



BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

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

**PRESENT : SRI MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

TUESDAY THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY TWO

Appeal No. 11 of 2022-23

Between

Sri S. Gopal Reddy, s/o. S. Thimma Reddy, MIG.1-6-15, Housing Board (Old),
Gadwal - 509125. Jogulamba Gadwal District. **.....Appellant**

AND

1. The Assistant Engineer / Operation / KT Doddi / TSSPDCL / Jougulamba
Gadwal District.
2. The Assistant Divisional Engineer / Operation / Gadwal / TSSPDCL/
Jogulamba Gadwal District.
3. The Assistant Accounts Officer / ERO / Gadwal / TSSPDCL / Jogulamba
Gadwal District.
4. The Divisional Engineer / Operation / Gadwal / TSSPDCL / Jogulamba
Gadwal District.
5. The Superintending Engineer / Operation / Gadwal Circle/ TSSPDCL /
Jogulamba Gadwal District. **..... Respondents**

This appeal is coming on before me for final hearing on 21.09.2022
in the presence of Sri Gopal Reddy, appellant in person and
Sri C. Sridhar - Sub-Engineer representing the respondents and having stood
over for consideration till this day, this Vidhyut Ombudsman passed the
following:-

AWARD

This appeal is preferred aggrieved by the Award passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum - Rural, Hyderabad - 45 (in short 'the Forum') of Telangana State Southern Power Distribution Company Limited (in short 'TSSPDCL') in C.G. No.28/2021-22/Gadwal Circle dt.18.12.2021.

CASE OF THE APPELLANT BEFORE THE FORUM

2. The case of the appellant is that the appellant and others have paid three Demand Drafts on 27.05.2019, 08.05.2019 and 09.05.2019 for an amount of Rs. 5,790/- each and registered at Consumer Service Centre, Gadwal for release of new agriculture Service Connection at Dharoor section. Since the new Service Connections were not released it was requested to the learned Forum to direct the respondents to sanction the estimates for poles and matching materials along with transformers and erect them to their agricultural borewells at an early date.

CASE OF THE RESPONDENTS BEFORE THE FORUM

3. In the written submissions of respondent No.5, before the Forum, it is submitted that the necessary estimate was already proposed by respondent No.1, who is the competent authority for sanction. The sanction will be given as per seniority First In, First Out (in short 'FIFO').

AWARD OF THE FORUM

4. The learned Forum, after considering material on record and after hearing both sides, directed the respondents to complete the works of extension of supply to the agricultural borewells of the complainant and others within 30 days.

5. Aggrieved by the Award passed by the learned Forum, the present appeal is preferred, contending among other things, that the respondents are delaying the matter in executing the work.

GROUND OF THE APPEAL

6. In the grounds of the appeal, it is, inter-alia, submitted that in spite of the specific direction of the learned Forum, there is no progress in the matter and hence it is prayed to resolve the matter and to pay compensation to the appellant.

WRITTEN SUBMISSION OF THE RESPONDENTS

7. In the written submissions by respondent No.1 before this Authority, it is, inter-alia, submitted that after estimate was sanctioned (8) farmers including one S. Thimma Reddy stated that there were crops in the agricultural farm, therefore they have requested to carry out the works after the first week of May 2022. Further the work was delayed due to FIFO and heavy rains in the months of June and July 2022. It is accordingly prayed to stop further

course of action against the respondents.

ARGUMENTS

8. The appellant has submitted that there was abnormal delay in releasing new Service Connections, therefore it is prayed to compensate him by the respondents.

9. On the other hand, on behalf of the respondents, it is submitted that due to FIFO, rains and also on the request of the other consumers, there was a delay in executing the works in releasing new Service Connections. Therefore it is prayed to close the appeal.

POINTS

10. The points that arise for consideration are:-

- i) Whether there are sufficient grounds to Award compensation to the appellant? and
- ii) To what relief?

POINT No. (i)

SETTLEMENT BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT

11. Both the parties have appeared before this Authority on 06.09.2022. 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

12. Since I took charge as Vidyut Ombudsman on 01.07.2022 and since there was no regular Vidyut Ombudsman earlier, the appeal was not disposed of within the prescribed period.

ADMITTED FACTS

13. It is an admitted fact that the appellant and others have applied for release of new Service Connections for their agricultural fields. It is also an admitted fact that the said Service Connections were released by the respondents, but with some delay.

CRUX OF THE MATTER

14. As already stated the work as requested by the appellant was executed. Regarding delay in executing the work, the respondents have given reasons that there were heavy rains at the relevant time and that they have followed FIFO. It is also submitted by respondent No.1 in the written submission that the farmers themselves requested to execute the work after first week of May 2022 inasmuch as crop was existing in their land at that time. Prima-facie it appears that due to the above reasons only there was delay in executing the works and, therefore, the respondents cannot be found fault for the delay. In view of the above discussion, I hold that there are no sufficient grounds to Award compensation to the appellant. This point is accordingly decided against the appellant and in favour of the respondents.

POINT No. (ii)

15. In view of the findings on point No. (i), the appeal is liable to be rejected.

RESULT

16. In the result, the appeal is rejected.

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 this the 25th day of October 2022.

Sd/-

Vidyut Ombudsman

1. Sri S. Gopal Reddy, s/o. S. Thimma Reddy, MIG.1-6-15, Housing Board (Old), Gadwal - 509125. Jogulamba Gadwal District.
2. The Assistant Engineer / Operation / KT Doddi / TSSPDCL / Jougulamba Gadwal District.
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer / Operation / Gadwal / TSSPDCL/ Jogulamba Gadwal District.
4. The Assistant Accounts Officer / ERO / Gadwal / TSSPDCL / Jogulamba Gadwal District.
5. The Divisional Engineer / Operation / Gadwal / TSSPDCL / Jogulamba Gadwal District.

6. The Superintending Engineer / Operation / Gadwal Circle/ TSSPDCL /
Jogulamba Gadwal Dist.

Copy to

7. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum -I, TSSPDCL,
H.No. 8-03-167/14, GTS Colony, Erragadda, Hyderabad - 500 045.

APPEAL NO. 11 OF 2022-23