterated that no prior notice of inspection was served upon the Appellant; that the inspection, including unsealing and testing of the meter and Current Transformers (CTs), was allegedly carried out in the absence of the Appellant or his authorised representative; that no meter particulars sheet or complete test records were furnished to the Appellant; and that no effective opportunity of hearing was afforded before raising the impugned short assessment. It was further submitted that the Appellant had refused to sign the inspection report and meter testing report, thereby disputing the inspection proceedings as well as the alleged finding that the metering arrangement was recording 28.51% slow.

Learned Counsel further contended that the Respondent has erroneously invoked Regulation 6.39 of the Supply Code, 2018. According to the Appellant, the applicability of the said Regulation presupposes acceptance of the testing results by the consumer. Since the Appellant had disputed the inspection, the testing procedure and the alleged findings from the very inception, it was argued that the Respondent could not have mechanically invoked Regulation 6.39 for raising the impugned assessment.

Without prejudice to the aforesaid contention, Learned Counsel submitted that even assuming Regulation 6.39 to be applicable, the Respondent has misconstrued the expression "for a maximum period of six months or from the date of last testing, whichever is later." It was argued that the Respondent has treated the maximum retrospective period of six months as an automatic or mandatory assessment period without examining the date of the last testing or the actual commencement of the alleged defect. According to the Appellant, such an interpretation renders the latter part of Regulation 6.39 otiose and defeats the legislative intent underlying the provision.

Learned Counsel further submitted that the Respondent's reliance upon Regulations 6.32 and 6.34 of the Supply Code, 2018 is misplaced. It was contended that while the Distribution Licensee is empowered to undertake inspection and testing of metering equipment, the exercise of such power does not dispense with the obligation to observe procedural fairness. It was argued that the Respondent was required to provide prior notice of inspection, ensure transparency during the testing process, furnish the relevant technical records to the consumer and grant an effective opportunity of hearing before determining any consequential liability.

Learned Counsel also relied upon the provisions of Regulations 6.18, 6.19 and 6.31 of the Supply Code, 2018 to contend that the responsibility for installation, maintenance, testing and ensuring the accuracy of the metering system rests upon the Distribution Licensee. It was therefore argued that the Respondent cannot shift the consequences of its own failure to maintain the metering arrangement onto the Appellant without strictly complying with the statutory procedure prescribed under the Supply Code, 2018.

Learned Counsel further submitted that the mere revision of the assessment amount from Rs.2,89,931/- to Rs.2,24,707/- does not cure the procedural infirmities or amount to compliance with the principles of natural justice. According to the Appellant, no effective opportunity of hearing was granted before determination of the alleged liability, and the objections raised by the Appellant regarding the inspection, testing procedure and computation of the assessment were never properly considered either by the Respondent or by the Learned CGRF.

On the aforesaid grounds, Learned Counsel prayed that the contentions raised by the Respondent Distribution Licensee be rejected and that the Representation be allowed by setting aside the impugned orders dated 17.03.2026 and 15.06.2026, together with the consequential short assessment raised against the Appellant.

E. Proceedings

Upon presentation of the Appeal/Representation, the matter was taken up for hearing through video conferencing on 13.07.2026. Mr. Rohan Sachdev, Learned Counsel appeared on behalf of the Appellant, while Shri Balbir Singh, Circle Head-II, Authorised Representative appeared on behalf of the Respondent Distribution Licensee.

At the outset, the Learned Counsel for the Appellant pressed the application filed under Regulation 36(f) of the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2024 seeking condonation of delay of eighteen (18) days in filing the present Appeal/Representation. After hearing the learned representatives of both parties and considering the explanation furnished by the Appellant, this Authority was satisfied that sufficient cause had been shown for not preferring the Appeal/Representation within the prescribed period. Accordingly, the delay of eighteen (18) days was condoned and the Appeal/Representation was admitted for consideration on merits.

Thereafter, Learned Counsel for the Appellant advanced submissions challenging the inspection conducted by the Respondent Distribution Licensee on 18.11.2025, the consequent short assessment raised against the Appellant and the orders passed by the Learned Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum. The Respondent, on the other hand, justified the inspection proceedings, the technical findings recorded during meter testing and the consequential assessment.

Having regard to the technical nature of the controversy, this Authority considered it necessary to call for the complete technical records forming the basis of the impugned assessment. Accordingly, the Respondent Distribution Licensee was directed to produce, inter alia, the meter reading history for the preceding two years, complete meter download data and event logs, details of the metering arrangement, meter and Current Transformer (CT) replacement records, installation and sealing reports, meter testing reports, laboratory reports, inspection reports and all other technical documents relied upon in support of the impugned assessment. The Respondent was further directed to produce all such records in complete, legible and duly authenticated form. The matter was thereafter adjourned to 20.07.2026 for further proceedings.

Pursuant to the aforesaid directions, the Respondent Distribution Licensee filed its written reply vide email dated 17.07.2026, enclosing therewith the load survey data, meter reading details, meter event logs, inspection reports and other supporting technical records. The reply and accompanying documents were taken on record. The Appellant also filed a rejoinder vide email dated 20.07.2026, which was likewise taken on record.

When the matter was taken up for hearing on 20.07.2026, Mr. Rohan Sachdev, Learned Counsel appeared on behalf of the Appellant. Shri Balbir Singh, Circle Head-II, Authorised Representative appeared on behalf of the Respondent Distribution Licensee along with Mr. Chandan Dhar, Manager (Meters), and Mr. Dhruv Shakuntlam, Sr. Executive (Legal), CPDL.

During the course of hearing, the Respondent explained the basis of the impugned assessment and submitted that the short assessment had been computed for the period from 02.06.2025 to 02.12.2025 on account of the metering arrangement having recorded consumption 28.51% slow, and that the terminal date of assessment had been taken as 02.12.2025, being the date on which the faulty Current Transformers (CTs) were replaced. The Respondent further referred to the meter event log and load survey data and submitted that the technical records indicated that the current in one phase had remained continuously at zero with effect from 20.09.2025.

In response, Learned Counsel for the Appellant submitted that the technical records had been supplied only on 17.07.2026 and that sufficient opportunity had not been available to examine and analyse the same. It was further submitted that technical assistance from the officers of the Distribution Licensee would be necessary to enable the Appellant to properly understand the load survey data, meter event logs and other technical records relied upon by the Respondent. Learned Counsel also expressed willingness to explore the possibility of an amicable resolution of the dispute after understanding the technical data.

Considering the nature of the dispute and with a view to facilitating a proper appreciation of the technical records as well as encouraging an amicable resolution of the grievance, this Authority directed the Executive Engineer of the Respondent Distribution Licensee to arrange a meeting in his office with the Learned Counsel for the Appellant or his duly authorised representative on or before 24.07.2026. The concerned technical officers were directed to explain the load survey data; meter event logs and other technical records relied upon by the Respondent and both parties were requested to make sincere efforts to resolve the dispute through mutual discussions. The matter was accordingly listed for further proceedings on 27.07.2026.

Pursuant to the aforesaid directions, the parties held a meeting on 22.07.2026 at the office of the Executive Engineer, Operation Division No. II, Chandigarh Power Distribution Limited. During the said meeting, the technical records were discussed in detail and negotiations were held between the parties. As a result thereof, the parties arrived at an amicable settlement of the dispute and reduced the agreed terms into writing for being placed before this Authority.

When the matter was taken up on 27.07.2026, the learned representatives of both parties jointly submitted that the dispute had been amicably resolved pursuant to the discussions held on 22.07.2026. The parties affirmed that the settlement had been arrived at voluntarily, without any coercion, undue influence or misrepresentation, and jointly prayed that the present Appeal/Representation be disposed of in terms of the mutually agreed settlement.

F. Settlement and Findings

The matter was taken up for final hearing through video conferencing on 27.07.2026. Mr. Rohan Sachdev, Learned Counsel appeared on behalf of the Appellant. Shri Balbir Singh, Circle Head-II, Authorised Representative appeared on behalf of the Respondent Distribution Licensee CPDL.

At the outset, the learned representatives of both parties submitted that, pursuant to the directions issued by this Authority during the hearing held on 20.07.2026, a meeting was convened on 22.07.2026 at the office of the Executive Engineer, Operation Division No. II, Chandigarh Power Distribution Limited. During the said meeting, the parties discussed the technical records forming the basis of the impugned assessment, deliberated upon their respective contentions and, after mutual discussions, arrived at an amicable settlement of the dispute.

The learned representatives jointly placed before this Authority the written terms of settlement executed between the parties and requested that the same be taken on record. Both parties unequivocally affirmed that the settlement had been arrived at voluntarily, out of their own free will and without any coercion, undue influence, fraud or misrepresentation. They further submitted that they had fully understood the terms of settlement, accepted the obligations arising therefrom and requested that the present Appeal/Representation be disposed of in terms thereof.

This Authority has carefully considered the settlement arrived at between the parties and has examined the terms thereof. The settlement has been arrived at after negotiations undertaken pursuant to the directions issued by this Authority and appears to be voluntary, fair and lawful. The agreed terms are not found to be contrary to any provision of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2024, the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2018 or any other applicable law. The settlement effectively resolves the dispute between the parties and, in the opinion of this Authority, deserves to be accepted.

The Ombudsman established under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003 is intended to provide an expeditious, effective and consumer-friendly forum for resolution of disputes.

Wherever the parties, after adequate opportunity and with full understanding of their respective rights and obligations, voluntarily resolve their dispute through mutual discussions, such settlement deserves due recognition, provided it is lawful and does not prejudice public interest. The present settlement satisfies these requirements.

In view of the voluntary settlement arrived at between the parties, this Authority considers that no useful purpose would be served by adjudicating upon the rival submissions advanced on the merits of the controversy, including the legality of the inspection, the interpretation and applicability of Regulation 6.39 of the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2018, the validity of the impugned short assessment or the correctness of the orders passed by the Learned Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum. Those questions no longer survive for determination in the present proceedings and are, therefore, left open without any expression of opinion on their merits.

Accordingly, the settlement entered into between the parties is accepted and shall form an integral part of this Order. The rights and obligations of the parties shall henceforth be governed by the terms of the said settlement, which shall be binding upon both parties.

G. Operative Order

In view of the foregoing discussion and having regard to the voluntary settlement arrived at between the parties, this Authority is satisfied that the dispute has been amicably resolved through mutual discussions pursuant to the proceedings conducted before this Authority. Since the settlement is voluntary, lawful and not opposed to any statutory provision or public policy, the same deserves to be accepted.

Accordingly, the Appeal/Representation is disposed of in terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties, which shall form an integral part of this Order. The agreed terms are recorded as under:

(i) In respect of the revised short assessment dated 07.04.2026 for an amount of Rs.2,08,717/-, it has been mutually agreed that the Appellant, Shri Harpal Singh, shall pay a sum of Rs.83,487/- to the Respondent Distribution Licensee, Chandigarh Power Distribution Limited (CPDL), on or before 31.07.2026.

(ii) In respect of the current electricity bill dated 14.07.2026 for an amount of Rs.3,81,875/- raised by the Respondent Distribution Licensee vide Memo No. 237, the Appellant shall pay a sum of Rs.1,90,938/- on or before 31.07.2026.

(iii) The balance amount of Rs.1,90,937/- pertaining to the aforesaid current bill dated 14.07.2026 shall be paid by the Appellant in three equal monthly instalments, the first instalment being payable on 31.08.2026, the second on 30.09.2026, and the third on 30.10.2026.

Both parties shall remain bound by the aforesaid settlement and shall faithfully comply with the terms and conditions mutually agreed between them.

In view of the settlement, this Authority has not considered it necessary to adjudicate upon the rival legal and factual contentions advanced by the parties on the merits of the dispute, and all such questions are left open.

It is made clear that the above settlement has been accepted by this Authority on the basis of the voluntary consent of both parties. In the event the Appellant fails to adhere to or commits any default in complying with the payment schedule or any of the terms of settlement recorded herein, it shall be open to the Respondent Distribution Licensee to approach this Authority by filing an appropriate application in the disposed of Appeal/Representation seeking such further directions or orders as may be considered necessary for implementation of the present Order and the settlement recorded herein, in accordance with law.

Before parting with the matter, this Authority places on record its appreciation for the constructive approach adopted by both the Appellant and the Respondent Distribution Licensee in resolving the dispute through mutual discussions. The efforts made by the parties pursuant to the directions issued by this Authority have avoided prolonged litigation and are consistent with the objective of the consumer grievance redressal mechanism established under Section 42 of the Electricity Act, 2003, namely, expeditious, fair and effective resolution of consumer disputes.

The Appeal/Representation stands disposed of in the above terms. All pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

The Registry is directed to communicate a copy of this Order to the Appellant, the Respondent Distribution Licensee and the Learned Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Chandigarh, for information and necessary compliance.

28/7/26

(C M Sharma)

Dated: 28.07.2026. Ombudsman (JERC)