



CWP-19091-2025 (O&M)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

112

CWP-19091-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.07.2025

Avinash Chand Sharma

... Petitioner

Vs.

Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. B.D. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ashvi Gulati, Advocate for
Mr. Ferry Sofat, Advocate for the respondents.

SUVIR SEHGAL J.

1. Instant writ petition has been filed for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing award dated 27.05.2025, Annexure P-8, passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat (Public Utility Services), Amritsar, (for short 'PLAPUS'), whereby an application filed under Section 22-C of the Legal Service Authorities Act, 1987 seeking direction to replace old, burnt and dead stop electric meter, has been dismissed.

2. Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is running a school with an electricity connection under the NRS category from the Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. (PSPCL) and he is regularly paying the consumption charges. Counsel states that

**CWP-19091-2025 (O&M)**

the electricity meter became defective in April, 2019 and despite informing PSPCL, meter was not replaced. In the meantime, petitioner started getting bills on average basis, which were on the higher side and he did not pay them. Counsel states that due to the outbreak of the Covid-19, a lockdown was imposed and the petitioner's educational institution also did not function, however, PSPCL continued to raise electricity bills on average basis. Counsel emphasis that the bill dated 25.09.2020 for an amount of Rs.2,76,140/- was raised by the respondents without supplying any details, which was challenged by the petitioner before PLAPUS, but the petition has been erroneously rejected vide impugned order, Annexure P-8.

3. Counsel asserts that once the electricity meter installed became defective, it was duty of the PSPCL to replace it within a period of 5 days and petitioner could not be charged on average basis. He submits that PLAPUS has failed to appreciate that charges being demanded from the petitioner pertain to the period when lockdown was imposed and the petitioner is not liable to make the said payment.

4. I have heard counsel for the petitioner and considered his submission besides examining the documents appended with the paper book.

5. The admitted case of the petitioner is that he has paid the electricity bills up to April, 2019 and has not made any payment for

**CWP-19091-2025 (O&M)**

the consumption charges thereafter. Electricity meter, which became defective in April, 2019 was replaced by PSPCL on 02.12.2020 and for the intervening period, energy bills have been raised on average basis. PSPCL has taken a stand that a bill dated 05.12.2020 was issued for an amount of Rs.3,33,260/- on the basis of the actual consumption, but petitioner failed to pay it. It is not the case of the petitioner that his school was lying closed and that he had not consumed any energy. In the absence of any other means to determine the consumption of energy from April, 2019 to December, 2020, the charging of the electricity bills on average basis by PSPCL cannot be faulted with. The delay in the replacement of the electricity meter has been explained by the PSPCL by stating that three phase electricity meter was not available till December, 2020 due to the outbreak of the pandemic. Petitioner is a defaulter and cannot seek the setting aside of the impugned bill, without depositing the charges for the energy consumed. This Court does not find any reason to interfere with the award passed by the PLAPUS.

6. Petition being bereft of merit is dismissed though with no order as to costs.

30.07.2025
pooja saini

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : **Yes/No**