



**206 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

LPA-602-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 01.12.2025

**M/S T.D.K.CARBONICS THROUGH ITS SALE PORPRIETOR
... APPELLANT**

V/S

**THE OMBUDSMAN, ELECTRICITY PUNJAB AND ORS
... RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Tejinderbir Singh, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Saini, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

Mr. Tejinderbir Singh, Advocate, has filed his vakalatnama on
behalf of the appellant which is taken on record.

In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order passed by the
learned Single Judge by which, the writ petition filed by the appellant
challenging the order passed by the Ombudsman Electricity, Punjab, dated
11.06.2012 (Annexure P-10) has been upheld.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submits
that the electricity meter was replaced twice but still, it has not been
declared that there was any fault in the electricity meter so as to give a high
reading of electricity consumption which is causing prejudice to the
appellant. He further submits that once the faulty meters have not been
checked in a manner required, the benefit should have been given by the

Ombudsman Electricity, Punjab qua the incorrect recording of high electricity consumption but the same was not given and by ignoring certain facts, the learned Single Judge has also upheld the order which is causing prejudice to the appellant. Hence, the order passed by the Ombudsman Electricity, Punjab dated 11.06.2012 as well as the order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 16.01.2017 may kindly be set aside.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1 submits that due reasons have been given by the Ombudsman as well as by the learned Single Judge not to accept the claim of the appellant, which reasons have not been shown to be incorrect and, therefore, the appeal filed by the appellant may kindly be rejected.

We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

It may be noticed that the grievance being raised by the appellant before the authority concerned was that the electricity meter was faulty and was running fast so as to show high consumption which meter has not been tested after being replaced to be treated as damaged so as to give the benefit to the appellant which assertion has been missed by the Ombudsman as well as by the learned Single Judge. It may be noticed that on the asking of the appellant, the electricity meter was changed once in the year 2010 and then again in the year 2011. The learned Single Judge has recorded a finding, which fact has gone un-rebutted, that even after the second change of meter in November, 2011, the reading/qua the consumption of electricity remain the same. The finding has been recorded by the learned Single Judge that in case the earlier meters were faulty, then the new meters would have given the correct reading to show less

consumption at the hands of the appellant whereas, even with the replaced meters, the consumption of the electricity remains the same as with the earlier two replaced meters and, therefore, it cannot be said that such meters were faulty so as to give benefit to the appellant. Learned counsel for the appellant has not been able to dislodge the said finding given by the learned Single Judge.

Once, the finding given by the Ombudsman and the learned Single Judge, have not been proved to be perverted, either on facts or law, no ground is made out for any interference in the matter.

The appeal lacks merit and is dismissed.

Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

01.12.2025
smriti

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No