

**BEFORE THE HARYANA ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION AT
PANCHKULA**

Case No. HERC/P. No. 66 of 2025

Date of Hearing : 08/04/2026

Date of Order : 30/04/2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

Complaint under section 142, read with section 146 & section 149 of the Electricity Act, 2003 & Regulation 2.32 of HERC (Forum & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 for imposing penalty u/s 142 and institution of complaint u/s 146 of the Electricity Act, 2003 on account of non compliance of the order/ direction passed by Ld. Corporate forum for redressal of consumer grievances (CGRF) Gurugram as well as continuing failure to comply with the direction of order number 4840/2025 dated 23-04-2025 by respondent(s) and for direction(s) to ensure strict compliance of the direction issued by the corporate CGRF DHBVN Gurgaon vide order dated 23-04-2025 and to impose the penalty as per HERC (Standard of Performance of Distribution Licensee and Determination of Compensation) Regulation 2020 Schedule - ii Sub Clause 2.

Petitioner

M/s Satguru Cotton Mill, Tohana Road, Bhuna Through its Partner Ashish Garg.

VERSUS

Respondent:

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited Through Its

1. Managing Director, DHBVN, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar
2. SE CBO, DHBVN, Commercial Back Office, Data Center, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar
3. SDO 'OP' Sub Division, DHBVN, Ratia Road Bhuna
4. XEN 'OP' Division Tohana, DHBVN, Near Amani, Tohana

Present

On behalf of the Petitioner

Sh. Akshay Gupta, Advocate

On behalf of the Respondent.

1. Sh. Raheel Kohli, Advocate
2. Sh. Vijendra Singh, SE, DHBVN
3. Sh. Krishan Kumar, XEN, DHBVN

QUORUM

**Shri Nand Lal Sharma, Chairman
Shri Mukesh Garg, Member
Shri Shiv Kumar, Member**

ORDER

1. **Petition:**

- 1.1 That Satguru Cotton Mill is a registered partnership firm situated at Tohana Road, Bhuna-125111.
- 1.2 That the Satguru cotton mill is having an HT electricity connection in the name of MS Satguru Cotton Mill bearing account number 9552903000 (Old Account number H55-BNHT-0004)
- 1.3 That Mr. Ashish Garg (hereinafter referred to as complainant/ petitioner) bearing Aadhar Number 8029-8443-1312 is the partner of M/s Satguru Cotton Mill and hereby authorized by the partners to file the present case.
- 1.4 The complainant petitioner filed a complaint before Corporate CGRF, DHBVN GURGAON on dated 21.02.2025 and the same was instituted on 28.02.2025 vide case number 4840/2025 and prayed:
 - i. Declare the action of the respondent for not adjusting/ refund excess ACD per regulation of HERC as illegal, arbitrary and unjustified and be quashed and:
 - ii. Direct the respondent to refund excess ACD/ Security with 18% interest (equivalent to LPSC) from the date refund due till realization.
 - iii. Direct the respondent to refund the interest on ACD with penal interest as per instructions of the Nigam.
 - iv. Direct the respondent to adjust the TOU-TOD rebate along with interest.
 - v. Direct the respondent to pay the compensation of Rs 1,00,000 to complainant on account of harassment, mental agony, pain suffered by its functionaries and legal expenses incurred and;
 - vi. Pass any other or further order which this Hon'ble Forum deems fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case in favor of complainant in the interest of Justice.
- 1.5 The Ld. Corporate CGRF DHBVN Gurgaon disposed off the case. The order passed by the CGRF held as under:

“ After considering the reply of both the complainant and SDO, above observations and submissions made by them in the hearing, the Forum directs the SDO (OP) :

 - I. *To refund/ adjust the excess ACD after reviewing the same as per HERC regulation 34-2016 for the financial year 2024-2025 and interest equalling to LPSC shall be paid to complainant from April-2023 on the amount of excess refundable ACD from 2023 onwards.*
 - II. *As per admission of respondent, the interest on ACD from 2021 has not been paid, so the respondent is directed to adjust the interest on ACD with penal interest as per his admission from the date refund due till realization and respondent may also check the previous records from 2010 and in case the interest on ACD not given then that may be adjusted with penal interest after due verification as per HERC regulations as it is SDO's duty to comply with Regulations.*

- III. *Further the SDO is directed to check the memo number 7401 to 7405 dated 6- 3-2018 and refund the TOU -TOD rebate for the period 2017-2018 along with interest as per HERC regulation.*
- 1.6 That the complainant received the electricity bill on 12.05.2025 but no adjustment/ refund has been made as per CGRF order.
 - 1.7 That the complainant received the electricity bill on 06.06.2025 but no adjustment/ refund has been made as per CGRF order.
 - 1.8 That the order dated 23.04.2024 was to be complied within 21 days i.e by 14.05.2025 but it's been around 3 months since passing of order dated 23.11.2024 by Ld. Corporate CGRF DHBVN Gurgaon and the same has not been complied with by the respondent SDO as the amount of interest on ACD along with penal interest for the period 2010 to 2025 (for the period interest on ACD not given) , refund of excess ACD amount and TOU-TOD rebate for the period 2017-2018 has not been adjusted in the bill as directed by the Ld. Corporate CGRF DHBVN Gurgaon and there has been deliberate and willful disobedience of order dated 23.04.2025 passed by Ld. Corporate CGRF DHBVN, Gurgaon. Respondent is required to refund/ adjust complete due refund as per the CGRF order but the same has not been paid /adjusted in the electricity bill of complainant's company.
 - 1.9 That the respondent has failed to comply with the order passed by Ld. Corporate CGRF DHBVN Gurgaon and forced complainant petitioner to file the complaint Before Hon'ble HERC under Section 142 Read with Section 146 & Section 149 of Electricity Act-2003 for non-compliance of order passed by Ld. Corporate CGRF DHBVN Gurgaon dated 23.04.2025.
 - 1.10 *Electricity Act, 2003- Section 142 "Punishment for Non-Compliance of directions by Appropriate Commission): in case any complaint is filed before the Appropriate Commission by any person or if that Commission by any person or if that Commission is satisfied that any person has contravened any of the provisions of this Act or the rules or regulations made, thereunder; or any direction issued by the Commission, the Appropriate Commission may after giving such person an opportunity of being heard in the matter, by order in writing, direct that, without prejudice to any other penalty to which he may be liable under this Act, such person shall pay, by way of penalty, which shall not exceed One Lakh Rupees for each contravention and in case if a continuing failure with an additional penalty which may extend to Six Thousand rupees for every day during which the failure continues after contravention of the first direction.*
 - 1.11 *Section 146: "Punishment for Non-Compliance of orders or directions- Whoever, fails to comply with any order or direction given under this Act, within such time as may be specified in the said order or direction or contravenes or attempts or abets the contravention of any of the provisions of this Act or any rules or regulations made thereunder, shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three months or with fine which may extend to one lakh rupees, with both in respect of each offence and in the case of continuing failure, with an additional fine which may extend to five thousand rupees for every day*

during which the failure continues after conviction of the first such offence:

(Provided that nothing contained in this section shall apply to the orders, instructions or directions issued under section 121.)

1.12 Section 149 (1) Where an offence under this act has been committed by a company, every person who at the time the offence was committed was in charge of and was responsible to the company for the conduct of the business of the company, as well as the company shall be deemed to be guilty of having committed the offence and shall be liable to be proceeded against and punished accordingly:

(2) Provided that nothing contained in this sub-section shall render any such person liable to any punishment if he proves that the offence was committed without his knowledge or that he had exercised all due diligence to prevent the commission of such offence.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), where an offence under this Act has been committed by a company and it is proved that the offence has been committed with the consent or connivance of or is attributable to any neglect on the part of any director, manager, secretary or other officer of the company, such director, manager, secretary or other officer shall also be deemed to be guilty of having committed such offence and shall be liable to be proceeded against and punished accordingly.

1.13 Regulation 2.32 of HERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (Regulation 2.32):

“The decisions of the Forum will be recorded and duly supported by reasons. The Order of the Forum will be communicated to the complainant and the licensee in writing within 7 days of the passing of the Order. The licensee shall comply with the order of the Forum within 21 days from the date of receipt of the order. In appropriate cases, considering the nature of the case, the Forum, upon the request of the licensee, may extend the period for compliance of its order up to a maximum of three months. The aggrieved consumer may approach the Ombudsman who will provide the consumer as well as the licensee an opportunity of being heard and decide the appeal.

In case of non-compliance of the order of the appropriate Forum, the aggrieved consumer may approach the Commission who will provide the consumer as well as the Licensee an opportunity of being heard. The Commission may initiate proceedings under section 142 of the Act for violation of the Regulations framed by the Commission.”

1.14 That as per HERC (Standard of Performance of Distribution Licensee and determination of compensation) Regulation, 2020 Schedule – II Sub Clause 20 provides that in case of compliance of CGRF is not made within the time framed defined in such order or the regulations specified by the commission in this regard, the compensation of Rs.100/- per day or part thereof is payable.

1.15 That as per HERC Fee regulations 10-2005 with its subsequent amendment(s), the connection of the complainant of HT category and using for commercial purpose as such Rs. 50,000 (Rupees Fifty

Thousand) is the court fee, which is being deposited vide Demand Draft

Prayer:-

It is, therefore, most humbly prayed that considering the submissions brought out above, this Hon'ble Commission may kindly be pleased to:

- i. Direct the respondent(s) to comply with order passed by the Ld. Corporate CGRF DHBVN vide order dated 23.04.2025 And:
 - ii. To impose penalty of Rs. 1 Lakh on respondent(s) under Section 142 of Electricity Act 2003 for failure to comply with the order / direction passed by Ld. CGRF on 23.04.2025 as well as continuing failure to comply with the directions and pay the dues to the complainant.And:
 - iii. To direct institution of complaint under Section 142 RW Section 146 of Electricity Act,2003 for failure to comply with the order / direction passed by the Ld. CGRF on dated 23.04.2025 as well as continuing failure to comply with the directions against the respondent SDO.And:
 - iv. To direct the respondent(s) to pay compensation @ Rs.100/ Day for non-compliance of order passed by CGRF within 21 days.And:
 - v. To award the penalty imposed on respondent(s) in favour of the complainant- petitioner. And:
 - vi. Direct respondent(s) to pay Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rs. One Lac only) as court fee and litigation expenses. And:
 - vii. To allow any other relief as deemed fit by the hon'ble Commission.
2. The case was heard on 15/10/2025, Sh. Krishan Kumar, XEN, DHBVN submitted that the orders of the CGRF have been complied and amounts admissible towards ACD and Interest already stands refunded to the petitioner. Regarding, ToD/ ToU refund the case is under process for challenging the same before Hon'ble High Court. Sh. Akshay Gupta counsel for the petitioner submitted that no calculation of refunds has been provided and there is no case pending in Hon'ble High Court regarding this matter. Sh. Amit Singh SDO, DHBVN submitted that the data pertaining to ToD is not available in the Energy Meter due to which the CGRF order could not be complied. Resultantly DHBVN has decided to challenge the same before Hon'ble High Court. The Commission took a serious view of this negligence. The order of the CGRF is dated 23/04/2025 and was required to be complied within 21 days but the same has not been complied with even after the lapse of 6 months. To the query of the Commission on the bringing this fact before CGRF, the SDO submitted that the fact was realised after passing of the order by

CGRF and during the compliance of the same. DHBVN has failed to challenge the same within stipulated period and till today there is no sanction or direction from LR to challenge the order of CGRF in Hon'ble High Court. The Commission observes that the consumer cases are not being defended properly before CGRF. The officers are not following any SoPs and appearing unprepared even before the Commission. The SE/CBO has not appeared, despite being party to the case. The lack of Co-ordination is clearly visible among different wings of DHBVN. Despite, numerous directions imparted time to time in different cases and discussions with MDs DISCOMs in various forums, on non-compliance cases, DHBVN has miserably failed to ensure compliance of the orders of Commission / CGRF. The Commission adjourns the matter and directs respondents to file its reply within three (3) weeks with advance copy to petitioner and petitioner to file its rejoinder within one week thereafter. Further, the Director (Operations), Director (Finance), SE/CBO and SE/OP are directed to appear in person with details of cases where compliance is still pending.

3. Reply Submitted on 06/11/2025:

- 3.1 The present reply is being filed through Amit Singh working as SDO, on behalf of Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam, (hereinafter referred to as 'DHBVN'), who is competent to file the present reply as well as is fully conversant with the facts and circumstances of the case on the basis of knowledge derived from the record.
- 3.2 The present petition has been filed by the Petitioners under Section 142, read with Section 146 & Section 149 of the Electricity Act, 2003 & Regulation 2.32 of HERC (Forum & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 for imposing penalty under Section 142 and institution of complaint under Section 146 of the Electricity Act, 2003 on account of non-compliance of the order/ direction passed by the Ld. Corporate Forum for redressal of consumer grievances (Ld. CGRF) Gurugram as well as continuing failure to comply with the direction of order number 4840/2025 dated 23-04-2025 by Respondents.
- 3.3 The Corporate Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, Gurugram vide its order dated 23.04.2025, directed the Respondents as under:
"To refund/ adjust the excess ACD after reviewing the same as per HERC regulation 34-2016 for the financial year 2024-2025 and interest equalling to LPSC shall be paid to complainant from April-2023 on the amount of excess refundable ACD from 2023 onwards."

As per admission of respondent, the interest on ACD from 2021 has not been paid, so the respondent is directed to adjust the interest on ACD with penal interest as per his admission from the date refund due till realization and respondent may also check the previous records from 2010 and in case the interest on ACD not given then that may be adjusted with penal interest after due verification as per HERC regulations as it is SDO's duty to comply with Regulations. Further the SDO is directed to check the memo number 7401 to 7405 dated 6- 3-2018 and refund the TOU -TOD rebate for the period 2017-2018 along with interest as per HERC regulation.”

I. REFUND/ADJUSTMENT OF EXCESS ACD AND PAYMENT OF INTEREST/PENAL INTEREST AS PER HERC REGULATION NO. 34 OF 2016

3.4 That in compliance with the aforesaid order, a calculation has been made by the department where a total sum of Rs. 27,78,350/- (Rupees Twenty-Seven Lakh Seventy-Eight Thousand Three Hundred and Fifty only) has been found to be refunded and the same has already been adjusted in the account of the Petitioner firm bearing A/c No. 9552903000 (Old A/c No. BNHT-0004). The detailed calculation sheet pertaining to the computation of the said refundable amount is appended, and a summary of the amount adjusted and refunded is reproduced below for the kind reference of the Hon'ble Commission:-

Summary of ACD	
Particulars	Amounts
Excess ACD	17,64,293/-
Excess ACD Interest	6,63,430/-
ACD Interest	2,53,590.77
Interest delay in release of ACD amount	97,036.71
Total amount to be refunded	27,78,350.48

3.5 That in compliance with the aforesaid order, it is respectfully submitted that the Respondents have already adjusted a sum of Rs. 25,70,769/- after adjusting a TDS of Rs. 46,261/- resulting in a net adjustment of Rs. 25,24,508/- (Rs. 25,70,769 – Rs. 46,261 = Rs. 25,24,508/-). The said adjustment was duly reflected in the electricity bill for the month of August, 2025. A copy of the Bill for the month of August, 2025 of the Petitioner and a table showing TDS deduction is appended.

It is further submitted that an amount of Rs. 76,723/-, had already been adjusted in the bill for the month of April 2022 after deduction of 20% TDS, amounting to Rs. 15,344.60/-, on account of non-availability of the PAN number, thereby resulting in a net adjustment of Rs. 61,378.74/- (Rs. 76,723 – Rs. 15,344.60 = Rs. 61,378.74). A copy of the bill for the month of April, 2022 is appended.

Furthermore, an additional amount of Rs. 1,30,858/- had also been refunded, which will be reflected in the electricity bill for the month of November, 2025.

- 3.6 That in view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the Respondents have duly complied with the directions contained in the aforesaid order. The total refundable amount of Rs. 27,78,350/-, as computed by the Nigam and detailed in Annexure R-1, had already been fully adjusted in the account of the Petitioner.
- 3.7 That it is submitted that there was no intentional delay in implementing the order passed by the Hon'ble CGRF, Gurugram. The process for refund of ACD interest was initiated promptly after receipt of the complaint by pursuing the matter with the SE/IT, DHBVN, Hisar, vide Memo No. 7832 dated 27.03.2025, Memo No. 7869 dated 01.04.2025, and Memo No. 8219 dated 16.04.2025, seeking updation of the security/ACD amount and interest thereon.
- 3.8 That it is further submitted that, as the billing operations are carried out through the R-APDRP platform, the refund amount of Rs. 25,24,508/- on account of excess ACD, interest thereon, and penal interest was processed and freezed by the CBO, DHBVN, Hisar, in July 2025, and duly reflected in the consumer's bill for August 2025. Hence, there was no deliberate or intentional delay in compliance with the CGRF order.
- 3.9 That moreover, reminders were issued by the Respondent vide Memo No. 8449 dated 30.04.2025 to the SE/RAPDRP for ensuring compliance, followed by several correspondences at various levels to expedite the implementation.
- 3.10 That subsequently, a letter was received from the Accounts Officer (CBO), Hisar, vide Office Memo No. Ch-30/AO/CBO dated 14.07.2025, directing that the matter be taken up with the Legal Remembrancer, HVPNL, Panchkula, for engagement of counsel to defend the case before the Hon'ble Commission, as the petitioner had already filed the present petition. Accordingly, Respondent No. 3 took up the matter with LR, HVPNL, Panchkula, seeking advice vide Office Memo No. 1245 dated 15.07.2025, followed by Memo No. 1991 dated 13.08.2025 and Memo No. 3136 dated 05.09.2025. As a result, counsel was engaged for filing a CWP before the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court on 29.09.2025, and the Hon'ble Commission was duly apprised through email dated 13.10.2025 enclosing the sanction letter issued by LR, HVPNL, Panchkula.
- II. CLAIM FOR REFUND OF TOU/TOD REBATE FOR THE PERIOD 2017-18 — IS INEXECUTIBLE IN ABSENCE OF THE TOD ENABLED METER. EVEN OTHERWISE, THE MATTER ALREADY STANDS ADJUDICATED AND TIME-BARRED.
- 3.11 That the issue regarding non-grant of Time of Use/Time of Day (ToU/ToD) tariff rebate for off-peak hours during the year 2017-18, was governed and implemented in terms of Sale Circular No. D-29/2017 issued by the Nigam. The said Circular provides that the ToU/ToD tariff scheme would be applicable only to those consumers who had opted for the scheme and were equipped with ToD-enabled meters capable of recording consumption separately during peak and off-peak hours, so that the rebate could be computed based on authenticated meter data. The Circular further stipulates that the ToD

tariff shall be admissible only where the metering equipment installed is capable of recording time-differentiated consumption, and where such data are verifiable from the meter records maintained by the Nigam.

- 3.12 Upon scrutiny, it has been found that the ToD-enabled (8-register) meter was not installed during 2017–18 and was subsequently installed only on 03.10.2019, as evidenced by the Meter Change Order (MCO) enclosed. Accordingly, during the period 2017–18, the consumption corresponding to off-peak (night) hours i.e., 10:00 PM to 05:30 AM, could not be recorded separately for purpose of rebate computation and therefore, the Petitioner was not eligible for the ToU/ToD tariff rebate under the aforesaid Circular. In other words, the absence of data available with the Respondent, the order passed by the Ld. CGRF is in-executable insofar as it relates to the Refund of the ToU/ToD for the period of 2017-18.
- 3.13 That the load survey report and meter data downloaded from M&P Division, Hisar, were also examined by the Respondents. However, the said records did not contain any distinct or verifiable off-peak consumption data for the relevant period. In the absence of such authenticated ToD readings, it is technically and procedurally not feasible to compute or grant any rebate under the ToU/ToD tariff scheme. As per Sale Circular No. D-29/2017, the rebate for off-peak (night) consumption could be extended only when time-differentiated energy consumption was recorded through a ToD-enabled meter and verified through the Nigam’s metering database. Therefore, in the absence of requisite meter data for the year 2017–18, the consumer did not qualify for the ToU/ToD rebate during the said period.
- 3.14 That it is further submitted that the Sale Circular No. D-29/2017 expressly stipulated that the benefit of ToU/ToD tariff would become operational only from the billing month following the successful installation and activation of a ToD-enabled meter. Hence, the eligibility of the consumer for availing the ToU/ToD rebate could arise only after 03.10.2019, i.e., the date on which the ToD-enabled (8-register) meter was actually installed and commissioned. Any claim for rebate prior to this date, therefore, stood outside the scope of the Circular and could not be considered under the governing provisions.
- 3.15 That it is also pertinent to submit that the Petitioner had suppressed and concealed material facts, including the Order dated 13.02.2023 passed by the Ld. CGRF in Complaint No. 4329/2022, wherein it was clearly recorded that:
*“2. Meter of the consumer was not compatible with TOU/TOD facilities... The Corporate Forum shall have jurisdiction ass per HERC regulation No. HERC-48/2020, First amendment 2022 on 06.04.2022
“ The Corporate Forum shall have jurisdiction to dispose of all the monetary disputes of an amount exceeding Rs. 3 lacs (Rs. 3,00,000/-) in each case. Provided that complaint/representation is made within 2 years from the date of cause of action...”*
- 3.16 The present complaint pertains to a cause of action that arose over seven years ago, and is, therefore, barred by limitation under

Regulation 6 of HERC Regulation No. HERC-48/2020 (as amended on 06.04.2022), which mandates that monetary disputes exceeding ₹3 lakh may be entertained only if filed within two years from the date of cause of action. In view of the above facts and the clear stipulations of Sale Circular No. D-29/2017 as well as HERC Regulation No. HERC-48/2020, it is submitted that the Petitioner is not entitled to any rebate under the ToU/ToD tariff for the year 2017-18. A copy of the Order dated 13.02.2023 passed by the Ld. CGRF in Complaint No. 4329/2022 is annexed.

PRAYER

In view of the foregoing submissions, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Commission may kindly:

- a. Take on record the compliance already effected by the Respondents with respect to the refund/adjustment of the ACD amount, in terms of the directions issued by the Ld. CGRF, and be pleased to accept the explanation tendered for the delay in implementation of the said order; AND
 - b. Not to impose any penalty and/or cost in respect of the refund of ToU/ToD rebate for the period from 2017-18, in view of the absence of verifiable data for the relevant period, rendering the said direction incapable of execution to that extent; AND
 - c. Not impose any penalty/cost not to impose any penalty and/or cost as the delay, if any, was neither deliberate nor attributable to any willful default, but was occasioned due to circumstances beyond the control of the Answering Respondent, AND/ OR
 - d. Pass any other order(s) deemed fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice.
4. The case was heard on 04/12/2025, The Commission taken a serious view of non-appearance of the Director (Operations), Director (Finance) and concerned SE/OP as called for personal appearance vide interim order dated 15/10/2025 and decided to issue show cause notice under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 to all concerned. Further, the request of SE/OP dated 03/12/2025 regarding exemption from personal appearance was not granted as the commission observes that the directions are not complied with. To the query of the Commission, the Concerned XEN and SDO submitted that the Compliance of the CGRF has been made, the counsel for the petitioner refuted the same, the order of the CGRF dated 23/04/2025 has not been complied with in 21 days and even till date. The Commission observes that the officers are not serious for implementation of the CGRF/Commission's orders and directs respondents to file the detailed report of such cases where compliance has

been made or still pending from 01/01/2025 to 30/11/2025 with date wise details of communications with different offices. Further, the Director (Operations), Director (Finance), SE/CBO and concerned SE/OP along with XEN and SDO are directed to appear in person. The respondents are directed to submit the compliance report of CGRF order dated 23/04/2025 before next date of hearing, with advance copy to petitioner.

5. The case was heard on 10/12/2025, At the outset, Sh. Raheel Kohli, counsel for the respondents submitted that the order has been complied. The report as per directions of the Commission for cases where compliance has been made or still pending from 01/01/2025 to 30/11/2025 (Pendency Report) with date wise details of communications with different offices has also been filed. The reply to the show cause notices will be submitted in prescribed time frame. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order has been partially complied with and remaining part has been stayed by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court. The counsel conveyed his satisfaction to the compliance report. The Commission accepted the pendency report submitted by the respondents and conveyed their observations on the same to the officers present in the court. Further, the oral submissions of the Director/Operations and Director/Finance were accepted and officers were exempted from submission of reply to the show cause notices. Accordingly, the matter was kept open and to come up next on 08/04/2026 for compliance of the directions issued in the similar matter regarding SoP in P.No. 72 of 2025 during hearing on 10/12/2025.

Commission's Order:

1. The case was heard on 08/04/2026 as per schedule in the court room of the Commission.
2. The Commission noted that DHBVN has issued Sales Instructions No. 01/2026 dated 07/01/2026 - Comprehensive Instructions and Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Consumer Grievance Redressal, Implementation of CGRF / Ombudsman / HERC Orders and Compliance with HERC Order No. 72 of 2025.

3. The Commission observes that the order of CGRF since has been complied with, nothing remains to be adjudicated in the present petition. DHBVN has issued requisite SoP as per directions of the Commission. However, the dispute was primarily pertaining to non-compliance of the CGRF orders in timely manner. The negligence on the part of officials/officers of Respondent Nigam cannot be ignored.
4. The Commission, therefore, directs the respondent DHBVN to make payment of ₹50,000/- Court Fee deposited by the petitioner along with ₹15,000/- towards litigation expenses to the petitioner within 30 days from the date of this order.
5. The petition is disposed of, in above terms.

This order is signed, dated and issued by the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission on 30/04/2026.

Date: 30/04/2026	Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
Place: Panchkula	(Shiv Kumar)	(Mukesh Garg)	(Nand Lal Sharma)
	Member	Member	Chairman