

**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 15 – 12 - 2011**

**Appeal No. 67 of 2011**

Between  
Smt.KKG Parvathi  
W/o.Sri K.Venkata Rao  
2-148, Sri Visakha Nagar colony  
Jammu Narayana puram  
Vizianagaram – 535 002.

**... Appellant**

**And**

1. Asst. Engineer / Operation / D2/EPDCL/ Vizianagaram
2. Assistant Divisional Engineer / operation / Town /EPDCL / Vizianagaram
3. Divisional Engineer / operation / EPDCL /Vizianagaram.

**....Respondents**

The appeal / representation dt.27.09.2011 (received on 30.09.2011) against the CGRF order of APEPDCL (in CG No.120/2011-12 dt.27.08.2011). The same has come up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 29-11-2011. Sri.K.Venkat Rao, on behalf of the appellant present and Sri G.Chiranjeevi Rao, DE/O/Vizianagaram, Sri B.V.Ramana ADE/O/Vizianagaram and G.Siva Kumar, AE//D2/Vizianagaram 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:

*“Smt K.K.G. Parvathi, Jammu Panchayat Limits, Vizianagaram District has filed a complaint stating that the complainant contacted the Call Centre to register the complaint for rectification of low voltage problem in their Colony and the concerned refused to register complaint. Hence the complainant approached the Forum to initiate action against the concerned who involved in this regard.”*

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

*“the SS-2, 100 KVA the following information is herewith submitted for favour of information.*

- 1) *Total Number of Services under SS-2 = 168 Nos.*
- 2) *Total Connected load = 113 KW.*
- 3) *Total Contracted Load = 82 KW.*
- 4) *Peak Load voltages: RN -236 YN: 239; BN = 235. Off load Volages: RN-237 YN: 239; BN-23.8.*
- 5) *Peak load currents: R=76 A Y=82 A; B=79 A. Off load currents=62 A Y= 66A; B=72A.*
- 6) *Neutral current during peak load 9A.”*

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

- *“The Forum herewith directed the respondents to conduct detailed load survey of each consumer’s connected load to provide additional Distribution Transformer to minimize low voltage problem. If any additional load is existing with any of the consumer as against the contracted that load should be regularized duly collecting Development charges and Security Deposit from the concerned consumer.*
- *The Forum herewith directed the Divisional Engineer/Operation/ Vizianagaram to conduct detail enquiry against the concerned who was on duty at that time to take suitable disciplinary action.*
- *The Compliance Report should be submitted with in 15 days after receipt of this Order.*
- *The Grievance of the complainant is not redressed”*

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that the Forum has relied upon the information furnished by AE which is on a fabricated data and also mislead the Forum and the Forum disposed the case without concentrating on the subject of the complaint and forced them to approach this authority to seek justice.

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

6. The appellant’s husband attended before this authority and stated that the call centre people failed to register the complaint submitted by his wife about the failure of the power and also about the voltage problem and they have not taken any action against the persons responsible in the call centre who refused to receive the

complaint submitted by his wife. The Forum in a specific direction directed the respondents to attend the representation made by the appellant and it appears the manager has submitted a report to the SE in which it is clearly mentioned that Sri P.T.Naidu at the call centre is there for receiving the complaint and on enquiry Sri P.T.Naidu found that a call was received by him towards register of the complaint from Visakhanagar colony and suddenly the phone line was disconnected. In this letter nothing is mentioned about the details at what time and in what manner they have talked are not mentioned and simply stated that it was sudden cut off, etc are mentioned. In the very said report, the manager has also failed in discharging his duty in conducting enquiry in an appropriate manner. The respondents are directed to entrust the matter to the said manager once again to conduct an enquiry about the detailed enquiry, the person who telephoned to him and what action initiated by him also to be enquired by the said manager.

7. So far as the voltage problem is concerned separate guidelines are issued to the respondents in appeal no. 61 of 2011 filed by the husband of the appellant.

8. In the result, the appeal is disposed with following directions

- (a) The respondents are directed to entrust the matter to the said manager to conduct an enquiry once again about the detailed enquiry, the person who telephoned to him and what action initiated by him also to be enquired by the said manager including the details of the talk before the alleged disconnection of telephone.
- (b) The respondents are directed to workout the consumption of each and every consumer in that area and provide necessary feedback from the department side to comply the voltage problem time and again it should be reported to this authority within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order about the voltage in that area.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 15<sup>th</sup> December 2011

**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**