



BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

First Floor 33/11 kV Substation, Beside Hyderabad Boat Club
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

**PRESENT : SRI MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

THURSDAY THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

Appeal No. 06 of 2025-26

Between

M/s. Ranjana Industries, represented by Sri Haladker Prabhu, H.No. 4-14/103/1/1,
Hasan nagar, Miralam Tank, Hyderabad 500002.

..... Appellant

AND

1. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Miralam Tank/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad South.
2. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Miralam/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad South.
3. The Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Charminar/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad South.
4. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Charminar/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad South.
5. The Superintending Engineer/Operation/Hyderabad South Circle/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad.
6. The Accounts Officer/Revenue/Hyderabad South/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad.

..... Respondents

This appeal is coming on before me for final hearing on 14.05.2025 in the presence of Sri Ravinder Srivastava - authorised representative of the appellant and Sri K. Venkatesh Goud - ADE/OP/Miralam and Smt. A.Kavitha - AAO/ERO/Salarjung having stood over for consideration, this Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following:-

AWARD

This appeal is preferred aggrieved by the Award passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum - (Greater Hyderabad Area) (in short 'the Forum') of Telangana State Southern Power

Distribution Company Limited (in short 'TGSPDCL') in C.G.No 188/2024-25 /Hyderabad South circle dt.29.03.2025, rejecting the complaint.

CASE OF THE APPELLANT BEFORE THE FORUM

2. The case of the appellant is that the respondents have released Service Connection No. V3005254 under Category-III (in short 'the subject Service Connection') to the appellant. The appellant issued one month's notice vide HT Reference No CC904223341481 dt:15.12.2022 to dismantle the subject Service Connection. The Security Deposit of Rs. 2,01,816/- is available with the respondents as in December 2022. Respondent No.3 has not refunded the said Security Deposit along-with interest as on 15.01.2023. The appellant addressed a letter on 24.01.2025 to respondent no.5 to refund Rs. 2,63,467/- which included 61,651/- interest on Security Deposit till 15.01.2023 and twice the interest rates from 15.01.2023 to 31.01.2025.

3. The respondents ought to have refunded Rs.2,63,467/- within 24 hours from 27.01.2025 as prescribed in Clause VII 7.1 of Regulation 5 of 2016 of the Telangana State Electricity Regulatory Commission (in short 'the Regulation'). Accordingly it was prayed to refund Rs.2,63,467/- as on 31.01.2025 along-with the interest till its refund.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS

4. In the written replies submitted by respondent No.3, it is stated that the premises of the subject Service Connection was dismantled by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Ranga Reddy and Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation team under Miralam Tank FTL issue. Since W.P. No 11896 of 2023 is pending before the Hon'ble High Court the dismantle proposal for the subject Service Connection was rejected. As of now a sum of Rs.2,01,816/- is available towards Security Deposit which will be settled based on the result of the Writ Petition.

AWARD OF THE FORUM

5. After considering the material on record and after hearing both sides, the learned Forum has rejected the complaint.

6. Aggrieved by the Award passed by the learned Forum, the present appeal is preferred, contending among other things, that the pendency of Writ Petition is nothing to do with the present appeal. Therefore, It is prayed to set aside the impugned Award and to refund Rs. 2,63,467/-with twice the rate of interest thereon from 31.01.2025 till its refund.

WRITTEN SUBMISSION OF RESPONDENTS

7. In the written reply filed by respondent No.3, she has reiterated her written submissions made before the learned Forum.

ARGUMENTS

8. The authorised representative of the appellant has argued that the appellant is entitled for refund of Security Deposit with twice the rate of interest till it is refunded. Therefore it is prayed to direct the respondents to refund the same.

9. On the other hand, respondent No.3 has supported the impugned Award and prayed to reject the appeal.

POINTS

10. The points that arise for consideration are:-

- i) Whether the appellant is entitled for refund of the Security Deposit amount with interest as prayed for ?
- ii) Whether the impugned Award passed by the learned Forum is liable to be set aside? and
- iii) To what relief?

POINT No. (i) and (ii)

ADMITTED FACTS

11. It is an admitted fact that the W.P. No.11896 of 2023 against the respondents herein and others was filed by the appellant. It is also an admitted fact that the said Writ Petition is pending.

SETTLEMENT BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT

12. Both the parties have appeared before this Authority on different dates virtually. Efforts were made to reach a settlement between the parties through the process of conciliation and mediation. However, no settlement could be reached. The hearing, therefore, continued to provide reasonable opportunity to both the parties to put-forth their case and they were heard.

REASONS FOR DELAY IN DISPOSING OF THE APPEAL

13. The present appeal was filed on 21.04.2025. This appeal is being disposed of within the period of (60) days as required.

CRUX OF THE MATTER

14. In the present case, it is necessary to refer to Clause 2.37 of the Regulation, which reads as under:-

“The Forum may reject the grievance at any stage under the following circumstances:-

- a. Where proceedings in respect of the same matter or issue between the same Complainant and the Licensee are pending before any Court, Tribunal, Arbitrator or any other Authority, or a decree or award or a final order has already been passed by any such court, tribunal, arbitrator or authority as the case may be;
- b. Where cases fall under Sections 126,127,135 to 139,152 and 161 of the Act;

- c. Where the grievance has been submitted two years after the date on which the cause of action arose or ceases to continue, whichever is later.
- d. In the cases, where grievances are:
- Frivolous, vexatious, malafide;
 - without any sufficient cause; or
 - Where there is no prima facie loss or damage or inconvenience caused or to be caused to the Complainant or the consumers who are represented by an association or group of consumers.

Provided that no grievance shall be rejected in writing unless the Complainant or Association of persons has been given an opportunity of being heard.”

15. In the present matter Clause 2.37(a) of the Regulation is relevant. It appears that earlier the learned Forum has passed the Award partly allowing the complaint in C.G. No 48/2021-22 on 28.06.2022 between the same parties. Aggrieved by the said Award the appellant has preferred Appeal No 17 of 2022-23 before this authority. That appeal was rejected on 09.03.2023, however, granting instalments to the appellant to pay the amount in question etc., in that appeal. Thereafter the appellant has preferred W.P. No 11896 of 2023 before the Hon'ble High Court. Money is involved in Appeal No. 17 of 2022-23 and also in the instant appeal. It is significant to note that the parties and the matter involved in both the cases is almost the same. Therefore it is a fit case to apply Clause 2.37{a} of the Regulation. Accordingly, I hold that the appellant is not entitled to refund the Security Deposit amount with interest as prayed for and the impugned Award is not liable to be set aside. The learned Forum has analysed the issues involved in this case properly and came to the

correct conclusion. These points are accordingly decided against the appellant and in favour of the respondents.

POINT No. (iii)

16. In view of the findings on point Nos. (i) and (ii), the appeal is liable to be rejected.

RESULT

17. In the result, the appeal is rejected, confirming the Award passed by the learned Forum.

A copy of this Award is made available at <https://vidyutombudsman-tserc.gov.in>.

Typed to my dictation by Office Executive cum Computer Operator, corrected and pronounced by me on the 15th day of May 2025.

**Sd/-
Vidyut Ombudsman**

1. M/s. Ranjana Industries, represented by Sri Haladker Prabhu, s/o. Sri Sangramappa Haladker, H.No. 4-14-103/1/1, Hasan nagar, Miralam Tank, Hyderabad, Cell: 9000006504, 9440944114.
2. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Miralam Tank/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad South.

3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Miralam/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad South.
4. The Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Charminar/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad South.
5. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Charminar/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad South.
6. The Superintending Engineer/Operation/Hyderabad South Circle/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad.
7. The Accounts Officer/Revenue/Hyderabad South/TGSPDCL/Hyderabad.

Copy to

8. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum of TSSPDCL- Greater Hyderabad Area, Door No.8-3-167/E/1, Central Power Training Institute (CPTI) Premises, TSSPDCL, GTS Colony, Vengal Rao Nagar, Erragadda, Hyderabad - 45..

