

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-291 of 2026

Date of Hearing: 10.09.2026 &
09.10.2026
Mode: Videoconferencing
Date of Order: 12.10.2026

In the matter of
Sh. Roop Chand,
House No. 470, Kaimbwala,
Chandigarh

...Appellant

Versus

Chandigarh Power Distribution Limited,
Through the Executive Engineer (Nodal Officer),
Electricity 'OP' Division No. 1, Chandigarh.

...Respondent(s)

**In the matter of Sh. Sandeep Bansal Versus Executive Engineer, 'OP' Div-1,
CPDL, Chandigarh**

Present:

Appellant

1. Mr. Roop Chand

Appellant in person

Respondent(s)

1. Mr. Sukhwinder Singh, Commercial Manager-1, Div-1, CPDL
2. Mr. Dhruv Shakuntlam, Sr. Executive Legal, CPDL, Chandigarh



ORDER

The present Appeal No. 291 of 2026 has been filed by **Shri Roop Chand, resident of House No. 470, Kaimbawala, Chandigarh**, 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, challenging the order dated 11.08.2026 passed by the Learned Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF), Chandigarh, in Complaint No. H-59/2026.

The dispute arises out of the Appellant's grievance regarding alleged excess billing of 1,200 units and miscellaneous charges in respect of his electricity connection, and the consequential demand for refund/adjustment of the excess amount allegedly collected, together with applicable interest. The Appellant has also sought litigation expenses and compensation for the alleged financial loss, inconvenience and harassment caused by the Respondent.

The Learned CGRF, vide its order dated 11.08.2026, directed the Respondent to overhaul the Appellant's electricity account for the period from **12.04.2025 to 13.04.2026**. The Learned CGRF also directed that no Late Payment Surcharge (LPSC) or delayed payment surcharge be levied for the period covered by the account overhaul to the extent such surcharge arose as a consequence of the revision of bills.

Aggrieved by the relief granted and alleging that the grievance had not been fully redressed, the Appellant approached this Authority. The representation was admitted upon scrutiny, and notice dated 18.08.2026 was issued to the Respondent. The Respondent, Chandigarh Power Distribution Ltd. (CPDL), filed its reply vide email dated 09.09.2026, asserting that the directions of the Learned CGRF had been complied with and that the necessary account revisions and consequential adjustments had been carried out.

The rival submissions, the consumption data furnished by the Respondent and the other material available on record have been considered for adjudication of the issues arising in the present appeal.

A. Submissions on Behalf of the Appellant

The Appellant submitted that the Respondent had issued an erroneous electricity bill in respect of the premises at House No. 470, Kaimbawala, Chandigarh, by charging an



excess consumption of 1,200 units along with miscellaneous charges. According to the Appellant, the billing was contrary to the applicable provisions of the JERC Electricity Supply Code, which require electricity bills to be based on actual meter consumption or duly authorised estimates in accordance with the prescribed procedure.

The Appellant further submitted that, despite bringing the alleged billing discrepancy to the notice of the concerned Sub-Division, no immediate rectification or adjustment was made. He contended that, in order to avoid Late Payment Surcharge, other consequential charges and the possibility of disconnection under Section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003, he was compelled to pay the disputed amount under protest by borrowing money on interest.

The Appellant contended that, where a consumer has been overcharged due to an error in billing, the excess amount collected is liable to be refunded or adjusted along with applicable interest in accordance with the relevant provisions of the JERC Electricity Supply Code. He alleged that the amount attributable to the excess billing of 1,200 units and the miscellaneous charges had not been refunded or appropriately adjusted, notwithstanding the proceedings before the Learned CGRF.

The Appellant also submitted that the prolonged provisional billing, failure to rectify the bills promptly and the necessity of pursuing the grievance before the consumer grievance redressal authorities had caused him financial hardship and inconvenience. He contended that the Learned CGRF, Chandigarh had not granted complete relief by failing to award litigation expenses and compensation for the alleged deficiency in service.

Accordingly, the Appellant prayed that the Respondent be directed to refund or credit-adjust the excess amount collected towards the alleged 1,200 units and miscellaneous charges; pay applicable interest on the excess amount from the date of payment until refund or adjustment; award litigation expenses of ₹10,000/- or such other amount as deemed appropriate; and grant suitable compensation for the alleged mental harassment, inconvenience, financial loss and administrative delay.

B. Submissions on Behalf of the Respondent

The Respondent, CPDL, opposed the appeal and submitted that the appeal filed by the Appellant was misconceived and devoid of merit, as the grievance adjudicated upon by the Learned CGRF, Chandigarh had already been addressed through revision of the Appellant's electricity account and consequential financial adjustments. The

Respondent contended that no surviving monetary or legal prejudice had been demonstrated by the Appellant to warrant further interference with the impugned order. The Respondent stated that the electricity connection bearing **CA No. 3000035788**, with Meter No. **CHIEP7556** and sanctioned load of **1.00 kW**, was installed at the subject premises. It submitted that the Appellant had approached its office on 30.03.2026 regarding discrepancies in the electricity bills, whereupon the matter was examined by the concerned officials.

The Respondent explained that provisional/average bills had been issued during the period from 12.04.2025 to 12.10.2025 and that the corresponding adjustments were subsequently carried out during the billing cycle from 12.10.2025 to 12.12.2025, resulting in a credit of ₹7,086/- in the Appellant's account. It further submitted that provisional/average bills issued during the period from 06.01.2026 to 12.03.2026 were subsequently adjusted during the billing cycle from 06.03.2026 to 13.04.2026, resulting in a further credit of ₹3,138/-.

The Respondent also stated that the regular electricity bill dated 19.06.2026, for the period from 07.05.2026 to 07.06.2026, was generated on the basis of actual meter readings and amounted to ₹2,096/-. According to the Respondent, the billing record was required to be considered as a whole, taking into account the provisional bills and subsequent reconciliations, rather than by examining individual billing cycles in isolation. With regard to the order dated 11.08.2026 passed by the Learned CGRF, the Respondent submitted that the Appellant's account had been overhauled for the directed period from 12.04.2025 to 13.04.2026, after considering the applicable tariff slabs and the relevant billing periods. It further contended that the LPSC/delayed payment surcharge, to the extent required to be reversed pursuant to the said order, had also been adjusted or refunded.

The Respondent relied upon its compliance report and the consumption data furnished in support of its contention that the account had been revised and the consequential adjustments incorporated. It denied any further deficiency in service and submitted that the Learned CGRF had passed its order after considering the material on record and affording the parties an opportunity of being heard.

On these grounds, the Respondent prayed that the appeal be dismissed and the order dated 11.08.2026 passed by the Learned CGRF, Chandigarh, be upheld.



C. Proceedings:

The present appeal was taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing on 10.09.2026. The Appellant challenged the order dated 11.08.2026 passed by the Learned Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF), Chandigarh, in Complaint No. H-59/2026, primarily on the ground that the relief granted in respect of the alleged excess billing and consequential adjustments was incomplete.

The Respondent, Chandigarh Power Distribution Ltd. (CPDL), filed its reply vide email dated 09.09.2026, which was taken on record. During the course of the hearing, it was considered necessary to obtain the relevant meter data pertaining to the subject electricity connection to facilitate proper examination of the consumption pattern and the billing dispute. Accordingly, the Respondent was directed to get the meter data downloaded and submit the same before this Authority latest by 14.09.2026. The matter was directed to be listed for further hearing upon receipt of the meter data.

Pursuant to the aforesaid direction, the Respondent furnished the meter download data vide email dated 15.09.2026. The matter was thereafter taken up for further proceedings on 09.10.2026, when the material furnished by the Respondent, including the consumption statement and the available Common Meter Reading Instrument (CMRI) data, was considered.

During the proceedings, the Respondent submitted that the CMRI data presently available in the records/system accessible to its Meter Management Group (MMG) Team pertained to the period from 01.10.2025 to 01.09.2026. It was stated that the said data contained the meter readings captured and submitted by the concerned MMG Team. The Respondent further submitted that, upon verification of the records/system presently accessible to the concerned team, CMRI data for any period prior to 01.10.2025 was not available and, consequently, could neither be downloaded nor furnished before this Authority.

The Respondent clarified that the non-furnishing of CMRI data for the period prior to 01.10.2025 was attributable to its non-availability in the system/records presently accessible to the concerned MMG Team and not to any deliberate withholding or non-disclosure of information. **The particulars furnished by the Respondent identified the consumer as Shri Roop Chand, the location as Village Kaimwala, Chandigarh, the CA/Account No. as 3000035788 and the A/C No. as 102KB51661045G.** The Respondent



accordingly placed the available CMRI data for the period from 01.10.2025 to 01.09.2026 on record for consideration.

The consumption statement furnished by the Respondent, along with their reply, covers the period from 12.06.2023 to 07.06.2026 and contains entries relating to meter readings, consumption, multiplying factor and meter status. A perusal of the statement reveals that certain billing periods were reflected as provisional and that adjustments were also recorded. In particular, a negative consumption figure of 677 units is shown for the period from 06.03.2026 to 13.04.2026. The statement also contains entries for which the corresponding meter-reading particulars are not fully reflected. These entries require examination alongside the billing records and the account adjustments claimed by the Respondent.

The Respondent has maintained that the Appellant's account was overhauled in compliance with the order dated 11.08.2026 passed by the Learned CGRF, Chandigarh and that the consequential adjustments, including reversal of the applicable Late Payment Surcharge/delayed payment surcharge, had been carried out. The Appellant, however, has alleged that the excess billing of 1,200 units and miscellaneous charges has not been fully refunded or adjusted and has sought applicable interest, litigation expenses and compensation.

The submissions of the parties and the material placed on record have been considered. The principal issues arising for determination are whether the account overhaul and consequential adjustments carried out by the Respondent fully comply with the directions contained in the order of the Learned CGRF, Chandigarh; whether the alleged excess billing and miscellaneous charges have been appropriately accounted for; and whether any further monetary relief is payable to the Appellant under the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions.

The absence of CMRI data for the period prior to 01.10.2025, as explained by the Respondent, is a matter to be considered in the context of the available billing records and other material on record. The extent to which the available data enables verification of the consumption figures and the correctness of the account adjustments falls for consideration in the findings and analysis that follow.

D. Findings and Analysis



I have carefully considered the submissions made by the Appellant and the Respondent, the impugned order dated 11.08.2026 passed by the Learned CGRF, Chandigarh, the consumption statement furnished by the Respondent, including Annexure D to its reply dated 09.09.2026, and the CMRI data subsequently submitted vide email dated 15.09.2026.

The principal issues requiring determination are:

- (a) Whether the Respondent has correctly recorded and accounted for the consumption of electricity during the disputed period;
- (b) Whether the account overhaul and consequential adjustments stated to have been carried out by the Respondent constitute full compliance with the directions contained in the order dated 11.08.2026 passed by the Learned CGRF;
- (c) Whether the Appellant is entitled to further adjustment/refund of the amount paid, including any Late Payment Surcharge (LPSC), together with applicable interest; and
- (d) Whether the facts established on record warrant compensation for deficiency in service under the applicable Standard of Performance Regulations.

The consumption statement furnished by the Respondent covers the period from 12.06.2023 to 07.06.2026. The particulars of the subject connection are reflected as Meter No. CHIEP7556, sanctioned load of 1.00 kW and multiplying factor of 1. The statement contains entries reflecting actual readings, provisional consumption, adjustments and certain meter-status codes.

A scrutiny of the statement reveals material inconsistencies in the recording and reconciliation of consumption, particularly from December 2024 onwards. These inconsistencies assume significance because the Respondent has relied upon the same statement to support its contention that the Appellant's account has been correctly reconciled.

The statement records a meter reading of 14,777 on 12.12.2024. No subsequent actual reading is reflected for the period ending 12.02.2025, for which consumption of 761 units is shown. The next recorded reading is 16,186 on 12.04.2025, against the earlier reading of 14,777, resulting in a difference of 1,409 units. While this difference corresponds arithmetically to the recorded readings, the intervening period was not supported by a contemporaneous reading in the statement.



Thereafter, provisional consumption of 591 units was recorded for each of the periods 12.04.2025 to 12.06.2025, 12.06.2025 to 12.08.2025 and 12.08.2025 to 12.10.2025. The statement subsequently records a reading of 21,986 on 12.10.2025, while the preceding reading shown is 16,186. The difference between these two readings is 5,800 units, which does not correspond with the three intervening provisional consumption entries aggregating 1,773 units. The record, as furnished, does not adequately explain this discrepancy or demonstrate how the provisional consumption was reconciled with the subsequent reading.

The statement further records a reading of 21,985 on 12.12.2025, followed by two provisional consumption entries of 381 units and 296 units for the subsequent periods. Thereafter, readings of 21,218, 21,498 and 22,013 are shown for the later billing periods. The recording of a reading of 21,218 after an earlier reading of 21,985 indicates a downward variation in the displayed meter reading. The subsequent reading of 21,498 is also lower than the reading of 21,985 recorded on 12.12.2025. These entries required a clear technical and billing reconciliation by the Respondent.

In particular, for the period from 06.03.2026 to 13.04.2026, the statement records the new reading as 21,218 and the old reading as 21,985, with the consumption shown as minus 677 units. However, the arithmetic difference between the displayed readings is minus 767, not minus 677. The Respondent has not furnished a satisfactory explanation for this discrepancy in the material presently available on record.

The above inconsistencies are not merely differences in the presentation of the data. They directly affect the verification of the units billed, the adjustment of provisional consumption and the correctness of the revised account. In the absence of a properly reconciled statement, the assertion that all provisional bills have been correctly adjusted cannot be accepted solely on the basis of the credits stated to have been granted.

During the proceedings held on 09.10.2026, the Respondent submitted that CMRI data was available only for the period from 01.10.2025 to 01.09.2026 and that data prior to 01.10.2025 was not available in the system/records presently accessible to the concerned MMG Team.

The explanation regarding the present non-availability of earlier CMRI data has been taken into consideration. However, the absence of such electronic data does not, by itself, establish that the consumption billed during the earlier period was correct. Nor



does it dispense with the Respondent's obligation to reconcile the account on the basis of the other available records, including meter-reading particulars, bills issued, provisional consumption entries and financial adjustments.

The Respondent was required to demonstrate the correctness of the billing and the reconciliation undertaken pursuant to the order of the Learned CGRF, Chandigarh where the consumption statement itself contains unexplained discrepancies, the absence of earlier CMRI data cannot be treated as a substitute for a complete account reconciliation.

The Learned CGRF, vide order dated 11.08.2026, directed the Respondent to overhaul the Appellant's account for the period from 12.04.2025 to 13.04.2026 and further directed that no LPSC or delayed payment surcharge be levied for the period covered by the overhaul to the extent such surcharge arose due to revision of bills.

The Respondent has submitted that it complied with the said directions by granting a credit of ₹7,086/- towards adjustment of earlier provisional bills and a further credit of ₹3,138/- towards subsequent provisional billing. It has also stated that the consequential LPSC/delayed payment surcharge was adjusted or refunded wherever required.

The grant of these credits is relevant; however, the fact that credits have been posted in the account does not, by itself, establish that the account has been correctly overhauled. The credits must be reconciled against the actual consumption chargeable for the relevant periods, the original bills, the revised bills and the payments already made by the Appellant.

The available statement does not furnish a complete and internally consistent reconciliation demonstrating how the consumption figures were derived, how the provisional bills were adjusted, or how the negative consumption entry was dealt with in arriving at the final amount payable.

In these circumstances, I find that the Respondent has not established, through the material presently available on record, that the account has been fully and correctly reconciled. A comprehensive account overhaul is, therefore, necessary to ensure that the Appellant is charged only for the consumption properly attributable to the relevant billing periods and that all amounts already paid are duly accounted for.

For this purpose, the reconciliation should commence from the reading of 14,777 recorded on 12.12.2024 and extend up to the reading of 22,013 recorded on 07.06.2026.

The purpose of directing this broader reconciliation is to ensure continuity and correctness of the account across the intervening billing cycles, rather than examining individual provisional bills in isolation.

The Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (Standard of Performance for Distribution Licensees) Regulations, 2015 are applicable to Chandigarh. Regulation 7, read with Regulation 8 and Schedule III, provides for compensation where a distribution licensee fails to meet the prescribed guaranteed standards of performance. Schedule III prescribes compensation of ₹50 for each day of default in relation to the resolution of billing complaints, subject to the applicable requirements of the Regulations.

In the present case, the Respondent has acknowledged that the Appellant approached its office on 30.03.2026 regarding discrepancies in the electricity bills. The consumption statement subsequently furnished by the Respondent contains unexplained inconsistencies in the recorded readings and the corresponding consumption figures. The Appellant was consequently required to pursue the grievance before the Learned CGRF and thereafter before this Authority.

The prolonged use of provisional consumption figures without a demonstrated and verifiable reconciliation, coupled with the discrepancies in the recorded readings and the failure to furnish a complete account reconciliation, establishes a deficiency in the Respondent's billing and grievance-redressal service. The Respondent was expected to maintain an accurate billing record and resolve the consumer's billing complaint within the prescribed period.

At the same time, compensation under the SOP Regulations must be determined with reference to the particular guaranteed standard violated and the period of default established on record. The material presently available establishes the date on which the Appellant approached the Respondent, but does not conclusively establish the date on which a correct and complete resolution of the billing complaint, if any, was affected.

Accordingly, the Respondent shall calculate and pay compensation under Schedule III of the SOP Regulations, 2015 at the prescribed rate of ₹50 per day of default, commencing upon expiry of the applicable seven-day period for resolution of the billing complaint dated 30.03.2026 and continuing until the date on which the account is correctly reconciled and the revised bill and complete statement of account are furnished to the



Appellant, subject to the applicable regulatory requirements. The calculation shall be disclosed to the Appellant along with the revised account.

This compensation is distinct from the refund or adjustment of excess electricity charges and LPSC, which are matters of account reconciliation. The direction is intended to give effect to the prescribed compensation for failure to meet the guaranteed standard and not to impose a separate punitive amount outside the applicable Regulations.

Once the account is overhauled, all payments already made by the Appellant, including the credits of ₹7,086/- and ₹3,138/- stated by the Respondent, shall be duly accounted for so that no amount is recovered twice and no legitimate credit is omitted.

Any amount found to have been collected in excess of the amount lawfully chargeable shall be refunded or adjusted in accordance with the applicable provisions of the JERC Electricity Supply Code. Applicable interest, wherever prescribed, shall be calculated from the relevant date of payment until the date of refund or adjustment.

Any LPSC or delayed payment surcharge paid by the Appellant during the period covered by the account overhaul, to the extent attributable to the billing errors or revisions, shall also be refunded or credited. The revised statement must separately identify the principal adjustment, the treatment of LPSC, the interest calculation, all credits already granted and the net amount payable or refundable.

The Appellant's claim for litigation expenses and additional compensation for mental harassment has also been considered. In view of the specific compensation mechanism available under the SOP Regulations and the directions for rectification and compensation contained in this order, no separate quantified award for mental harassment or litigation expenses is being made in the absence of a sufficiently established basis for determining such additional amounts.

E. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing discussion, I find that the consumption statement furnished by the Respondent contains material inconsistencies in the recorded readings, provisional consumption and the subsequent adjustment of units. The Respondent has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the credits granted in the Appellant's account constitute a complete and correct reconciliation of the disputed billing periods.

The Respondent's explanation regarding the non-availability of CMRI data prior to 01.10.2025 has been considered. Nevertheless, the absence of such data does not

relieve the Respondent of its obligation to prepare a correct account on the basis of the available meter-reading records, bills, provisional consumption entries and payments made by the Appellant.

The record further establishes deficiency in the Respondent's billing and grievance-redressal service. Compensation is, therefore, warranted under the applicable Standard of Performance Regulations, 2015, subject to calculation in accordance with the prescribed standard, rate and period of default.

Accordingly, the appeal is allowed to the extent indicated below. The impugned order dated 11.08.2026 passed by the Learned CGRF, Chandigarh, is modified and supplemented by the directions contained in the operative portion of this order. The Respondent shall carry out a comprehensive account overhaul, reconcile all payments and adjustments, refund any excess amount and applicable LPSC/interest, and pay the prescribed compensation for the established deficiency in service.

F. Order

In view of the findings and conclusions recorded above, **Appeal No. 291 of 2026 is disposed of with the following directions:**

1. The Respondent, Chandigarh Power Distribution Ltd. (CPDL), shall overhaul and reconcile the Appellant's electricity account from the meter reading of **14,777 recorded on 12.12.2024 up to the meter reading of 22,013 recorded on 07.06.2026**. The reconciliation shall cover all intervening billing cycles and shall be carried out after verifying the available meter-reading records, consumption entries, provisional bills, adjustments and payments.
2. While carrying out the account overhaul, the Respondent shall specifically reconcile the provisional consumption entries, the reading recorded as 21,986 on 12.10.2025, the subsequent reading of 21,985 on 12.12.2025, the readings recorded during March-May 2026, and the negative consumption adjustment shown in the statement. The revised account shall clearly explain the calculation of units chargeable for each billing period.
3. All payments made by the Appellant and all credits already granted, including the credits of ₹7,086/- and ₹3,138/- stated by the Respondent, shall be duly accounted for in the revised statement. No amount already paid or credited shall be recovered or adjusted twice.



4. Any excess amount found to have been collected as a result of the account reconciliation shall be refunded or adjusted in accordance with the applicable Regulations. Any LPSC/delayed payment surcharge paid by the Appellant during the period covered by the account overhaul, to the extent attributable to the billing errors or revisions, shall also be refunded or credited. Applicable interest shall be paid wherever prescribed under the relevant provisions of the JERC Electricity Supply Code.
5. The Respondent shall calculate and pay compensation to the Appellant under Schedule III of the JERC (Standard of Performance for Distribution Licensees) Regulations, 2015, at the prescribed rate of ₹50 per day of default for failure to resolve the billing complaint within the guaranteed standard. The calculation shall commence upon expiry of the applicable seven-day resolution period following the complaint dated 30.03.2026 and continue until the date on which the account is correctly reconciled and the revised bill and complete statement of account are furnished, subject to the applicable regulatory requirements. The calculation shall be furnished to the Appellant in writing.
6. The Respondent shall prepare and serve upon the Appellant a revised bill and a complete, itemised statement of account, showing the period-wise consumption, original charges, revised charges, provisional billing adjustments, payments received, credits granted, LPSC reversals, applicable interest and compensation payable, within **15 days from the date of receipt of this order**.
7. A copy of the revised bill, the complete statement of account and the compensation calculation shall be furnished to the Appellant through an appropriate mode of communication. The Respondent shall retain the supporting calculation and billing records for verification, if required.
8. The Appellant's request for separate quantified litigation expenses and additional compensation for mental harassment is not granted, for the reasons recorded in the Findings and Analysis. This shall not affect the Appellant's entitlement to the refund/adjustment, applicable interest and SOP compensation specifically directed above.



9. The Respondent shall submit a compliance report before this Authority, along with a copy of the revised bill, the complete statement of account and the compensation calculation, within **21 days from the date of receipt of this order.**

The order dated 11.08.2026 passed by the Learned CGRF, Chandigarh, stands modified and supplemented to the extent indicated above.

The appeal is disposed of accordingly.

Pronounced on: 12th day of October, 2026.

Handwritten signature of Chandan Sharma in black ink, with the date 12/X/26 written below it.

(C. M. Sharma)

Electricity Ombudsman (JERC)