



HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE COMMISSION
S.C.O. No. 38 & 39 (2nd FLOOR), SECTOR 17-A, CHANDIGARH-160017
Website- <https://haryana-rtsc.gov.in/> Telephone: 0172-2711050

No. 2280
To

Dated: 18th June, 2025

The SGRA-cum-XEN (Op),
Division (Electricity), Gulha Cheeka.
Contact: 9315457367
E-mail: xenopguhla@uhbvn.org.in

The FGRA-cum-SDO(Op),
Sub Division (Electricity), S/DIV Siwan.
Contact: 9354726209
E-mail: sdoopsiwan@uhbvn.org.in

The DO-cum-CA (Op),
Sub Division (Electricity), S/DIV Siwan.
Contact: 8295426068
E-mail: casiwan@uhbvn.org.in


Subject: Revision Details - AAS25/1379079 Name- Sh. Sohan Lal Service- Billing Complaints [RTS - 7 Days] UHBVN Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal(Saral) on 08.05.2025.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the orders dated 16.06.2025 passed by Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, Chandigarh in respect of above case for information and compliance. **The SGRA-cum-XEN is requested** to send compliance of these orders, to the Commission by 10.07.2025. The compliance report must be sent only through email to rtsc-hry@gov.in. **A physical copy of the same must not be sent. The reply must mention the name and designation of the signatory without which it shall not be entertained.**

BY THE ORDER OF THE HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE COMMISSION AT CHANDIGARH.

Encl: As above

|

(Sube Khan)


Under Secretary-cum-Registrar,
Haryana Right to Service Commission
E-mail: rtsc-hry@gov.in

Endst. No. 2281

Dated: 18th June, 2025

A copy of the above is forwarded to the following for information:-

- i. The Managing Director, UHBVN
- ii. Sh. Rajinder Kumar, SE, UHBVN, Nodal Officer for RTS matters on behalf of UHBVN E-mail: r.untale@gmail.com.
- iii. The appellant - Sh. Sohan Lal Phone No. 7015739705.


(Sube Khan)

Under Secretary-cum-Registrar,
Haryana Right to Service Commission
E-mail: rtsc-hry@gov.in



HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE COMMISSION
S.C.O. No. 38 & 39 (2nd FLOOR), SECTOR 17-A, CHANDIGARH-160017
Website- <https://haryana-rtsc.gov.in/> Telephone: 0172-2711050

Interim orders

(In respect of Revision Details - AAS25/1379079 Name- Sh. Sohan Lal Service- Billing Complaints [RTS - 7 Days] UHBVN Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal(Saral) on 08.05.2025.)

Hearing date: 16.06.2025

Time: 10:30 am

Case type	Revision on AAS	
Department	Energy (UHBVN)	
Name of Service	Billing Complaints	
Date of application	24.12.2024	
RTS timeline	7 Days	
RTS Due Date	02.01.2025	
District	Kaithal	
Name of the Appellant	Sh. Sohan Lal	
Designated Officer	Designation	CA – Sub-Division (Electricity)-S/DIV SEWAN
	Action taken with date	Closed on 30.01.2025 (As per CGRS)
	Remarks of DO	"All document uploaded in CBO. PDCO updated in next billing cycle." - (As per CGRS)
First Grievance Redressal Authority	Designation	SDO – Sub-Division (Electricity)-S/DIV SEWAN
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to FGRA	03.01.2025 Auto Appeal (Saral)
	Remarks of the Appellant	NA
	Action taken by the FGRA with date	Appeal Resolved on 31.01.2025
	Remarks of FGRA	"All document uploaded in CBO. PDCO updated in next billing cycle"
Second Grievance Redressal Authority	Designation	XEN - Division (Electricity)-Gulha Cheeka.
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA	20.02.2025 (Self Filed by Applicant on Saral Portal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	"in the department mistake meter pdco not enter in ccb. and showing high bill generated and not to refund my security"
	Action taken by SGRA with date	Final Judgement Delivered on 03.04.2025
	Remarks of SGRA	"final judgement"
Commission	Date of filing of Revision	08.05.2025
	Mode of Revision	Self Filed by Applicant on Saral Portal

	Remarks of the Appellant	"As per given Application my account has been made pdco by you but my acoount security not has to returned me so request to return my security"
	Whether Revision has been filed in time?	Yes
	Whether service has been applied under correct category?	Yes

2. Taking cognizance of the matter, the Commission sent a letter to the FGRA-cum-SDO (Op), Sub-Division (Electricity), S/DIV Siwan vide letter no. 1742 on 14.05.2025. He was directed to investigate the matter and send the action taken report by 23.05.2025. A response was received from FGRA-cum-SDO (Op), Sub-Division (Electricity), S/DIV Siwan vide no. 490 on 26.05.2025 stating that the connection was closed on 29.01.2025 and was effected in RAPDRP on 30.01.2025. Further, his security deposit of Rs. 8,000 was adjusted in the same connection on 17.04.2025.

However, the Commission observed the following: -

- i. The appellant applied for PDCO in 2022 and was effected only in 2025. Further, when the PDCO was effected in January 2025 as per their admission, the security deposit was adjusted on 17.04.2025, after a delay of over two and a half months. The notified timeline for the refund of the meter security as a service is 30 days.
- ii. SGRA in its orders had not fixed any responsibility for the delay in effecting the PDCO.
- iii. It was noted that the adjustments were effected online before the revision was raised with the Commission. However, there has been a significant delay in the effect of the same even after filing of the application.

3. The above observations were conveyed to the FGRA-cum-SDO (Op), Sub-Division (Electricity), S/DIV Siwan vide letter no. 2048 dated 03.06.2025 and a hearing was scheduled to be held before Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission on 16.06.2025 at 10:30 am along with the concerned DO-cum-CA. The hearing took place as scheduled, which was attended by:

- i. Sh. Rajinder Kumar, SE, UHBVN, Nodal Officer for RTS matters on behalf of UHBVN.
- ii. Sh. Ashish Gautam, FGRA-cum-SDO (Op), Sub-Division (Electricity), S/DIV Siwan.
- iii. Sh. Preetam, DO-cum-CA (Op), Sub-Division (Electricity), S/DIV Siwan.
- iv. Sh. Sohan Lal, the appellant.

The appellant reiterated the contents of his complaint dated 21.12.2024, which was also enclosed while filing appeals with various authorities, including the Commission, through the AAS Portal. The SDO reaffirmed the contents of his earlier reply dated 26.05.2025 as well as the latest reply dated 13.06.2025, which was received on 16.06.2025. While the earlier reply has been incorporated in paragraph no. 2, the latest reply stated that although the appellant's connection had been permanently disconnected upon his request in February 2022, due to a clerical oversight, the disconnection was not updated in the system records and billing continued on an average basis. He further stated

that this issue arose due to data migration from the Hartron system to the RAPDRP system. The SDO informed that the connection of Sh. Sohan Lal, which continued to be billed on an average basis, was identified during a rectification drive and was officially closed in the ledger on 30.01.2025. Subsequently, a request for adjustment of the ACD amount was received through the CGRS Portal on 05.02.2025. A sum of Rs. 8,000/- was adjusted in the bill on 17.04.2025. Further verification revealed that an amount of Rs. 91,122/- is pending in his account, which will be made zero. Once approved, the refund of the ACD will be processed and transferred to the consumer's preferred bank account. A time period of one week has been requested to complete the process. In conclusion, he tendered an apology for the unique and complex nature of the case.

4. The Commission has carefully considered all facts and circumstances of this case. The lapses on the part of the CA and the SDO are writ large on the face of it. The Commission does not agree with the contention of the SDO that this case is of a unique and complex nature. In fact, it is a very simple case. The consumer had his connection permanently disconnected and submitted a written request on 15.03.2022 for the refund of the security amount. This application, which is duly enclosed with his representation, can be accessed on the AAS Portal. The application was marked to the "CA/CC for n/a" by the then SDO on 15.03.2022. It was admitted by Sh. Preetam that he has been posted as CA in the subdivision since February 2020. When asked why he did not act upon the application, he stated that it was not his responsibility but that of the cashier. However, when asked whether he forwarded the application to the cashier, he had no answer. Moreover, when the appellant filed his complaint on 24.12.2024, the CA should have carefully reviewed the request and taken appropriate action—not only to close the wrongly generated bill but also to initiate the refund of the security amount along with applicable interest. Instead, the case was closed on the CGRS portal on 30.01.2025 without taking any such action. In fact, a final bill of Rs. 91,122/- was generated, which is incorrect, as no bill should have been raised after the PDCO was issued in 2022.
5. Furthermore, when the appeals were filed before the FGRA and SGRA, the security amount was adjusted against this erroneous bill rather than being refunded to the consumer. As for the security amount, the SDO clarified that it is Rs. 8,000/- and not Rs. 26,280/- as claimed by the appellant. He stated that while the appellant had deposited Rs. 26,280/- at the time of applying for the new connection, only Rs. 8,000/- was towards the security deposit; the remaining amount was non-refundable. When both the CA and SDO were asked why the adjustment of Rs. 8,000/- was made in the wrongly generated bill instead of a refund and why interest was not granted on the ACD amount as per Clause 4.15.4 of the HERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2014 dated 08.01.2014, the SDO admitted that interest should have been paid to the consumer but was inadvertently omitted. It is evident that neither the initial request nor the subsequent complaint filed by the appellant were properly reviewed. The CA failed to act on the request marked to him on 15.03.2022, resulting in this matter remaining unresolved for more than three years and three months. The appellant is yet to receive his rightful refund. Though Rs 8,000/- of the security amount was refunded, it was incorrectly adjusted against a bill that should

have been nullified. The SDO acknowledged that interest was due for the delay, yet it was not paid highlighting the disregard for consumer rights.

6. In view of the above, following is ordered:-

- (i) The Commission imposes a penalty of Rs. 5,000/- on Sh. Preetam, DO-cum-CA in exercise of its powers vested under Section 17(1)(h) of the Haryana Right to Service Act, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') for non-delivery of this service despite the request of the consumer having been specifically marked to him on 15.03.2022. Further, the latest application dated 24.12.2024 was erroneously closed on 30.01.2025 without any resolution. He is also directed to pay a compensation of Rs. 5,000/- to the complainant, Sh. Sohan Lal. The XEN, Division Gulha Cheeka is directed to ensure that amount of Rs. 10,000/- is deducted from his salary of June, 2025 to be paid in July, 2025 and deposit Rs. 5,000/- in the State Treasury under the Receipts Head 0070-60-800-86-51 and Rs. 5,000/- is paid in the bank account of Sh. Sohan Lal. He is also requested to intimate compliance to the Commission along with photocopies of the Challan etc., at its email id rtsc-hry@gov.in. Sh. Sohal Lal is requested to provide the following details to the XEN, Division Gulha Cheeka (xenopguhla@uhbvn.org.in) as well as to the Commission for making the payment of the compensation:-
 - (a) Name of the Bank
 - (b) Name of the Account holder in the Bank
 - (c) Bank Account Number
 - (d) Address of the Bank
 - (e) IFSC Code
- (ii) Accordingly, this is a fit case where disciplinary action should be recommended against Sh. Ashish Gautam, FGRA-cum-SDO (OP), by the Commission in exercise of its powers under Section 17(1)(d) of the Act for failing to satisfactorily discharge his duties as FGRA. The matter came to his notice on 03.01.2025 but he resolved it only on 31.01.2025 by merely nullifying the wrongly raised bill, as claimed by him. However, he neither reviewed the consumer's request nor the appeal in its entirety and failed to initiate any steps for refund of the security deposit. The refund was processed only after the final judgment of the XEN-cum-SGRA, when the security amount was adjusted against the wrongly raised bill. His claim that this is a unique and complex case is also incorrect, as is evident from the above sequence of events. Nevertheless, considering that this is the first lapse on his part that has come to the notice of the Commission, a lenient view is taken. His written and oral apology is accepted and he is hereby warned to exercise greater diligence in the future.
- (iii) The action taken by Sh. Gaurav Lochab, XEN, Division Gulha Cheeka, is also found to be deficient. Even while delivering the final order on 03.04.2025, no substantial steps had been taken either to nullify the wrongly raised bill or to initiate the refund of the security amount along with interest. It is evident that the judgment was delivered in a mechanical manner, without properly examining the core grievance of the appellant. His contention that the appellant had expressed satisfaction with the

resolution of the issue is incorrect, as otherwise, the appellant would not have filed a revision before the Commission. The fact remains that the consumer has still not received his refund to date. Therefore, this case also warrants a recommendation for disciplinary proceedings against him under Section 17(1)(d) of the Act. However, the Commission is refraining from making such a recommendation at this stage, in the hope that the refund along with applicable interest would be processed and paid to the consumer within the next 15 days. Failing this, the Commission will be constrained to reconsider initiating disciplinary action against him.

The Commission should be apprised of the directions contained above as well as payment of refund to the consumer by 10.07.2025.

16th June, 2025

