

**BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

Present

**K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu  
Vidyut Ombudsman**

Dated: 30 -07-2011

**IA No. 2 of 2011**

**In**

**Appeal No. 44 of 2010**

**Between**

Sri K.Anjaneyulu  
S/o.Sri Venkata Raju,  
Prop: Sri Venkateswara Rice Mill,  
Peruru – 533 218.  
Amalapuram (M), EG Dist.

***... Appellant***

**And**

1. Assistant Engineer / operation / Town /Amalapuram
2. Assistant Engineer / operation / Rural /Amalapuram
3. Assistant Divisional Engineer / Operation / Amalapuram
4. Divisional Engineer/Operation/ Amalapuram

***....Respondents***

The appeal / representation filed dt.06.05.2011 (received on 16.05.2011) of the appellant has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 18.07.2011 at Visakhapatnam. The appellant being absent and Sri Y.Eswar Rao, Sub-Engineer/Rural/Amalapuram, for respondents present and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed / issued the following :

**AWARD**

The petitioner filed this petition to take appropriate action against respondent Nos. 1 to 5 for violation/ disobedience of the orders by this authority in appeal no. 44

of 2010 dated 30.11.2010 and for implementation of 3 phase 24 hours supply equally to Bit –I and Bit-II of Peruru village, Amalapuram mandal.

2. The very grievance of the petitioner is that this authority passed an award directing the respondents to comply the orders of the Hon'ble Lokayukta and also directions of this authority to provide supply equally to Bit-I on par with Bit-II within 4 months from the date of receipt of this order with a direction that the appellant is at liberty to move this authority or Lokayukta if it is not complied.

3. Accordingly, the petitioner filed this petition for taking necessary action against the respondents. The appellant failed to attend before this authority though the same was posted for hearing at Visakhapatnam on 18.07.2011. But Sri Y.Eswar Rao, Sub-Engineer/Rural/Amalapuram representing the respondents was present and submitted a document dated 18.03.2011 to the effect that they are taking steps for construction of sub-station enabling them to supply 24 hours 3phase supply to Peruru village for both the bits. They have also mentioned in the said letter that the erection of 33/11 kV SS was sanctioned in CR 16/2010-11. The tendering process is also completed and the work is also entrusted to the contractor and the said process is also in process and requested to extend some more time till the sub-station work is completed at Peruru.

4. When the work is entrusted to a contractor with a direction to complete the work, naturally it takes some more time to complete the work and the same is to be seen by the appellant that at any time if really the work is not done and construction is not in progress it can be reported to this authority. But there is no point in directing the respondents to do the work within a particular time as it depends upon the supply of the material, construction of work by the contractor, etc. Further, the respondents are directed to expedite the construction of the sub-station work as early as possible and the appellant is at liberty to move this authority if there is any delay in construction work and basing on the representation, this authority can take appropriate steps. But taking action under those circumstances as sought by the

appellant is not appropriate as they have to come with a concrete proposal of construction of sub-station, etc and they are also doing the same with an intention to supply the power as ordered by this authority.

5. In the light of the above said discussion, the petition is disposed accordingly.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 30<sup>th</sup> July 2011

**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**