



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

118

CWP No.9621 of 2025

DATE OF DECISION : 4th APRIL, 2025

Surinder Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. Sub Division Office Sirhind &
another

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

* * * *

Present : Mr. Harjot Singh Bedi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Batta, Advocate for the respondents.

* * * *

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. Through the instant writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for setting aside the award dated 24.09.2024 (Annexure P-7), passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat (Public Utility Services), Fatehgarh Sahib, wherethrough, the application/representation preferred by the petitioner for settlement of bill has been dismissed.

2. The petitioner filed a petition before the Permanent Lok Adalat for setting aside the notice/order No.829 dated 07.07.2019 (Annexure P-3) and bill dated 24.07.2019, issued by respondent-distribution licensee, on the ground that the earlier illegal assessment order/demand order was made and petitioner was burdened to pay ₹78,082/-, which was challenged before the Permanent Lok Adalat and the matter was settled vide award dated 25.07.2018, wherethrough, the petitioner was directed to deposit an amount of ₹16,895/- on account of electricity consumption with the respondent-distribution licensee. The amount was duly deposited by the petitioner and thereafter the petitioner



used to deposit electricity consumption bills after every two months and now the respondents illegally issued the demand letter dated 01.07.2019, requiring the petitioner to deposit an amount of ₹3,46,564/-. The notice (*supra*) was challenged merely on account that no electricity bill was raised by the respondent-distribution licensee after the receipt of amount on 08.08.2018. Rather, after a long period i.e. about one year, the impugned electricity bill and demand notice, were served upon the petitioner. Therefore, the same is required to be set aside.

3. Learned Permanent Lok Adalat dismissed the petition after recording the fact that the bills during the interregnum period, i.e. from 25.07.2018 to 01.07.2019, have been duly issued to the petitioner, however, the same have not been deposited. Now the impugned award has been challenged through the instant petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in fact, the main issue is of jumping of the electricity meter. He submits that in the month of September, 2018 the consumption of electricity was shown to be 16097 units, whereas, the average electricity consumption of the petitioner for the preceding months was recorded only about 1000 to 1500 units.

5. No other argument is raised before this court by counsel for the petitioner.

6. This court has considered the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and finds no merit therein. Further, this court also does not find any infirmity or illegality in the impugned award passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat, requiring any interference by this court for the hereinafter extracted reasons:



(i) The sole argument regarding jumping of electric meter for the month of September, 2018, has never been pleaded in the petition filed before the Permanent Lok Adalat. The counsel for the petitioner has been specifically confronted with this aspect, and he fairly conceded that though there is no pleading in the petition with regard to jumping of electricity meter, rather, he submits that it was only argued before the Permanent Lok Adalat. However, the Permanent Lok Adalat failed to appreciate this argument in its right perspective. The perusal of the impugned award reflects that the energy bill for the month of September, 2018 was for 187 days, which is about six months, whereas the other energy bills, placed on record by the petitioner, pertain to two months only. Therefore, the argument as raised before this court, is totally devoid of merit. This court cannot presume about the jumping of meter, without there being any substance on record or in absence of pleading. Therefore, this argument is rejected.

(ii) The issue of not serving electricity bills from 25.07.2018 to 01.07.2019 has been duly considered and it reflects from the record that the bills have been duly served upon the petitioner, however, he failed to deposit the same. The relevant observations of the Permanent Lok Adalat in this regard is extracted hereinafter:

“11. Ld. counsel for the applicant has submitted that the applicant is a consumer of the respondents and his electricity meter account number is KC52KC450619H. The respondents have demanded Rs. 700821-from the applicant previously and dispute was settled in the Lok Adalat and letter no. 570 dated 25.7.2018 Ex. A1 was issued directing the applicant to deposit Rs. 16895/- and the applicant deposited this amount vide receipt dated 8.8.2018 Ex. A2. Thereafter the respondents did not issue the electricity bills



and issued another letter no. 829 dated 1.7.2019 Ex. A3 asking the applicant to deposit the amount of Rs.3,46,564/-. He further submitted that the applicant inquired this letter and he was handed over the bill dated 24.2.2019 Ex.A4 demanding the amount of Rs. 3,75,100/-, But the respondent did not explain about this bill regarding the period for which it was issued. He has also submitted that the respondent cannot claim the disputed amount without issuance of electricity bills.

12. On the other hand Ld. Counsel for the respondents has placed on record various electricity bills issued to the applicant. The bill dated 21.1.2018 is for Rs. 1,32,430/-, bill dated 24.3.2018 is for Rs. 1,53,290/-, bill dated 26.5.2018 is for Rs. 1,66,580/-, bill dated 26.7.2018 is for Rs. 88080/-, bill dated 27.9.2018 is for Rs. 2,89,550/-, bill dated 24.11.2018 is for Rs. 3,15,210/-, bill dated 27.1.2019 is for Rs. 3,42,290/-, bill dated 26.3.2019 is for Rs. 3,64,410/-, bill dated 25.5.2019 is for Rs. 4,036,630/-, bill dated 24.7.2019 is for Rs. 78040/-, bill dated 4.10.2019 is for Rs. 3,86,690/-. These bills have been issued in the name of applicant who is having electricity connection bearing account no. KC52KC450619H.”

7. In view of the above discussion, the petition stands dismissed.

4th April, 2025
'raj'

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>