



**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA**  
First Floor 33/11 kV substation, Hyderabad Boats Club Lane  
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

**:: Present:: Smt. UDAYA GOURI**

**Tuesday the Eighteenth Day of December 2018**

**Appeal No. 43 of 2018**

**Preferred against Lr.Dt.28.08.2018 vide D.No. 526 of CGRF II**

**Between**

M/s. Technocrat, beneficiary Rajendra Flexo Prints, Plot No.88(part), Sy.No.48,  
Kattedan, RR District - 500 077. Represented by its Proprietor,  
M. Rakesh Kumar Jain - 9391033606..

**... Appellant**

**AND**

1. The ADE/OP/Gagan Pahad/TSSPDCL/RR District.
2. The DE/OP/Rajendranagar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The SE/OP/Rajendranagar/TSSPDCL/Mehdipatnam.

**... Respondents**

**The above appeal filed on 29.08.2018, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 20.11.2018 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. Rakesh Kumar Jain - Appellant and Sri. J. Dasaradha - ADE/OP/Gaganpahad and Sri. D. Somi Reddy - DE/DPE/RR South for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both the parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;**

**AWARD**

**This is an Appeal filed against the orders of CGRF-II vide D.No. 526 of 2018 dt.28.08.2018.**

2. The contention of the Appellant is that in view of the demand notice issued by ADE/OP/Gaganpahad/F.theft/D.No.914/18 dt.30.07.2018 for an amount of Rs 51,14,674/- for the period from 03.11.2011 to 05.07.2018 i.e. for 6 years 8 months they lodged a complaint before the CGRF-II, but the said learned CGRF failed to entertain their grievance and returned the file on the ground that the complaint is lodged before the disposal of the representation made by the Appellant to the SE/OP/Rajendranagar with regarding to the back billing. Hence aggrieved by the said

order the present Appeal is filed.

3. The contention of the Appellant before this office is as follows: 1. That the Respondent No.3 vide its letter No. ADE/OP/Gaganpahad/F.Theft/D.No.914/18 dt.30.07.2018 issued assessment notice for back billing of Rs 51,14,674/- for the period from 03.11.2011 to 05.07.2018 i.e. for 6 years 8 months duly changing the category from LT III (Industrial) to LT II (Commercial).

4. That the Respondent No.3 also informed in Clause 5.2 of assessment notice that if the complainant is agreeable with the assessment of back billing he shall make representation before DE/OP/Rajendra Nagar / SE/OP/Rajendranagar, the designated officers for appeal within 15 days from date of serving of notice. Accordingly, the complainant filed a representation dt.24.08.2018 before SE/OP/Rajendranagar.

5. That the SE/OP/Rajendranagar has disconnected power supply on 23.08.2018 without notice, opportunity in violation of act, 2003. Immediately the Appellant filed the representation dt.24.08.2018 and requested for restoration of power supply but the SE/OP/Rajendranagar has not considered the representation and request of the Appellant and restored the power supply.

6. The Appellant relied on the following which was requested to be considered:

i. The Appellant is the tenant at the premises situated at plot No. 88 (Part), Sy No.48, Kattedan, RR Dist - 500 077 which belongs to the Techno Crathence, the complainant is the beneficiary. The said premises is having supply of LT-III Industry Category.

ii. The Appellant is the manufacture of plastic articles for the packaging goods (plastic bags, sacks, containers, boxes, cases, carboys, bottles etc.). A copy of Udyog Aadhaar Memorandum printed on 01.12.2017 is furnished. The Appellant has various consumers who require this packaging material and as they have to sell their own product on their own brand, design, logo pattern hence as per the requirement of various consumers and upon their request their brand, design, logo pattern are printed on the plastic bags which are manufactured by the complaint. Hence, the main activity of the Appellant is manufacturing of the plastic bags/ packaging material and not printing.

Hence, the reclassification of the Respondents saying the Appellant have changed their activity as printing is incorrect, arbitrary and not sustainable.

iii. As per Clause 3.3 of GTCS the classification of consumers under different categories shall be as specified by the Commission in the tariff orders issued from time to time or by any other order of the commission. That as per Clause 213.1.3.3. Of Tariff Order of FY 2012-13 (Page No. 156) the LT Category III(B) Industrial is application for Small Scale Industrial Unit which have been licenses by the Industries Department as bona fide Small Scale Industries and given registration Number SSI Registration scheme.

iv. As per Clause 9.18 of Tariff Order dt.23.06.2016 of FY 2016-17 (Page No. 208) "Industrial Purpose shall means, supply for the purpose of manufacturing, processing and // or preserving goods for sale." As our unit falls under manufacturing process, processing and or preserving goods for sale our power supply falls under LT Industrial III Category which is at present in the same category.

v. That the Appellant company right from the inception is in the activity of manufacturing of articles of plastic bags etc and is still continuing the same manufacturing activity. There is no change in the manufacturing activity of the complainant till today. The action of the Respondent in reclassification of the category unilateral without basis or material for reclassification.

Vi. The claim of the back billing assessed amount for the period from 03.11.2011 to 05.07.2018 made vide Lr.No.ADE/OP/Gaganpahad/F.theft/D.No.914/18 dt.30.07.2018 is barred by Section 56(2) of Electricity Act,2003 and

vii. Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad for the state of Telangana and the state of Andhra Pradesh in order dt.29.02.2016 in WP No. 6493 of 2016 directed the Respondents to issue notice calling objections from the complainant for change of category. The competent authority shall pass speaking order and communicate to the complainant duly considering the objection along with the material filed by the complainant. It is pertinent to note at this juncture that the competent authority of respondent company has not passed any speaking order for change of category. It is pertinent to note at this juncture the following facts:-

- a. The Appellant is not having any due amount to the Respondents as on date and not in default.
- b. The disconnection of power on 23.08.2018 is illegal, without notice which is a violation of section 56(2) of Electricity Act,2003.
- c. The claim of Rs 51,14,674/- will become due only after passing of speaking order by the competent authority.
- d. The claim of back billing for the period 6 years 8 months is in violation of provisions of Act,2003 and
- e. The Respondent No.3 has disconnected power supply without any notice and in violation of Section 56(2) of Electricity Act,2003 on 23.08.2018. The Appellant is suffering for production loss and financial loss each day.

7. The Hon'ble Vidyt Ombudsman vide its order dt.06.03.2018 in Appeal No. 27 of 2017 passed the order in favour of Appellant therein which is similar to the present Appeal.

8. Hence requested the following:

- a. To set aside the return memo bearing No. Chairperson/CGRF-II/TSSPDCL/D.No.526/2018 dt.28.08.2018 passed by the CGRF.
- b. To set aside the claim of Rs 51,14,674/- made vide Lr.No.ADE/OP/Gaganpahad/F.theft/D.No.914/18 dt.30.07.2018 and
- c. Any such other order or orders as may deem fit by the Hon'ble Ombudsman in the circumstance of the appeal in the interest of justice and fair play.

#### **9. Written submissions of the Respondents**

- i. The power supply of M/s Technocrat SC No. 3405-03537, LT Cat-III, 49 HP has been released on 24/02/2004.
- ii. The Appellant is the tenant of the above premises.

Although the appellant obtained a Udyog Aadhaar Memorandum printed on 01.12.2017, in that Udyog Aadhar he was taken of manufacture of plastic articles, packaging of goods (plastic bags, sacks, containers, boxes, cases, bottles etc.,). But his activity is only printing on the polythene covers i.e. tubes in this process the the consumer procuring plastic tube bundles as shown in the video (pendrive).

After printing above bundles, the same bundles are taken away for further process. There is no lamination process, cutting and pouching process in the premises of SC No.3405-03537.

In fact, the name implies Rajendra Flexo Pack printed on the covers does not need any lamination process.

iii. As per the Tariff Order 2011-12 the printing process changed from Category III to Category II. Although bonafide industrial certificate existing.

iv. In this service premises there is no manufacturing process the tubes (plastic bundles) brought from outside for printing in the service premises and again printed bundles taken away for the further process pouching and cutting, the printing on polythene covers comes under Cat-II as per Hon'ble High Court Order vide WP No. 151/2012.

v. On 02/11/2011 Sri. P. Ashok, ADE/DPE has inspected the premises and found that the service is being utilised for printing purpose to print on polythene carry bags. Hence he booked a case vide DPE/RRS/SD01/5171/11 for the change of category from HT Cat-I to HT cat II. Since then they are using the service for above printing purpose only. They never manufactured any plastic articles upto this case is booked.

vi. The Section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003 is not applicable for this case (Back Billing) the period was taken because a case was booked for HT Cat-I to HT Cat-II for an amount of Rs 1,34,136/-. The consumer has paid the above said amount and accepted the case for conversion from HT Cat-I to HT Cat-II. Whereas, the category was not changed to commercial at that time. Hence the back billing was levied for the entire period from 2011 to 05/07/2018.

vii. In this, the consumer was not submitted any representation for reclassification form category change from industrial to commercial as because the consumer accepted and paid the amount of Rs 1,34,136/- in previous case of 2011.

viii. A notice was served to the consumer dt.30.07.2018 and acknowledgement was received. Hence after that the consumer was not appealed for the final assessment order. Hence, the service was disconnected after 23 days i.e. 23/08/2018.

ix. In the Appeal No. 27/2017 dt. 06.03/2018 the service in this case is Roto Printer having lamination process, cutting, pouching apart from printing in the same premises. In this case only printing on polythene covers is the process.

x. All of the above facts consumer is utilising supply for only printing on polythene covers. Hence, the back billing case is booked.

**10. Rejoinder dt.17.11.2018 of the Appellant.**

i. The reply reflects half information which suits their contents. That the Respondent when visited to the factory of the Appellant taken the video of printing processing only. They have not taken the video of process converting plastic granules into roll of pouch, cutting process, pouching process and punching process. It is pertinent to note that before cutting process the pouch rolls passed through the rollers wherein the print on the pouch takes place and the Respondent has filed only video of this process and avoided the other process undertaken by the Appellant.

ii. The appellant is filing the full process undertaken by them in pen drive and also filing photograph to establish the processing activity.

iii. Regarding the name of the company of the Appellant as Rajendra Flexo Prints, it is not must and necessary that the name of the company does show the manufacturing process of the company. It is an identity of an entity, an artificial person which requires for the purpose of statutory compliance as per the statutory provisions.

The Appellant submitted para wise remarks against the written submissions of the Respondents as following:

**Para No.3**

The statement of Respondent No.3 stating that as per Tariff Order 2011-12 the printing process changed from Cat III to Cat -II although bonafide industrial certificate existing is falls.

The following facts are to be noted of Tariff Order of 2011-12 of Page No. 169.

a. LT Category II Tariff is applicable to teh consumer who undertake non domestic activity, who undertaken commercial activity and who do not fall in any other LT Category i.e. LT I, LT III to LT VIII Categories. In the present case the appellant falls under LT III Category and

b. LT category II Tariff is applicable to the printing presses exclusively and that not to the industry which is having printing process as one of the manufacturing process of its product.

The following facts are to be noted of Tariff Order of 2011-12 of page No. 171:

- a. LT category III(A) Industrial Normal Category is applicable for industrial purpose shall mean supply for purpose of manufacturing, processing and or preserving goods for sale and
- b. The newspaper printing units also come under this category.

The following facts are to be noted of Tariff Order of 2011-12 of Page No. 174:

The LT Category III (B) Industrial is applicable to Small Scale Industrial Units which have been licensed by the Industries Department as bonafide Small Scale Industries and given registration number under SSI registration scheme with connected loads above 75 HP and Upto 150 HP.

In the present case the Appellant has compiled the conditions of LT Category III(A) and LT Category III(B) i.e.

- a. The applicant is having manufacturing process:
- b. The applicant is having MSME/SSI Certificate; and
- c. The applicant is having connected load above 75 HP i.e. 97 HP.

Hence, the Appellant falls under LT III Industry category and not in LT II Commercial Category.

#### **PARA No.4**

Regarding manufacturing process explained in Para 2 above. The appellant is not doing any printing on polythene covers. Please note that as per permission of industry department through SSI certificate, the Appellant is authorised to manufacture packaging material. It is false to say that no manufacturing process the tube (Plastic Bundles brought from outside for printing in the Appellant premises and that printed bundles are taken away for further process of pouching and cutting. The Respondents have attempted to mislead this Hon'ble authority and also by taking partial video of the Appellant process and projecting as if only printing is carried out whereas the facts is that even PP pouches are also manufacture until pouches. On the other hand the Respondents also admitted that only printing of covers comes under Category II as per the orders of WP No. 151 of 2015.

That earlier also the respondents issued similar order directing this appellant to pay as per category II. This appellant approached before Hon'ble High Court vide WP No. 151 of 2012 and batch, the Hon'ble High Court vide its order dt.03.07.2012 allowed the petition and directed the Respondents to issue notices

to the petitioners calling for objections for changing category and that upon consideration of the objections and material the competent authority shall pass speaking order and communicate the same, further directed the Appellant to pay the electricity charges on LT Category III(A). It is submitted that in spite of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court without following the orders of the Hon'ble High Court the Respondents have passed impugned order in violation of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court. Hence, the statement of the Respondent No.3 not correct and not maintainable.

**Para No.5**

The alleged inspection was conducted only on 02.11.2011 and that there was a change of category. In this regard it is submitted against the said change of category the Appellant approached Hon'ble High Court in WP No. 151 of 20102 and the above said orders was passed by Hon'ble High Court. The Respondents in violation of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court reiterating the very same cause of action which is illegal and unlawful.

**Para No.6.**

That Section 56(2) specifically provides for limitation of two years for raising any claim. It is false and incorrect to state that the Appellant is paid Rs 1,34,136/- and thereby accepted for conversion. The Respondents are put to strict proof of the same.

**Para No.7**

After passing of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court in WP No. 151 of 2012 dt.03.07.2012 the Respondents have not issued any notice but have unilaterally issued impugned order dt.30.07.2018 which is not only in violation of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court and also barred by limitation under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act,2003.

**Para No. 9 & 10.**

The Appellant is not doing exclusive printing on polythene covers. Please consider the detail explanation of para No. 4 above.

11.           Heard both sides.



12. In the face of the averments by both sides the following issues are framed:-

**Issues**

- i. Whether the Appellants are entitled for setting aside the claim of Rs 51,14,674/- made by the Respondents vide Lr.No.ADE/OP/Gaganpahad/F.theft/D.No.914/18 dt.30.07.2018? and
- ii. To what relief?

**Issue No.1**

13. The Appellant stated to be the tenant of the premises situated at Plot No. 88 (Part) Sy No. 48, Kattedan, holds an electricity connection bearing SC No. 3405 03537 released under LT Category III on 24.02.2004. Initially in the year 2011 a back billing case was booked vide case No. DPE/RRS/SD01/5171/11 on 08.11.2011 towards change of category from Industrial to Commercial for an amount of Rs.1,34,136/-. The Appellant paid the said amount on 30.11.2011 without any protest. Subsequent to this payment the Respondents had not changed the billing category of the subject service connection under Commercial Category. And after 6 years the Respondents identified the mistake and now claimed the differential tariff charges from industrial to commercial from 03.11.2011 to 05.07.2018, by issuing the provisional assessment notice vide Lr. No 914, dt.30.07.2018 for an amount of Rs 51,14,674/-.

14. Subsequently, the Appellant opposed the above given back billing case levied for an amount of Rs 51,14,674/- and filed a representation dt.24.08.2018 before SE/OP/Rajendranagar. Before finalisation of the back billing case by the SE/OP/Rajendranagar, the Appellant instead preferred an appeal before the CGRF, where the CGRF held that since the subject matter of the grievance of the Appellant is pending with SE/OP/Rajendranagar, unless the said matter has been disposed of by the SE, this forum cannot entertain grievance filed by the Appellant and the complaint was returned. Notwithstanding the above directions of the CGRF the Appellant filed this appeal based on the Clause 14.8.1 of GTCS, which mandates the consumer for entitlement to approach the forum at any stage, if he so desires and the Appellant further pleaded that as per the Clause 2.37 of Regulation 3 of 2015 no grievance shall be rejected in writing unless the

complainant or association of persons has been given the opportunity of being heard.

15. Hence the present issue relates to classification of billing category of the service number 3405 03537. Admittedly during the Tariff Order 2011-12, the billing category of the printing press was classified under commercial category and the relevant portion of the said Tariff Order is as under:

Clause 146. The issue of classification of Newspaper printing & printing presses has been brought to the notice of the Commission by CPDCL and it stated that Newspaper printing units shall be classified under HT-I Industry and all other printing activities shall come under HT-II Others. Similar treatment shall be extended to LT consumers also i.e., Newspaper printing in LT-III Industrial & other printing activities in LT - II Non Domestic/Commercial.

**Commission's view:** The Commission accepted the proposal of CPDCL and included the Newspaper printing units in HT-I Industry and LT-III Industrial as the case may be. All other printing activities shall come under HT-II Others or LT-II Non Domestic/Commercial as the case may be.

16. Relying on the above directions of the ERC, the Respondents proposed back billing under commercial Category-II from the existing industrial category -IIIA stating that the Appellant service usage of supply is for printing purpose i.e. printing on polythene carry bags. Initially the back billing case was booked and assessed for an amount of Rs 1,34,136/- for the period from 01.04.2011 to 02.11.2011 vide Lr.No. 1077 dt.16.11.2011. Following this notice a second back billing case was booked to the same effect vide Lr.No. 914 dt. 30.07.2018 and assessed an amount of Rs 51,14,674/- for the period from 03.11.2011 to 05.07.2018. The Appellant initially though not objected to the same back billing notice towards change of category from Industrial to Commercial and paid the proposed amount of Rs 1,34,136/- but denied the subsequent notice on the same account issued for Rs 51,14,674/-.

17. As such the issue that remains to be addressed is the determination of nature of activity carried out by the Appellant. The Appellant relied on that they are using the supply for the manufacture of plastic articles for the packaging of goods, plastic bags, sacks, containers, cases, carbois, bottles etc. and submitted a copy of Udyog Aadhaar Memorandum printed on 01.12.2017. The Appellant further

added that the Appellant has various consumers who require this packaging material and as they have to sell their own product on their own brand, design, logo pattern hence as per the requirement of various consumers and upon their request their brand, design, logo pattern are printed on the plastic bags which are manufactured by the complaint. That there main activity of the Appellant is manufacturing of the plastic bags/ packaging material and not printing. Hence, argued that the reclassification of the Respondents saying the Appellant have changed their activity as printing is incorrect, arbitrary and not sustainable. On the other hand the ADE/OP/Gaganpahad held that though the Appellant obtained udyog aadhaar memorandum printed on 01.12.2017 which was taken for manufacture of plastic articles, packaging of goods (plastic bags, sacks, containers, boxes, casess, bottles etc.,) but his activity is only printing on the polythene covers i.e. tubes in this process, that the consumer procuring plastic tube bundles as shown in the video (pendrive). That in the said premises there is no manufacturing process. The tubes (plastic bundles) were brought from outside for printing in the service premises and again printed bundles taken away for the further process pouching and cutting, the printing on polythene covers comes under Cat-II, Commercial.

18. In support of their claim both the parties submitted the videos showing the nature of activity of the premises. The Appellant argued that the Respondents video reflects half information which suits their contents and the video taken was of printing processing only and submitted their own side of view through a video in pendrive and photographs and stated to be full process involved in the premises. On examination of both the video content of the pendrive given by the Appellant and the Respondents, shows that there is a process of extrusion of polythene/plastic involving the raw material in pellet form which are extruded into rolls i.e. plastic granules are converted into plastic rolls and printing activity was shown on the plastic rolls in the video submitted by the Appellant. The video content of the Respondents shows the existing meter bearing Sc.No. 3405 03537 and activity of the premises, which shows that only printing is being done on the plastic rolls. The evidences produced by both the parties has to give conclusive data to arrive at a conclusion, both the video content is contradictory to each other. The video content of the Appellant failed to show the existing meter and the subject service connection number, though claimed to have shown the whole

premises. This goes to show that the activity shown by the Appellant cannot be ascertained that the premises shown was of the SC No. 3405 03537 in question.

19. The Appellant relied on the Clause 9.18 of Tariff Order dt.23.06.2016 of FY 2016-17 (Page No. 208) "Industrial Purpose shall means, supply for the purpose of manufacturing, processing and/or preserving goods for sale." As our unit falls under manufacturer process, processing and or preserving goods for sale our power supply falls under LT Industrial III Category which is at present in the same category.

The Appellant held on the definition of manufacturing process as stated above in the Tariff Order. In the similar order of the Vidyut Ombudsman in Appeal No. 27 of 2017, M/s. Ambika Industries, in view of the extrusion of polythene involving the raw material in pellet form (resign) through which rolls of plastic are extruded, the industry was held involving manufacturing process and orders were issued in favour of the Appellant. Though the Appellant showed such activity through the video content but failed to give conclusive evidence as the premises belongs to subject service connection and further there was no mention of conversion of plastic granules into plastic rolls in the petition filed as claimed through the subsequent Video content.

20. A perusal of the contentions of the Appellant clearly go to show that it is claiming that it is involved in the activity of manufacturing of articles of plastic bags etc. and is still continuing the same manufacturing activity and that there is no change in its activity till date and if the same is to be accepted then the question arises is why did the Appellant agree the back billing case in view of the change of category from industry to commercial in the year 2011 and why it paid the amount demanded under the said category without any protest and the Appellant failed to explain such a stand taken by it in the year 2011. Hence now cannot go back and claim otherwise.

21. The plea taken by the Appellant is that as per the Clause 3.3 of GTCS the classification of consumers under different categories shall be as specified by the Commission in the tariff orders issued from time to time or by any other order of the commission, whereas the Respondents in that as per the Tariff Orders 2011-12 the subject service connection printing press is classified under commercial by the Hon'ble Commission.

That as per the Clause 213.1.3.3. Of Tariff Order of FY 2012-13 (Page No. 156) the LT Category III(B) Industrial application is for Small Scale Industrial Unit which have been licenses by the Industries Department as bona fide Small Scale Industries and given registration Number SSI Registration scheme. Whereas the Respondents held that though they are holding the certificate their nature of activity is only printing covers and showed the evidence through the video in the pendrive.

22. The Appellant relied on the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad for the state of Telangana and state of Andhra Pradesh in WP No. 6493 of 2016 directed the Respondents to issue notice calling objections from the complainant for change of category. The competent authority shall pass speaking order and communicate to the complainant duly considering the objection along with the material filed by the complainant. Further held that the competent authority of respondent company has not passed any speaking order for change of category. Here it is to be noted that on the representation filed by the Appellant against the back billing notice on 24.08.2018, before the final orders of SE/OP/Rajendranagar, the Appellant instead preferred an appeal in the CGRF and not exhausted his option to obtain a speaking order.

23. The Appellant further contended that the present case of back billing is hit by section 56(2) of the Electricity Act,2003. A perusal of Section 56(2) shows that the same is applicable only when disconnection is sought for non payment of energy charges and that the same is used only for collection of the due amount on the threat of disconnection, that too for the period below 2 years. Hence the contention of the Appellant that the Respondents are barred under Section 56(2) from recovering the arrears for more than 2 years cannot be entertained. Apart from that under Clause 3.41 of GTCS (Amended on 31.05.2014), the DISCOM is permitted in the case of reclassification to revise the bills for the entire ascertained period and in case of uncertainty, the period of retrospective billing shall be limited to 12 months immediately preceding the date of inspection.

24. Hence in the face of the fact that the Appellant has accepted the classification of its service connection from LT-III (Industrial) to LT-II (Commercial) in the year 2011 and paid the demanded amount from the Respondents, is sufficient to show that the service connection of the Appellant comes under the

category of LT-II Commercial and as such cannot now deny the same. Hence decides this issue against the Appellant.

**Issue No.2**

25. In the result the Appeal is dismissed but since there is a lapse on the part of the Respondents who failed to change the billing category of the service under commercial after the inspection and payment made thereof in 2011 for back billing, the Appellant is allowed to pay the demanded back billing amount in 12 monthly instalments under Clause 9 of Regulation 7 of 2013 and since the negligence is on the part of the Respondents resulting in huge burden on the Appellant, the SE/OP/Rajendranagar is directed to enquire into the said negligence and initiate disciplinary action against the persons responsible and inform the result of the enquiry to the Office of the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana within 3 months.

TYPED BY Office Executive cum Computer Operator, Corrected, Signed and Pronounced by me on this the 18th day of December, 2018.

Sd/-

**Vidyut Ombudsman**

1. M/s. Technocrat, beneficiary Rajendra Flexo Prints, Plot No.88(part), Sy.No.48, Kattedan, RR District - 500 077. Represented by its Proprietor, M. Rakesh Kumar Jain - 9391033606.
2. The ADE/OP/Gagan Pahad/TSSPDCL/RR District.
3. The DE/OP/Rajendranagar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The SE/OP/Rajendranagar/TSSPDCL/Mehdipatnam.

**Copy to :**

5. The Chairperson, CGRF- II, GTS Colony, Vengal Rao Nagar, Erragadda, Hyderabad.
6. The Secretary, TSERC, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapul, Hyd.