



## BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, HARYANA

Bays No. 33-36, Ground Floor, Sector-4, Panchkula-134109

Telephone No. 0172-2572299

Website: <https://herc.gov.in/Ombudsman/Ombudsman.aspx#>

E-mail: [eo.herc@nic.in](mailto:eo.herc@nic.in)

(Regd. Post)

**Appeal No.** : 32 of 2025  
**Registered on** : 26.06.2025  
**Date of Order** : 26.08.2025

**In the matter of: -**

**Appeal against the order passed by CGRF DHBVN Gurugram on 16 June 2025 in Case No DH CGRF 4898 of 2025**

Smt. Mohini Sabharwal, C-988, Sushant Lok-I, Gurugram  
Versus

**Appellant**

1. XEN OP, S/U Divn., DHBVN, Gurugram  
2. SDO/OP S/Divn., DHBVN, Sushant Lok

**Respondent**

**Before:**

Shri Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Electricity Ombudsman

**Present on behalf of Appellant:**

Ms. Ravneet Anand representative of appellant

**Present on behalf of Respondents:**

Shri Satpal Singh, SDO

Shri Sanjay Bansal, Advocate

### ORDER

**A.** Smt. Mohini Sabharwal, C-988, Sushant Lok-I, Gurugram has filed an appeal against the order passed by CGRF DHBVN Gurugram on 16 June 2025 in Case No DH CGRF 4898 of 2025. The appellant has requested the following relief: -

1, Smt. Mohini Sabharwal, resident of C-988, Sushant Lok-1, Gurugram, Account No. 3935832934, hereby file this appeal against the dismissal of my complaint by the Corporate Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (CGRF), DHBVN, Gurugram vide Order dated 16.06.2025 in Complaint No. 4898/2025. While the CGRF has rightly acknowledged that the charge imposed arises under Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003, the assessment process and subsequent recovery are vitiated by serious procedural lapses that render the demand illegal and unenforceable.

#### **Grounds of Appeal - Procedural Violations of Section 126:**

##### **1. Lack of Proper Assessment Procedure under Section 126**

As per Section 126(3) of the Electricity Act:

"The assessing officer shall provide a reasonable opportunity of being heard to the person... before finalizing the assessment."

Violation:

- No show-cause notice or opportunity of personal hearing was given before raising the 4,45,229 demand in 2025.

- The audit finding from 2017 was directly imposed without due process or revisiting the original assessment.

- There is no fresh "assessment order" explaining the calculation basis for this revised demand.

##### **2. Contravention of Section 126(5)-Limitation**

Section 126(5) requires that:

"... no order of assessment shall be made after the expiry of two years from the date of occurrence of such unauthorized use."

Violation:

- The alleged unauthorized use occurred in May 2017.
- The new demand based on audit was raised in 2025, after 8 years, far exceeding the statutory 2-year limitation.

### **3. Breach of Natural Justice & Improper Recovery Practice**

- The PD account (No. 0412350000) was fully settled in 2017 (6,25,000 paid), and all contractual obligations ended thereafter. (Receipts June and July 2017 attached).
- The DHBVN illegally transferred a lapsed audit penalty to my active account (No. 3935832934) without consent or justification.
- This practice violates both principles of natural justice and the contractual privity of accounts.

### **4. Non-Supply of Audit Report or Justification**

- Despite requests, no copy of the audit report, calculation sheet, or legal basis for reassessment was provided.
- The demand was added without transparency, violating Regulation 9 of the HERC Supply Code.

#### **Additional Legal Grounds:**

#### **1. Time-Barred Recovery - Section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003**

As per Section 56(2), no sum due from a consumer is recoverable after two years from the date it first became due unless continuously shown in bills or acknowledged by the consumer.

In this case:

- The alleged dues pertain to the year 2017.
- There has been no communication, billing, or acknowledgment of this demand until 2025.
- Thus, the ₹4,45,229 demand is clearly time-barred and not legally enforceable.

#### **2. Promissory Estoppel-Final Settlement Already Done**

The original demand (Memo No. 1566) was fully settled by me through payments in June and July 2017. After payment, the account was permanently disconnected, concluding all obligations.

Raising a new demand 8 years later constitutes a breach of finality and violates the principle of promissory estoppel, as I acted in good faith based on DHBVN's closure of the account.

#### **3. Arbitrary Transfer of Liability to Another Account**

Transferring a settled PD account's dues to my unrelated active account (No. 3935832934) violates basic principles of contract and billing integrity.

- The accounts are distinct.
- There is no notice, consent, or valid justification for transferring past liabilities to a current account.

This constitutes unauthorized and coercive recovery, causing financial and mental distress.

#### **4. Violation of Transparency Norms under HERC Supply Code**

The utility has failed to provide:

- The audit report forming the basis of the new demand.
- A detailed breakdown or methodology for the ₹4.45 lakh calculation.

This lack of transparency contravenes Regulation 9 of HERC Supply Code, which mandates clear, reasoned billing.

#### **5. No Fresh Assessment Order as Required under Section 126(3)**

Section 126(3) requires the assessing officer to conduct a hearing and issue a speaking order.

- In this case, no fresh assessment order has been shared.
  - A mere audit observation does not substitute for the due process of assessment.
- Therefore, the revised charge lacks legal standing.

#### **Prayer/Relief Sought:**

In light of the above, I respectfully request this Hon'ble Ombudsman to:

1. Set aside the demand of Rs. 4,45,229 added to my account based on procedurally flawed assessment under Section 126.
2. Declare the recovery time-barred under Section 126(5) and Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003.
3. Direct DHBVN to remove the charge from my active account and restrain from initiating any coercive action.
4. Issue directions to DHBVN to comply strictly with statutory requirements in assessment and recovery proceedings under Section 126.

**B.** The appeal was registered on 26.06.2025 as an appeal No. 32 of 2025 and accordingly, notice of motion to the Appellant and the Respondents was issued for hearing the matter on 14.07.2025.

**C.** Vide email dated 12.07.2025 respondent SDO has submitted reply, which is reproduced as under:-

In this connection it is intimated that a connection in the name of Mrs. Mohini Sabharwal R/o C-988 Sushant Lok Phase-1 Gurugram bearing account no 0412350000 having load 40 Kw under DS category was existing under this Sub Division. The premise of the consumer was checked vide LL-1 No 22/1322 dated 24.05.2017 (Copy enclosed as Annexure-'A') During checking unauthorized use of Electricity found used by the consumer DS to NDS purpose and a penalty amount of Rs 614759/- was imposed under section 126 of Electricity Act 2003 (Copy enclosed as Annexure-'B') which was deposited by the consumer vide BA16 No 041235068201 dated 01/07/2017 & BA16 No 041235011937 dated 07/07/2017 (Copy enclosed as Annexure-C & 'D'). During Audit Inspection of FY 2017-18, the Audit party pointed out that the fixed charges are not taken in account as well as the difference of KVAH & KWH also not charged while calculating the penalty in respect to LL-1 No 22/1322 dated 24.05 2017. As such a Half Margin No 037/88



dated 08/03/2018 was issued by internal Audit team (Copy enclosed as Annexure-'E') The calculation sheet of provisional notice & the amount pointed out by Audit team as under-

(A) Amount charged as per provisional Notice in respect to LL-1 No 22/1322 dated 24/05/2019.

Unit charge	Assessment	One year payment	Amt. already charged
72369 KWH	1186852	572093	614759

(B) Actual amount to be charged as per Sales Circular D-17/2014 dated \_\_\_\_ respect to LL-1 No 22/1322 dated 24/05/2017 which was also pointed out by Audit team.

Unit charge	Fixed Charge	Assessment	Already Assessed in Sundry	Amt. to be charged
8041 KVAH	163200	262104	614759	876863
Difference Amount to be charged (B-A)				262104

The amount pointed out by the Audit team was charged in the already PDCO disconnected connection on 11/04/2018 as the connection was already disconnected on 04/10/2017 (copy enclosed as Annexure-'F') but it is pertinent to mention here that the amount was not recovered at that time reason being the amount was charged in already PDCO Account no i.e. 0412350000. Thereafter the Audit of aforesaid period was also carried out by internal audit of DHBVN and issued a Half Margin No 34/49 dated 27/11/2018 of Rs 295072/ on the same LL1. No. 22/1322 dated 24/05/2017 and the amount of Rs 183126/- charged on 12/03/2019 against Re 295072/ in already PDCO consumer account (copy enclosed as Annexure-'G')

Further added that the sites of PDCO defaulting consumers were checked and found that an another connection in the name of Mrs. Mohini Sabharwal bearing account no 3935832934 found running at same premise whereas the amount charged against the Half Margin No 037/88 dated 08/03/2018 & 4/49 dated 27/11/2018 was not found recovered from the consumer. As such the defaulting amount found outstanding against already PDCO connection was charged in current running account no. 3935832934 on dated 24/05/2025 after serving the notice to the consumer vide this office memo no 39 dated 11/04/2025 (copy enclosed as Annexure-'H')

Now, the detailed analysis of the both Half Margins, billing details & LL1 has been carried out reason being one no Half Margin 34/49 dated 27/11/2018 was not found traceable due to shuffling of the office of DLF S/Division several times from one place to another place and the same has been traced out now with the help of Audit team. After going through the contents of both of the Half Margins, billing status & LL1 No 22/1322 dated 24/05/2017 it has been observed that an amount

of Rs 293875.38/- is found chargeable as per Sales Circular no 43/2007 dated 20/07/2007, Sales Circular no D35/2015 dated 14/10/2015, Sales Circular No D27/2016 dated 12.09.2016 Sales Circular No D14/2016 dated 28.03 2017 & Sales Circular No D37/2016 dated 23.11.2016 on account of fixed charges was not taken into consideration as well as the difference of KWH & KVAH was not charged at that time. The details is given as under-

<b>KWH</b>	<b>72369</b>	<b>Difference= 8041</b>			
<b>KVAH</b>	<b>80410</b>				
<b>FSA Rates</b>		<b>Days</b>	<b>Rates</b>	<b>KWH</b>	<b>FSA @ 2 times</b>
24/05/2016	01/09/2016	100	1.67	1982.46	6621.43
01/09/2016	01/04/2017	212	1.3	4202.82	10927.35
01/04/2017	24/05/2017	53	0.65	1050.70	1365.91
		<b>Total =</b>		<b>7236</b>	<b>18915</b>
SOP @6.15 per KVAH=	8041*6.15*2	98904.3			
FSA=	As calculated	18915			
FC=	170*40*12*2	163200			
Mtax=	As calculated	18915			
FC=	(SOP+FSA+FC)*2%	5620.38			
ED=	7236*1	7236			
<b>Total</b>		<b>293875.38</b>			

This is for your kind information and further necessary action, please

**D.** Hearing was held on 14.07.2025, as scheduled. Both the parties were present through Video Conferencing. Appellant representative submitted that she has already deposited the amount of Rs. 6,15,000/- in 2017 against the notice dated 28.06.2017 served by SDO under section 126 of Electricity Act. Now again through a notice dated 11.04.2025, an amount of Rs. 4,45,229/- has been placed in her current running account after 8 years. The amount charged against section 126 has already been stands deposited. The appeal in this case is against afresh notice dated 11.04.2025 in which section 126 Electricity Act does not substantially prevail. SDO respondent intimated that request for engaging counsel has been sent to LR office and reply to the appellant appeal will be submitted within 10 days with a copy to appellant. SDO respondent also submitted that there will be rectification in the notice issued on 11.04.2025, Rectification will also be incorporated in his reply. Appellant shall submit a rejoinder, if any, within 2 days after receipt of respondent reply with a copy to be provided to the Respondent.

Therefore, the matter is adjourned and shall now be heard on 05.08.2025.

**E.** Hearing was held on 05.08.2025, as scheduled. Both the parties were present through Video Conferencing. During the hearing, SDO respondent intimated that the counsel for the matter has been engaged yesterday and an email from the

engaged counsel for respondent has been received today vide which he has requested for short adjournment for filing the reply against the appeal filed by the appellant. Accordingly, respondent counsel was directed to file the reply within a week i.e. by 12.08.2025 with a copy to the appellant. Further appellant was directed to file the rejoinder, if any, within two days after the receipt of respondent counsel's reply.

Therefore, the matter is adjourned and shall now be heard on 21.08.2025.

**F.** Vide email dated 15.08.2025, counsel of respondent SDO has submitted further reply, which is reproduced as under:-

1. That it is pertinent to mention the premises of the consumer was checked vide LL-1 No. 22/1322 dated 24-05-2017 (Annexure R-1). During checking, it was found that the consumer was using unauthorized use of electricity i.e. Domestic Supply for the purpose of Non-domestic Supply. The report of Annexure R-1 states in its note that:- The above checking has been made in presence of Sh. Naveen Kumar S/o Sh. Dhani Ram, Manager M/s The Perch Service Apartment & Luxury Suits site at C-988, Sector-43, opposite Marriota Hotel. As per the energy bill, the supply is of DS category where as supply is being presently used for commercial purpose i.e. for guest house, visiting card is attached herewith. Photography made for evidence. Further action may be taken as per Nigam's instructions. In India, illegal electricity connection are addressed under the Electricity Act of 2003, with penalties including imprisonment and fines, specially section 135 deals with electricity theft, including unauthorized connections. Penalties can involve imprisonment for up to 3 years, a fine up to Rs. 10,000/-, or both. For repeat offences, the penalties become more severe, including imprisonment for up to 5 years and a fine of up to one lakh rupees or more. And in this present matter department has, only, charged the chargeable amount.
2. That in addition to penalties, offender may be required to compensate the electricity provider for stolen electricity and any damages caused. The offence may be compounded, allowing the offender to settle the matter by paying a compounding fee without facing imprisonment. The Electricity Act of 2003 aims to deter electricity theft and ensure a reliable power supply by imposing strict penalties on those who engage in unauthorized connection and other related offences.
3. That it is appropriate and important to mention that Rs. 4,45,229/- was paid by the consumer which was outstanding after the audit report, shows the consent of the consumer towards her wrong action by using the domestic supply in non-domestic supply.
4. That section 126 Empowers electricity officials to assess and penalize consumers for unauthorized use of electricity. This includes various scenarios like using electricity through artificial means, using it for purposes not authorized, or tampering with meters. The assessment is a provisional one and appeal can be filed before an Appellate Authority under section 127



of the Electricity Act, where as the appellant has no where mentioned about section 127 of the Act.

**On Merits:-**

1. That in the reply of contents of the appeal it is submitted as per clause 7.1.3 of Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 dated 18-04-2014 (Copy enclosed as Annexure R- 1 A) which elaborates in the provisions of section 135 of the Act has to be used where the alleged act has been done with dishonest intension. In such cases recourse (course of action) shall not be taken to section 126 of the act. It is only in the cases where sufficient evidence of dishonest intension is not available. But in the present case sufficient evidence is available as in the inspection report the visiting card of the Guest House is attached with the report proving it as the commercial activity in the name of domestic supply. So the contentions of the appellant are wrong and denied.
2. That the penalty amount of Rs. 6,14,759/- was imposed on consumer vide Memo No. 1566 dated 28-06-2017 under subject final order of “Assessment for unauthorized use of electricity under section 126 of Indian Electricity Act 2003” (Annexure R-2). As per the para 3 of Annexure R-2, it is clearly mentioned by the respondent department:-  
  
The above facts indicate that you have been indulging in unauthorized use of electricity under section 126 of Indian Electricity Act 2003. Accordingly, under signed the authorized assessing officer, in terms of Haryana Govt. Gazette notification no. 1/12/2003-1 power, has provisionally assessed the electricity charges amounting to Rs. 6,14,759/- to be paid by you for the above unauthorized act.
3. That the penalty amount was deposited by the consumer vide Annexure R-3 & R-4.
4. That during audit inspection of Financial Year 2017-18, the audit party pointed out, that the Fixed charges are not taken in account as well as the difference of KVAH & KWH was also not charged while calculating the penalty in respect of LL-1 No. 22/1322 dated 24-05-2017 (Annexure R-1).
5. That a Half Margin No. 037/88 dated 08-03-2018 was issued by internal audit team (Annexure R-5). The calculation sheet of provisional notice and amount pointed out by audit team is as under:-

Actual amount to be charged as per Sales Circular D-17/2014 dated 18-04-2014 in respect to LL-1 No. 22/1322 dated 24-05-2017 which was pointed out by the audit team-----

<b>Units Charge</b>	<b>8041 KVAH</b>
<b>Fixed Charge</b>	<b>163200</b>
<b>Assessment</b>	<b>262104</b>
<b>Already Assessed</b>	
<b>In Sundry</b>	<b>614759</b>
<b>Amount to be charged</b>	<b>8,76,863/-</b>
<b>Already charged</b>	<b>6,14,759/-</b>
<b>Amount to be charged</b>	<b>2,62,104/-</b>

6. That the amount pointed out by the audit team was charged in the already PDCO disconnected connection on 11-04-2018, as the connection was already disconnected on 04-10-2017. But it is important to mention here that the amount was not recovered at that time, reason being, the amount was charged in already PDCO account no. 0412350000. Thereafter the audit of aforesaid period was also carried out by the internal audit of DHBVN and issued a Half Margin No. 34/49 dated 27-11-2018 (Annexure R-6) of Rs. 2,95,072/- on the same LL-1 No. 22/1322 dated 24-05-2017 and the amount of Rs. 1,83,126/- charged on 12-03-2019 against Rs. 2,95,072/- in already PDCO consumer account.
7. That the sites of PDCO defaulting consumers were checked and found that an another connection in the name of Mrs. Mohini Sabharwal bearing account no. 3935832934 found running at the same premises, where as the amount charged against the Half Margin No. 037/88 dated 08-03-2018 and 34/49 dated 27-11-2018 was not found recovered from the consumer. As such the defaulting amount found outstanding against already PDCO connection was charged in current running account no. 3935832934 on dated 24-05-2025 after serving the notice to the consumer vide this office memo no. 39 dated 11-04-2025 (Annexure R- 7).
8. That as per notice dated 11-04-2025, the appellant has paid Rs. 4,45,229/- as pending dues. It is further submitted that billing details, Half Margins and other record was not traceable due to shuffling of the office of DLF S/Divn. Several times from one place to another place. After many efforts and with the help of audit team the same was traced out. After detailed analyses of both the Half Margins, it has been observed that an amount of Rs. 2,93,875.38/- is found chargeable.
9. That it is pertinent to mention that consumer has deposited Rs. 4,45,229/- whereas her net chargeable amount is Rs. 2,93,875/- So the respondent department after deducting Rs. 2,93,875/- out of Rs, 4,45,229/- has adjusted Rs. 1,51,355/- in the consumer's August 2025 bill (Copy of bill is annexed as Annexure R-8).

So it is, therefore, prayed that keeping in view the above contentions of the respondent department, the present appeal of the appellant may kindly be dismissed. And pass any other order in favour of respondent in the interest of justice.

- G.** Vide email dated 18.08.2025 appellant has submitted rejoinder to the reply filed by respondent which is reproduced as under:-

**1) Time-Barred Recovery - Section 56(2), Electricity Act, 2003**

The Respondents admit LL-1 No. 22/1322 is dated 24.05.2017 and the Half Margins arose in 2018, yet the alleged short-recovery was first charged only in May 2025 - well beyond the two-year period prescribed by Section 56(2). "No sum due from any consumer shall be recoverable after the period of two years from the date when such sum became first due unless it has been



shown continuously as recoverable as arrears." The Respondents further admit the demand was not traceable and not shown continuously in any bill. The recovery is therefore legally unenforceable.

**2) Finality of Assessment & Double Recovery**

A penalty of Rs. 6,14,759/- under Section 126 was assessed and fully paid in July 2017. The department accepted the payment and did not undertake any lawful reassessment within the prescribed framework. The subsequent demands of Rs. 2,93,875.38 and Rs. 4,45,229 (paid under protest on 23.05.2025) amount to re-opening a settled assessment and constitute double recovery, absent any fresh, valid assessment and due process.

**3) No Automatic Revival of Liability Merely Because the Consumer Is the Same**

Although both the PDCO account and the running account stand in the Appellant's name, liability that is not carried forward as arrears and is revived after seven years cannot be foisted onto the running account. Mere identity of the consumer does not override statutory limitation or the requirement of continuous disclosure in bills.

**4) Audit/Half-Margin Notes Do Not Create Consumer Liability by Themselves**

Half Margin Nos. 037/BB (08.03.2018) and 34/49 (27.11.2018) are internal audit observations. They do not, by themselves, impose a charge on the consumer. Any recovery must be preceded by a fresh, speaking assessment, a complete computation (period-wise and head-wise), and notice/hearing - none of which preceded the 2025 debit.

**5) Breach of Natural Justice**

The running account was debited without a proper show-cause, speaking order, or reasonable opportunity to contest. The lone memo dated 11.04.2025 preceded the levy by only a few days and did not contain the complete working. This violates principles of natural justice and the procedure under Section 126 and the Supply Code.

**6) Misplaced Reference to Section 135**

References to Section 135 (theft) are misconceived since no FIR/criminal action was initiated. The matter proceeded under Section 126 and was concluded in 2017 upon payment. Section 135 cannot be invoked belatedly to justify delayed or enhanced recovery.

**7) Proportionality & Computation Gaps**

If the alleged shortfall stems from fixed-charge omissions or KVAH/KWH differential, the Respondents were required to raise a timely, itemized supplementary bill with tariff heads (energy, fixed, FSA, surcharges) and period-wise breakup. No such contemporaneous, consumer-served computation has been produced.

**PRAYER**

In view of the above, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Ombudsman may please:

1. Quash and set aside the impugned recovery loaded on A/c No. 3935832934 in May 2025 arising from LL-1 dated 24.05.2017 and Half Margins of 2018, as time-barred, procedurally defective, and without jurisdiction.
2. Direct refund/adjustment of Rs. 4,45,229/- paid under protest on 23.05.2025, with appropriate interest.
3. Restrain the Respondents from disconnection or coercive steps based on the impugned demand.
4. Grant any other relief(s) deemed just and proper.

**H.** Hearing was held on 21.08.2025, as scheduled. Both the parties were present through Video Conferencing. Reply of the respondent counsel with a copy to appellant was received through email on 15.08.2025 and appellant rejoinder was received vide email dated 18.08.2025 in response to the reply received from the respondent counsel. Both the parties were heard at length.

Main issue raised by the appellant was related to the demand of Rs. 4,45,229/- which was raised by the respondent vide memo no. 39 dated 11.04.2025. Appellant submitted that the recovery was time barred as per section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003. As the amount belonging to the year 2018 was charged in the May, 2025 which is well beyond the two years period prescribed by the section 56 (2) of Electricity Act.

Respondent counsel explained that out of Rs. 4,45,229/-, an amount of Rs. 1,51,355/- had been adjusted in the appellant's August 2025 bill for which the appellant was not satisfied and submitted that the whole amount Rs. 4,45,229/- is not chargeable being time barred as per section 56 (2) of Electricity Act. SDO respondent and respondent counsel were directed to submit the justification of charging the amounting to Rs. 4,45,229/-. Also, if any documents showing the charging of Rs. 4,45,229/- before April 2025 are available may be submitted. Further SDO respondent and respondent counsel were directed to submit the details of charging Rs. 4,45,229/- alongwith the justification for refunding the amount 1,51,355/- in appellant's August 2025 bill. Information be submitted within four days.

Arguments in the main matter have been led by both the parties today. Final decision in the matter will be issued through a separate order after receipt of the above mentioned information from SDO respondent/respondent counsel.

### **Decision**

It has been observed that the demand of Rs. 6,14,759/- raised through notice dated 28.06.2017 under section 126 stands already deposited by the appellant in 2017. But now the matter pertains to quashing of demand of Rs. 4,45,229/- raised through notice dated 11.04.2025 and deposited under protest by appellant under section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003.

After hearing both the parties and going through the record made available on file, it is clear that appellant is requesting for quashing of Rs. 4,45,229/- as per section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003 being time barred. In compliance of the interim order dated 21.08.2025, an email dated 22.08.2025 has been received from respondent

counsel but in this email desired information has not been provided neither the details of charging of Rs. 4,45,229/- nor the justification of refund of amount of Rs. 1,51,355/- in appellant August, 2025 bill has been provided. Also, no documents showing that charging of Rs. 4,45,229/- before April, 2025 have been submitted. Main pray of appellant is regarding charging of Rs. 4,45,229/- related to year 2018 has been charged after more than 8 years and as per electricity Act, 2003 Section 56 (2) no amount can be charged after two years once it becomes due. It is a fit case where Rs. 4,45,229/- has been charged after 8 years of its detection. Also, it is evident the amounts in the bill of appellant has been charged and refunded at the will of Nigam officers/officials. Hence, amount of Rs. 4,45,229/- should be withdrawn as per section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003 and refunded to the appellant in her next bill. Further, it is directed that action against delinquent officers/officials be taken by Chief Engineer/Operation, DHBVNL, Delhi and strict advisory be issued to responsible Officers/officials to avoid such mistakes and stopping harassment of consumers in future.

The instant appeal is disposed of accordingly.

Both the parties to bear their own costs. File may be consigned to record.

Given under my hand on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2025.

Sd/-

**(Rakesh Kumar Khanna)**

**Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana**

**Dated:26.08.2025**

**CC-**

**Memo. No.1325-1331/HERC/EO/Appeal No. 32/2025 Dated: 26.08.2025**

**To**

1. Smt. Mohini Sabharwal, C-988, Sushant Lok-1, Gurugram (Email [anand\\_ravneet@yahoo.com](mailto:anand_ravneet@yahoo.com))
2. The Managing Director, DHBVN, Hisar (Email [md@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:md@dhbvn.org.in)).
3. Legal Remembrancer, Haryana Power Utilities, Panchkula (Email [lr@hvpn.org.in](mailto:lr@hvpn.org.in)).
4. The Chief Engineer Operation, DHBVN, Delhi (Email [ceopdelhi@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:ceopdelhi@dhbvn.org.in)).
5. The SE/OP, Circle, Gurugram-II, DHBVN, Gurugram (Email [seop2gurugram@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:seop2gurugram@dhbvn.org.in))
6. The XEN OP, S/U Divn., DHBVN, Gurugram (Email [xenopsuburbangurugram@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:xenopsuburbangurugram@dhbvn.org.in))
7. SDO/OP S/Divn., DHBVN, Sushant Lok (Email [sdoopslok@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:sdoopslok@dhbvn.org.in))