

BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

Present

K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu
Vidyut Ombudsman

Dated: 19-02-2013

Appeal No. 3 of 2013

Between

Ms.Komara Vijaya Susanna Ruth
D/o. K.Chitti Raju,
C4, type – II, P&T Quarters, chikkadapalli
Hyderabad – 20.

... Appellant

And

1. Asst Engineer/Operation/APEPDCL/Payakaraopeta
2. Asst Divisional Engineer/Operation/ APEPDCL/ Yelamanchili
3. Divisional Engineer/Operation/ APEPDCL/ Anakapalli

...Respondents

The appeal / representation filed on 22.12.2012 of the appellant has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 29.01.2013 at Viakhapatnam. Appellant absent. But Memo filed on 23.01.2013 and Sri B. Simhachalam Naidu, ADE/O/Yelamanchili and Sri G.Soma Raju, AAE/O/P.R.Peta (Town) 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:

Dispute: "though he paid estimated charges for one pole extension on 3-5-2012 for new domestic service connection at Payakaraopeta, Visakhapatnam Dist. So far, the new service is not released".

2. The respondent-2 submitted his written submissions as hereunder:

“The Payakaraopeta Village and Mandal is being expanded and many small layouts are existing with extended LT lines from the existing LT net. At present all the new layouts are obtaining approval from the competent authorities as per the present layout electrification procedures. Certain individual applications are being registered. The petitioner’s application was also processed along with others and an estimation was made and sanctioned. Mean while certain circular instructions were received vide Memo. No. 950/12 Dt.12-3-12 with an endorsement dated 11-4-12 from CGM/O&CS stating that no release of services have to made in partially electrified and un-electrified layouts. As such, the said application is not processed.”

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

- **It is observed that the petitioner has submitted application on 8-2-2012 and as per the estimation sanctioned vide NO. YLMNSC05-15242 an amount of Rs.9312/- was paid on 13-4-12 by way of DD and submitted to ADE on 3-5-12. Whereas the ADE has received instructions with endorsement dated 11-4-12 stating that not to issued services in the partially or un-electrified areas. Had he acted swiftly and cancelled the estimation at least on 12th of April and intimated the consumer they would have not taken the DD on 13-4-12. Further, the DD was also accepted and acknowledged on 3-5-12 which is binding on the respondents to release service.**
- **The respondents are therefore, directed to release the service within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order and report compliance failing which section 146 of Electricity Act 2003 will attract for delay.**
 - **With the above direction the CG.No. 475/2012-13 is disposed off.**

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant filed this appeal stating that inspite of direction given by the Forum, they have not released the service connection and they are not caring the orders of the Forum and requested this authority to give a direction to the respondents to release the service connection forthwith.

5. The appellant absent on the date of hearing but filed a memo stating that the service connection was released in the first week of January 2013. He did not raise any protest or objection with regard to delay caused in releasing the service

connection. So, this authority is constrained to arrive at a conclusion that the order of the Forum is implemented and the dispute is resolved.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 19th February 2013

**Sd/-
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**