Territorial Jurisdiction: State of Jharkhand

AUTHORITY OF THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN: JHARKHAND

Present: Gopal Kumar Roy
Electricity Ombudsman
2nd Floor, Rajendra Jawan Bhawan
Main Road, Ranchi- 834001.

Dated- Ranchi, the 13th day of August 2024

Appeal No. EOJ/02 of 2023
(Arising out of judgment passed in case no.78 of 2019 by the VUSNF/CGRF, Hazaribagh)

M/S Amit Steel Industries Private Limited,
its registered office at II-B, 33, Industrial Area,
P.O & P.S – Balidih, Distt. Bokaro through its
Director Amit Prasad, S/O Late A. K. Prasad,
resident of 151, Gujrat Colony, Chas, P.O &
P.S- Chas, District- Bokaro ----------Appellant

Versus.

1. Jharkhand Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd.,
through its Managing Director, having
its Head Office at Engineering Building,

Dhurwa, Post Office & P. S. - Dhurwa,
Dist. Ranchi-834004

2. General Manager-cum-Chief Engineer,
Jharkhand Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd.
Hazaribagh Electric Supply Area,
P.O & P.S - Hazaribagh, District- Hazaribagh.

3. Electrical Superintending Engineer,
Electric Supply Circle, Chas,
P.O & P.S – Chas, District – Bokaro.

4. Electrical Executive Engineer (Commercial & Revenue),
Jharkhand Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd.
Electric Supply Circle, Chas,
P.O & P.S – Chas, District – Bokaro. ----------Respondent

Counsel/Representative

On behalf of Appellant : Mr. Rahul Lamba, Advocate
On behalf of Respondent : Mr. Mohan Kumar Dubey, Standing Counsel

JUDGEMENT

1.The present appeal has arisen out of the Judgement / Order passed by the learned Vidyut Upbhokta Shikayat Nivaran Forum (hereinafter shall be referred as VUSNF), Hazaribagh in case No.-78/2019 on 28.12.2022.

2. Reliefs sought for by the Appellant in this appeal :

The Appellant, in the present appeal, prays for the following reliefs:-

(i) For quashing/ setting aside the Order, bearing no.97 and dated 28.12.2022, passed by the Ld. Vidyut Upbhokta Shikayat Nivaran Forum, Hazaribagh in Case No. 78/2020, whereby the complaint of the Appellant, for revising the monthly energy bills from April 2013 to March 2019 as excess charge including penalty have been imposed on the Appellant which are contrary to the relevant Tariff Order and for refunding the said excess amount with interest to the Appellant, was dismissed;

(ii) For an order directing the Respondent to revise the monthly energy bills of the Appellant from April 2013 till March 2019 in accordance with the relevant Tariff Order and by specifically revising the value of contract demand by treating the actual demand, which is higher than the contract demand for three continuous months, as the new contract demand.

(iii) For declaring that the actions of the Respondent, with respect to fixing 385 KVA as the actual demand of the Appellant in all the energy bills from May 2015 to October 2017, as unjustified, arbitrary and illegal.

(iv) An order directing the Respondents to refund to the Appellant the excess charges, which are contrary to the Tariff Order and collected from the Appellant, with interest in terms of the Supply Code Regulations or any other law;

(v) Issuance of any other appropriate order(s) and / or direction(s), as may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case and in the interest of justice.

3. Operative portion of impugned Order No.97.

The instant case is dismissed in view of Order passed in case no.77/2019 and aforesaid findings by this Forum.

4. Operative portion of impugned Order No.96.

The detailed statement of calculation prepared on the basis of the change of Tariff from HTSS to HTS from October 210 to October 2017 and Additional Charge added in the bill for the month of November 2017 are quashed. The current bill for the month of November 2017 will be intact if it is not found revisable by the Respondents in view of rebates, if any. The respondents are directed to prepare fresh detailed statement of bill after providing rebates, if any, from the month of October 2010 to October 2017 on the basis of the change of Tariff from HTSS to HTS and Tariff Order applicable from time to time and raise bill accordingly. The Respondents are further directed to permit the petitioner to deposit Additional Security Money and to enter into new agreement for the enhanced contract demand of 385 KVA within time fixed by the Respondents are further directed to change Tariff from HTS to HTSS from the month of November 2017 onwards and raise bill accordingly. Hence this case is disposed of in terms of my aforesaid findings and order.

5. Grounds taken in appeal by the Appellant.

The impugned Order is contrary to law and facts involved in the present case. The impugned Order has made an erroneous finding that the consolidated energy bill statement from October 2010 to October 2017 invariably indicates that it has been prepared on the basis of the actual increasing monthly load than the contracted load of 300 KVA from October 2010 to October 2017 as per prevalent tariff order from time to time. The Impugned Order has failed in considering the relevant part of the tariff Orders and the fact that the monthly energy bills of the Appellant were in violation of the Tariff Orders. The Impugned Order ought to have considered Section 14 of the 2012 Tariff Order, which categorically provides that in case the

actual demand is higher than the contract demand for three continuous months then the same shall be treated as the new contract demand for the purpose of billing of future months. The relevant part of the said Tariff order is reproduced herein below for ready reference:

" *In case actual demand is higher than the contract demand for three continuous months, the same shall be treated as the new contract demand for the purpose of billing of future months and the consumer will have to get into a new agreement for the revised contract demand with the licensee."*

The impugned Order failed in considering that since continuously for three months i.e. April 2013 to June 2013 the actual demand of the Appellant was more than the contract demand, therefore the new contract demand of the Appellant from the month of July 2013 became 337.20 KVA for future billing purposes. But the Respondent did not change the contract demand to 337.20 KVA in the energy bills of the Appellant for the month of July 2013 onwards. On the contrary, the Respondent fixed the contract demand of the Appellant at 300 KVA and imposed penalty on the Appellant for having excess actual demand considering the contract demand at 300 KVA of the Petitioner in the energy bills from July 2013 onwards. If the contract demand would have been considered as 337.20 KVA in the energy bill of July 2013 onwards them there was no excess actual demand of more than 110% of the contract demand of 337.20 KVA and no penalty could have been imposed. However, the Respondent has acted totally arbitrary and contrary to the tariff Order in the energy bills of the Appellant from July 2013 onwards. The Impugned Order erred in not considering that in terms of all the relevant tariff orders for the period between 2013 to 2019, whenever the actual demand of the Appellant ecceeded the contract demand for three continuous months, then the said exceeded actual demand ought to have been the new contract demand of the Appellant for the purpose of billing of future months. However, the Respondent have failed in changing the

original contract demand to the new contract demand and have consequently and erroneously imposed penalty in the monthly energy bills of the Petitioner on the alleged ground that the actual demand has exceeded the 110% of the original contract demand i.e. 330 KVA. Accordingly, the monthly energy bills raised by the Respondent are contrary to the relevant tariff order and deserves to be revised by changing the contract demand and by withdrawing the penalty amount. The Impugned Order also failed in considering that in several monthly energy bills for the period between August 2014 to October 2017, the Respondents have erroneously imposed the penal charges of 2 times the normal tariff on the ground that allegedly the actual demand of the Appellant was exceeding 110% of the contract demand. It is humbly submitted as per the relevant Tariff Orders, the penal charges 2 times the normal tariff can be imposed only in the case where there is an undertaking given by the consumer that the actual demand will not exceed the contract demand for a period of at least six months and such undertaking is subsequently not complied by the consumer. The relevant part of the tariff order is extracted herein below for ready reference:

" *In case the consumer fails to respond within 15 days, the licensee would have the right to initiate enhancement of load as per the last recorded contract demand. While, in case the consumer provides an undertaking that the actual demand shall not exceed the contract demand again for a period of at least six months from the last billing, the licensee shall continue to bill the consumer as per the existing contract demand and billing demand.*

Provided that if the consumer fails to adhere to the undertaking and the actual demand exceeds the contract demand within the subsequent six months of the undertaking, the consumer shall have to pay a penal charge of 2 times the normal tariff for a period of three consecutive months and the licensee shall, after serving 7

days' notice to the consumer, enhance the contract demand of the consumer as per the last recorded actual demand."

The Impugned Order should have considered that in the present case there was no undertaking given at all by the Appellant and hence there was no possibility of non-compliance of such undertaking. Accordingly, in no event the penal charges of 2 times the normal tariff could have been imposed on the Appellant. But the Respondent has arbitrarily and incorrectly imposed, the penal charges of 2 times the normal tariff, in the energy bills of the Appellant. The Impugned Order through has taken note of the letter dated 02.09.2015 of the Respondents but the Impugned Order erred in not considering that the Respondents, vide its letter dated 02.09.2015, had enhanced the contract demand of the Appellant from 300 KVA to 385 KVA. Accordingly, after September 2015, the Respondent in the monthly energy bills erroneously imposed penal charges on the Appellant when the actual demand for all such periods was less than the contract demand of 385 KVA. The Impugned Order erred in not taking into consideration the fact that the Respondent has also erroneously fixed 385 KVA as the actual demand of the Appellant in all the energy bills from May 2015 to October 2017. It is humbly submitted that the actual demand of a consumer can never remain static and the value of actual demand always varies from month to month. But in the present case the Respondents have kept the value of actual demand of the Appellant at a static value of 385 KVA in all the energy bills from May 2015 to October 2017 which is unjustified, arbitrary and illegal. The impugned order has also not considered that there were other errors in the monthly energy bills of the Appellant. The Impugned Order has erroneously made a finding that in view of the memo no.1651 dated 02.09.2015 including letter no.911 dated 03.06.2015 the relief claimed by the Petitioner from April 2013 @ 331 KVA and from January 2014 @ 385 after changing tariff from HTS to HTSS is not acceptable as being unfounded. The order dated 16.11.2022 passed by the

Ld.Vidyut Upbhokta Shikayat Nivaran Forum in case no.77/2019 is erroneous and unsustainable in law or on facts. Accordingly, the Impugned Order is also erroneous and unsustainable as it is based on the said order dated 16.11.2022. The Impugned Order ought to have not dismissed the complaint of the Appellant. The impugned Order is perverse and not sustainable in law.

6. Supplementary Affidavit on behalf of the Appellant:

The Appellant is filing this Supplementary Affidavit to bring on record certain crucial facts which may have a direct bearing on the adjudication of the instant case. The Appellant has filed the present case inter alia seeking direction of this Hon'ble Forum upon the Respondent for revising the monthly energy bills of the Appellant from April 2013 to March 2019 as excess charges including penalty have been imposed on the Appellant which are contrary to the relevant tariff Order and for refunding the said excess amount with interest to the Appellant. The sais excess charges including penalty has been imposed by the Respondent, in earlier bills of the Appellant during the said period, considering the erroneous and incorrect contract demand of the Appellant. As per the tariff order, the Respondents were required to increase the contract demand of the Appellant during the relevant period from April 2013 to March 2019. However, in the earlier bills of the Appellant, the Respondent failed in increasing the contract demand. Because of such incorrect contract demand taken by the Respondent, excess billing including penalty was imposed on the Appellant. The Respondent now have understood their error in calculating the contract demand of the Appellant and therefore in their final bill, dated 06.03.2023 issued to the Appellant for the period November 2010 to March 2019, the Respondent has rectified the value of contract demand at the relevant point. For example, in the earlier bill of July 2013 the Respondents had incorrectly taken the contract demand as 300 KVA and imposed consequential

penalties on the Appellant but now in the said final bill, dated 06.03.2023, the Appellant has correctly taken the contract demand as 337 KVA July 2013. Likewise, the March 2014, earlier the contract demand was incorrectly taken as 300 KVA but in the said the final bill to correct contract demand of 385 KVA has been taken. The Respondent have also understood their error in calculating the 'Maximum Demand Consumed' which is the actual consumption, of the Appellant and therefore in their final bill, dated 06.03.2023 issued to the Appellant for the period November 2010 to March 2019, the Respondent has rectified the value of 'Maximum Demand Consumed' at the relevant point. For example, in the earlier bill March 2016 the Respondents had incorrectly taken the 'Maximum Demand Consumed' as 385 KVA and imposed consequential penalties on the Appellant but now in the said final bill, dated 06.03.2023, the Appellant has correctly taken the 'Maximum Demand Consumed' as 349.20 KVA for March 2016 and has correctly not imposed penalty. Likewise, for July2017 the Respondents had incorrectly taken the 'Maximum Demand Consumed' as 385 KVA and imposed consequential penalties on the Appellant but now in the said final bill, dated 06.03.2023, the Appellant has correctly taken the 'Maximum Demand Consumed' as 357.60 KVA July 2017. The said final bill issued by the Respondent is correct as far as the value of contract demand of the Appellant is concerned but the same is incorrect to the extent it classifies the Appellant as HTS instead of HTSS. This Hon'ble Forum may be pleased to direct the Respondent to revise all of the previous bills raised on the Appellant considering the correct and admitted contract demand and 'Maximum Demand Consumed' as provided in the final bill dated 06.03.2023 issued by the Respondent on the Appellant and further considering the Appellant as HTSS consumer during the said relevant period.

7. Counter Affidavit on behalf of the Respondents :

Before giving a para-wise reply, the respondent authorities crave leave of this to bring certain important facts and information to the knowledge of this Hon'ble Court which is essential for just and proper verification of the case. The petitioner is a consumer of the respondent company having consumer no. BIA-09. The petitioner earlier had been availing a sanctioned load of 300 KVA under HTS tariff from November 2004. The petitioner applied for the tariff change from HTS to HTSS on the date of 13/10/2010. Petitioner in his application had undertaken to install a 750 kg induction furnace in place of an existing 300kg. induction furnace. It is stated and submitted that pursuant to application of the petitioner dated 13.10.2010, necessary procedure for change of tariff was carried out by the officials of respondents and thereupon approval for change of tariff from HTS to HTSS was given to the petitioner on 03.11.2010. Subsequently an agreement for supply of electricity under HTSS tariff was executed with the petitioner on 08.11.2010. The Application of petitioner for conversion of tariff from HTS to HTSS was given with two conditions. Firstly, the petitioner was to deposit an additional security amount and secondly, the petitioner was to submit the purchase paper or cubical induction furnace equipment and manufacture technical specifications of the induction furnace. The respondents started to bill the petitioner under HTSS tariff ,however the petitioner failed to comply with the conditions attached to the approval letter dated 03.11.2010. As per provision made under tariff order 2010 as was approved by JSERC, Submission of manufacturer technical specification was essential for change of tariff from HTS to HTSS. It is after lapse of almost 2 years when requisite document and additional security was not deposited. The Electrical Executive Engineer (commercial & Revenue) through letters contained in memo no.1777 dated 04.10.2012 and memo no.1930 dated 26.10.2012 requested the

petitioner to submit manufacturer technical specification. The petitioner through aforementioned letter was made cautions of the fact that if requisite documents are not submitted, then the company could start to bill him on the earlier tariff of HTS. That irrespective of repeated requests made to the petitioner for submission of requisite documents, failed to submit documents required for change of tariff from HTS to HTSS. The respondent company being a public sector undertaking must undergo statutory audit being conducted by Accountant General, Jharkhand. In the course of the audit, it was detected that the petitioner for the period between April 2013 to March 20174 had continuously exceeded maximum contract demand of 300 KVA. The petitioner for the period in between October 2013 to February 2014 had continuously exceeded its maximum contract demand of 300 KVA. Audit report received from the office of Accountant General, Jharkhand had revealed that the petitioner had been availing maximum contract demand for the period between October 2013 to February 2014. The respondents after getting the Audit report requested the petitioner to execute a fresh agreement and to deposit additional security amount for exceeded load through letter vide memo no.911 dated 03.06.2015. The petitioner has not responded to the letter vide memo no.911 dated 03.06.2015. Thereafter, The Electric Supply Circle (ESE), Chas communicated to the petitioner through letter vide memo no. 1651 dated 02.09.2015 that his maximum contract demand had been enhanced to 385 KVA based on audit report, and he was requested to deposit an extra security amount. The petitioner finally submitted technical specification in November 2017, afterward the respondent authorities calculated total chargeable amount from the petitioner till October 2017 which came to the sum of 32,05,847.00/- The petitioner in terms of provision made under tariff order 2010 is legally bound to pay the additional security of exceeded contract demand and since technical specification had been submitted in the month of November 2017, he is liable to pay amount

payable under HTS tariff till October 2017.The submission of technical specification in the month of November 2017, the petitioner is being charged bill under HTSS tariff. The petitioner till date has neither paid the bill served to him being calculated in terms of audit objection raised by Accountant General, Jharkhand nor has deposited security amount for additional 85 KVA and is presently paying current energy charges only. The petitioner failed to deposit the bill raised from him in the month of November 2017, due amount has now risen to 55,46,661/-. The petitioner has continuously requested by the authorities to deposit Rs.55,46,661/-, however no amount was paid which constrained the respondent to issue statutory notice under section 56 (2) of The Electricity Act, 2003. The Electric Executive Engineer (C&R), Electrical Supply Circle, Chas through letter contained in Memo no. 2911 dated 01.11.2019 issued notice u/s 56 (2) of The Electricity Act, 2003. The petitioner has earlier moved before VUSNF Hazaribagh vide case no.77/2020. The para-9 of Judgement order no.97 dated 28.12.2022 passed by VUSNF, Hazaribagh for case no. 78/2020 states that " The operative portion of the ORDER passed in case no.77/2019 invariably indicates that the respondents have been directed to prepare fresh detailed statement bill after providing rebates, if any, from the month of October 2010 to October 2017 based on change of tariff from HTSS to HTS tariff and tariff order applicable from time to time and raise bill accordingly and in this view of the matter I find that the relief claimed for by the petitioner for refund of excess amount from April 2013 till date along with interest in terms of clause 10.7.4 of Supply Code Regulation 2015 are squarely covered by the order passed in 77/2019. Moreover, this relief is also baseless because at that time the Supply Code Regulation 2015 was not in existence. The petitioner is also not entitled for any other relief/ reliefs.

It would not be out of place to mention here that in case no.77/2019 it has been directed in view of admission of the respondents in their Counter Affidavit in para 16 and para 18, to convert the tariff from HTS to HTSS from November 2017 onwards and to allow the petitioner to enter into an agreement for enhanced contract load of 385 KVA and to deposit additional security money. Hence the instant case is dismissed in view of order passed in case no.77/2019 and aforesaid findings by this Forum." After final disconnection of the petitioner's connection the final energy bill amounting Rs. 22,27,932/- in the line of judgement order no.96 passed by VUSNF, was served to the petitioner vide. Electrical Executive Engineer (Commercial & Revenue), Electric Supply Circle, Chas on dated 15.03.2023. Petitioner made payment of the same final energy bill on dated 16.03.2023 vide RTGS No.CNRBR52023031651424730. In compliance with the judgement passed by VUSNF, Hazaribagh revised assessment arrear has been raised keeping in mind section 14 tariff order 2012 JSERC. Contract demand has been revised two times in the energy bill, 1st in July 2013 (keeping CD 337 KVA) & 2nd in March 2014 (keeping CD 385 KVA).

FINDINGS

8. On 25.4.2024 the appellant M/S Amit Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd filed a supplementary affidavit on certain facts which go to the root of the appeal. The supplementary affidavit has been signed by Mr. Amit Prasad, Director of the appellant company. The Supplementary Affidavit has been filed by the appellant to bring on record certain crucial facts which have a direct bearing on the adjudication of the instant case.

It is stated in supplementary affidavit that the appellant has filed the present case inter alia seeking direction upon the Respondent for revising the monthly energy

bills of the appellant from April 2013 to March 2019 as excess charges including penalty have been imposed on the appellant which are contrary to the relevant tariff order and for refunding the said excess amount with interest to the appellant. The excess charges including penalty has been imposed by the respondent, in earlier bills of the appellant during the said period, considering the erroneous and incorrect contract demand of the appellant. As per the tariff order, the respondents were required to increase the contract demand of the Appellant during the relevant period from April 2013 to March 2019. However, in the earlier bills of the appellant, the respondent failed in increasing the contract demand. Because of such incorrect contract demand taken by the respondent, excess billing including penalty was imposed on the appellant. The respondents now have understood their error in calculating the contract demand of the appellant and **therefore in their final bill, dated 06.03.2023 issued to the appellant for the period November 2010 to March 2019, the respondent has rectified the value of contract demand at the relevant point.** For example, in the earlier bill of July 2013 the respondents had incorrectly taken the contract demand as 300 KVA and imposed consequential penalties on the appellant but now in the said final bill, dated 06.03.2023, the appellant has correctly taken the contract demand as 337 KVA July 2013. Likewise, in March 2014, earlier the contract demand was incorrectly taken as 300 KVA but in the said final bill the correct contract demand of 385 KVA has been taken. The respondent have also understood their error in calculating the 'Maximum Demand Consumed' which is the actual consumption, of the appellant and therefore in their final bill, dated 06.03.2023 issued to the appellant for the period November 2010 to March 2019, the respondent has rectified the value of 'Maximum Demand Consumed' at the relevant point. For example, in the earlier bill March 2016 the respondents had incorrectly taken the 'Maximum Demand Consumed' as 385 KVA and imposed consequential penalties on the appellant but now in the said final bill, dated

06.03.2023, the appellant has correctly taken the 'Maximum Demand Consumed' as 349.20 KVA for March 2016 and has correctly not imposed penalty. Likewise, for July 2017 the respondents had incorrectly taken the 'Maximum Demand Consumed' as 385 KVA and imposed consequential penalties on the appellant but now in the said final bill, dated 06.03.2023, the appellant has correctly taken the 'Maximum Demand Consumed' as 357.60 KVA July 2017. **The said final bill issued by the respondent is correct as far as the value of contract demand of the appellant is concerned but the same is incorrect to the extent it classifies the appellant as HTS instead of HTSS**. The Respondent be directed to revise all of the previous bills raised on the appellant considering the correct and admitted contract demand and 'Maximum Demand Consumed' as provided in the final bill dated 06.03.2023 issued by the respondent on the appellant and further considering the appellant as HTSS consumer during the said relevant period.

9. The Clause-15 of the Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Guidelines for Establishment of Forum for Redressal of grievances of the Consumer, Electricity Ombudsman and Consumer Advocacy) Regulation, 2020 deals with Appeal / Representation before the Electricity Ombudsman. It reads as follows:

> **15. Appeal/ Representation**
>
> Any consumer aggrieved by an order made by the Forum (s) may prefer an appeal/representation against such order to the Electricity Ombudsman within a period of thirty days from the date of the receipt of the order, in such form and manner as may be laid down in these Regulations.
>
> Provided further that the Electricity Ombudsman may entertain an appeal after the expiry of the said period of thirty days if sufficient cause is shown for not filing the appeal within that period; but not exceeding a maximum period of 60 days from the date of receipt of the order.

> Provided, further that the Electricity Ombudsman shall entertain no appeal by any consumer, who is required to pay any amount in terms of an order of the Forum, unless the consumer has deposited in the prescribed manner, at least fifty percent of the amount or furnish such security in respect thereof as ordered by Ombudsman.

It is apparent from the provision made under Clause -15 of These Regulations 2020 that the appeal shall lie to the Electricity Ombudsman, when a consumer is aggrieved by an order made by the learned VUSNF/CGRF.

The appellant M/S Amit Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd had filed this appeal being aggrieved by the order of the learned VUSNF – Hazaribagh passed in Case No-78/2019 on 28.12.2022. The appellant in his supplementary affidavit dated 25.4.2024 at para-9 has stated that - **"Though the said final bill issued by the Respondent is correct as far as value of contract demand of the Appellant is concerned but the same is incorrect to the extent it classifies the appellant as HTS instead of HTSS."**

I find that at present the consumer has got no grievance in 'Final Bill' issued by the distribution licensee. The consumer M/S Amit Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd has preferred another appeal before this Authority of the Electricity Ombudsman for quashing/ setting aside the Order, bearing no.96 and dated 16.11.2022, passed by the Ld. Vidyut Upbhokta Shikayat Nivaran Forum, Hazaribagh in Case No. 77/2019, to the extent it has allowed the Respondents to change the tariff application to the Appellant from High Tension Special Service ("HTSS") with retrospective effect from October 2010 to October 2017.

The matter of classification of consumer M/S Amit Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd as HTS instead of HTSS was/is under active consideration before this Authority of

Electricity Ombudsman in Appeal No.- EOJ/01/2023. The matter shall take its own recourse in that very appeal.

10. In view of my findings and comments made above, it is therefore

ORDERED

that the appeal be and the same is

DISPOSED OFF

accordingly, as there is no persistence of grievance to the consumer appellant M/S Amit Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd. after rectification and issuance of final bill dated 6.3.2024 by the distribution licensee Jharkhand Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. and its officers, the respondents.

The parties shall bear their own cost. There shall be no order of cost. Let a copy of this judgement be supplied to the parties.

(Dictated & Corrected by me) Pronounced by me

(G. K. ROY) (GOPAL KUMAR ROY)

Electricity Ombudsman : Jharkhand