



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

No. 4230  
To

Dated: 25/9/24

The Additional Chief Secretary to Govt. of Haryana.  
Energy Department.

The XEN (OP)-cum-SGRA,  
Division (Electricity), Mahendragarh.  
Contact: 8059888300  
E-mail: [xenopmohindergarh@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:xenopmohindergarh@dhbvn.org.in)

The SDO(Op)-cum-FGRA,  
Sub Division (Electricity), Kanina.  
Contact: 8059888303  
E-mail: [sdoopkanina@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:sdoopkanina@dhbvn.org.in)


The CA(Op)-cum-DO,  
O/o Sub Division (Electricity), Kanina.  
Contact: 8059888303  
E-mail: [sdoopkanina@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:sdoopkanina@dhbvn.org.in)

**Subject:- Revision Details - AAS24/1050675 Name- Sh. RAMPAT Service-Billing Complaints [RTS - 7 Day] DHBVN Self Filed by Applicant on Saral Portal(Saral) on 29.07.2024.**

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the orders dated 20.09.2024 passed by Sh. T.C. Gupta Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, Chandigarh in respect of above case for information and compliance.

**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](mailto:rtsc-hry@gov.in)

Endst. No. 4231

Dated: 25/9/24

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

- i. Sh. Vikas Kadian, XEN, DHBVN, Nodal Officer for RTS matters on behalf of DHBVN E-mail: [kadianvikas@yahoo.com](mailto:kadianvikas@yahoo.com).
- ii. the appellant - Sh. Rampat Phone No. 9588193382 E-mail: [reginking77@gmail.com](mailto:reginking77@gmail.com) (through AAS).

  
(Sube Khan)

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



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

**Final Orders**

**Revision Details - AAS24/1050675 Name- Sh. RAMPAT Service- Billing Complaints [RTS - 7 Day] DHBVN Self Filed by Applicant on Saral Portal (Saral) on 29.07.2024.**

Hearing date: 17.09.2024

Time: 10:30 am

Case type	Revision on AAS	
Department	DHBVN	
Name of Service	Billing Complaints	
Date of application	26.03.2024	
RTS timeline	7 Days	
RTS Due Date	04.04.2024	
District	Mahendergarh	
Name of the Appellant	Sh. Rampat	
<b>Designated Officer</b>	Designation	CA, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Kanina
	Action taken with date	29.03.2024 (Closed)
	Remarks of DO	Closed
<b>First Grievance Redressal Authority</b>	Designation	SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Kanina
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to FGRA	30.03.2024 (Self Filed)
	Remarks of the Appellant	'The department misread account number 2723212000 as 0723212000. Hence I am again filing the complainant and kindly solve it. Complaint is as follows, I have account number 6124366259 and I was paying my bills with this number itself. From past few months I am receiving 2 bill messages on my registered mobile number. The second account number for which I am receiving messages is 2723212000. Earlier when I.'
	Action taken by the FGRA with date	Appeal Dismissed on 30.03.2024
	Remarks of FGRA	"ACCOUNT NUMBER 6124366259 IS IN THE NAME OF SH. RAMPAT , VILLAGE GOMLA. ACCOUNT NUMBER 0723212000 IS IN THE NAME OF SMT. SUNITA W/O SH. SADA SINGH MAJRA KHURD CITY MAHENDERGARH."
<b>Second Grievance Redressal Authority</b>	Designation	XEN, Division (Electricity)-Mahendergarh



	Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA	30.03.2024 (Self Filed)
	Remarks of the Appellant	"The department misread account number 2723212000 as 0723212000. Hence I am again filing the complainant and kindly solve it. Complaint is as follows, I have account number 6124366259 and I was paying my bills with this number itself. From past few months I am receiving 2 bill messages on my registered mobile number. The second account number for which I am receiving messages is 2723212000. Earlier when I."
	Action taken by SGRA with date	Appeal dismissed on 06.05.2024
	Remarks of SGRA	"The connection has been disconnected at the request of the consumer."
<b>Commission</b>	Date of filing of Revision	29.07.2024
	Mode of Revision	Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal
	Remarks of the Appellant	"The connection i.e. 2723212000 has still not been disconnected, I am still receiving new bills on both the account numbers including the one which was requested and is said by the department that it have been disconnected."
	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, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Kanina, vide No. 3346 dated 07.08.2024. He was directed to investigate the matter and submit the action taken report by 16.08.2024.
3. A response was received from the FGRA-cum-SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Kanina through email dated 17.08.2024, stating that the consumer has an AP connection in his village. After reviewing the ledger details, it was concluded that the account with the number 2723212000 was the correct one, whereas the one on which he had been paying his bills for some time, i.e., 6124366259, was incorrect. Accordingly, a PDCO was generated on 02.08.2024 and the same was executed on 09.08.2024.

However, the Commission noted the following:-

- i. The action taken by the DO and FGRA is inadequate. In his appeal to the FGRA, the consumer specifically mentioned that the department was confusing two different account numbers, yet the appeal was dismissed based on the same premise.
- ii. Even in the PDCO, the computer-generated account number mentioned at the top is 6124366259, which the department now claims to be incorrect. The department

has admitted that this is an old AP connection, indicating that serious lapses have occurred from the outset.

4. The above observations were communicated to the SGRA-cum-XEN, Division (Electricity)-Mahendergarh; FGRA-cum-SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Kanina; and DO-cum-CA, (O/o SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Kanina) vide letter No. 3748 dated 30.08.2024. A hearing was scheduled before Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, on 17.09.2024, at 10:30 am. The hearing took place as scheduled and was attended by:

- i. Sh. Vikas Kadian, XEN, DHBVN, Nodal Officer for RTS matters on behalf of DHBVN.
- ii. Sh. Umesh Verma, FGRA-cum-SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Kanina
- iii. Sh. Shiv Kumar, DO-cum-CA, (O/o SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Kanina).
- iv. Sh. Anshuman S/o Sh. Harvinder S/o Sh. Rampat, the appellant.

The appellant reiterated the contents of his complaint, stating that he had account number 6124366259 and had been regularly paying bills associated with this account. However, he suddenly began receiving bills for another account, number 2723212000. As a result, he started receiving two bills but continued paying only those related to his original account. He subsequently filed his complaint on 26.03.2024, which was erroneously closed by the CA, citing the following:

*“ACCOUNT NUMBER 6124366259 IS IN THE NAME OF SH. RAMPAT, VILLAGE GOMLA. ACCOUNT NUMBER 0723212000 IS IN THE NAME OF SMT. SUNITA W/O SH. SADA SINGH MAJRA KHURD CITY MAHENDERGARH.”*

Then he filed an appeal with the FGRA-cum-SDO on 30.03.2024 clearly stating that ‘The department misread account number 2723212000 as 0723212000. Hence, I am again filing the complainant and kindly solve it’ and he also reiterated contents of his complaint. Surprisingly, the FGRA dismissed his appeal on the same date i.e. on 30.03.2024 by giving wrong comments as under:-

*“ACCOUNT NUMBER 6124366259 IS IN THE NAME OF SH. RAMPAT, VILLAGE GOMLA. ACCOUNT NUMBER 0723212000 IS IN THE NAME OF SMT. SUNITA W/O SH. SADA SINGH MAJRA KHURD CITY MAHENDERGARH.”*

He then filed an appeal with the SGRA-cum-XEN on 30.03.2024, who investigated the case and disconnected one of the connections. However, he continued receiving bills for both accounts, which led him to file a revision with the Commission on 29.07.2024. He also stated that he had personally met Sh. Umesh Verma, SDO, who had promised that the necessary action would be taken by the end of the day, but it was not. When he sent a message to the SDO regarding the receipt of another incorrect bill, no action was taken. He further stated that he has been harassed by DHBVN and forced to file numerous appeals without any resolution.



5. (i) Sh. Shiv Kumar, DO-cum-CA, stated that he closed the complaint on 29.03.2024 after verifying the account numbers in the system. However, he mistakenly interpreted account number 2723212000 as 0723212000. He added that this file earlier belonged to the City Mahendergarh sub-division, which was migrated to their sub-division in 2022. The file was not available in his sub-division until it was located last week. It has since been found that the complainant's correct connection number is 2723212000 and therefore, the consumer is only liable to pay the bill for this connection.
- (ii) The FGRA-cum-SDO reiterated the contents of his reply dated 17.08.2024. However, when he was asked why he dismissed the appeal on 30.03.2024, i.e. the same day when it was received, he had no answer. He was further questioned about why, when the consumer had clearly stated that the department had misread account number 2723212000 as 0723212000, he did not address this and instead reiterated the comments as mentioned in para no. 4 above. Again, he had no answer but apologized for the oversight.
- (iii) Sh. Ranbir Singh, SGRA-cum-XEN, was unable to attend the hearing as he had to be present at a hearing in the Haryana Right to Information Commission and thus, he deputed the SDO to represent him.
6. The Commission has carefully considered all facts and circumstances of this case. Following deficiencies are evident in this case:-
- (i) Sh. Shiv Kumar, DO-cum-CA, wrongfully closed the complaint on 29.03.2024 without investigating in whose name the connection was released. He misread account number 2723212000 as 0723212000 and closed the complaint. Moreover, the hearing took place before the SGRA-cum-XEN, when the incorrect account number was identified on 06.05.2024 but the PDCO, was entered on 02.08.2024, i.e. after nearly three months. Since, account number 6124366259 was closed, as it was determined that this connection did not belong to the complainant, therefore, all payments made by the consumer against this account should have transferred to the correct account number, 2723212000. However, this sundry was prepared only after the Commission issued notice and scheduled a hearing. The CA and the SDO stated that this would be sent to the CBO, but due to a binder issue, approval may take some time. Meanwhile, the consumer continued to face harassment, as he has received a bill for his new account number, 2723212000, with arrears, despite having already paid the bills for his original connection. It is unfortunate that consumers have to approach the Commission for such minor issues. Thanks to the conceptualization and implementation of the Auto Appeal System (AAS) by the Commission that the consumers now have the opportunity to file appeals through subsequent appellant authorities. While these matters should have been resolved at the initial stage by the DO or at the FGRA level, without the Auto Appeal System, consumers would have faced much greater hardship. In view of the above, finding Sh. Shiv Kumar, CA, guilty of various omissions, the Commission, exercising its powers under Section 17(1)(h) of the Haryana

Right to Service Act, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") imposes a token penalty of Rs. 1,000 upon him and awards compensation of Rs. 1,000 to the consumer, Sh. Rampat, to be paid from Sh. Shiv Kumar's salary. The XEN is directed to ensure the deduction of Rs. 2,000 from his September 2024 salary, to be paid in October 2024. While Rs. 1,000 be deposited in the State Treasury under the Receipts Head 0070-60-800-86-51, Rs. 1,000 be disbursed to the consumer. The XEN is requested to provide proof of compliance to the Commission by 10.10.2024 through email only, along with photocopies of the challan, at the Commission's email: [rtsc-hry@gov.in](mailto:rtsc-hry@gov.in). Sh. Rampat is requested to provide the following details to the office of the XEN ([xenopmohindergarh@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:xenopmohindergarh@dhbvn.org.in)) and the Commission through email for the compensation payment:

- (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) The conduct of the FGRA-cum-SDO is entirely unsatisfactory. It is unfortunate that he did not even read the contents of the appeal filed on 30.03.2024 and dismissed it on the same day, despite having ample time to decide the appeal. According to the provisions of the Act, the appellate authority has 30 working days, which roughly translates to 40 calendar days. Therefore, he had sufficient time to investigate the matter and take corrective action. Instead, he failed to review the appeal properly, misread account number 2723212000 as 0723212000 and dismissed the appeal by recording following incorrect comments:-

*"ACCOUNT NUMBER 6124366259 IS IN THE NAME OF SH. RAMPAT, VILLAGE GOMLA. ACCOUNT NUMBER 0723212000 IS IN THE NAME OF SMT. SUNITA W/O SH. SADA SINGH MAJRA KHURD CITY MAHENDERGARH."*

Moreover, when the SGRA investigated the matter and dismissed the appeal on 06.05.2024, he did not promptly initiate a case for adjusting the amount already paid by the consumer to the new account. Additionally, the PDCO was generated on 02.08.2024, even though the appeal was dismissed on 06.05.2024 with the statement, "*The connection has been disconnected at the request of the consumer.*" If the disconnection had been completed on 06.05.2024, why did it take nearly three months for the disconnection to be carried out on 02.08.2024 and approved on 09.08.2024? This delay not only reflects carelessness but also dereliction of duties. Therefore, due to these lapses, the Commission, in exercise of its powers under Section 17(1)(d) of the Act, recommends to the Additional Chief Secretary, Energy Department to initiate disciplinary proceedings against Sh. Umesh Verma, SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity), Kanina. The



ACS, Energy Department, is requested to inform the Commission of the action taken in this case within 30 days of receiving these orders, as provided in Section 18(1) of the Act, which states as follows:

*The State Government shall consider the recommendations made by the Commission under clauses (d), (e) and (f) of sub-section (1) of section 17 and send information to the Commission of action taken within thirty days or such longer time as may be decided in consultation with the Commission, In case the State Government decides not to implement any of the recommendations of the Commission, it shall communicate the reasons for not acting on the recommendations to the Commission.*

- (iii) Regarding the role of the SGRA-cum-XEN, although he identified the problem and got the connection disconnected, he wrongfully dismissed the appeal on 06.05.2024. The XEN seems to be unclear about the difference between 'dismissing' and 'allowing' an appeal. Given that there was merit in the consumer's case, the appeal should have been allowed rather than dismissed. Dismissing an appeal implies that there was no merit, which was not the case here. Moreover, although he stated that the connection was disconnected at the consumer's request and dismissed the appeal on 06.05.2024, the PDCO was entered only on 02.08.2024 and approved on 09.08.2024, approximately three months later. He should have ensured that the PDCO was entered before allowing the appeal and resolving the issue. Additionally, he should have got prepared and ensured sending of the sundry for the amount already paid by the consumer for the disconnected account to the CBO for approval before closing the appeal. These are serious lapses. However, since he has partially taken action, the Commission records its displeasure for his failure to fully resolve the appeal as warranted by the facts. He is warned to be more careful and if any further lapses are found in future, this case will be combined with those cases for recommending disciplinary action against him to the State Government. It is hoped that he will not present such an occasion to the Commission again.

With these orders, this revision is hereby allowed and disposed of.

20<sup>th</sup> September, 2024

