

**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**  
**O/o: ANDHRA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
**4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad – 500 004**

Present

**K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu**  
Vidyut Ombudsman

**Dated 19 – 12 - 2011**

**Appeal No. 80 of 2011**

Between  
Sri T.V.R.Reddy  
Door No.8-7, Narayya Well Street,  
Old Town, ANaparthi – 533342  
EG Dist

**... Appellant**

**And**

1. Asst. Engineer / Operation / EPDCL/ Rangampeta
2. Asst. Divisional Engineer / Operation / EPDCL/ Jaggampeta
3. Divisional Engineer / operation / EPDCL /Jaggampeta

**....Respondents**

The appeal / representation dt.11.11.2011 against the CGRF order of APEPDCL (in CG No.263/2011-12 dt.20.10.2011). The same has come up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 02-12-2011. Sri.T.V.R.Reddy, appellant present and Sri M.Rajasekhar, ADE/O/Jaggampeta on behalf of respondents present, heard and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed/issued the following:

**AWARD**

The petitioner filed a complaint against the Respondents for Redressal of his Grievances and stated as hereunder:

*“he has filed a complaint stating that the damaged poles and conductor have not been replaced even after giving complaint one year ago. Hence, requested the Forum to resolve his problem at the earliest.”*

2. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent has filed his written submission as hereunder:

*“that a complaint made by Sri T.V.R. Reddy of Anaparthi Village regarding low voltage, damaged conductor and poles of SS 10, Nallamilli Village is Rangampeta Section.*

*The above mentioned SS10, Narayana Well’s Village DTR work was proposed by HVDS and work entrusted to M/s. Vishwanadh, Projects by the contraction Wing. Shortly the work will be taken up and rectify the consumer problem in 2 to 3 months.”*

3. After hearing both sides and after considering the material placed before the Forum, the Forum passed the impugned order as here under:

- *“The execution of HVDS works by the contractor in that particular area i.e. SS10, Nallamilli Village, Rangampeta Mandal should be given priority to complete the replacement of damaged poles and conductor as the complainant is requesting many times and he is suffering in fact.*
- *All the respondent s are herewith directed that they should ensure the above work is to be attended on top priority under HVDS Scheme.*

*With above directions, the CG.No.263/10-11 is disposed off.”*

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that they are getting low voltage due to erection of 14 poles through the fields of other riots and due to the said voltage drop, several motors were also burnt and some of the wires were also touching the heads of the riots and everybody is apprehending danger, while attending the works. When the facts were placed before the SE they were replying that they would do in the HVDS work and inspite of that, no action was taken and requested this authority to take immediate steps on this aspect.

5. Now, the point for consideration is, “whether the order passed by the Forum is liable to be set aside or modified? If so, on what grounds?”

6. The appellant Sri T.V.R.Reddy present before this authority and stated all these facts with lot of anguish.

7. Whereas, the respondents are represented by Sri M.Rajasekhar, ADE/O/Jaggampeta present before this authority and stated that they would complete the work within 15 days and also filed a paper to that effect addressing to this authority. In this paper, the DTR work was proposed in HVDS work and it was entrusted to M/s. Vishwanath projects, Hyderabad and the works were also being

executed under the close supervision of construction wing giving priority to this item. The ADE/construction /Jaggampeta has also completed the pegmarking of lines and DTR for the above work. The ADE/Construction has also promised through his letter that the works will be completed within three weeks positively.

8. In the light of the above said representation, there is no need for this authority to set aside or modify the order but a direction has to be given to the respondents to complete the work within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order, failing which action will be taken under S.146 of EA 2003. No order as to costs.

9. With this observation, the appeal is disposed of.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 19<sup>th</sup> December 2011

**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**