



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

(Through E-mail Only)

Letter No. 1350

Dated 19.03.26

To

Sh. Sanjeev Sharma,
The Commercial Assistant.
O/o SDO (Op), Sub-Division, Bahadurgarh.
E-mail: sanjeev1983611@gmail.com


Subject: Revision Details - AAS25/1811664 - Energy (UHBVN) Name- SMT INDRAWATI W O Service- Meter Complaint - Replace slow/fast/meters/Creeping or stuck meters - Whole Current Meter - Rural [RTS - 7 Days] Self Filed by Applicant on Saral Portal (Saral) on 14.09.2025.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the orders dated 17.03.2026 passed by Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, Chandigarh in respect of above case for information and necessary action.

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. 1351

Dated: 19.03.26

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

- i. The Managing Director, UHBVN, Panchkula, Haryana.
- ii. The SGRA-cum-XEN(Op), Division (Electricity), Bahadurgarh, UHBVN Contact: 9354726618 E-mail: xenopbahadurgarh@uhbvn.org.in
- iii. Sh. Narender Kumar, SE, UHBVN, Nodal Officer for RTS matters on behalf of UHBVN E-mail: narenderoxen@gmail.com.
- iv. The appellant - Smt. Indrawati Phone No. 9911745600 E-mail: krishanchhillar35@gmail.com (Through AAS).


(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

Final orders

(In respect of Review Application received from Sh. Sanjeev Sharma, the Commercial Assistant O/o SDO (Op), Sub-Division, Bahadurgarh regarding Revision Details - AAS25/1811664 - Energy (UHBVN) Name- SMT INDRAWATI W O Service-Meter Complaint - Replace slow/fast/meters/Creeping or stuck meters - Whole Current Meter - Rural [RTS - 7 Days] Self Filed by Applicant on Saral Portal (Saral) on 14.09.2025.)

Hearing date: 17.03.2026

Time: 11:30 am

A review application was received from Sh. Sanjeev Sharma, the Commercial Assistant O/o SDO (Op), Sub-Division, Bahadurgarh vide email dated 02.03.2026. In the review application, he has sought review of the final orders of the Commission dated 30.12.2025 conveyed vide letter no. 0006 dated 01.01.2026, in which the Commission imposed penalty of Rs. 5,000/- each along with payment of compensation of Rs. 1,000/- each, for the two incorrectly prepared sundries, on the concerned CAs.

1. In the application, he stated that the proposed fixation of responsibility and recovery from his salary is factually incorrect, legally unsustainable and administratively impracticable for the brief facts and submissions stated herein below.

I. Brief Facts:

The consumer had been billed on average/provisional basis from the year 2017 to 2022. Thereafter, irregularities in billing occurred due to prolonged average billing, RAPDRP data migration issues, delay in meter replacement and subsequent system corrections. The RTS order itself had recorded that average billing had continued for nearly 90 months, minus bills had been generated and adjustments had been made in a piecemeal manner which indicated systemic and supervisory failures at the Nigam level. It was further submitted that as per the record, all sundries/adjustments had been approved by the SDO, bills had been generated through the billing software/billing agency and the role of the Commercial Assistant had remained confined to preparation of sundries on the basis of system data and instructions of superior officers.

II. Misapplication of Electricity Supply Code, 2014:

It was submitted that the Hon'ble Commission had relied upon Regulations 6.10.4 and 6.10.5 of the Electricity Supply Code, 2014. Regulation 6.10.4 provides that "the officer concerned shall satisfy himself before giving notice to the consumer", while Regulation 6.10.5 mandates that "the licensee shall review the amount charged". As per the Electricity Supply Code and the established practice of UHBVN, the "officer concerned" refers to the Assessing/Sanctioning Authority, i.e., the SDO. It was contended that a Commercial Assistant had no statutory authority to assess under-charging, issue notices, review demand or approve/reject billing adjustments. Therefore, fastening liability upon the Commercial Assistant under the said regulations was not

legally justified.

III. Date of Joining Ignored – Liability for Pre-Joining Period:

It was further submitted that he had been posted as Commercial Assistant in the present Sub-Division only in the year 2021 by way of transfer vide Office Order No. 201 dated 14.09.2021 issued by SE (OP), Circle UHBVN Jhajjar. However, the dispute pertained to the period from 2017 to 08.11.2024. Therefore, any lapse prior to the year 2021 could not be legally or logically attributed to him. It was also submitted that no responsibility had been fixed upon the then CA/revenue staff, the then SDOs or the billing agency for the earlier period.

IV. Billing Agency's Role Completely Overlooked:

It was submitted that during the entire dispute period, the work of meter reading, uploading of readings, bill generation and bill distribution had been carried out by the billing agency engaged by the Nigam. Prolonged average billing, minus bills and delayed corrections could not have occurred without lapses at the level of the billing agency and its supervision. However, no responsibility had been fixed upon the billing agency, while the Commercial Assistant, who neither records meter readings nor generates bills, had been singled out which amounted to selective and disproportionate fixation of responsibility.

V. Sales Instruction No. U-01/2026 – Designated Officer without Supporting Staff:

It was further submitted that under Sales Instruction No. U-01/2026 dated 15.01.2026, the Commercial Assistant had been declared as the designated officer for monitoring and reporting purposes. However, in practice adequate clerical/support staff as per sanctioned strength had not been provided in Sub-Divisions despite continuous increase in workload. The shortage of staff had also been acknowledged by the Department during meetings held with the SDSE Association. In the absence of adequate staff support, effective monitoring had become difficult. Although SDOs and XENs were posted in the offices, the actual execution of billing and allied work was being carried out through clerical staff and therefore fixing unilateral responsibility upon the Commercial Assistant in the absence of adequate staff support was stated to be arbitrary and unjust.

VI. Core Facts of the Case Ignored:

It was also submitted that certain core facts of the case had not been duly considered. The FGRA-cum-SDO (OP), Sub-Division UHBVN Bahadurgarh had informed the Commission that the consumer meter had already been replaced and that the consumer had been billed on average basis from 2017 to 2022. For the billing cycle from 10.07.2022 to 08.11.2024, a bill on OK basis had been generated on the basis of actual consumption and necessary adjustments had been carried out to rectify earlier billing issues. It was also explained that certain sundries mentioned in the order had not been prepared by the Sub-Division and were system-generated adjustments in the billing portal after updating the meter reading. The concerned JE had inspected the site and

reported that the consumer's MDI had been found to be 3.27 against the sanctioned load of 1 KW. As per the office record, the consumer had paid the electricity bill only twice during the entire period. Despite these facts being placed on record, the same were stated to have not been duly considered.

VII. Recovery During Pendency of Disciplinary Proceedings:

It was further submitted that a draft charge sheet in the matter had already been forwarded to the higher authorities and departmental enquiry was proposed. It was contended that recovery during the pendency of disciplinary proceedings would not be appropriate as it may prejudice the defence before completion of the enquiry.

VIII. Prayer:

In view of the above facts and submissions, it was prayed that no recovery may be effected from his salary and that any proposed recovery may be withheld or kept in abeyance till the final outcome of the pending disciplinary proceedings. It was further prayed that responsibility, if any, may be examined holistically and period-wise, including the role of the then CA/revenue staff, the billing agency, availability of staff and the approving/supervisory authorities (SDO/XEN), strictly in accordance with the Electricity Supply Code and UHBVN rules. It was also requested that Sales Instruction No. U-01/2026 may be applied in a reasonable and balanced manner so that the principles of fairness, proportionality and natural justice are upheld. It was further stated that in the event of any coercive recovery or adverse action during the pendency of the disciplinary proceedings, appropriate legal remedies may be availed.

2. To proceed further in the matter, a hearing was scheduled before Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission on 13.03.2026 at 11:30 a.m. The hearing was held as scheduled and was attended by Sh. Sanjeev Sharma, the Commercial Assistant O/o SDO (Op), Sub-Division, Bahadurgarh. He reiterated the contents of his review application which have been incorporated in the preceding paragraphs.

3 In compliance of the Commission's orders dated 30.12.2025, the XEN had informed vide his reply dated 14.01.2026 that the SDO prepared one sundry on 16.12.2024 which was correct. The other two sundries were not prepared by the office and were only adjustments for previous average billing which was automatically adjusted by the billing software after filling a new reading in the portal. It was also stated that a draft charge sheet has been framed against Sh. Sanjeev Sharma, CA and has been sent to the higher authorities. The Commission had imposed penalty on the CA for preparation of two wrong sundries but now it has been revealed that instead of CA, they were prepared automatically by the system. Therefore, the Commission in exercise of its powers vested under Section 17 (1) (i) of the Haryana Right to Service Act, 2014 reviews its orders dated 30.12.2025 and rescinds the penalty imposed on Sh. Sanjeev Sharma, as well the orders to pay compensation by the CA. If the amount has already been deducted from his salary in accordance with the Commission orders dated 30.12.2025, same be refunded to him forthwith instead of depositing the same in the State Treasury

and payment to the revisionist. It is clarified that the Commission had awarded compensation to the revisionist at the rate of Rs. 500/- per wrongly issued bill (minus Rs. 2,000/-). This minus was on account of compensation deducted from the salary of CA. Now since the orders to pay compensation from the salary of CA have been reviewed, let the whole amount of compensation @ Rs.500/- per wrongly issued bill be paid by UHBVN out of its funds as per consistent policy adopted by the Commission in all such cases, which it may recover from the defaulting officials after conducting a thorough investigation.

17th March, 2026

