



**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**

Monday the Twelfth Day of November 2018

Appeal No. 44 of 2018

Preferred against order dt. 25.09.2018 in C.G.No. 250/2018-19  
of Habsiguda Circle

Between

M/s. Hariyana Steel Centre (KDM) Pvt.Ltd., Plot No. 1/5, 8-141, IDA Nacharam,  
Hyderabad - 500 076. Cell: 9848346211..

**... Appellant**

**AND**

1. The ADE/OP/Habsiguda/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
2. The DE/OP/Habsiguda/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The SAO/OP/Habsiguda Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The SE/OP/Habsiguda Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

**... Respondents**

The above appeal filed on 29.09.2018, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 24.10.2018 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. Ravinder Kumar Agarwal - Appellant and Sri. P. Suchender - SAO/OP/Habsiguda circle 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 by the CGRF in CG No. 250 of 2018-19 dt.25.09.2018. The Appellant contended before the CGRF that its a HT consumer styled as M/s. Hariyana Steels Center (KDM) Pvt. Ltd. and that it is having SC No. HBG937 and that it had filed a complaint before the CGRF seeking for redressal of 7 grievances i.e. (i) to set aside the claim of the Distribution Licensee to an extent of Rs 70,25,496/- demanded by the SE/OP/HBG/SAO/AAO(HT)/JAO/SA I/RRE 937 bearing D.No.83/18 dt.27.01.2018 (ii) to give effect of deration of their service to CMD 75 KVA from 850 KVA of their service w.e.f. 16.09.2014 (iii) to withdraw an amount of Rs 16,02,099/- pertaining to the period from 16.09.2014 to 12/2014 (iv) to withdraw

an amount of Rs 25,50,657/- of surcharge levied on their service from Dec,2014 to 31.01.2018 (v) to adjust the interest on security deposit from 01.04.2014 to 29.11.2017 (vi) to issue no due certificate and (vii) any other orders which the forum feels necessary in the interest of justice and that the CGRF rejected all the said grievances raised by them, and hence they filed the present Appeal.

2. The Appellant i.e. M/s. Hariyana Steels Center (KDM) Pvt. Ltd. with HT Service No. HBG 937 filed the Appeal with the following grievances by setting aside the orders of the CGRF. The grievances raised by the Appellant are as follows:-

- I. To set aside the claim of the distribution licensee of Rs 70,25,496/- demanded vide Lr.No. SE/OP/HBG/SAO/AAO(HT)/JAO/SA1/RRE937/D.No.83/18, Dt.27.01.2018.
- II. Delay in deration of load from 850 KVA to 75 KVA against the service HBG 937.
- III. To give effect of deration of their service from 850 KVA CMD to 75 KVA CMD w.e.f. 16.09.2014.
- IV. To withdraw an amount of Rs 16,02,099/- pertaining to the period from 16.09.2014 to 12/2014 towards minimum charges levied without affecting the deration.
- V. To withdraw an amount of Rs 25,50,657/- towards surcharge from 12/2014 to 31.01.2018.
- VI. To adjust the interest on security deposit from 01.04.2014 to 29.11.2017.
- VII. To issue No Due Certificate and any other orders which may be necessary in the interest of justice.

3. The Appellant in support of their grievances stated that they have applied for deration of CMD from 850 KVA to 70 KVA in ICSC(Integrated Customer Service Center), Habsiguda, vide HT reference No. 2149369 dt.12.09.2014. The Respondent No.1, SE/OP/RR East( now Habsiguda) vide its Lr.No. SE/RR East/Coml/D.No.1175/14 dt.22.09.2014, informed that since the service was under disconnection and also huge arrears are pending, the deration of load has not been considered. Simultaneously the HT agreement for revised derated CMD of 75 KVA was submitted before DE/OP/Habsiguda. The Divisional Engineer, vide its Lr.No.DEE/OP/HBG/Comml/D.No.1885/14-15 dt.16.09.2014, signed the agreement w.e.f. 16.09.2014, for the revised CMD of 75 KVA. On approaching CGM/Commercial vide letter dt.20.10.2014, approval was accorded for the deration of CMD from 850

KVA to 75KVA, vide CGM (Comml)/SE(C)/DE(C)/ADE-1/D.No.1609/14, Dt: 13.11.2014, w.e.f. 16.09.2014, and directed to Contact SE/Operation/RR East. Subsequently, request was placed vide letter Dt: 5.12.2017 for the Revision of bills w.e.f. 16.09.2014, but the SE/Operation/RR East did not given the effect of the same. Further the Agreement was terminated w.e.f. 29.11.2014. That the Respondent No. 1 vide its letter No.SE/OP/HBG/SAO/AAO(HT)/JAO/SA.1/RRE937/D.No.83/18 dt.27.01.2018, claimed an amount of Rs 70,25,496/- including Rs 16,02,099/- of Minimum Charges of September to December,2014 billing months without effecting the deration of CMD from 850 KVA to 75 KVA and ignoring the amended Clause 5.9.4.2 of General Terms and Conditions of supply proceeding No,APERC/Secy/96/2014 dt.31.05.2014, Rs 25,50,868/- of sucharge was levied from December,2014 to January,2018 and not adjusted interest on Consumption Deposit from 01.04.2014 to 29.11.2017. According to the Appellant it was stated that they are liable to pay net amount of Rs 28,20,445/- as on the date 29.11.2014, subject to adjustment of ICD 2014-15 and 2015-16.

Further the Appellant relied on the orders given on the similar subject in the Appeal No. 25 of 2018, Dt 19.07.2018, M/s. Jaya Diagnostic and Research Center Ltd. by this authority.

4. The Respondents submitted their written submissions through Respondent No.1 i.e. SE/OP/Habsiguda vide Lr.No.1044 dt.19.10.2018 as follows:

They contended that the claim made by them for Rs 70,25,496/- vide Lr.No. SE/OP/HBG/SAO/AAO(HT)/JAO/SA I/RRE 937 bearing D.No. 83/18 dt.27.01.2018 is made through revised termination order as per GTCS and since no abnormal claim is made by TSSPDCL the same cannot be set aside. They claimed that the consumer has applied for deration of load from 850 KVA to 75 KVA vide HT Reg No.2149369 dt.12.09.2014. In this regard, CGM (Comml) has given approval for deration of CMD from 850 KVA to 75 KVA w.e.f. 16.09.2014 or from the date of agreement for the revised CMD of 75 KVA whichever is later, as per the terms and conditions vide the ref 3rd cited. The consumer has concluded agreement with DE/OP/Habsiguda dt.16.09.2014. In this regard it is to inform that the service was under disconnection for non-payment of CC charges on dt.30.07.2014. The consumer has not come forward for payment of the dues under disconnection and get the service reconnected to effect the load deration. Hence, there is no delay in deration of load from the department's side. The Respondents further contended that since the service connection of the Appellant is under disconnection at the time of the agreement of deration from

850 KVA to 75 KVA and since he has not paid the dues to get the service connection reconnected to effect the load of deration the question of derating CMD of 75 KVA with effect from the date of application i.e. 16.09.2014 does not arise. The Respondents further contended that since the service was disconnected on 30.07.2014 for non payment of CC charges, minimum charges for 4 months from the date of disconnection of the service i.e. upto 29.11.2014 is liable to be paid by the Appellant as per GTCS rule 5.9.4.3 and as such there is no point in withdrawing minimum payable by the consumer for the period between 16.09.2014 to Dec,2014. They also asserted that the surcharge will be levied on the dues as per the rate prevailing in the Tariff Order issued by the Hon'ble TSERC but not Rs 25,50,657/- as claimed by the Appellant. They further contended that the available security deposit of Rs 12,50,868/- was adjusted against the payable dues at the time of termination of HT agreement on 29.11.2014 vide Lr.No.SE/OP/RRE/SAO/JAO(HT)/F.No.937 D.No.573/17 dt.24.06.2016, hence the question of paying interest on the security deposit does not arise. They also claimed that NOC will be issued to the Appellant only when all the due payments are made by the Appellant.

5. The SE/OP/Habsiguda further stated that the consumer representations made to the CMD/TSSPDCL was already examined at corporate office and informed to the HT consumer that the request for revision of bills for 75 KVA from dt.16.09.2014 and adjustment of security deposit cannot be considered as service was under disconnection at the time of entering into the agreement for 75 KVA and thus the agreement was not affected. The consumer was requested to make the payment of requisite charges to set the connection restored at the first instance and thereafter claim deration of load of estimates from 850 KVA to 75 KVA.

A letter was addressed to the consumer to arrange the payment immediately to avoid action under RR Act of 1984. As the consumer has not responded to the said letter, FORM-A notice is issued as per the RR Act to arrange the payment.

6. The SE/OP/Habsiguda vide its Lr.No.83 dt.27.01.2018 informed the Appellant to pay an amount of Rs 70,25,496/- which is payable after adjustment of available consumption deposit of Rs 12,50,868/- along with the surcharge upto 31.01.2018, the following is the breakup of the various amounts levied by the Respondents:

### CMD 850 KVA Cat-I

1. Date of agreement : 11/08/2001  
2. Date of supply 300 KVA : 11/08/2001  
3. Type of service : Cat-I  
4. Whether initial period is over : Yes  
5. Date of disconnection (final reading KWH-2523.10,  
KVAH - 2566.47 MD-0.503, TOD - 265.47) : 30/07/2014  
6. Date of termination : 29/11/2014  
7. Whether the bill is raised till the final reading : Yes  
8. Dues as on date of disconnection (30.07.2014)

Upto dt.22.08.14	- Rs 26,89,681.00
Sep,14	- Rs 4,98,581.00
Oct,14	- Rs 4,71,410.00
Nov,14	- Rs 4,79,732.00
Dec,14	- <u>Rs 1,52,376.00</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>- <u>Rs 42,91,780.00</u></b>

- (DC = Rs 2,38,000, EC = Rs 1,94,820, CC = Rs 1125 x7/30 days) : (22.11.14 - 29.11.14)  
(=Rs 1,01,253,83 + Rs 5,08,98.70 + Rs 223.54 = Rs 152376.07)

(OR)

9. Arrears due upto 22.11.2017 : Rs 46,24,470.53  
10. Less Excess billed to be withdrawn(29.11.14 to 22.2.14)  
Dec,14 CC bill Rs 4,85,067.00 (-) Rs 1,52,376.00 = : Rs 3,32,691.00  
**CC Arrears dues total : Rs 42,91,779.53**  
11. FSA Dues (Nov-08 to Mar-09, May-09 to Mar-10 &  
Jun-10 including court case) (+) : Rs 14,33,926.53  
12. Total dues upto termination : Rs 57,25,706.37  
13. Less: Security Deposit available (-): Rs 12,50,868.00

14. Balance amount to be paid by the consumer (13-12) Rs 44,74,838.37  
Add Surcharge( dec to Jan 18 = 38 months) =

(Rs 44,74,838.71 x 1.5% x 38 M) (+) Rs 25,50,657.87

**Net amount due** Rs 70,25,496.24

Or say Rs 70,25,496.00

As on the date 01.10.2018, the Respondents claimed an amount of Rs 75,62,476/- which includes CC dues + FSA Rs 44,74,838/- + Rs 30,87,638/- Surcharge @ 1.5% from 01.12.2014 to 30.09.2018.

7. The sequential order of the events is that M/s. Hariyana Steel Centre, service connection was disconnected over non payment of CC bills on 30.07.2014. The appellant applied for the deration of CMD from 850 KVA to 70 KVA in ICSC(Integrated Customer Service Center), Habsiguda, vide HT reference No. 2149369 dt.12.09.2014. In the meanwhile the DE/OP/Habsiguda, concluded the revised agreement for the derated CMD of 75 KVA, w.e.f. 16.09.2014, vide Lr.No.1885 dt.16.09.2014. However the request for deration was not considered by the SE/OP/RR East, in view of UDC (Under Disconnection) and pending arrears, and same was informed to the Appellant, vide Lr.No.1175 dt.22.09.2014. Subsequently the Appellant placed a representation before CGM/Commercial/TSSPDCL vide Letter dt. 20.10.2014, for the deration of CMD from 850 KVA to 75 KVA, which was accorded approval w.e.f.16.09.2014, vide Lr.No.1609 dt.13.11.2014, on contrary to the letter of SE/OP/RR East wherein the request was rejected. The approval order for the deration of CMD to 75 KVA of the CGM/Commercial was not affected in view of the dues pending for want of payments. From 2014 to 2017 the subject remained unresolved. Further the Appellant approached again to the Respondent No.1 SE/OP/Habsiguda vide letter dt.15.12.2017, wherein the request was made for revision of bills from 16.09.2014, which was not considered. Thereafter the SE/OP/Habsiguda vide its Lr.No.83 dt.27.01.2018, informed the Appellant that the HT SC No. HBG 937 agreement is terminated w.e.f. 29.11.2014 as per the GTCS clause 5.9.4.3 and demanded net amount of Rs 70,25,496/- which included CC arrears, FSA dues, surcharges less the available security deposit. The Appellant again approached the CGM/Commercial, vide letter dt.10.01.2017 requesting for revision of bills in view of deration of CMD to 75 KVA w.e.f.16.09.2014 and adjustment of security deposit available with the said service connection. On contrary to their earlier approval for deration of CMD from 850 KVA to 75 KVA w.e.f. 16.09.2014, the CGM/Commercial vide Lr.no 201, dt:24.04.2018, did not considered the request in view of disconnection at the time of enter into agreement for 75 KVA and further requested the Appellant to make payment of the requisite charges to get

the connection restored at the first instance and thereafter claim for deration of CMD. Following which the Appellant approached the CGRF seeking relief on their grievances.

8. On the basis of the said averments the following issues are settled:

**Issues**

i. Whether the Appellant is entitled to set aside the claim of Rs 70,25,496/- as claimed by the Respondents through Respondent No.1 towards amounts due from the Appellant?

ii. Whether there is a delay in the deration of the load from 850 KVA to 75 KVA pertaining to the Appellant's service connection?

iii. Whether the Appellant is entitled for deration of CMD 75 KVA w.e.f. 16.0.2014 ?

iv. Whether the Appellant is entitled to withdraw Rs 16,02,099/- pertaining to the period from 16.09.2014 to Dec,2014?

v. Whether the Appellant is entitled to withdraw surcharge amount of Rs 25,50,657/- from Dec,2014 to 31.01.2018 ?

vi. Whether the Appellant is entitled for adjustment of interest on security deposit from 01.04.2014 to 29.11.2017 and

vii. Whether the Appellant is entitled for issuance of NOC i.e. No Objection Certificate from the Respondents?

vii. To what relief?

**Issue Nos. ii & iii**

9. Provisions governing the deration of CMD and termination of the agreement

The following are the provisions stipulated in the General Terms and Conditions over deration of CMD or termination of agreement in respect of HT supply.

Amended Clause 5.9.4.2 of the GTCS vide proceeding No.APERC/Secy/96/2014 dt.31.05.2014 :

Deration of CMD or Termination of Agreement in respect of HT Supply: *“The consumer may seek reduction of contracted maximum demand or termination of the HT Agreement after the expiry of the minimum period of the Agreement by giving not less than one month notice in writing expressing his intention to do so. However, if for any reason the consumer chooses to derate the CMD or terminate the Agreement, before the expiry of the minimum 2 year period of the Agreement, the CMD will be derated or the Agreement will be terminated with effect from the date of expiry of the initial two years period of the Agreement or after expiry of one month notice period whichever is later. The Company can also terminate the HT Agreement, at any time giving one month notice if the consumer violates the terms of the HT Agreement, or the GTCS or the provision of any law touching the Agreement including the Act and rules made thereunder, and AP Electricity Reforms Act, 1998. On termination of the HT Agreement the consumer shall pay all sums due under the Agreement as on the date of its termination.”*

As per the above given clause the Appellant may seek reduction of CMD after the expiry of minimum period of agreement by giving not less than one month notice in writing expressing his intention to do so, the minimum agreement period of two years is completed in this case, the date of application towards request for deration of CMD from 850 KVA to 75 KVA was registered in ICSC(Integrated Customer Service Center), Habsiguda, vide HT reference No. 2149369 on dt.12.09.2014. The completion of one month notice period shall commence of 11.10.2014. The agreement for the revised CMD of 75 KVA was executed with DE/OP/Habsiguda on 16.09.2014. In view of the above the actual date of effect of deration as per the above said clause shall be from 11.10.2014 i.e. from the date of completion of one month notice period. The effect of deration was denied by the Respondents in view of UDC(Under Disconnection) and pending dues on the service, claimed for the payment of dues and restored the supply, then only the deration held to be affected.

Now the question arises whether the effect of deration can be denied in view of the UDC(Under Disconnection) and pending dues on the service. This question was categorically discussed when a consumer raised similar question during objections/Suggestions on ARR items in the Tariff Order 2016-17, page 38, under clause 2.33: DERATION OF CONTRACTED DEMAND. Based on the said clause, in the Appeal No. 25 of 2018, M/s. Jaya Diagnostic and Research Centre Ltd., this authority given orders directing that denial of deration of CMD in view of the pending dues as



highly unjustified. The extracts of the relevant portion of discussion held on this subject in the Tariff Order 2016-17, is reproduced below as follows:

***Clause 2.33 Deration of contracted demand***

***SRI. A.V.S. Suresh from Kamineni Steel & Power India Pvt. Ltd. has requested to allow deration of contracted demand without any reference to clearance of pending bills or dues.***

*Further, it was also requested not to levy deemed consumption charges (minimum demand) during the disconnection period.*

***Reply from Licensees***

***Deration on CMD will be done without any reference to clearance of pending bills/dues. However in case of restoration of disconnected supply, the supply will be restored only after clearing the dues.***

*The deemed consumption charges, as per the terms and conditions of Supply agreement, have to be paid even if the electricity is not consumed. This is because supply has been disconnected by the Licensee due to non-payment of electricity charges, theft of electricity or unauthorized use or for any other valid reason.*

***Commission's view***

***As the Licensees have stated that they are not insisting on arrears payment at the time of deration of contracted demand, the Commission agrees with the view of the Licensees.***

*However, for the restoration of supply of a disconnected service after considering deration of CMD, the Licensee can do so after paying the pending bills. Regarding levying of minimum energy consumption charges for all categories except HT-I (B), the Licensees can charge the same as per the provisions of this Tariff Order.*

On the above given para, the Licensee clearly replied that deration of CMD will be done without any reference to clearance of pending bills/dues to which the Hon'ble Commission agreed with the Licensee's view.

Hence, this goes to show that there is beyond doubt that the claim of the Respondents over denial of deration of CMD due to pending dues is not Justified.

The other reason that the Respondents claimed was that the service was under disconnection at the time of enter of the revised agreement of 75 KVA, hence the agreement was not effected. Then the question arises that during disconnection period whether the HT Agreement is ceased/terminated or it is active. The Respondents continued to bill the demand charges towards monthly minimum charges at 850 KVA CMD during disconnection period. The termination of agreement over pending dues is governed by the following Clause of the GTCS:

**5.9.4.3 Termination of LT Agreement and HT Agreement on account of disconnection:** *Where any consumer, whose supply is disconnected for nonpayment of any amount due to the Company on any account, fails to pay such dues and regularise his account within three Months from the date of disconnection, the Company shall after completion of 3 months period, issue one Month notice for termination of the LT or HT Agreement, as the case may be. If the consumer still fails to regularise the account, the Company shall terminate the Agreement with effect from the date of expiry of the said one-Month notice. Such termination shall be without prejudice to the rights and obligations incurred or accrued prior to such termination.*

*Provided that where the Company fails to issue notice or terminate the Agreement as prescribed above, the consumer shall not be liable to pay the minimum charges for the period beyond 4 months from the date of disconnection and the Agreement shall be deemed to have been terminated at the end of 4 months period from the date of disconnection.*

As per the above given clause, the Agreement shall be deemed to have been terminated at the end of 4 months period from the date of disconnection. Hence, the HT Agreement shall be terminated from 29.11.2014. Until this date the HT agreement will be enforce. As per the amended clause 5.9.4.2 the date of effect of revised CMD of 75 KVA shall commence from 11.10.2014, i.e. after completion of one month notice period. As on that date the agreement is very much in force and is not under termination, which means all the specified terms and conditions between the Appellant and Licensee shall be active, which enables the Appellant to revise the agreement on reduction of contracted demand. Hence the plea of the Respondents in not affecting the revised 75 KVA Agreement concluded by the DE/Op/Habsiguda Dt: 16.09.2014, owing to disconnection period is not tenable. However the plea of the Appellant to effect the deration of 75 KVA CMD w.e.f.16.09.2014 from the date of

revised agreement cannot be considered as per the amended Clause 5.9.4.2 and shall be effected from 11.10.2014. Hence decides these issues against the Respondents.

**Issue No.iv**

10. In view of the discussions in issue Nos. ii & iii, this office is of the view that the Appellant is entitled for minimum charges on CMD of 75 KVA instead of 850 KVA w.e.f. 11.10.2014. And as such the Respondents is directed to revise the bills to that effect. Hence decides this issue in favor of the Appellant.

**Issue No. v**

11. The contention of the Appellant is that they are entitled to withdraw an amount of Rs 25,50,657/- towards surcharge from 12/2014 to 31/01/2018 is denied by the Respondents on a ground that the surcharge will be levied on the dues as per the rates prevailing in the Tariiff Orders issued by the Hon'ble TSERC. In the face of the said contentions by both sides the provisions of Clause VII(7.1)(ii) of Regulation 5 of 2016 is perused and found as follows:

*“Where the complaint of a consumer is genuine and revision of a bill already issued becomes necessary, the due date for payment of bill shall be reckoned from the date of revised bill for the purpose of disconnection of supply or for levy of additional charges for belated payment.”* and found that as per the above the surcharge shall be levied as per the Tariff rates available in the corresponding Tariff Orders of various financial years, however the burden of surcharge shall not be imposed on the revised quantum of amount owing to the revised CMD. Hence concludes that the Appellant is entitled for withdrawing the surcharge amount levied from 11/10.2014. Accordingly decides this issue.

**Issue No.vi**

12. The Appellant sought to adjust the interest on security deposit from 01.04.2014 to 29.11.2017. The Respondents on the other hand contended that the security deposit amount of Rs 12,50,868/- was already adjusted against the due amounts payable at the time of termination of HT agreement on 29.11.2014. Hence the question of interest on the security deposit does not arise. A perusal of the records admittedly show that the Appellant had a security deposit amount of Rs 12,60,868/- on the date of termination of the HT agreement, but the same also shows that the said amount was already adjusted towards the amount due and payable by the Appellant

on the date of termination of the agreement i.e. 29.11.2014. And as such the question of any interest accruing on the amount does not arise. Hence concludes that the Appellant is not entitled for any interest on security deposit in view of the adjustment of the said amount towards the dues payable by the Appellant. Hence decides this issue against the Appellant.

**Issue Nos. i & vii**

13. The contention of the Appellant is that they are entitled to set aside the claim of the distribution licensee to the extent of Rs 70,25,496/- as demanded by the SE/OP/HBG/SAO/AAO(HT)/JAO/SA1/RRE 937/D.No.83/18, Dt.27.01.2018. The Respondents on the other hand contended that the said claim has been made as per GTCS norms and that the same is not an abnormal claim made by the Appellant as such the Appellant is not entitled for termination of the said demand. A perusal of the evidence on record shows that the demand of Rs 70,25,486/- by the Respondents includes different amounts on different heads such as CC dues, Monthly Minimum Charges, FSA dues and surcharges and this office has already ordered for revised bills under issue Nos. iv and v w.e.f. 11.10.2014. Hence the Appellant is liable for payment of pthe remaining amount as claimed by the Appellant. The contention of the Appellant that they are entitled for NOC can only be considered on their payment of the final revised bills. In other words the Appellants are entitled for the NOC on the payment of the amount according to the revised final bills that shall be issued by the Respondents in view of the findings in issue Nos. iv and v. Hence accordingly decides these issues.

**Issue No. viii.**

14. In the result the Appeal is accordingly disposed.

15. The licensee shall comply with and implement this order within 15 days for the date of receipt of this order under clause 3.38 of the Regulation 3 of 2015 of TSERC.

TYPED BY Office Executive cum Computer Operator, Corrected, Signed and Pronounced by me on this the 12th day of November, 2018.

Sd/-

**Vidyut Ombudsman**

1. M/s. Hariyana Steel Centre (KDM) Pvt.Ltd., Plot No. 1/5, 8-141, IDA Nacharam, Hyderabad - 500 076. Cell: 9848346211..
2. The ADE/OP/Habsiguda/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The DE/OP/Habsiguda/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The SAO/OP/Habsiguda Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
5. The SE/OP/Habsiguda Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

**Copy to :**

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