

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

Present

K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu
Vidyut Ombudsman

Dated 19- 12 - 2011

Appeal No. 79 of 2011

Between
Sri D.Bhasakara Ramakrishna
Deputy Executive Engineer
S.A.C.B.Sub Division
Dowlaiswaram., EG Dist.

... Appellant

And

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

....Respondents

The appeal / representation dt.09.11.2011 (received on 14.11.2011) against the CGRF order of APEPDCL (in CG No.266/2011-12 dt.18.10.2011). The same has come up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 02-12-2011. Sri D.Bhasakara Ramakrishna, DEE for 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 requisite amount has been paid for extension of 24Hours power supply to Peddapuram lift irrigation scheme-I at Borrampalem (for dedicated 11 KV feeder) as the service is fed from mixed feeder experiencing interruption quire often. Hence, they requested the Forum for arranging to erect dedicated 11 KV feeder to avoid frequent interruptions to the LIS.”

2. The 1st Respondent has filed his written submission as hereunder:

“that a complaint made by Sri D. Bhaskara Ramakrishna, Deputy Executive Engineer regarding Extension of Hrs. 11KV Power Supply through dedicated Feeder to Peddapuram Lift Irrigation Scheme of SC.No. HT RJY 690.

1No. Estimate was sanctioned for erection of 6.6 KM 11KV Line and 1No. 11KV Bay with VCB to provide Dedicated Feeder from 33/11 KV SS Jaggampeta for extending 24Hrs. Supply to the above mentioned LI Scheme in the month of July, 2006.

The Irrigation authorities have paid the Necessary Charges to the Department Rs. 18,73,050/- towards SLC Charges, Rs. 15,45,000/- towards Development Chares and Rs. 10,30,000/- towards SD Charges in the Month of October 2006.

Mean while, new SS namely Borrampalem SS near by the above LI Scheme was constructed and By erecting 1.04RKM 11KV Line, supply was extended from the newly constructed Borrampalem SS though 11KV Borrampalem Industrial Feeder. Presently the above LI Scheme getting 24Hrs uninterrupted power supply except during ELRs. The balance 5.56 KM 11KV Line was not erected and 11 KV breaker with Bay extension was also not erected. The materials for the Balance 5.56 KM were drawn from the stores by the Previous AEs who worked in the Gandepalli Section and presently the materials are not available.

The matter was already brought to the notice of Higher authorities and after getting suitable instructions balance work will be taken up.”

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

- “There is no deficiency service in this regard and as stated by the Second Respondent, the left irrigation scheme is getting 24 Hrs. supply from newly constructed Borrampalam Sub-Station.*
- Whether the balance work is to be done or not? That has to be decided by the Licensee duly getting mutual consent in between Licensee and Lift Irrigation authorities. Accordingly further course of action will be decided.*

Accordingly, the CG.No.266/11-12 is disposed off.”

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that the LI scheme is tagged from the industrial feeder and they were forced very much inconvenience in the power supply during that period. After frequent requests with different cadres of APEPDCL authorities, the power supply during that period for the LI scheme was restored after a lapse of 8 to 12 hours time. In the mean time, the pumping of water to the fields was stopped due to the failure of power supply affecting the ayacut under the LI scheme. Even after paying necessary amounts for continuous power supply with dedicated feeder, they are unable to get continuous power supply and in addition to that every time they have to approach the EPDCL authorities for providing continuous supply. Providing power

supply from the industrial feeder to the LI scheme unnecessary breakdowns will occur due to line faults and other industrial loads causing power failure to the LI scheme during running of pumps. Hence, they requested to give an order to arrange 11kV dedicated feeder to the scheme at an early date to avoid interruptions in the power supply.

5. Now, the point for consideration is, “whether the impugned order is liable to be set aside or modified? If so, in what manner?”

6. The appellant Sri D.Bhasakara Ramakrishna, DE / Irrigation present before this authority and submitted that they have paid huge amounts for erection of 11kV line at a length of 6.6km and one number 11kV bay extension and VCB erection to form a dedicated feeder from 33/11kV SS Jaggampeta for extension of 24hours supply to the Peddapuram LI scheme and they have not provided the same and frequent interruptions are there and the Forum has failed to appreciate the said aspects and rejected the request.

7. Whereas, the respondents are represented by Sri M.Rajasekhar, ADE/O/Jaggampeta present and submitted a letter addressed by ADE to this authority stating that the estimate was made with 33/11kV at Borrampalem was not in existence and proposed 11kV line directly from 33/11kV SS Jaggampeta situated at 6.6KM from LI scheme but at the time of execution Borrampalem SS had come into existence. Hence, 11KV line was laid directly from Borrampalem SS duly erecting 1.04RKM of 11kV line tagged on to the industrial express feeder which is being fed with 24 hours uninterrupted power supply, except during emergency load reliefs availing from EHT substations. The lines were laid from Borrampalem SS with the view that the power interruptions due to the reduced line length and also the voltage profile will be considerably improved. At present there is no problem except during emergency load reliefs.

8. The ADE/O/Jaggampeta has categorically stated that there is a problem inspite of supplying power and if a separate bracket is fixed to the dedicated line there will be no problem in supplying power to the LI scheme. It is also an admitted fact that if the length of the line is more there will be a voltage problem. This has

been admitted by both the sides. The DEE/I&CAD represented that he would discuss with his higher officials about the fixation of separate bracket for solving the problem he would report this authority about the same. Till today, they have not reported anything, though they were given 10 days time for discussion and for reporting.

9. In the light of the above said discussion, the impugned order is hereby set aside with a direction to the respondents to fix the separate bracket to the dedicated line as stated before this authority. Still if there is any problem in supplying the same for 24 hours, the respondents are directed to give a dedicated line as granted earlier. No order as to costs.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 19th December 2011

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN