



**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. 197

Dated: 23 Jan. 2025

To

The Managing Director,  
DHBVN, Hisar.

The Managing Director,  
UHBVN, Panchkula.

Sh. Kuldeep Atri,  
the SGRA-cum-SDO(Op),  
Division (Electricity), Palwal.  
Contact: 8059888222  
E-mail: xenoppalwal@dhbvn.org.in

Sh. Pankaj Panwar,  
the then FGRA-cum-SDO(Op),  
Sub Division (Electricity), Sub Urban, Palwal.  
(Now, XEN, Greater Faridad.)  
Contact: 09718599180  
E-mail: xenopgreaterfaridabad@dhbvn.org.in

The FGRA-cum-SDO(Op),  
Sub Division (Electricity), Sub Urban, Palwal.  
Contact: 8059888223  
E-mail: sdoopsuburbanpalwal@dhbvn.org.in

Sh. Kuldeep,  
the then DO-cum-JE(Op),  
Sub Division (Electricity), Sub Urban, Palwal.  
(Now, O/o Sub Division (Electricity), Sector-55, Ballabgarh)  
Contact: 09540956668  
E-mail: Sdoopec55@dhbvn.org.in

**Subject:- Revision Details -Revision Details -AAS24/1120832 Name-Sh. SHESH PAL  
Service- Meter Complaint - Replace Burnt Meter [RTS - 3 Day] DHBVN Self  
Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal(CM Window) on 27.11.2024.**

**Sir,**

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the orders dated 21.01.2025 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

Endst. No. 198

Dated: 23 Jan. 2025

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

- Sh. Vikas Kadian, XEN, DHBVN, Nodal Officer for RTS matters on behalf of DHBVN E-mail: kadianvikas@yahoo.com.
- The appellant - Sh. Shesh Pal Phone No. 9810432069 Email: surajja ivikkendra@gmail.com.

(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 (2<sup>nd</sup> FLOOR), SECTOR 17-A, CHANDIGARH-160017**  
**Website- <https://haryana-rtsc.gov.in/> Telephone: 0172-2711050**

**Final orders**

**(In respect Revision Details - AAS24/1120832 Name - Sh. SHESH PAL Service - Meter Complaint - Replace Burnt Meter [RTS - 3 Day] DHBVN Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal (CM Window) on 27.11.2024.)**

Case type	Revision on AAS	
Department	DHBVN	
Name of Service	Meter Complaint - Replace Burnt Meter	
Date of application	27.04.2024	
RTS timeline	3 Days	
RTS Due Date	01.05.2024	
District	Palwal	
Name of the Appellant	Sh. Shesh Pal	
Designated Officer	Designation	JE, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Sub-Urban, Palwal
	Action taken with date	No action
	Remarks of DO	No remarks
First Grievance Redressal Authority	Designation	SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)- Sub-Urban, Palwal
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to FGRA	31.05.2024 (Auto Appeal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	NA
	Action taken by the FGRA with date	No action taken
	Remarks of FGRA	No Remarks
Second Grievance Redressal Authority	Designation	XEN, Division (Electricity)-XEN, Palwal
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA	16.07.2024 (Auto Appeal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	NA
	Action taken by SGRA with date	Final Judgement Delivered on 02.09.2024
	Remarks of SGRA	"The appeal is hereby resolved Penalty Imposed: Rs. 2000/- on Sh. Kuldeep Sharma, JE"
Commission	Date of filing of Revision	27.11.2024
	Mode of Revision	Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal
	Remarks of the Appellant	"not satisfied with SGRA"
	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 SGRA-cum-XEN, Division (Electricity), Palwal, Sh. Pankaj Panwar, the then FGRA-cum-SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity), Chautala, Sirsa, FGRA-cum-SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity), Chautala, Sirsa and Sh. Kuldeep, the then DO-cum-JE, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Sub-Urban, Palwal vide letter no. 5497 dated 11.12.2024. They were directed to investigate the matter and send the action taken report by 20.12.2024. A reply from the XEN was received vide letter no. 17648 on 20.12.2024, reiterating the contents of his final judgment dated 02.09.2024 as summarized under:-

1. Complaint is covered under 'Underground Cable Breakdown' for which the RTS timeline is two days.
2. The 11KV line was damaged and supply was restored after filling the straight joints of XLPE cable. The same was done thrice, after which the cable was replaced on 28.10.2023.
3. SDO was directed to investigate the matter. Further, a penalty of Rs. 2,000/- was imposed on Sh. Kuldeep, DO-cum-JE. Draft show cause was sent to higher authorities to initiate disciplinary action against him.
4. FGRA-cum-SDO was given a warning.

Additionally, a reply from the SDO, Sub-Urban Palwal, was received vide letter no. 6166 on 20.12.2024 wherein it was informed that the complainant was requested to have his meter checked on 07.03.2024 and 13.03.2024 but he did not attend. The meter was subsequently checked on 12.07.2024 and was found to be functioning within permissible limits. The lab report, prepared by the JE was submitted on 10.10.2024. Furthermore, a reply was received from Sh. Pankaj Panwar, the then SDO and now XEN, Greater Faridabad, on 23.12.2024. He informed that the estimate for replacing the damaged cable was sent to XEN (OP), Palwal and that the cable was replaced on 28.10.2023. He also mentioned that the complainant was repeatedly requested to visit the office through various letters but he failed to respond.

3. The Commission has carefully considered all the facts and circumstances of this case. To begin with, the Commission observes that the notified service was incorrectly categorized in the CM Window portal. The service was categorized as 'Meter Complaint – Replace Burnt Meter'. However, based on the respondents' replies and as agreed by the Commission, it should have been classified under the notified service of 'Underground Cable Breakdown', which has a stipulated resolution timeline of two days. The facts reveal that the complainant faced the issue on 09.09.2023 and subsequently filed a CM Window complaint on 04.10.2023. It is noted from a second CM Window complaint, dated 02.01.2024, that after intervention by the Deputy Commissioner, the issue was resolved on 28.10.2023. Another CM Window complaint was lodged on 27.04.2024, requesting penal action against the defaulting officials, which eventually reached the Commission as a revision on 27.11.2024. The complainant's assertion that a 50-day disruption in electricity supply can be detrimental to any small business—particularly an oil mill—is valid and well-founded. He further requested a refund of the MMC charged for the corresponding period of disruption. The Commission is addressing these aspects separately. With respect to allowing the revision for initiating penal action against the

respondents, the Commission finds itself restrained, as the issue was already resolved on 28.10.2023. While the Commission sympathizes with the complainant regarding his financial losses, it also notes that the respondents made three attempts to fix the cable. When those efforts were unsuccessful, the entire line was replaced, ultimately restoring supply. Turning to the revision escalated to the Commission, the primary grievance concerns invoking penal action against the officials. The Commission acknowledges that had the first complaint been escalated to it earlier, it would have been obligated to address the lapses. However, as the work was completed and the revision now pertains solely to initiating action against the respondents, the Commission is not inclined to do so in view of the efforts made by the respondents. The Commission's role is to ensure timely service delivery and take action against delinquent officials when warranted. In this particular case, the service was eventually delivered, albeit with delays. The concerned SGRA has already invoked penal provisions against the DO-cum-JE, which the Commission finds appropriate and sufficient within its service delivery oversight framework. At the same time, the Commission emphasizes that it is not a "court of justice" and distinguishes its mandate from forums handling claims for damages. While it does not dismiss the complainant's right to seek damages, the Commission asserts that such claims fall outside its purview. In conclusion, the Commission draws a clear distinction between service delivery and its associated consequences, such as damages. While the complainant has a strong case for seeking compensation, the Commission reaffirms its primary responsibility to oversee service delivery and ensure accountability within that scope.

4. Regarding the claim for a refund of the MMC for the disrupted period, the Commission observes that the notified service addressing refunds specifically pertains to Refund of Advance Consumption Deposit/Consumption Security/Meter Security on closure of account after adjustment of all dues. It is noted that only the following types of refunds fall under the scope of the notified service, and even then, they are contingent upon the closure of account after adjustment of all dues, which does not appear to apply in this case. At the same time, the Commission expresses strong displeasure with the operations of the toll-free number 1912, which, as reported, closed the complaint within hours without resolving the issue. The purpose of this toll-free number is not merely to record citizens' grievances as a formality but to ensure their thorough resolution. Several directions and advisories have been issued by the Nigam in the past regarding the proper handling of grievances at the DO/FGRA/SGRA levels. The Commission urges both Managing Directors to issue suitable advisories and provide requisite training for the personnel operating these call centers. The Commission also highlights the need for officials directing the call center to mark complaints appropriately. The Nigams are encouraged to examine the SARAL helpline center, which operates within the State, to refine their process flows and improve complaint management.

With these observations, the revision is hereby dismissed. The Commission reiterates that this dismissal pertains solely to the aspect of service delivery and does not preclude the complainant from seeking compensation or other justice through other appropriate forums.

22th January, 2025

