



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. HRSC-010004/20/2024 /2185  
To

Dated: 20/5/24

The Managing Director,  
DHBVN.

The SE,  
DHBVN, Fatehabad.  
E-mail:

The Sub Divisional Officer-cum-FGRA  
S/D, DHBVN, City, Jakhal, Haryana.  
E-mail: sdoopjakhal@dhbvn.org.in  
(M) 9812452724

**Subject:-** **Revision No.-AAS24/1036005, SONIKA, , Service- Billing Complaints**  
**[RTS - 7 Day]Filed through Self- on 18.03.2024, DHBVN, Fatehabad.**

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the orders dated 15<sup>th</sup> May, 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

Endst. No. HRSC-010004/20/2024 /2186

Dated: 20/5/24

A copy of the above is forwarded to the appellant Ms. Sonika, (M) 9813297041  
Email:- sunilkumarinsa2012@gmail.com for information and compliance

(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 of Revision No.-AAS24/1036005, Ms. SONIKA, Service- Billing Complaints [RTS - 7 Day] Filed through Self- on 18.03.2024, DHBVN, Fatehabad.**

**Hearing date: 09.05.2024**

**Time: 12:15 pm**

Case type	Revision on AAS	
Department	DHBVN	
Name of Service	Billing Complaints	
Date of application	11.03.2024	
RTS timeline	7 Days	
RTS Due Date	20.03.2024	
District	Fatehabad	
Name of the Appellant	Ms. Sonika	
<b>Designated Officer</b>	Designation	CA, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Jakhal, Tohana, Fatehabad.
	Action taken with date	Closed on 12.03.2024
	Remarks of DO	"I HAVE PAID MY ALL BILL TIME TO TIME FROM 2 YEARS BUT NOW MY BILL IS 38414 RS WHICH IS WRONG ILLEGAL I CAN NOT PAID THIS BIG AMOUNT PLEASE RECHECK IT AND TAKE ACTION AGAINST MY WRONG BILL"
<b>First Grievance Redressal Authority</b>	Designation	SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Jakhal, Tohana, Fatehabad.
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to FGRA	13.02.2024 (Filed through self)
	Remarks of the Appellant	"i have paid all my bill month by month from apprx 2 years, now this bill rs 38414 is illegal, please clear this issue"
	Action taken by the FGRA with date	Appeal Resolved on 13.03.2024
	Remarks of FGRA	"On dated 13.3.2024 consumer visited this office and detail information about his bill provided to him and now consumer /complainant satisfied with information provided to him. Copy of action taken report is attached herewith for ready refernce."
<b>Second Grievance Redressal Authority</b>	Designation	XEN, Division (Electricity)-Tohana, Fatehabad.



	Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA	13.03.2024 (Filed through self)
	Remarks of the Appellant	<i>"I have not satisfied with your judgement, because i paid all bill time to time, after 2 years you can not give high amount bill to anybody, he cannot afford this, if your online system is damage, this is not my fault, if my meter is damage, please change it, replace it, "</i>
	Action taken by SGRA with date	Appeal Resolved on 18.03.2024.
	Remarks of SGRA	"complaint resolved by sub divn on dated 12.03.2024."
<b>Commission</b>	Date of filing of Revision	18.03.2024
	Mode of Revision	Filed through self
	Remarks of the Appellant	<i>"AFTER 2 YEAR DEPARTMENT SENT ME, 40000 RS BILL, A CUSTOMER CAN NOT PAY, BIG AMOUNT OF BILL, WHEN I PAID ALL MY BILL MONTH BY MONTH, THIS IS YOUR SYSTEM FAULT, I CANNOT AFFORD THIS BIG AMOUNT BILL, BECAUSE I PAID ALL MY BILL REGULAR MONTH BY MONTH"</i>
	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 notices to the XEN, Division (Electricity)-Tohana, Fatehabad, SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Jakhal, Tohana, Fatehabad and CA, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Jakhal, Tohana, Fatehabad, vide letter no. 1065, 1067 and 1068 dated 21.03.2024. They were directed to investigate the matter and send the action taken report by 02.04.2024.
3. Responses were received from Sh. Bhajan Singh, SDO (OP), Sub Division Jakhal vide memo no. 3006 dated 26.03.2024 and from Sh. Yogesh Kumar, O/o SDO (OP), Sub Division Jakhal vide memo no. 3007 dated 26.03.2024, stating that the appeal was resolved on 12.03.2024 by the CA after complete verification of the billing records. On 13.03.2024, the complainant's representative visited the SDO's office and the complete billing record was shown to him. The complaint was resolved on 13.03.2024, only after his satisfaction. Further, it was mentioned that the consumer was billed less than his actual consumption due to collusion between the meter reader and the consumer. The meter reader has been removed. The consumer was billed based on actual consumption and a bill

amounting to Rs. 36,236 was raised. The revised energy bill was paid by the consumer on 22.03.2024. The reply was not found to be satisfactory, hence, to fix responsibility, a hearing was scheduled to be held before Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission on 09.05.2024 at 12:15 pm vide Commission's letter no. HRSC-010004/20/2024/1773 dated 29.04.2024. The hearing took place as scheduled, which was attended by:

- i. Sh. Bhajan Singh, SDO (OP), Sub Division Jakhal, Tohana, Fatehabad.
  - ii. Sh. Sunil Kumar, Brother-In-Law (देवर) on behalf of Smt. Sonika, the appellant.
4. Sh. Sunil Kumar stated that he has been regular in depositing the bills but suddenly, he received a bill of Rs. 40,000/- (approx.). How can DHBVN expect a consumer to suddenly pay this amount of Rs. 40,000/- when he has been paying his regular bills in the range of Rs. 500/-, 700/-, 1,000/- etc. On the other hand, the SDO reiterated the contentions of his reply dated 26.03.2024 and stated that there was a meter reader, namely, Sh. Jeevan Dass who used to record the meter reading and was showing the meter status as active but he had deliberately entered a wrong code R3 because of which the bills were being generated on average basis. He quoted an example that for the period from 20.04.2022 to 09.11.2022 i.e. for approximately six and half months, the consumption of units was 2300 but the bill was raised only for 475.78 units i.e. even less than one-fourth. Therefore, he is of the opinion that the meter reader was in collusion with the consumer. Similar instances came to the notice of the DHBVN and then they launched a campaign to correct all such bills. He has already corrected majority of such bills and only 0.3% of the bills are being issued on average basis in his sub division as compared to HERC norm of 0.5%.
5. The Commission has carefully considered all the facts and circumstances of this case. It is clear that the bill in February, 2024 cycle has been correctly raised but the only thing is that it also includes the under-billing units of previous months over a period of last 2 years. There is a no documentary proof to show that there was collusion between the consumer and the meter reader but the lapse or the cheating on the part of the meter reader is apparent. However, at the same time, it is also the responsibility of the power utility to detect such cases and it cannot be allowed to go on for two years. If the wrong code was being entered, it should have been detected in two or three billing cycles but the same cannot be allowed to perpetuate for two years. How can a customer be asked to suddenly pay an amount of Rs. 36,236/- when his average bill was much less? Action has been taken against Sh. Jeevan Dass by the power utility as he has been removed from the service but he was only a daily worker and now he will find a job elsewhere. However, in the process, the consumer has suffered. The



power utility has also suffered in the sense that they lost interest on the under-billed amount. Therefore, to balance the ends of justice, the Commission is of the opinion that the latest bill of Rs. 36,236/- has been correctly raised but for the inconvenience caused to the consumer, the Commission in exercise of its powers vested under Section 17(1)(h) of the Act, awards a compensation of Rs. 5,000/- to the consumer. This amount may either be deducted from the due amount, if any of the meter reading agency whose meter reader had wrongly recorded the meter code and if this is not possible then same should be paid by the power utility. The Commission is refraining from ordering this deduction from the salary of the CA or the SDO whose duty was it to check whether the bills are being correctly issued or not, as the Commission is of the considered opinion that such discrepancies if continued for more than three billing cycles (2 years in this case) should have been checked at their level for taking corrective action. It was also the duty of the Commercial/IT wing of DHBVN to detect the number of cases with F code or R3 code or any other code due to which, the bills are being generated on average basis for so long. MD, DHBVN is advised to take necessary corrective action in this regard. The SE, DHBVN, Fatehabad is directed to ensure payment of compensation to the consumer and intimate the same to the Commission within 30 working days of the receipt of these orders. Smt. Sonika, the appellant is requested to provide the following details to the SDO 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

With these orders, the case is hereby disposed of.

15<sup>th</sup> May, 2024

