



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**

WEDNESDAY THE TWELFTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY TWO

Appeal No. 12 of 2021-22

Between

Sri Marapaka Raju, s/o. Yadagiri, Quilashapur (V), Raghunathpally (M),
Jangaon (D).Cell: 9347542245. **.....Appellant**

AND

1. The Assistant Engineer / Operation / Quilashapur - 9440811378
2. The Assistant Divisional Engineer / Operation / Raghunathpally -
8331035403.
3. The Divisional Engineer / Operation / Jangaon - 9440811319.

..... Respondents

This appeal is coming on before me for final hearing on 12.09.2022 in the presence of Sri Marapaka Raju, appellant in person and Sri Ch. Ravinder - AAE/OP/Quilashapur and Sri K. Manohar Reddy - ADE/OP/Raghunathpally representing the respondents and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following:-

AWARD

This appeal is preferred aggrieved by the Award passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum - I(Warangal), (in short 'the Forum') of Telangana State Northern Power Distribution Company Limited (in short 'TSNPDCL') in C.G.No.176/2020-21/Jangaon Circle dt.26.04.2021.

CASE OF THE APPELLANT BEFORE THE FORUM

2. The case of the appellant is that he has Ac. 0.34 guntas of agriculture land in Sy.No. 949/B, for which he applied for release of Service Connection and also paid requisite demand draft on 12.04.2017. Electricity poles were erected but the Service Connection was not released to the appellant. Therefore it is prayed to direct the respondents to release power supply to the agriculture land of the appellant as stated above.

CASE OF THE RESPONDENTS BEFORE THE FORUM

3. In the reply filed by respondent No.1 before the Forum it is submitted that while stringing of L.T. line Sri Shaga Yadaiah has objected for stringing the said line on the ground that the land belongs to him. Further the Civil Court has also granted Ad-Interim injunction Order against the appellant herein in respect of the land in question.

AWARD OF THE FORUM

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

5. Aggrieved by the Award passed by the Forum, the present appeal is preferred, contending among other things, that the learned Forum has not considered the material on record properly.

GROUND OF THE APPEAL

6. In the grounds of appeal, it is, inter-alia, submitted that the learned Forum has decided the complaint without giving an opportunity to the appellant. Therefore it is requested to direct the respondents to release the Service Connection in favour of the appellant.

7. Respondent No.3 filed a written submission dt.09.09.2022 stating that the work in question has been completed.

8. The appellant also filed an application dt.12.09.2022 before this Authority stating that the conductor wire was connected to the poles upto the bore motor of the appellant.

9. Heard both sides.

10. The points that arise for consideration are:-

- i) Whether there are sufficient grounds to direct the respondents for the relief claimed by the appellant?
- ii) Whether the impugned Award / Order is liable to be set aside? and
- iii) To what relief?

POINT No. (i) and (ii)

SETTLEMENT BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT

11. Both the parties have appeared before this Authority on 12.09.2022. 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.

13. During the pendency of the appeal, both parties have filed representations before this Authority that the respondents have released Service Connection to the borewell of the appellant as prayed for. Thus the grievance of the appellant is resolved. In view of these factors I hold that there are no sufficient grounds to direct the respondents in respect of the relief claimed by the appellant and the appeal is liable to be closed.

POINT No. (iii)

14. In view of the findings of point (i) and (ii), the appeal is liable to be closed.

RESULT

15. In the result, the appeal is closed.

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 12th day of October 2022.

Sd/-

Vidyut Ombudsman

1. Sri Marapaka Raju, s/o. Yadagiri, Quilashapur (V), Ragunathapally (M), Jangaon (D).Cell: 9347542245.
2. The Assistant Engineer / Operation / Quilashapur - 9440811378.
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer / Operation / Raghunathpally - 8331035403.
4. The Divisional Engineer / Operation / Jangaon - 9440811319.

Copy to

5. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum- 1, TSNPDCL, Warangal.

APPEAL NO. 12 OF 2021-22