BEFORE THE GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

GANDHINAGAR

Petition No. 2148 of 2022.

In the Matter of:
Petition under Sections 142 & 143 read with Sections 2 (22) (b), 55 (1) and Section 177 (c) of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Petitioner	:	M/s Dipak Textile B-150, Vishkarma Nagar, Village: Pipodara Taluka: Mangrol, District: Surat - 394110.
Represented by	:	Ld. Adv. Mr. Parth Thummar.
		V/s.
Respondent No. 1	:	Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited "Urja Sadan", Nana Varachha Road Kapodara, Surat- 395006.
Represented by	:	Mr. K.B. Mehta, Mr. N.M. Chaudhari and Mr. B.P. Dodiya.
Respondent No. 2	:	Dy. Engineer (O&M) Dakshin Gujarat Vij Company Limited Sub- Division Office, Pipodara, Kim, Surat.
Represented by	:	Mr. K.B. Mehta

CORAM:

Pankaj Joshi, Chairman
Hiren Shah, Member

Date: 11/08/2026.

ORDER

1. The present Petition has been filed by Petitioner M/s Dipak Textile under Sections 142 & 143 read with Sections 2 (22) (b), 55 (1) and Section 177 (c) of the Electricity Act, 2003 *inter-alia* seeking following reliefs.

   (a) Technical Investigation Team (TIT) may be appointed by the Honourable Commission and let the TIT study the consumption due to capacitor banks. The behaviour of the meter at different kVAr capacitors should be investigated. Such a report should reach the Honourable Commission within three months.

   (b) Based on the final TIT report, the petitioner may be given justice. Respondents may please be ordered to refund the collected amount with an 18% p.a. rate of interest.

   (c) The Honourable Commission may make the CGRF of DGVCL more professional and consumer-centric by inducting more experienced and retired district judges as its members. CGRF of DGVCL does not allow a technical person with the consumer complainant to explain the technical facts of the case. This is an injustice to the consumers. Clause 2.43 of the (Notification No.: 2 of 2019) is misused by the officers of the forum to prevent technical persons with the party who is a party to any proceedings before the forum. It is insisted that either the party or his employee should only appear.

   (d) The Honourable Commission may please quash the order of the CGRF (No: DGVCL/C&R/Forum/Case No. 52/2020-21/20 No. 13382 dated

19.09.2020) as it did not decide the matter entirely and judiciously.

(e) Please hold that, "the meter which records huge energy consumption due to only PF correction capacitors while the actual motive (resistive and inductive) load is off, is not the correct meter.

2. The facts mentioned in the Petition, in brief, are as under:

2.1. It is stated that the Petitioner is a consumer of the Respondent Company and operates a small textile factory situated at B-150, Vishwakarma Nagar, Village Pipodara, Taluka Mangrol, District Surat, Gujarat – 394110. The Petitioner is registered under Consumer No. 12471/003370/9 with a contracted load of 65 kW under the LTMD tariff category.

2.2. It is stated that the electricity connection was released to the Petitioner on 16.04.2007. The Petitioner has been regularly paying all electricity consumption bills and had never raised any dispute with the Respondent Licensee prior to the COVID-19 lockdown.

2.3. It is stated that following the outbreak of COVID-19, a nationwide lockdown/curfew was imposed, pursuant to which all industries, except those providing essential services such as food and allied activities were required to remain closed from March 2020 until the restrictions were gradually relaxed by the Government. Immediately after the imposition of the lockdown, the workers migrated to their native places, and no manufacturing or production activities were carried out during the lockdown period. Public movement was severely restricted, with only doctors, nursing staff, police personnel

and persons engaged in essential services being permitted to move. Consequently, the Petitioner's factory remained completely closed during the said period.

2.4. On 26.05.2020, the Respondent issued an electricity bill to the Petitioner reflecting consumption of 10,816 units. Aggrieved thereby, the Petitioner has lodged a complaint with the Respondent. It is submitted that although the MRI data of the meter were retrieved by the Respondent, the same were never supplied to the Petitioner. Thereafter, the Petitioner approached the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (CGRF) by filing a Complaint on 31.07.2020. The matter was heard by the CGRF on 19.09.2020. It is submitted that instead of examining the factual circumstances prevailing during the lockdown, the CGRF decided the matter solely on the basis of the MRI report. The Petitioner was neither shown nor furnished a copy of the MRI report for his examination or study.

2.5. It is stated that the Petitioner subsequently came to know that several other consumers had also been issued similar electricity bills despite their industrial units remaining closed during the lockdown period. It is further submitted that many consumers had switched off their industrial machinery but inadvertently left the capacitor banks connected to the main switches. Except for a few tube lights kept operational for safety and security purposes, no electrical load was in use. Therefore, where the lighting load is separately metered, the meter recording motive power ought not to have registered any consumption since the operational load was admittedly nil during the relevant period.

2.6. It is stated that the capacitor used for power factor correction is a storing device. The power consumption of the purely capacitive circuit (no other load, except capacitors, is zero). Thus, a purely capacitive circuit consumes zero active power. No power is dissipated in a purely capacitive circuit even though a current is flowing in the circuit. Even if it is assumed that the conventional capacitors have some resistance, the consumption due to that may be the least.

2.7. It is stated that the logical program fed into the meter by the meter manufacturer, records kWh consumption when the actual resistive and inductive combined load is zero, but it senses the circulating current due to capacitor as load and accordingly it converts capacitive current into the load current and registers kWh.

2.8. It is stated that the forum in its conclusion said that if the present Petitioner has any dispute with the meter, the licensee should resolve the same. It is submitted that when the forum itself doubts a meter, it was the duty of the CGRF to find the truth about the meter, MRI data etc. The Petitioner further raised the question that whether the meter tested applying only capacitive load, or not.

2.9. It is stated that the licensee has extorted consumption charges from the Petitioner for the units they never consumed for any production activities during the lockdown period. This is nothing but a case of a defectively designed energy meter. The CGRF has failed to protect the rights of the consumers and is controlled by the licensee. It is also stated that the Petitioner understands from his business friends that a public-spirited person has filed a Petition before the Commission which may have a similar subject matter. The Petitioner supports

such a Petition as being the victim of wrong billing due to an incorrect meter that records huge units when only the PF correction capacitors are on.

3. The matter was kept for hearing on 11.11.2022 and the Commission passed Daily Order dated 15.11.2022 recording that neither the Petitioner nor any representative on behalf of the Petitioner was present but the Petitioner sent an email dated 10.11.2022 about his inability to remain present for the hearing and requested the Commission to decide the matter in his absence. It is further recorded in the aforesaid Daily Order that the representative appearing on behalf of the Respondent DGVCL submitted regarding non-receipt of Petition and requesting the Commission to direct the Petitioner to make available the copy of the Petition to the Respondent. Accordingly, the Petitioner was directed to serve copy of the Petition to the Respondent DGVCL within one week. The Respondent DGVCL was directed to file reply, if any, to the Petition within three weeks' time from receipt of same, with copy to the Petitioner and the Petitioner was also directed to file its rejoinder reply, if any, within weeks' time after receipt of reply from the Respondent DGVCL.

4. Thereafter, the matter was listed for hearing on 18.07.2023 and the Commission passed Daily Order dated 24.07.2023 recording that neither the Petitioner nor the Respondent No. 1 were present during the hearing. It was noted that the Petitioner through email and additional submissions dated 14.07.2023, sought disposal of the matter on merits, citing personal difficulty and the unavailability of its technical consultant, and requested directions to the Respondents

to file their reply. The Respondent No. 2 (DGVCL) by email dated 18.07.2023 has informed the Commission that despite the directions contained in the Daily Order dated 15.11.2022 and repeated requests, the Petitioner had still not served a copy of the Petition. Accordingly, the Petitioner was directed to serve copy of the Petition to the Respondent DGVCL within one week and file proof of service. The Respondent DGVCL was directed to file reply, if any, to the Petition within three weeks' time from receipt of same, with copy to the Petitioner and the Petitioner was also directed to file its rejoinder reply, if any, within weeks' time after receipt of reply from the Respondent DGVCL. It is noted that the matter was adjourned due to the non-appearance of the Petitioner and Respondent No. 1.

5. Thereafter, the matter was listed for hearing on 02.01.2025 and the Commission passed Daily Order dated 31.03.2025 recording that none of the Respondents were present during the hearing. It was further noted that during the hearing, Petitioner has submitted that they have not received the copy of the Reply filed by the Respondents. Accordingly, the Respondents were directed to provide the copy of the Reply to the Petitioner within two weeks' time and file compliance affidavit for the same and the Petitioner was also directed to file its rejoinder reply, if any, within two weeks' time after receipt of reply from the Respondent DGVCL.

6. The Respondent DGVCL vide affidavit dated 24.04.2025 filed its reply in the matter and stating as under:

6.1. The Respondent No. 2 has raised preliminary objection with regard to maintainability of the Petition. It is submitted that as per provision

2.69 of Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019, the Petitioner ought to have approach by way of filling of representation within 30 days before the learned Electricity Ombudsman, Ahmadabad considering the memo of Petition. It is submitted that the Petitioner has approached Commission without adopting due procedure of law set out by the Commission. Hence, the present petition deserves to be dismissed on the ground of maintainability of the petition in view of lack of jurisdiction under prevailing Rules/Regulations.

6.2. It is submitted that the monthly bill i.e. March billed in April-2020 issued to the Petitioner amounting to Rs. 92,085.48 for consumption of 248970 kWh (units) reading was based on the meter recording data on 18.03.2020. Subsequently, on account of impact of COVID-19 pandemic, the Central Government has announced the nationwide lock-down resulting into restricted movement across the country. Accordingly. Respondents were forced to carry out billing of all consumers including Petitioner's installation on 26.05.2020 and recorded 259786 kWh. Accordingly, a bill was issued to Petitioner amounting to Rs. 85,727/- based on the meter reading unit consumption of 10816 kWh.

6.3. It is submitted that the Petitioner made a written complaint to the office of Respondent No. 2 through letter dated 17.06.2020. In order to address the representation of the Petitioner, the officers/employees of Respondent No. 2 has visited location of the Petitioner on 30.06.2020 & 20.07.2020. However, both times factory

found in closed conditions. Hence, no action could not be taken by Respondent No.2 regarding the identification of complaint of Petitioner.

6.4. It is further submitted by Respondents that on occasion of 3rd time i.e. on dated 21.07.2020, officer/employees of Respondent No. 2 again visited the premises of the Petitioner. During such visit, the electrical load at Petitioner premise was not active and therefore, it was requested to Petitioner to start the power but Petitioner denied to start the power supply. Hence, in order to resolve grievance of Petitioner and to find out actual position, MRI Data was collected in presence of representative of Petitioner.

6.5. It is submitted that the electricity bills issued to the Petitioners are in accordance with the prevailing Tariff Orders and Supply Code provisions of the State and the bills are issued based on the MRI data collected from the Petitioner's electricity connection meter which has been carried out in the presence of the authorized representative of the Petitioner. Thus, any contentions of the Petitioner regarding premises were in use or not, is not required to be proceeded as the billing is to be carried out by Respondent Company specifically based on the metering data.

6.6. It is submitted that in case of Petitioner application Reg. No. 52/2020-21, CGRF vide Order No:DGVCL/C&R/Forum/Case No.52/2020-21/20/13382 dated 19.09.2020 has noted that the billing carried out by Respondent company based on the MRI data is correct and in accordance with the law.

6.7. It is submitted that the present petition is not maintainable due to lack of jurisdiction as well as the Order by CGRF in favor of the Respondent Company and accordingly, the present petition deserves to be dismissed with cost.

7. The matter was lastly heard on 14.07.2026 and the Commission passed the Daily Order dated 15.07.2026. The Counsel appearing for the Petitioner and the representative for the Respondents have made their submissions and completed their arguments in the matter. The Commission in the aforesaid Daily Order had directed both the parties to file their respective written submissions, if any, within one week from the date of the Order. However, neither the Petitioner nor the Respondents have chosen to file any written submission in the matter despite the liberty was granted by the Commission in its Daily Order dated 15.07.2026.

8. Heard the parties. We note that the present Petition has been filed by M/s Dipak Textile under Sections 142 and 143 read with Sections 2(22)(b), 55(1) and 177(c) of the Electricity Act, 2003, *inter alia*, seeking to appoint a Technical Investigation Team (TIT) to investigate the electricity consumption recorded due to capacitor banks and to examine the behaviour of the electricity meter at different kVAr capacitor levels, with a direction to submit its report before the Commission within a period of three months. The Petitioner has further prayed for refund of the amount allegedly recovered by the Respondents, along with interest at the rate of 18% per annum, based on the findings of the TIT. The Petitioner has also raised issue related to the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) of DGVCL.

Further, the Petitioner has sought quashing and setting aside of the order dated 19.09.2020 passed by the CGRF, DGVCL in Case No. DGVCL/C&R/Forum/Case No. 52/2020-21/20 No. 13382, on the ground that the said order failed to adjudicate the issues raised by the Petitioner in a complete and judicious manner. The Petitioner has also prayed for a declaration that a meter which records substantial energy consumption solely on account of power factor correction capacitors when the actual resistive and inductive load remains switched off cannot be regarded as a correct meter.

9. We note that the Respondent DGVCL has raised a preliminary objection regarding the maintainability of the present Petition on the ground that the Petitioner has directly approached the Commission without availing the statutory remedy available under the GERC (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 (CGRF Regulations, 2019). It is submitted that against the Order dated 19.09.2020 passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (CGRF) in Case No. 52/2020-21, the Petitioner was required to file a representation before the Electricity Ombudsman within the prescribed period of limitation. However, instead of approaching the Electricity Ombudsman, the Petitioner has directly filed the present Petition before the Commission. It is further contended that the Petition is not maintainable as it essentially raises consumer billing and metering disputes, which fall within the exclusive statutory jurisdiction of the CGRF and the Electricity Ombudsman under Sections 42(5) and 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003. Accordingly, the Respondents have submitted that the Petition is not maintainable for want of jurisdiction.

10. Since, the Respondent DGVCL has raised preliminary objections with respect to the maintainability of the Petition on the grounds of lack of jurisdiction, therefore, without going into the merits, the Commission deems it appropriate to decide the preliminary issue of the present case, as to whether the present Petition is maintainable before the Commission under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 and whether the Commission has jurisdiction to entertain the same, particularly, when the issues raised essentially pertain to consumer billing and metering disputes which fall within the statutory domain of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman under Sections 42(5) and 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003.

11. The Commission has carefully examined the pleadings of both the parties as available on record, the preliminary reply and written submissions filed by Respondent DGVCL and the relevant provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 and Regulations framed thereunder.

11.1. We note that although the Petitioner in the present Petition has raised a larger technical issue relating to capacitor consumption and metering, but a plain reading of the Petition reveals that the core grievance pertains to alleged high electricity bills issued to Petitioner during the COVID-19 lockdown period, allegedly on account of recording of energy consumption in the capacitor banks. It is not in dispute that, being aggrieved by the action of the Respondent, the Petitioner had approached the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) by filing Case No. 51 of 2020-21. The CGRF, vide its order

dated 19.09.2020 passed in Case No. 51 of 2020-21, adjudicated the grievance raised by the Petitioner and passed appropriate Order.

11.2. We note that the Electricity Act, 2003 provides a clear and unambiguous statutory framework for redressal of consumer disputes. In this regard, it is relevant to refer the Section 42(5) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read as under:

> *"Every distribution licensee shall, within six months from the appointed date or date of grant of licence, whichever is earlier, establish a forum for redressal of grievances of the consumers in accordance with the guidelines as may be specified by the State Commission."*

11.3. Further, the Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003 also provides as under:

> *"Any consumer, who is aggrieved by non-redressal of his grievances under sub-section (5), may make a representation for the redressal of his grievance to an authority to be known as Ombudsman to be appointed or designated by the State Commission."*

11.4. We also note that in exercise of the powers conferred on it by clauses (r) and (s) of Sub-section (2) of Section 181 read with Subsections (5) to (7) of Section 42 of the Electricity Act, 2003 (36 of 2003) and all other powers enabling it in this behalf, the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (GERC) issued Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019, Notification No. 2 of 2019, providing

for establishing Forum(s) for redressal of Grievances of Consumers, appointing Ombudsman / Ombudsmen by the Commission, making representation against non-redressal of Grievances of Consumers, time and manner of settlement of Grievances by the Ombudsman / Ombudsmen and matters incidental and ancillary thereto. In this regard it is necessary to refer the relevant provision of in the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 which are as under:

"……

1.5. Definitions:

c) "Complainant" means (a) any Consumer or Consumers including their legal heirs or successors, having a Complaint against a Licensee and lodging the same either directly or through their representatives; or (b) any voluntary consumer association or associations, registered under the law for the time being in force and making the Complaints in the larger interest of the Consumers; or (c) any Consumer(s)/voluntary consumer association(s) where the Licensee does not register or fails to register the Complaint of such Consumer(s)/voluntary consumer association(s); or (d) any person whose electricity connection is disconnected; or (e) an applicant for a new connection for the supply of electricity.

d) "Complaint" means any complaint made by a Complainant, either in writing, including e-mail and facsimile modes, or verbally over phone if such numbers are specified by a Licensee for lodging complaints, or by visiting personally to such offices of the Licensee which are designated by the Licensee for registering the

complaints, to a Licensee, which may, without limitation, include complaints relating to:

i. *any fault, imperfection, shortcoming or inadequacy in the quality, nature and manner of performance which has been undertaken to be performed by the Licensee in pursuance of a licence and/or any contract or agreement or under the Electricity Supply Code or in relation to Standards of Performance of Licensees, as specified by the Commission;*

ii. *any unfair trade practice or restrictive trade practice which has been adopted by the Licensee in providing Electricity Service; or*

iii. *Electricity Services which are being offered for use to the public in contravention of the provisions of any applicable law including safety code, rules and regulations, as prescribed by the competent authorities under the relevant laws or established through prudent industry practices, and as a result whereof the life and safety of the human beings, livestock or property is put at risk and endangered.*

e) *"Electricity Service" includes supply, billing, metering and maintenance of electrical energy to the Consumer and all attendant sub-services and also any other service which a Licensee is required to provide pursuant to his licence or under any applicable law.*

f) "Forum" means the forum for redressal of Grievances of the Consumers to be constituted by the Licensee in terms of Sub-section (5) of Section 42 of the Act.

h) "Grievance" shall mean a grievance of the Consumer arising out of the failure of the Licensee to register or redress a Complaint, and shall include any dispute between the Consumer and the Licensee with regard to any Complaint or with regard to any action taken by the Licensee in relation to or pursuant to a Complaint.

j) "Ombudsman" means an authority appointed or designated by the Commission, under Regulation 3.1 pursuant to Sub-section (6) of Section 42 of the Act.

2.69. A Complainant may prefer a representation before the Ombudsman appointed/ designated by the Commission under the following circumstances:

i. If the Complainant is aggrieved by the non-redressal of the Grievance by the Forum within the period specified;

ii. If the Complainant is aggrieved with the order passed by the Forum;

iii. Non-implementation of Forum's order by the Licensee in specified time limit.

2.70. Such a representation may be made within a period of 30 days after issue of order by the Forum or expiration of 30 days after the deadline specified for issue of the order, or within 30 days

after the deadline specified for implementation of order, whichever is applicable.

……"

11.5. Thus, the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2019 provides a complete mechanism for adjudication of consumer grievances relating to billing, metering, supply, and allied issues, vesting original jurisdiction with the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) and appellate/supervisory jurisdiction with the Electricity Ombudsman. On the other hand, Section 86(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 provides for the adjudicatory jurisdiction of the State Commission stipulating that the Commission shall adjudicate upon the disputes between the licensees and generating companies and to refer any dispute for arbitration.

11.6. Further, the adjudicatory jurisdiction of the Commission does not extend to a dispute between a distribution licensee and individual consumers relating to metering, billing etc., particularly when separate statutory forums have been provided and created for that purpose under Section 42 of the Act.

11.7. We also pursued the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission v. Reliance Energy Limited, [(2007) 8 SCC 381], as relied by DGVCL. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, while interpreting the Sections 42(5), 42(6), and 86(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003, has conclusively settled the law

on this aspect. In paragraph 33 of the said judgment, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

> *"As per the aforesaid provision, if any grievance is made by a consumer, then they have a remedy under Section 42(5) of the Act... a proper forum for redressal of the grievances of individual consumers has been created by the Commission. Therefore, now by virtue of sub-section (5) of Section 42 of the Act, all the individual grievances of consumers have to be raised before this forum only. In the face of this statutory provision we fail to understand how could the Commission acquire jurisdiction to decide the matter when a forum has been created under the Act for this purpose."*

11.8. In paragraph 34 of the Judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is further clarified the scope of Section 86(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 as under:

> *"Section 86(1)(f) ... does not encompass within its domain complaints of individual consumers. It only provides that the Commission can adjudicate upon the disputes between the licensees and generating companies... The proper forum for that is Section 42(5) and thereafter Section 42(6)."*

11.9. Thus, Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the consumers must resort to a mechanism of dispute resolution provided under the Act and the State Commission cannot assume jurisdiction over such disputes.

11.10. We also note that the aforesaid legal position has been consistently followed and reiterated by the Hon'ble APTEL in its various judgments, wherein it has been held that consumer billing and metering disputes squarely falls within the jurisdiction of the CGRF and Ombudsman and that the State Commission cannot be converted into a Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum. The Hon'ble APTEL has repeatedly observed that once the grievance redressal mechanism under Section 42 of the Electricity Act is operational, the jurisdiction of the State Commission to entertain individual consumer disputes stands excluded.

11.11. By applying the aforesaid statutory provisions and settled judicial principles to the present case, the Commission finds that the Petitioner, in substance, has raised issues relating to alleged incorrect billing and metering, affecting consumers and therefore jurisdiction to entertain such disputes lies with CGRF and Ombudsman. Further, it is also evident from the records that the Petitioner has in fact availed such remedy by way of approaching the CGRF, DGVCL by filing the Case No. 51 of 2020 and the CGRF, DGVCL also passed the Order. Therefore, entertaining such a Petition would amount to permitting circumvention of the mandatory statutory redressal mechanism provided under Section 42 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and would defeat the legislative intent behind the creation of a specialized, decentralized consumer grievance redressal framework.

11.12. In view of the above deliberation, the Commission holds that the present Petition is not maintainable. The Commission lacks jurisdiction to entertain the Petition as the grievances, if any, fall

within the exclusive domain of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum under Sections 42(5) and the Ombudsman under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003. Accordingly, the Petition is liable to be rejected on the ground of lack of jurisdiction.

12. We also make it clear that findings of the Commission on the aforesaid issues are on independent grounds and without embarking upon any examination of the technical aspects or factual correctness of the allegations raised. The Commission clarifies that it is not entering into the issue of sufficiency or insufficiency of data, evidences, or particulars as pleaded in the present Petition. The Petition is being rejected solely on threshold grounds, i.e., lack of jurisdiction and not on the merits or otherwise of the allegations relating to capacitor banks, metering technology, or billing practices.

13. In view of the foregoing, the present Petition is dismissed as not maintainable.

14. With this Order, the present Petition stands disposed of.

15. Order accordingly.

Sd/-	**Sd/-**
[Hiren Shah]	**[Pankaj Joshi]**
Member	**Chairman**

Place: Gandhinagar.
Date: 11/08/2026.