

Before the Himachal Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission
Vidyut Aayog Bhawan, Block No. 37, SDA Complex, Kasumpti, Shimla-09.

CORAM:

Sh. Devendra Kumar Sharma,
Chairman
Sh. Yashwant Singh Chogal,
Member (Law)
Sh. Shashi Kant Joshi,
Member

Date of order: 17.03.2025

In the matter of:-

Finalization of the Himachal Pradesh Electricity Supply (Sixth Amendment) Code, 2024.

ORDER

The Himachal Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission (hereinafter referred to as “the Commission”) published the Himachal Pradesh Electricity Supply Code, 2009 in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh on 29th May, 2009 which has been amended from time to time. The aforesaid Code has hereinafter been jointly referred to as “the Principal Code, 2009”.

2. The HPSEBL and other Stakeholders of electricity have submitted proposals to carry out amendments in certain provisions of the Himachal Pradesh Electricity Supply Code, 2009. The said proposals were referred to the Electricity Supply Code Review Panel for consideration.
3. The Electricity Supply Code Review Panel held a meeting on 21.06.2024 to discuss/deliberate on the proposals received from the stakeholders related to amendment of existing provisions of the Principal Code, 2009.
4. Recommendations of the Electricity Supply Code Review Panel were received in the Commission on 25.06.2024 through Executive Director (Technical) cum Convener, Supply Code Review Panel.
5. Therefore, the Commission in exercise of the powers conferred under it under Section 181 of the Electricity Act, 2003 (36 of 2003) (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”) and all other powers enabling it in this behalf, notified the Draft Himachal Pradesh Electricity Supply (Sixth Amendment) Code, 2024 on 10th October, 2024.

As required under sub-section (3) of Section 181 of the Act and Rule 3 of the Electricity (Procedure for Previous Publication) Rules, 2005, the same were also published in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh on 21st October, 2024.

- 6 The Commission also invited public objections and suggestions by 22nd November, 2024 by way of insertions in two Newspapers i.e. “The Tribune” and “Dainik Bhaskar” dated 27th October, 2024. The full text of the draft amendments was also made available on the Commission’s website: www.hperc.org.
7. The Commission, also vide its letter dated 23.11.2024, requested the major stakeholders, including Industries Associations, Hoteliers Association, Department of MPP & Power, Government of Himachal Pradesh, Department of Urban Development, Government of Himachal Pradesh, Directorate of Energy, Himachal Pradesh Power Transmission Corporation Limited, Consumer Representative and Distribution Licensee to send their suggestions/objections as per the aforesaid public notice.
8. The Commission received suggestions/objections on the draft amendments from the following stakeholders:-
 - a. The Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Limited (HPSEBL);
 - b. The Parwanoo Industries Association, Plot No.4A, Sector-2, Parwanoo, Distt. Solan; and
 - c. Sh. K.S. Dhaulta, Consumer Representative, Shanti Bhawan, Phase-III, Sector-6, New Shimla-171009(HP).
9. A Public Hearing in the matter was scheduled to be held on 9th December, 2024 from 11 A.M onwards in the Commission. The Public Notice in this regard was published in the Newspaper viz. “Divya Himachal” and “The Times of India” on 23rd November, 2024.
10. As scheduled, the public hearing was held on 9th December, 2024. The list of participants who attended the public hearing is annexed as **Annexure-“A”**.
11. Consideration of written submissions and viewpoints expressed in the public hearing by the stakeholder(s) and Commission’s analysis/view.-

The Commission has carefully examined and analysed the written suggestions/objections and the viewpoints expressed by the stakeholders during the public hearing. The analysis and views of the Commission are as under:-

I. Comments/suggestions on amendment of sub-para1.2 for inserting sub-para1.2.41A:-

Sh. K.S. Dhaulta, Consumer Representative has submitted that the Residential Welfare Association(s) is a body registered under the H.P. Societies Registration Act, 2006 or under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, so the proposed definition i.e. “Residential Welfare Associations or Association” may include the words “Societies Registered under the Societies Registration Act” to make it more specific, comprehensive and inclusive.

Commission’s View:-

The Commission agrees with the suggestions of the Consumer’s Representative and accordingly the definition has been modified to the extent as suggested.

II. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of para 1.3:-

Sh. K.S. Dhaulta, Consumer Representative has submitted that the proposed amendment of para 1.3 of the Principal Code, 2009 to align the same with rules framed by the Ministry of Power, GoI, without referring the same to the Electricity Supply Code Review Panel and without inviting the suggestions and comments of the stakeholders/Review Panel on State specific issues may not be proper and objections and suggestions may be invited.

Commission’s View:-

The Commission is of considered opinion that whenever any amendment to Principal Code, 2009 is carried out, the due process laid down/provided in sub-section (3) of the Section 181 of the Act, and rule (3) of the Electricity (Procedure of Previous Publication) Rules, 2005 is duly followed by inviting the objections/suggestions from the stakeholders. The proposed amendment has also been duly published and objections have been invited.

As such, the Commission decides to retain the provisions proposed in para 13 of the Principal Code without any change.

III. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of sub-para 2.1.6.1(A):-

No comments have been received on the omission of words “or joint dedicated feeder” from the sub-para 2.1.6.1(A) of the Principal Code. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change without any modifications.

IV. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of clause (a) of sub-para 2.1.6.1(A) and for substitution of table:-

The Parwanoo Industries Association has submitted that there is no relevance in retaining the load limits in kW/MW in the table under sub-para (a) of para 2.1.6.1(A) for eligibility criteria to decide the standard supply voltage, so the 3rd and 4th column may be deleted as only demand has relevance to the quantum of current flowing through the conductors.

Commission’s View:-

The Commission on analysis, is of the opinion that the suggestion of the stakeholder to delete 3rd and 4th column of table specifying maximum connected load in kW/MW for common feeder and dedicated feeder cannot be accepted as it is necessary to provide for limits related to connected load in kW/MW keeping in view the system design, safety and security aspects. Hence, the Commission decides to retain the provisions of the draft amendment without any change.

V. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of first proviso of clause (a) of sub-para 2.1.6.1(A):-

The Parwanoo Industries Association has submitted that the load limit of special category loads at 11/22 kV supply voltage also deserves a revision from 750 kW to 1250 kW in line with the revision of load limits at 11 kV.

Commission’s View:-

The Commission is of the view that the distortion in the power supply due to the special category loads, if not mitigated properly, affects the quality of supply. Such loads introduce higher level harmonics in power supply system and need to be judiciously restricted in order to provide quality

supply to all the consumers. As such, the Commission do not agree with the suggestions made by the Parwanoo Industries Association to enhance the existing limit of special category loads and decides to continue with the existing load limit as proposed in the draft amendment.

VI. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of sub-para 2.1.6.1(A) with respect to the insertion of additional provisos to be inserted after the 4th proviso to clause (a) of sub-para 2.1.6.1(A):-

(a)The Parwanoo Industries Association has submitted that the proposal of levy of incremental surcharge in addition to the LVSS is imposition of yet another surcharge for supply at non-standard voltage. There is no merit in having multiple surcharges for the same purpose. In case, the Commission feels that the imposition of incremental surcharge is a better proposal than levy of LVSS (Low Voltage Supply Surcharge), in that event, the LVSS must be scrapped. Further, there is no point in having multiple surcharges for the same cause. This will further complicate the billing system and is against the move towards ease of doing business. The Association further suggested that the incremental surcharge should not be allowed. The Association has also mentioned in its suggestions that the LVSS itself has resulted in a lot of litigation.

Also that the industry in the State of H.P. has been expecting the abolition of LVSS and has been requesting the Commission to abolish this surcharge which is not justified and that the Commission has already adopted voltage based energy tariff for 66kV/ 132kV/ 220 kV supply voltages. We should rather move towards actual voltage based tariffs instead of tariffs based on standard supply voltages, which can contain the aspect of LVSS also. In case the Commission does not agree for abolition of LVSS, the proposal of yet another surcharge should be dropped for the reasons explained above.

It is also mentioned that some of the States have high voltage rebates applicable to the consumers to whom the supply is given at a voltage higher than the standard supply voltage. Whereas, in the State of Himachal Pradesh, it is not a level playing field, where the LVSS is

charged for a lower actual supply voltage. According to the Association, in order to encourage the consumers to switch to a higher voltage in order to reduce losses, the same can be done by re-introducing the system of high voltage rebate.

- (b) The HPSLDC has submitted that the Control Centre building of HPSLDC is adjacent to the 132 kV sub-station building of HPSEBL, and the power supply to the HPSLDC Control Room is fed from the 33/0.4 kV sub-station transformer of the 132/66/33kV sub-station at Jutogh, operating at 0.4 kV supply voltage since the establishment of HPSLDC in 2001. The control centre requires an uninterrupted and reliable power supply for continuous monitoring of grid operations. Due to space constraints and right-of-way (ROW) limitations, HPSLDC cannot install its own distribution transformer to access a standard supply voltage. Considering the critical nature of HPSLDC's responsibilities under the Electricity Act, 2003 especially the 24x7 grid operation and monitoring, it is requested that HPSLDC be exempted from the provisions of this proviso and also from the Lower Voltage Supply Surcharge (LVSS).
- (c) During Public hearing, Sh. Rakesh Bansal representative of the Parwanoo Industries Association has reiterated the written submissions made by the Association. He has suggested that the proposed provision of sub-para 2.1.6.1(A) relating to incremental surcharge should not be allowed and that there is no point in having multiple charges for the same cause. According to him, some of the States have high voltage rebate applicable to the consumers to whom the supply is given at a voltage higher than standard supply voltage, so the system of high voltage rebate may be introduced in the State.

Commission's View:-

- (a) The Commission has carefully analysed the comments, suggestions and submissions of the Parwanoo Industries Association and Sh. Rakesh Bansal, Representative of the Association. In view of the substitution/ amendment of Table contained in clause (a) of sub-para 2.1.6.1 (A), the

same shall substantially enhance the load limits on all voltage levels and large number of existing consumers paying Lower Voltage Supply Surcharge (LVSS) who will fall within the revised load limits corresponding to the standard supply voltage and will not have to pay LVSS. The imposition of incremental charges in addition to LVSS is appropriate in a scenario where despite the availability of standard supply voltage, such consumers do not switch over to standard supply voltage. Therefore, the Commission decides to retain the proposed fifth proviso with slight amendment as under :-

“Provided further that where an existing consumer, on 01.04.2025, is already availing supply at a voltage lower than the standard supply voltage as per the table specified above in clause (a) of sub-para 2.1.6.1(A), the consumer shall have the option to switch to the relevant standard supply voltage, if such standard supply voltage has been made available to him by the licensee or to continue availing supply at such lower voltage by paying lower voltage supply surcharge (LVSS) in accordance with the relevant Tariff Order upto 01.04.2026, and thereafter by paying monthly incremental charges, on compounding basis @ 0.33% of the Energy Charges, in addition to the LVSS. If such consumer does not exercise option to switch over to the relevant standard supply voltage on or before 01.03.2027, then, after serving a 30 days notice to the consumer, the licensee shall proceed for permanent disconnection as per Para 7.1:”

The Commission has also noticed that provisions of the proposed sixth proviso are similar as provided in sub-para 4.2.2 of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission decides to drop the proposed sixth proviso. The Commission also observed that it would be appropriate to shift the proposed seventh proviso with minor changes below the table under Clause (a) of sub- para 2.1.6.1 (A) as under :-

“Provided further that for Domestic Category Consumers, as defined in the Tariff Orders of Distribution Licensee for the corresponding year, the maximum connected load shall be 20 kW at 230 Volt instead of 15 kW at 230 Volt.”

Further, the Commission decides to retain the proposed eighth and ninth provisos without any modifications, which shall now be the sixth and seventh provisos.

However, as far as the suggestion to provide for rebate on account of availing supply at higher voltage level is concerned, the Commission do not find merits in the suggestion, as the intent of the amendment is to encourage and bring all consumers under the ambit of standard supply voltage corresponding to their load demands.

(b) The suggestions made by the HPSLDC are not a subject matter of present regulatory process. Therefore, the Commission is of the view that the submissions by the HPSLDC need to be addressed by the HPSEBL administratively within the ambit of enforced provisions.

VII. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of sub-para 2.1.6.1(A) with respect to the Explanation to be inserted after clause (b) of the sub-para 2.1.6.1(A):-

No comments have been received on the insertion of the Explanation after clause (b) of the sub-para 2.1.6.1(A). Therefore, the Commission adopts the amendment without any modifications.

VIII. Comments/suggestions on the amendment/omission of sub-para 2.1.6.1(B):-

No comments have been received on the omission of sub-para 2.1.6.1(B) of the Principal Code. Therefore, it is ordered to be omitted.

IX. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of clause (iii) of sub-para 2.1.6.1(C):-

No comments have been received on the substitution of clause (iii) of the sub-para 2.1.6.1(C) of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change without any modifications.

X. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of Explanation succeeding to sub-para 2.1.6.1(C):-

No comments have been received on the substitution of the “Explanation” succeeding to sub-para 2.1.6.1(C) of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change without any modifications.

XI. Comments/suggestions on the amendment/omission of sub-para 2.1.6.2:-

No comments have been received on the omission of sub-para 2.1.6.2 of the Principal Code, 2009. In view of the amendments to sub-para 2.1.6.1 (A) above, sub-para 2.1.6.2 has become irrelevant, therefore, it is ordered to be omitted.

XII. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of sub-para 2.1.6.3:-

No comments have been received on the amendment of sub-para 2.1.6.3 of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change without any modifications.

XIII. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of sub-para 3.1.4:-

No comments have been received on the substitution of the existing figure “60” in the sixth row and second column of the table under sub-para 3.1.4 of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change without any modifications.

XIV. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of clause (a) of the sub-para 3.1.6:-

No comments have been received on the substitution of existing figure “120” in the sixth row and second column of the table under clause (b) of sub-para 3.1.6 of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change without any modifications.

XV. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of clause (b) of the sub-para 3.1.6:-

No comments have been received on the substitution of the existing figure “120” in the sixth row and second column of the table under clause (b) of sub-para 3.1.6 of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change without any modifications.

XVI. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of clause (b) of the sub-para 3.1.6 with respect to addition of Explanation at the end of the sub-para 3.1.6:-

No comments have been received on the addition of the Explanation at the end of sub-para 3.1.6 of the Principal Code, 2009. However, on careful consideration of the matter, the Commission adopts the change with a slight modification as under:-

“Explanation.- For the purpose of this sub-para 3.1.6, all areas excluding areas covered under sub-paras 3.1.6 (a) (i) and 3.1.6 (a) (ii) having height

above 1000m from Mean Sea Level shall be considered as hilly areas/terrain.”

XVII. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of para 3 i.e. insertion of paras 3.1A and 3.1B after para 3.1:-

(a) The Consumer Representative has submitted that the proposed amendment may not be practicable and shall be counter-productive in most of cases relating to the Resident Welfare Association(s), those have either no vacant land or having no adequate land or conducive site for Sub-station.

To impose such conditions on the Association(s) or Developer(s), to get the supply, shall escalate the cost of the project and put additional burden on the consumers, to meet the additional costs of Sub-station and electricity supply thereof. Thus, proposed condition needs to be re-visited to provide supply to such colonies as per existing provisions of Supply Code.

(b) The Consumer Representative has also submitted that the consumer of the State should not be burdened for this arrangement between the HPSEBL and Associations/Developers of housing colonies, to get domestic connection to his house/flat in the State.

Commission's View:-

(a) The Commission on careful analysis of the suggestions of the Consumer Representative is of the considered view that some vacant land/space within the vicinity of the Residential Complex for Sub-station has to be provided for single point supply failing which it would not be feasible to install suitable distribution main infrastructure including transformer. Alternatively, the resident may have individual connections in case such space is not made available. Therefore, the Commission decides to retain the draft amendment Regulations with a slight modification in sub-para (A) of para 3.1A of the Amendment.

(b) As far as the issue raised by the Consumer's Representative that the consumers of the State should not be burdened for the arrangements

between the HPSEBL and Association of housing colony to get domestic connection to house/flat, the Commission is of the opinion that, in such arrangement(s), the provisions of Himachal Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission (Recovery of Expenditure for Supply of Electricity) Regulations, 2012 shall apply.

XVIII. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of para 3.3:-

No comments have been received on the substitution of the existing words/letters and figure “three (3) working days” in sub-para 3.3.1(i) of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change without any modifications.

XIX. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of para 3.9 and para 3.10:-

- (a) The Parwanoo Industries Association has submitted that the matter was reviewed during the suggestions given by the licensee, for the tariff for FY 24-25 where the Commission had agreed to continue with the system of temporary reduction of contract demand. However, the Association further suggested that the temporary reduction be allowed upto the time when the level of chargeable contract demand is further reduced to a level of 80% from the present level of 85%.
- (b) The HPSEBL has submitted that the draft amendment proposal to omit the para 3.10 of the Principal Code, 2009 may be finalized. However, the applicability of the revised provision may be made effective from next financial year i.e. 01.04.2025 in view of the existing provisions of temporary revision which might have been applicable/in force upto 31.03.2025.

Commission’s View:-

The Commission has considered the rival submissions and in view of the same and the significant variation in contract demand requirement of seasonal industries and some other consumers having similar circumstances, the Commission decides to forgo the proposed amendments of paras 3.9 and 3.10 of the Principal Code, 2009 and also decides to retain the provision of Principal Code, 2009 without any change. However, in order to make the provisions of Chapter III of the

Principal Code, 2009 more clear, the Commission decides to add clause (f) after clause (e) of sub-para 3.10.1 of para 3.10 as under:-

“(f) Non compliance of distribution performance standards specified under this chapter shall attract the provisions of Schedule appended to the Himachal Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission (Distribution Performance Standards) Regulation, 2010 as amended from time to time.”

XX. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of para 4.4:-

The HPSEBL has submitted that the words “additional meter” may be substituted with the words “additional meter with allied metering equipment”.

Commission’s View:-

The Commission does not find merits in the suggestions made by the HPSEBL since the metering equipment is a part of meter as defined under para 1.2.36 of the Principal Code, 2009. Hence, the Commission decides to retain the proposed draft amendment without any change.

XXI. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of para 4.4.8:-

The Parwanoo Industries Association has submitted that the existing provisions of para 4.4.8 protects the consumer from overhauling of his account due to defects in overall metering, restricting the period of overhauling to a maximum of six months due to mistakes and non-action of the licensee. The licensee is trying to exclude the CT/PT meters out of this purview. The meter is clearly defined to include CT/PT and such equipment and it is absurd to approve any sub-classification of the metering. Meter does not mean only the meter, but CT/PT is a part of it. Inclusion of this provision would mean that licensee can overhaul for a indefinite period. The very objective of the consumer protection under the Electricity Act, 2003, shall stand defeated in case the proposed amendment is allowed. It is submitted that the licensee first adopted this proposal and included it in their sales manual since last many years and have now proposed it to be adopted in the Supply Code. This will encourage inefficiency and

negligence on the part of the licensee to observe and check the meters at regular intervals. It is prayed that this proposal be scrapped as there are no merits in it. Further, such practice is not existent in any other State of the country.

Commission's View:-

Suggestions of the Parwanoo Industries Association are devoid of merits as the proposed amendment is in addition to existing provisions offering more clarity. Further, the suggestions made by the Parwanoo Industries Association that proposed amendment will take away the protection offered to the consumers/ licensee in existing provisions is devoid of merits as the proposed amendment does not dilute any of existing provisions of the Principal Code, 2009. The Commission is also aware of the Central Electricity Authority (Installation and Operation of Meters) Regulations, 2006 wherein the sub-clauses (m) and (p) of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation (2) provide that:

“(m) ‘Instrument Transformer’ means the ‘Current Transformer’ (CT) or ‘Current Transformer’ (CT) and ‘Capacitor Voltage Transformer’ (CVT) or ‘Current Transformer’ (CT) and ‘Inductive Voltage Transformer’ (IVT);

(p) ‘Meter’ means a device suitable for measuring, indicating and recording the conveyance of electricity or any other quantity related with electrical system and shall include, wherever applicable, other equipment such as Instrument Transformer necessary for the purpose of measurement and also mean ‘Correct Meter’, if it complies with the standards as specified in the Schedule to these regulations;”

Therefore, the CT/PT meter includes measuring instrument and associated CT/PT in case of CT/PT meters. Existing provisions of sub-para 1.2.36 and 1.2.37 of the Principal Code, 2009 define the meter accordingly. Commission also believes that accuracy class of meter specifies percentage error limits of measuring instrument as well as of CT/PT in case of CT/PT meter. The Commission is also aware that exact date from which percentage error of a meter deviated from the percentage error limit corresponding to accuracy class of meter cannot be ascertained, in such cases overhauling of consumer accounts shall not be allowed beyond six months. The Commission is of firm opinion that in case of incorrect

connections, defective CT/PT, calculations and mistake, wrong multiplying factor etc., the exact date from which such discrepancy occurred can be conclusively ascertained from record of the meter and such consumer accounts need to be overhauled from such date. The proposed amendment is in no way against the interest of the consumers as perceived by the Parwanoo Industries Association as overhauling may also result in reimbursement of excess billed amount in favour of consumer. However, in order to bring in more clarity to the proposed amendment, the Commission decides to amend the proposed provisions as under:-

a) Definition of “Accuracy” and meaning of “Accuracy class” below Regulation 1.2.1 is being inserted as under :-

“1.2.1A “Accuracy” means the accuracy of meter vis-a-vis its Accuracy Class. “Accuracy class” shall have the meaning as specified in the regulations framed by the Central Electricity Authority under section 55 of the Act.”

b) A proviso below clause (ii) of sub-para 4.4.8 is being inserted as under:-

“Provided that in case of meters where error in recorded energy is due to wrong CT/PT connections or inputs there from, wrong multiplication factor, calculation mistakes etc. the accounts of consumer will also be overhauled in terms of Regulation 4.4.8 (ii) above.”

XXII. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of para 5.2.1.4:-

The HPSEBL has suggested to substitute para 5.2.1.4 of the draft Amendment with modification in para 5.2.1.4.2 as under:-

“5.2.1.4.2 The revision of the Sanctioned Load, if any, based on the actual recorded maximum demand shall be as under:

(a) in case of increase in recorded maximum demand, the lowest of the monthly maximum demand, where the recorded maximum demand has exceeded the sanctioned load limit at least three times during a financial year, shall be considered as the revised Sanctioned Load, and the same shall be automatically reset from the billing cycle in next financial year and consumers shall be informed of this change in calculation through Short Message Service or mobile application. The applicable charges for additional contract demand shall be recovered as per relevant HPERC Regulations; and

(b) in case of reduction of maximum demand, the revision of sanctioned load shall be done in accordance with the Supply codes/ Standard

Operating Procedures issued by the respective Regulatory Commission.”

Commission’s View:-

The Commission does not find any merits in the suggestions of the HPSEBL to omit the lines appearing in the opening para 5.2.1.4.2 of Amendment proposal i.e., *“In case maximum demand recorded by the smart meter exceeds the Sanctioned Load in a month, the bill, for that billing cycle, shall be calculated based on the actual recorded maximum demand and consumers shall be informed of this change in calculation through Short Message Service or mobile application.”*, as it is prudent/justifiable to calculate bills on the basis of actual recorded maximum demand.

The other suggestions of the HPSEBL w.r.t. the provisions relating to recovery of charges in cases where contract demand gets revised automatically and informing the consumer, regarding automatic revision of its Contract Demand, through SMS or Mobile Application, the Commission is of the opinion that the suggestion is genuine and thus, the Commission agrees to the suggestion and decide to modify the proposed amendment to such extent as under:-

“5.2.1.4.2 In case maximum demand recorded by the smart meter exceeds the Sanctioned Load in a month, the bill, for that billing cycle, shall be calculated based on the actual recorded maximum demand and consumers shall be informed of this change in calculation through Short Message Service or mobile application:

Provided that the revision of the Sanctioned Load, if any, based on the actual recorded maximum demand shall be as under:-

- (a) in case of increase in recorded maximum demand, the lowest of the monthly maximum demand, where the recorded maximum demand has exceeded the sanctioned load limit at least three times during a financial year, shall be considered as the revised Sanctioned Load, and the same shall be automatically reset from the billing cycle in next financial year. The consumers shall be informed of this revision in Sanctioned Load through Short Message Service or mobile application. The applicable charges for such additional contract demand/sanctioned load shall be recovered as per the relevant applicable Regulations; and*

(b) in case of reduction of maximum demand, the revision of sanctioned load shall be done as per the relevant applicable Regulations.”

Further, as no comments/suggestions have been received, on the substitution of the words “every month” with the words “a day” in sub-para 5.2.1.4 of the Principal Code, 2009 and on insertion of new sub-para 5.2.1.4.1 after sub-para 5.2.1.4 of the Principal Code, 2009, therefore the Commission adopts these changes without any modification.

XXIII. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of para 5.2.9:-

No comments have been received on the insertion of new sub-para after sub-para 5.2.9.2 of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change without any modifications.

XXIV. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of para 7.1.1:-

No comments have been received on the insertion of new clause (i) after clause (h) of the sub-para 7.1.1 of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change with a slight modification as under:-

“(i) in case of default at the end of the consumer to switch over to standard supply voltage {clause (a) of the sub-para 2.1.6.1(A) }.”

XXV. Comments/suggestions on the amendment of sub-para 7.1.2:-

No comments have been received on the insertion of new proviso after 2nd proviso to sub-para 7.1.2 of the Principal Code, 2009. Therefore, the Commission adopts the change without any modification.

12. The Commission, through newspapers, came to know that during the process of KYC being carried out by the distribution licensee, around 30% power meters in some of areas have been found on name of deceased consumers. The Commission is of the view that the title of such connection(s) are required to be changed. Therefore, to ease out the process of change of title/name of the deceased consumer, the Commission decides to add following proviso to the sub-para 3.5.1 of Principal Code, 2009.

“Provided that no test report shall be required in cases of transfer of title or change of name of a deceased consumer. The Licensee shall devise, and make available on its website, a simple application/ agreement format for such purpose within 30 days of its Publication in the official gazette.”

13. The Commission, after concluding its views on the objections and suggestions received on the draft amendments of the Principal Code, 2009 and the deliberations in the public hearing conducted thereon, decides to finalize the Himachal Pradesh Electricity Supply (Sixth Amendment) Code, 2025 by incorporating the changes on the above lines and other minor clarificatory changes as considered necessary.

Further, to ensure smooth implementation of the provisions of Amendment Code, the same shall be enforced w.e.f 01.04.2025.

Sd/-

Shashi Kant Joshi
Member

Sd/-

(Yashwant Singh Chogal)
Member (Law)

sd/-

(Devendra Kumar Sharma)
Chairman

Annexure-“A”

Sr. No.	Participants
1	Er. Rakesh Kapur, SE (SERC), HPSEBL
2	Er. Pravesh Kaundal, Sr. XEN, HPSEBL
3	Er. J.S Upadhay, Sr. XEN, HPSEBL
4	Er. Sanjay Ronal, Sr. XEN, HPSLDC
5	Er. Abhishek Bhadhur Singh, AE HPSLDC
6	Sh. K.S. Dhaulta, Consumer Representative
7	Sh. Rakesh Bansal, Sr. Vice President, Parwanoo Industries Association