

BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

Present

K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu
Vidyut Ombudsman

Dated: 22 -03-2013

Appeal No. 18 of 2013

Between

Sri Golla Mallesh

S/o.Ananthappa

Peddempalli (V), Damargidda (M)

Mahaboobnagar Dist.

... Appellant

And

1. Addl.Assistant Engineer / Operation/Damargidda/ APCPDCL / Mahaboobnagar
2. Assistant Divisional Engineer/ Operation / Kodangal / APCPDCL/ Mahaboobnagar
3. Divisional Engineer / Operation/APCPDCL / Mahaboobnagar / Mahaboobnagar
4. Superintending Engineer / Operation/APCPDCL/Mahaboobnagar Circle / Mahaboobnagar

...Respondents

The appeal / representation filed on 10.01.2013 of the appellant has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 18.03.2013 at Hyderabad. Sri Swamy Jaganmayananda, representative of the appellant present and Sri R.Anand Reddy, ADE/O/Kondangal and Sri K.Venkatanarayana AAE/O/Damragidda for respondents present and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed / issued the following :

AWARD

The appellant filed a complaint against the Respondents for Redressal of his Grievances and stated as hereunder:

“They are the farmers of Peddempally Village, Damargidda Mandal, Mahaboobnagar District dug the borewells in their lands and paid amounts through DDs for erection of DTR on 05.10.2011. The concerned officials were not responding properly and releasing the transformer without maintaining proper seniority. Hence requested to enquire into the matter and arrange to release the DTR.

The following are the ryots applied for erection of a new transformer and to release service connections including the appellant herein:

Sl.No.	Name of the consumer	Village	DD.No/Date	PCB No./Date
1	Golla Errappa, S/o. Chinna Bichappa	Peddempally	606194/01.06.2012	19411/03.08.2012
2	Golla Mahesh, S/o. Ananthappa	Peddempally	90677/12.07.2012	19411/03.08.2012
3	Buneed Ganjilappa, S/o. Narsappa	Peddempally	914192/25.07.2012	19411/03.08.2012
4	Golla Nagamma, W/o. Pedda Bichappa	Peddempally	606191/01.06.2012	19412/03.08.2012

2. The 1st respondent has filed his written submissions as hereunder:

“The complainant Sri Golla Mahesh and others at Pedempally (V) in Damargidda (M) have approached the consumer Grievances Redressal Forum/Hyderabad for 1 No. Additional 25 KVA 3-phase DTR to their agriculture bore wells.

During Physical verification he found that the complainant Sri Golla Mahesh and others at Pedempally (V) in Damargidda (M) are utilizing the Electricity Power supply to their borewells un-authorizedly from near by existing 100 KVA 3-PH DTR, and the same ryots have paid necessary Demand Drafts in the month of August - 2012 for new agriculture service connections.

As per the Agriculture seniority list of Damargidda Section the seniority No of above ryots are 276, 277, 278, and 279.

Hence the sanction and Erection of DTR may be completed within the next six months period.”

3. After hearing both sides and after considering the material placed before the Forum, the Forum passed the impugned order as here under:

“Sri Golla Mallesh and three others of Peddempalli village have applied for new connections. While two of them remitted the requisite amount in June the other two did so in July this year.

The four applicants have been drawing power unauthorisedly as per the written submission of the Respondents.

The Respondents are directed to release new connections strictly as per the applicants’ position in the priority list. In the meanwhile, the unauthorised service must be disconnected immediately. Theft cases may be booked against them.

The SE/Operation/Mahaboobnagar is hereby directed to take action against the concerned officials for their failure to initiate action against the applicants.

Action taken may be intimated to the Forum within a week's time.

The complaint is disposed accordingly.”

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that they have paid amounts for supplying 25 kVA DTR and they promised to do it, and that they made efforts to file cases against them on the ground of illegal connections and notices were also issued to that effect and requested this authority to set aside the order of the Forum and order for release of DTR immediately.

6. Now, the point for consideration is, “Whether the impugned order is liable to be set aside? If so, on what grounds?”

7. The representative of the appellant Sri Swamy Jagannathanananda appeared before this authority and submitted that inspite of payment of the amounts through DDs for erection of DTR, they have not provided on the ground of lack of seniority and it is only a rouse invented to escape their liability. It is also further pointed that DTR supply was given to the persons who are juniors to the appellant and inspite of the direction given by the Forum, they have not provided the same and they may be ordered for implementation of the order immediately.

8. The respondents are represented by Sri R.Anand Reddy, ADE/O/Kondangal and Sri K.Venkatanarayana AAE/O/Damragidda and they have stated that the material was drawn and erection would take within 20 days after the carry forward of budget in the month of April.

9. It is clear from the record that the complainants have registered their new applications in the CSC with a request for new agriculture services and sanction, erection of 25 kVA DTR of Husnabad (V), Kodangal (M), Peddampally (V), Damargidda (M), Kudurumalla (V), Doulthabad (M), Nandipad (V), Maddur (M) and

that the seniority numbers are submitted to the Forum and the services are released basing on their seniority. The Forum has ordered that the complainant and 3 others of Peddampally village have applied for new agricultural services and the respondents have reported that all the four farmers are already drawing power unauthorisedly. If the appellant and others are having the existing service connection, the same shall be continued till the new DTR is erected. In case of any disconnection, the same shall be restored forthwith by the respondents.

10. In the 3rd para of the order, it has simply directed “the respondents to book theft cases against them and also directed them to initiate action against the concerned officials for their failure to take action against the four applicants. The action taken may be intimated to the Forum within a week.”

11. This direction is contradictory to the earlier direction given by the Forum. On one hand it has ordered to release supply within 15 days and at the same time directing the department officials to take action against the appellant and 3 others, which itself is contradictory. When the DTR connected to their line is not properly supplying power they have asked for enhanced DTR of 25 kVA and thereupon asked them to pay the amounts. Accordingly they paid the amounts. At any rate the order passed by the Forum is self contradictory and observation of the Forum about booking of theft cases against the applicants is liable to be set aside. Hence, the same is hereby set aside.

12. The respondents have stated that it may take some more time for them to release the service connection while looking into the seniority, material aspects and budget.

13. In the light of the above assurance, this authority feels that it is justified to order the respondents to provide DTR by 01.05.2013.

14. In the light of the above observation, the respondents are directed to provide DTR and release regular service connections by 01.05.2013, failing which necessary steps will be initiated by this authority u/s 146 of Electricity Act, 2003.

15. With this observation, the appeal is disposed. No order as to costs.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 22nd March 2013

Sd/-

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN