



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

212

CWP-15339-2019

Date of Decision: 28.04.2026

ADDITIONAL SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, PSPCL

...Petitioner

Vs.

M/S KAY JAY FORGINGS (P) LIMITED

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Tushar Gera, Advocate for
Mr. Jagdeep S. Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. D.S. Sobti, Advocate
for the responden0074

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 258.08.2017 passed by Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Patiala (for short 'Redressal Forum')

2. The respondent is a private limited company which is engaged in the business of manufacturing of billet. It disclosed billet heater of 100KW in the detail of load supply at the time of clubbing of two connections i.e. Account No.FP02/00257 and FP03/00140. Both the connections were converted into new account No.FP/02/1218. The respondent was having another account No.3002808904. It shifted its 100KW billet heater from Plot No.C-3, Focal Point, Ludhiana to C-20

Focal Point, Ludhiana. The petitioner issued circular No.27 of 2014 dated 29.05.2014 holding that w.e.f. 01.01.2014 consumers where induction billet heaters are installed shall be treated as PIU Category. The petitioner treating the respondent as PIU Category vide notice dated 25.05.2017 raised demand of Rs.40,09,142/-. The demand accrued on account of difference in tariff. The matter reached to Redressal Forum constituted under Section 42 of Electricity Act, 2003. The Redressal Forum on the basis of documents submitted by consumer formed an opinion that 100 KW billet heater was shifted from Plot C-3 to Plot C-20, thus, there was no question to charge tariff as applicable to PIU.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no evidence of shifting of 100 KW billet heater from Plot C-3 to Plot C-20, thus, findings recorded by Redressal Forum are factually incorrect and needs to be set aside. The respondent never informed petitioner about shifting of billet heater from one premises to another.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

5. From the perusal of impugned order, it is evident that respondent produced returnable gate pass dated 12.02.2013. Original copy was shown to the Redressal Forum which found that gate pass though is an internal document, however, can be relied upon. The respondent-consumer has submitted letter to petitioner-utility supplier and it was duly received. The petitioner is claiming that there is no evidence of shifting of heater from Plot C-3 to Plot C-20. Heater is not a small equipment. The petitioner has right to inspect premises of the consumer. The petitioner neither inspected premises nor produced any

concrete evidence disclosing that heater was actually utilized in Plot C-3 entailing conversion from Large Supply connection to PIU.

6. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

7. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

April 28, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No