



BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, HARYANA
Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission
Bays No. 33 - 36, Sector - 4, Panchkula-134109
Telephone No. 0172-2572299; Website: - herc.nic.in
E-mail: eo.herc@nic.in

(Regd. Post)

Appeal No. : 8/2024
Registered on : 21.02.2024
Date of Order : 18.04.2024

In the matter of:

Appeal against the order dated 15.01.2024 passed by CGRF UHBVNL, Panchkula in complaint no. UH/CGRF- 240/2023.

Smt. Nandita Mohan, House No. 150 Sector-6, Panchkula

Appellant

Versus

1. The Executive Engineer Operation Division, UHBVN, Panchkula
2. The SDO ('Op.'), Sub Urban Sub Division, UHBVN, Panchkula

Respondent

Before:

Sh. Virendra Singh, Electricity Ombudsman

Present on behalf of Appellant:

Shri Uday Mohan son of appellant

Shri V K Malik representative of appellant

Present on behalf of Respondents:

Shri Neelanshu Dubey, SDO (Operation), S/U Sub Division, UHBVN, Panchkula

ORDER

A. Smt. Nandita Mohan has filed an appeal against the order dated 15.01.2024 passed by CGRF, UHBVNL, Panchkula in complaint No. UH/CGRF- 240/2023.

The appellant has requested the following relief: -

1. The appellant has a residential connection with 48 KW sanctioned load. The meter installed gets power supply through CT and PT.
2. The appellant has always paid the energy bills in time and there has been no default whatsoever.
3. The normal consumption of electricity by appellant has remained in the range of 5000 units per month.
4. In the month of August 2023, the appellant received a bill of Rs. 13,08,715 on account of 1,86,920 units for the period of 251 days. This comes to an average of 23, 365 units per month which is not possible and was patently wrong.
5. The appellant approached the SDO/Executive Engineer of UHBVN to correct the bill which they did not do, and the appellant was compelled to deposit an amount of Rs. 5 lakhs as part payment via receipt number 454044600380 dated 10/8/2023. The appellant filed a complaint with the

CGRF but since no decision was taken by CGRF on the complaint the appellant further deposited the following –

Sr. No	Receipt Number	Amount deposited as part payment	Date
1.	454044600380	5 lakhs	10/8/2023
2.	454044654450	3 lakhs	4/9/2023
3.	454044648826	1 Lakhs	3/10/2023
4.	454044640705	1 lakhs	31/10/2023
5.	454044613103	Rs. 27,063	6/12/2023
6.	454044680899	Rs. 50,000	4/01/2024
7.	Online Paid	Rs. 2 Lakhs	30/1/2024
Total		Rs. 12,77,063	

6. Surcharge – The appellant has also submitted monthly bills in addition to the surcharge which was levied. The surcharge was above and beyond the bills amount, and was only levied due to in delay of the CGRF in taking any decision on this dispute.
7. In addition, as per instructions, the CT meter has to be checked after every 6 months. However, there were serious lapses and the meter was not checked for over 21 months. Furthermore, this checking was done only on our dispute and in our absence.

To avoid disconnection of power supply pending settlement of the dispute by the CGRF.

8. The CGRF vid the impugned orders dated 15/2/2024 has rejected the complaint and held the amount of Rs. 13,08,715 as chargeable.
9. The order passed by the CGRF is passed without considering the merits of the case and ignoring the prayer and pleadings of the appellant as explained below:
 1. The load of the appellant is 48 KW and as per the charge available for assessing consumption issued by the HEREC contains a provision of charging 50 Units per KW per month as per para 6.9.1 d (1) of supply code 2014. By this method the consumption comes to 2400 units per month as against 23,365 units billed per month.
 2. Before the period of Dec 2022, the average consumption per month was recorded as 4150 units.
 3. After July 2023, the average consumption per month comes to 3904 units considering a period of July 2023 – Dec 2023.
 4. Even for accessing consumption under section 126, although the same is not applicable in this case, the formula of assessment is given for 25% load factor, 30 days and 16 hours daily in a month.

On this basis the consumption comes to as 5760 units (12 x 30 x 16).

All these formula have been ignored without any discussion/logic or arguments simply because the respondent has stated in their reply that the meter was checked and found in order.

5. The order does not explain how a consumption of over 23,000 units can be consumed by a load of residential connection and none of the formula given above support their contention.

The order is not based on facts. It is mentioned that the consumption of the consumer for the period of 11/2022 and 12/2023 turns to 42160 units. The energy bills of these months are enclosed.

The application of multiplication factor of 20 is not correct because the MDI has been recorded as 111.98 KVA in the month of Dec 2022 which is not possible for a load of 48KW. Therefore, the obvious conclusion is that there is something wrong either with the metering equipment, calculation of multiplication factor, reading instrument or method or preparation of bills. It is therefore prayed that the appeal may kindly be accepted and Justice be granted to the appellant.

- B.** The appeal was registered on 21.02.2024 as an appeal No. 8/2024 and accordingly, notice of motion to the Appellant and the Respondents was issued for hearing the matter on 06.03.2024.
- C.** The respondent SDO vide email dated 28.02.2024 has submitted reply, which is reproduced as under:

In this connection it is submitted that a complaint of Smt. Nandita Mohan regarding exaggerated bills of electric connection bearing account no. 4540446629 has been received to this office.

The detail reply regarding the above complaint is as under:

The consumer is having electricity connection under the domestic category bearing sanctioned load of 48 KW. As per the available record the LT-CT meter had been installed on the said connection vide SCO No. 1218/140 dated 10.01.2019 vide CA-21 No. 24/1.

As per the available billing record of the MRBD the reading of the consumer had been punched by the meter reader each month manually with proper latitude and longitude co-ordinate available the shut. As per the monthly details the bill of the consumer got trapped in the high bill in the month of 12/22

when the monthly consumption of the consumer for the period of 11/22 to 12/22 turns out to be 42160 units.

Moreover, in the next month of Jan 2023 also the consumption of the consumer came out to be 126200 units. The bill of the consumer for the period of 11/22 to 07/23 were raised on average units and bill as per consumption was raised in 07/2023 of 186920 units of amount Rs. 13.08 Lacs after adjustment of already paid amount.

In order to ascertain the above, reading and accuracy of the LT-CT meter, the LT-CT meter has been checked by the M&P wing vide MT report No. MT-1-A27-923-4 dated 04.09.2023.

Hence, taking in view of the above facts the bill of the consumer is of consumption in the meter and all necessary formalities as per his earlier representation has been already made by this office and it is requested to consider the reply and submit the reply before the commission for further direction please.

D. The appellant vide email dated 06.03.2024 has submitted reply in response to the reply submitted by respondent, which is reproduced as under:

The undersigned has already made an appeal with all details and supporting documents on dated 31/01/2024. The order passed by CGRF by justifying the amount of energy bill is rightly chargeable from the consumer on the basis on M&P wing checking report.

I further pray to honorable court that due consideration may kindly be given under rules and regulations while deciding the case on merits. There is no doubt that by ignoring all the norms, the inflated energy bill amounting to Rs. 1308714 was issued for the period 16/11/2022 – 25/7/2023 (251 days) in compliance to this, I have paid Rs. 12,77, 063 in various installments along with current bills and surcharge levied upon. In this contest, the M&P authority checked the CT Meter after a gap of 21 months by floating all the instructions stands issued for which acceptance of consumer no obtained at site. If M&P checked report is correct then why accumulated energy bill was issued and its justification for higher accumulation needs to be explained.

1. As per instructions, the average load factor in domestic case above 3 Kw is 0.06.
 - a. Even if we assume 10 hours of continuous usage - consumption on 10 hours basis $48 \times 30 \times 10 \times 0.06 = 864$ units

- b. Even if we assume 12 hours of continuous usage - $48 \times 30 \times 12 \times 0.06 = 1036.80$ units
 - c. But we have been charged 23,365 units per month.
2. The period for which wrong energy bill stands issued relates mostly to the winter season for which the consumption on higher side that is 23365 units per month cannot come on a sanctioned load of 48 Kw.
 3. As per the Electricity Consumer Right 2020 notified by Central Government, licensee cannot send bill for more than 3 months if issued on average basis consumer has right not to pay the bill.
 4. What were the reasons for stoppage of issue of 2-3 average bills was done for earlier rules.
 5. M/s competent (MRBD agency) be held responsible for the lapse of recording of CT meter reading and the penalty be imposed on them.
 6. The commercial accountant has not also verified the fact and figures at the initial stage.
 7. Fair judgement not done in this case and being a very doubtful case, the benefit of doubt should go to the consumer and hence not liable to pay the amount of the wrong bill.

At last, I have already submitted my 3 options for issuing of revised correct energy bill on average basis which we have submitted before.

It is also prayed that all aspects be taken into account while deciding the case. It is a clear-cut violation of rules and lapses on the part of the company/officials concerned/office in charge for not catching the case in time and penalizing the consumer unnecessary. Hoping that my genuine grievances be considered.

- E.** Hearing was held on 06.03.2024, as scheduled. Both the parties were present during the hearing through video conferencing. At the outset, the representative of the appellant submitted that the consumption during the month of December, 2022 and January, 2023 is very much on the higher side as compare to the consumption of November, 2022. Further, he requested that meter may be got checked in the M&T Lab. The respondent SDO is directed to get the meter checked from the M&T Lab within 7 days and submit the report with an advance to the appellant. The matter was adjourned for hearing on 27.03.2024.
- F.** Hearing was held on 27.03.2024, as scheduled. Both the parties were present during the hearing through video conferencing. Both the parties requested for short adjournment as meter could not be tested in M&T Lab as the firm named

ZERA has installed the equipment in the lab but software yet to be installed. Acceding to the request, the matter was adjourned and shall now be heard on 09.04.2024.

- G.** The respondent SDO vide email dated 08.04.2024 has submitted reply, which is reproduced as under:

Please refer to the Appeal filed by Smt. Nandita Mohan bearing account no. 4540446629 before the Commission vides appeal no. 8/2024 vide which on dated 06.03.2024, it has been directed by the Electricity Ombudsman Haryana to get the meter of the consumer checked in the M&T Lab and submit its report.

As per direction, the meter of the appellant got checked in the M&T Lab Yamunanagar in the committee of the Executive Engineer and the report is as under:

- a) Accuracy checked on the meter test and found within permissible limit.
- b) Billing Data downloaded with BCS.
- c) Download data sent to SDO 'Op.' for analysis.

As per the available report, the data has been retrieved through CMRI and is hereby submitted.

- H.** Hearing was held on 09.04.2024, as scheduled. Both the parties were present during the hearing through video conferencing. At the outset, the representative of the appellant requested for short adjournment to go through the M&T Lab Test result which was received on 08.04.2024. Acceding to the request, the matter was adjourned for hearing on 18.04.2024.

- I.** The appellant vide email dated 15.04.2024 has submitted final submission after going through the M&P lab Yamuna Nagar data, which is reproduced as under:

1. Connection Details:

Name of consumer	Nandita Mohan
Address of the premises	House no. 150 Sector 6 Panchkula
Connected Load	48 KW
Category of supply	Domestic
Account No.	4540446629
Energy Meter	UHBNL 3 phase CT meter with a multiplying factor of 20
Name of UHBVN Op S/Division Panchkula	Sub-urban S/Division Panchkula

2. Analysis of Billing and Consumption data: The billing data for the above-said account is as under.

- a. For the period 19.04.2022 to 16.11.2022 [up to the reading of 7344 recorded on 16.11.2022]

Particulars	Units	Max MDI	Remarks
Max consumption in a month (30 days) during the above period	6072		The consumption of 5060 units was recorded during 25/06/2022 to 20/07/2022 for 25 days. For 30 days, it is 6072 units
Average consumption during the above period	3914	1.51 VA	

There is no dispute for the above period.

- b. For the period 16.11.2022 to 16.12.22: On 16.12.2022: - MDI is 111.98 KVA and the reading is 9452 thereby giving a consumption of 42,160 i.e. $20 \times (9452 - 7344)$. The max demand of 111.98 & consumption of 42,160 units during a month is impossible with a connected load of 48 kW until & unless, the consumer adds an additional load to such an extent which can record an MDI value of 111.98 KVA, which the licensee has not alleged any -where. Accordingly, the consumption of 42,160 units during this month is not acceptable.

Neither the SDO Operation nor the M&P Lab has commented on the above issue. The M&P Lab has reported that accuracy of the meter is within permissible limits and that no internal examination was carried out. As the monthly consumption of the consumer prior to this period never exceeded 6072 units, it is a case of malfunctioning of the energy meter during this period, which neither SDO Operation nor M&P Lab bothered to investigate. The consumption recorded during this period is not acceptable. It will be in fitness of things that the consumer for this period be charged on a reasonable basis commensurate with consumption pattern of previous months.

- c. For the period 16.12.22 to 25.01,2023: - Reading of 15762 was recorded on 25.01.2023, thereby a consumption of 1,26,200 units i.e. $20 \times (15762 - 9452)$ was recorded during this period. This much consumption is impossible during the period of 39 days with a connected load of 48 KW and permissible demand factor & the number of hours per day. All of us know that the entire connected load is never used simultaneously and all the time. Neither the SDO

Operation nor M&P Lab investigated the cause of abnormal consumption. The consumption recorded during this period is not acceptable. It will be in fitness of things the consumer for this period be charged on a reasonable basis commensurate with consumption pattern of previous months.

- d. For the period 25.01.2023 till 25.07.2023: - During this period, the readings have been recorded every month but the same was wrongly posted in the record in the old reading column instead of new reading column. Accordingly, the consumption was shown to be zero and ad-hoc bills were issued on a very high average consumption basis. The recorded data for the period is reproduced in table 'A' below.

Table A

Old reading date	Reading	New reading date	Reading	consumption	Billed units (ad-hoc) on average basis
25.01.2023	15762	15.02.2023	0	0	1308
15.02.2023	15846	20.03.2023	0	0	2055.4
20.03.2023	15944	18.04.2023	0	0	1806.2
18.04.2023	16088	18.05.2023	0	0	1868.6
18.05.2023	16245	28.06.2023	0	0	2553.8

The UHBVN has not pointed out that the readings recorded during the above period were incorrect. Rather, they have issued a bill on 31/07/2023 by duly taking note of the recorded readings to be correct up to 31.07.2023 which also includes the period stated above. In fact, the bills should have been rightly issued as per table 'B' as under: -

Table B

Old reading date	Reading	New reading date	Reading	consumption	Billed units (ad-hoc)
15/02/2023	15762	20.03.2023	15846	1680	In view of availability of data, issue of ad-hoc bills on average basis was undesirable and the same should have been issued for the consumption as worked out in this table
20.03.2023	15846	18.04.2023	15946	2000	
18.04.2023	15946	18.05.2023	16088	2804	
18.05.2023	16088	28.06.2023	16245	3140	

The consumption during the above period varied between 1680 and 3140 units per month which is comparable with the consumption for the period 19.04.2022 to 16.11.2022.

It is, further, established that the attitude of the licensee has not been consumer friendly. It preferred to issue the bills for the above period

initially on an average basis (which also included the extraordinarily high consumption for the period 16/11/2022 to 25/07/2023) instead of actual consumption basis during this period. Ultimately in the bill dated 31.07.2023 for an amount of Rs 13,08,715/-, the consumer was billed based on actual consumption for this period.

The dispute now only remains in respect of bills for the period 15/11/2022 to 25/01/23.

3. Payment: The consumer has already deposited the following amounts including the current bill -

Serial No.	Receipt No.	Amount deposited as part payment in Rs	Date
1	454044600380	5 lakhs	10.08.2023
2	454044654450	3 lakhs	04.09.2023
3	454044648826	1 lakh	03.10.2023
4	45404460705	1 lakh	31.10.2023
5	454044613103	27,063	06.12.2023
6	454044680899	50,000	04.01.2024
7	Paid online	2 lakhs	30.01.2024
8	454044654986	2,89,518	06/03/2024
Total			15, 66, 581

Surcharge: The licensee issued monthly bills in addition to levy of surcharge. The surcharge is above and beyond the billed amount and was levied only due to delay by the CGRF in taking a decision on this dispute. The surcharge levied is, therefore, also requested to be waived on settlement of the case.

4. Negligence/Lapses on the part of UHBVN:

As per Section 5.3.2 of the Electricity Supply Code

“5.3.2 The licensee shall Monitor the consumption pattern of the consumer and get the meter checked wherever considered necessary to ensure that the meter is in proper working order”

This means, the licensee shall monitor the consumption pattern of the consumer and get the meter checked wherever considered necessary to ensure that the meter is in proper working order.

The licensee has failed to perform this duty because,

- i. When Excessive consumption was recorded on 16/12/2022 and 25/01/2023, the licensee failed to check the premises and verify the facts at site for such a huge variation.

- ii. The licensee woke up only on 31.07.2023 after a lapse of 7 months when it rendered the bill for 7-8 months including the excessive consumption as mentioned above. Even at this stage, the meter was not checked.
- iii. The M&P staff is required to inspect each CT meter every six months, but this was not followed. The last inspection of this meter was carried out on 25.12.2021. It establishes the negligence on the part of M&P lab. Had the instructions been followed, this situation would not have arisen.
- iv. On our request, the meter was checked by M&P at site on 4.09.2023 i.e. after a lapse of 8-9 months as the meter recorded excessive consumption & MDI reading on 16.12.2022. The testing after a lapse of 8-9 months is meaningless and may not depict a correct picture.
- v. The Junior Engineer and SDO were also required to check the meter readings of a consumer with a load of 48 KW & CT meter which was never done.

In view of the above lapses/negligence on the part of the licensee in monitoring the consumption pattern of the consumer and checking of the energy meter & its consumer unfriendly attitude, it is not entitled to any benefit of doubt. It is the other party who are entitled to it.

5. PRAYER:

It can be safely concluded from the above submissions as under: -

- i. The average monthly consumption of the consumer is of the order of 3176 units pm and maximum consumption of 6072 units pm except for the period 16.11.22 to 16.12.2022 when consumption of 42,160 units was recorded & for the period 16.12.2022 to 25.01.2023 when consumption of 1,26,200 units was recorded. During this period even MDI recorded 111.98 KVA.
- ii. The extra-high consumption recoded during the two months & 10 days period of 16.11.2022 to 25.01.23 is beyond imagination and is difficult to accept until and unless the consumer adds an additional load to such an extent which can record an MDI value of 111.98 KVA & consumption of 1,26,200 units in 39 days, which the licensee has not alleged any-where.

- iii. No doubt, the M&P lab has reported that accuracy of the meter is within permissible permits and that no internal examination was carried out. Neither the SDO Operation himself nor the M & P Lab has made any effort to investigate the causes of high consumption & KVA readings during the period stated in sub-para ii above. It is difficult to accept the findings of M&P lab in the absence of any specific investigation into the high consumption as stated earlier. It is worth mentioning here that even a doctor will not prescribe the medicine exclusively based on a laboratory report. He will prescribe the medicines based both on lab tests & physical examination & symptoms of the patient.
- iv. While taking any decision, in addition to Laboratory reports, one must consider the physical conditions at site in addition to feasibility & practicality. In this case also, it is necessary to consider whether extra high consumption is practically possible.
- v. As the attitude of the license has been consume unfriendly & there are lapses on the part of licensee in monitoring the consumption pattern of the consumer and checking of the energy meter & its consumer unfriendly attitude, it is not entitled any benefit of doubt. It is the other party who are entitled to it.

It is, therefore, requested that the above facts may kindly be considered & benefit of doubt granted to us for deciding the case. Normally for a disputed period, a consumer is billed based on average consumption of previous months, which, in this case is 3914.3 units per month. However, to settle the case amicably, we may be billed for the disputed period (15.11.2022 to 25.01.2023) based on maximum consumption of 6072 units per month. The excess amount paid & surcharge levied may be refunded.

- J.** Hearing was held today, as scheduled. Both the parties were present during the hearing through video conferencing. At the outset, the representative of the appellant submitted that the consumption of 42160 units for the period 16.11.2022 to 16.12.2022 is on the higher side. Also, MDI recorded is 111.98 which is not possible. Further, the consumption from 16.12.2022 to 25.01.2023 is 126200 units in 39 days which is also not possible even if the total load is run for 24 hours. Although readings have been recorded every month for the period 25.01.2023 to till 25.07.2023 but average bills issued which shows casual

attitude of Nigam's officials. The meter should have been checked and monitored by the Nigam as per Section 5.3.2 of the Electricity Supply Code. The appellant argued that the appellant may be billed for period from 16.11.2022 to 25.01.2023 at rate of 6072 units per month as the monthly consumption of the appellant prior to this period had never exceeded 6072 units, it is a case of malfunctioning of the energy meter during this period.

Per contra, the respondent SDO submitted that rejoinder submitted by the appellant has been received from the EO office today. Recording of higher MDI may be due to increase in running load and/or instant/ internal/ wiring fault in the premises of the appellant during the period. The working of the meter has been got checked from M&P on 25.12.2021, 04.09.2023 and 07.03.2024 and found within permissible limit. In compliance of the order dated 06.03.2024, the meter was got checked in M&T lab on 04.04.2024, wherein the accuracy found within permissible limit. Since the meter working is OK therefore, there is no room for any adjustment. Further submitted that the available billing record of the MRBD, the reading of the consumer had been punched by the meter reader each month manually with proper latitude and longitude co-ordinate available the shut. As per the monthly details the bill of the consumer got trapped in the high bill in the month of 12/22 when the monthly consumption of the consumer for the period from 16.11.2022 to 16.12.2022 turns out to be 42160 units. In the next month of Jan 2023 also the consumption of the consumer came out to be 126200 units. The bill of the consumer for the period of 11/22 to 07/23 were raised on average units and bill as per consumption was raised in 07/2023 of 186920 units of amount Rs. 13.08 Lacs after adjustment of already paid amount. After receipt of request from the appellant regarding high bill, the meter was got checked from JE concerned and in order to ascertain accuracy of the LT-CT meter, the LT-CT meter was got checked by the M&P wing vide MT report No. MT-1-A27-923-4 dated 04.09.2023, wherein the meter accuracy was found within permissible limit. Further submitted that, as per sale circular no. 2/2020, the LT 3-phase above a load 20 kW is to be checked by M&P wing once every three years whereas in this case the meter was got checked earlier on their request. As the bill is as per consumption therefore, nothing is refundable.

- K.** The CGRF UHBVN Panchkula passed order dated 15.01.2024 in the matter, the operative part of the order is reproduced as under:

“After examining the reply of the respondent SDO, the record available on the file and hearing both the parties, the Forum has observed that the

consumer is having electricity connection under domestic category bearing sanctioned load of 48 kW and LT-CT meter was installed on the said connection vide SCO no. 1218/140 dated 10.01.2019 vide CA-21 No. 24/1 as per available billing record of the MRBD the reading of the consumer has been punched by the meter reader each month manually with proper latitude and longitude co-ordinate available the shut. The bills of the consumer for the period 11/2022 to 07/2023 were raised on average units and bill as per consumption was raised in 07/2023 for Rs. 13.08 lacs against consumption of 186920 units after adjustment of already paid amount. As per report supplied by the SDO/ respondent, the accuracy of the LT CT meter has also been got checked from M&P Wing vide MT-1 No. A27-923-4 dated 04.09.2023 which is genuine. Hence the consumption recorded by meter is justified based on M&P Wing Checking report dated 04.09.2023 and amount of bill i.e. Rs. 13.08 lacs is rightly chargeable from the consumer.

Therefore, the case is disposed of without cost to either of the parties.”

- L.** After going through written as well as oral averments made by both the parties and record placed on the file, it is observed that plea taken by the appellant in the present appeal that consumption recorded in its meter for period from 16.11.2022 to 25.01.2023 is very high due malfunctioning of the energy meter during the ibid period, is not substantiated since the working of the meter has been got checked by the respondent SDO from M&P wing on 25.12.2021, 04.09.2023 and 07.03.2024 and its accuracy found within permissible limit. Pursuant to the interim order dated 06.03.2024, the meter was also got checked by the respondent SDO in M&T lab Yamunanagar on 04.04.2024, wherein the accuracy of meter was found within permissible limit. Therefore, the bill of consumption recorded during the ibid period is payable by the appellant and the decision of the CGRF dated 15.01.2024 is in order and upheld. The present appeal is disposed of accordingly.

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

Given under my hand on 18th April, 2024.

Sd/-

(Virendra Singh)

Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana

Dated: 18.04.2024

CC-

Memo. No. 239-45 /HERC/EO/Appeal No. 8/2024

Dated: 19.04.2024

1. Smt. Nandita Mohan, # 150 Sector 6, Panchkula.
2. The Managing Director, UHBVN, IP No.: 3&4, Sector-14, Panchkula

3. Legal Remembrancer, Haryana Power Utilities, Shakti Bhawan, Sector- 6, Panchkula – 134109.
4. The Chief Engineer (Operation), Sector - 14, Panchkula
5. The Superintending Engineer (Operation), Panchkula, SCO 89, Sector-5, Panchkula.
6. The Executive Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Panchkula, Flat No-517 & 518, Power colony, Industrial Area Phase-2, Panchkula.
7. The SDO (Operation), Sub Urban Sub Division UHBVN, Panchkula, 66 KV, Sub-station, Power Colony, Industrial Area Phase-2, Panchkula.

Appeal No. 8/2024/EO