

**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 22-11-2011**

**Appeal No. 25 of 2011**

Between  
Sri P.Subramanyam  
D.No.64-58-D6, S. Nagappa street,  
Kurnool.

**..... Appellant**

And

1. Assistant Engineer/Operation/Pedakodabur/CPDCL/Kurnool Dist
2. Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Mantralayam /CPDCL/Kurnool Dist
3. Divisional Engineer/Operation/Adoni/CPDCL/Kurnool District
4. Superintending Engineer/Operation/Kurnool Circle/CPDCL/Kurnool District

**..... Respondents**

The appeal / representation is received on 27-05-2011 against the CGRF order of APCPDCL (in CG No.KNL-38/2010-11/Kurnool Circle dated 28-03-2011). The same has come up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 16-11-2011. Sri. P. Subramanyam, appellant present and Sri N.Narendra Kumar, DE/Operation/Adoni, Sri.Y.Chandra Sekhar, ADE/Operation/ Mantralayam on behalf of respondents present, heard and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed/issued the following:

**AWARD**

The Appellant filed a complaint before the Forum, *“stating that he was having lands in Hulikanvi Village, P.Kadubur Mandal and he was facing low voltage problem since his Agriculture Service was located at the tail-end. Due to the low voltage problem, his electric motor got burnt. Because of these problems, he could not cultivate his agriculture lands.*

*He further requested the Forum to direct the AE/O/Peddakadabur to provide 100 kVA Transformer in addition to the existing 63 kVA Transformer in Hulkanni Village.”*

2. The ADE/Operation/Mantralayam, 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, submitted in his written submission” that on enquiry, it was learnt that the Complainant never approached either the A.E nor ADE office for redressal of his grievance. When they went for inspection along with the A.E on 23-02-2011, it was observed that the transformer available to the Complainant’s Service was feeding supply for both lightning and agricultural load.

It was also stated that the problem of low voltage could be solved by shifting the existing 63 kV Transformer to the load centre and enhancing the capacity to 100 kVA. There was no requirement of additional Transformer. This work would be taken up after necessary estimate was sanctioned.

3. The Forum examined the complainant and respondents No.1 & 2, while conducting enquiry. After hearing both sides and after considering the material on record, the Forum passed the impugned order as here under:

*“The Respondents are directed to complete the work on or before 15-03-2011 as deposed by the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent and report compliance to the Forum within 15 days thereafter duly producing a letter from the complainant stating that the work has been completed to his satisfaction.*

*The complaint is disposed off accordingly”.*

4. Aggrieved by the non-compliance of the order, the Appellant preferred this appeal, questioning the same that the order of the Forum is not complied with inspite of the requests made by him and also requested to provide another 25 kVA Transformer near by his lands to solve the problem.

5. Now the point for consideration is, whether the impugned order requires any modification or direction for implementation? If so, on what grounds?

6. The Appellant who appeared before this authority stated that he has got 11 acres of land and are at tail-end and the crops on the land were spoiled due to low voltage and inspite of the directions from the Forum, the respondents did not comply the same and that another 25 kVA Transformer nearby his land if provided would solve the problem once for all.

7. Whereas the respondents who appeared before this authority stated that the order of the Forum is complied with and the voltage problem is solved. When it is going to erect 100 kVA in the middle of the lands, the adjacent owner of the land objected for the same and therefore they have replaced 100 kVA Transformer by changing the 63 kVA Transformer and the appeal is to be disposed as not maintainable.

8. When the neighbouring owner has not agreed for shifting it to near his land, they cannot compel. Further more if the Transformer is shifted near to the lands of the Appellant, it may cause inconvenience to others as the appellant admitted that his land are at the tail-end, so there is no other option for the department. The respondents have also complied the orders of the Forum. If the Appellant wants a transformer exclusively to his lands, he can purchase and get it installed in his land. His request for 25 kVA to the lands is not originally pleaded and the plea now raised cannot be acceded to.

9. In the light of the above discussion, the impugned orders does not require any modification or directions and hence, the appeal is dismissed as in-fructuous.

**This order is corrected and signed on this day of 22<sup>nd</sup> November, 2011**

**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**