

## **BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

Present

**K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu  
Vidyut Ombudsman**

Dated: 26 -03-2013

**Appeal No. 24 of 2013**

Between

Sri Chikoti Anjaiah

R/o. H.No.7-72, Madhurpuri Road No.3, Dilsukhnagar  
Hyderabad – 60.

***... Appellant***

**And**

1. Asst.Engineer/operation/Choutuppal/APCPDCL/Nalgonda
2. Assistant Divisional Engineer/ Operation / Ramannapet/ APCPDCL/ Nalgonda
- 3 Asst.Accounts Officer/ERO/Ramannapet/APCPDCL/Nalgonda
- 4..Divisional Engineer / Operation/APCPDCL / Nalgonda/Nalgonda
- 5.. Superintending Engineer / Operation/Nalgonda Circle/APCPDCL/Nalgonda

***....Respondents***

The appeal / representation filed dt.10.01.2013 (received on 11.01.2013) of the appellant has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 21.03.2013 at Hyderabad. Sri C.Anjaiah, appellant and Sri S.Satyanarayana, AAO/ERO/Ramannapet and Sri K.Narasimha Reddy Sr.Assistant/ERO/Ramannapet 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:

“He approached the Forum after the Respondents failed to solve his problem despite making representations on 29-02-2008 and 29-12-2008. In those representations he pointed out that a bill was issued with wrong readings. Though he made several trips to the Department, the problem was not solved. But suddenly they disconnected his service in February 2008. Yet they continued to issue him monthly bills.

Suddenly they issued a notice on Form A demanding Rs. 40,396. It was issued by the ERO Ramannapet. Hence, requested that a bill be issued for the actual consumption and his service number is 412261127.

2. The respondent no.1 submitted his submissions as hereunder:

“He inspected the service on 12-08-2011 and found that the service was under disconnection. The Final Reading was noted as 3996. It is observed that the consumer was using supply with connected load  $\frac{1}{2}$  HP motor and one tube light. As the consumer has not paid the outstanding dues, notice under the Revenue Recovery Act was issued on 18-07-2011 for Rs.40,396/-. It is observed that the consumer was using supply for cattleshed and construction of sheds. There are five domestic services and one commercial service in addition to S.C.No.1127 in the name of Ch. Anjaiah. The bill will be revised for the period from the date of release of supply to February 2008 duly taking the connecting load and the consumption pattern. As per the consumer's request the service will be dismantled after finalization of the bill.”

3. The respondent no.3 submitted his submissions as hereunder:

“As per AE's letter with ADE's counter signature the bill will be revised by him. As the consumer did not want to continue the S.C.No.1127 of Lingoiguda, the demand raised beyond 4 months from the date of disconnection will be withdrawn. The revised bill amount based on the field recommendation will be communicated to the consumer duly adjusting the available Security Deposit of Rs.1,600/- for final settlement of the bill for the purpose of dismantlement.”

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

**“Both the Complainant and the Respondent agree that the connected load is  $\frac{1}{2}$  HP Motor plus one Tube light. The service was released on 29-12-2006 and disconnected during February 2008 for non-payment of the bill amount. As deposed by the First Respondent the Final Reading noted as 3996 at the time of his physical inspection held on 12-08-2011.**

**Hence, the consumption of 3996 units recorded for the period form December 2006 to February 2008 for the above said connected load is observed as abnormal.**

**In view of the above, the Respondents are directed to bill the computed consumption for the above said period based on the connected load and revise the bill. The amounts paid along with Security Deposit is to be adjusted against the revised bill and to issue notice to the consumer if any amount is due from him, to dismantle the service as desired by the Complainant.**

**The complaint is disposed off accordingly.”**

5. The appellant herein filed a complaint against SC No.1127 of Lingoiguda (V), Choutuppal (M) and the said dispute was resolved by the Forum as hereunder:

**Both the Complainant and the Respondent agree that the connected load is ½ HP Motor plus one Tube light. The service was released on 29-12-2006 and disconnected during February 2008 for non-payment of the bill amount. As deposed by the First Respondent the Final Reading noted as 3996 at the time of his physical inspection held on 12-08-2011.**

**Hence, the consumption of 3996 units recorded for the period from December 2006 to February 2008 for the above said connected load is observed as abnormal.**

**In view of the above, the Respondents are directed to bill the computed consumption for the above said period based on the connected load and revise the bill. The amounts paid along with Security Deposit is to be adjusted against the revised bill and to issue notice to the consumer if any amount is due from him, to dismantle the service as desired by the Complainant.**

6. The appellant submitted an application before this authority as if he is aggrieved against SC No.1177 of Lingoiguda (V), Choutuppal (M), Nalgonda Dist for which no application is filed before the Forum and no order is passed by the Forum. He requested this authority to conduct an enquiry and take necessary steps in doing justice since no response is received from the officials of the department. He has also submitted several applications on this said SC No.1177 to the AE/O/APCPDCL/Choutuppal/Ramannapet/Nalgonda on 29.09.2011 and 10.09.2012.

7. This authority numbered the appeal as if it is an appeal preferred against the SC No.1127 on which the Forum already passed an order.

8. When the appellant appeared before this authority on 21.03.2013, he stated that there is no dispute with regard to SC No.1127 and the same is resolved as per the orders of the Forum and there is no grievance with regard to SC No.1127.

9. Whereas the respondents are represented by Sri S.Satyanarayana, AAO/ERO/Ramannapet and Sri K.Narasimha Reddy Sr.Assistant/ERO/Ramannapet appeared before this authority and they have also stated no complaint is filed before the Forum against SC No.1177.

10. In view of the above said discussion, there is no need for this authority to pass an order on SC No.1127 as the dispute is already resolved. So far as the application with regard to SC No.1177 is concerned, the entire material is to be forwarded to the Forum to conduct an enquiry and pass appropriate orders after giving notice to both the parties. The application is forwarded along with annexures.

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

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 26<sup>th</sup> March 2013

**Sd/-**  
**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**