

BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

Present

**K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu
Vidyut Ombudsman**

Dated: 25 -03-2013

Appeal No. 30 of 2013

Between

Indian Consumer Services

Sri V.Venkatswara Rao (Consumer Activist)

55-1-19/7, Flat No.6, FF, Taruni Apartment

J.R.Nagar, Old Venkojipalem, VSP – 22.

... Appellant

And

1. Asst.Accounts Officer/ERO/West/APEPDCL/Visakhapatnam

2..Divisional Engineer / Operation/Zone-I/APEPDCL / Visakhapatnam

....Respondents

The appeal / representation filed dt.28.01.2013 (received on 31.01.2013) of the appellant has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 20.03.2013 at Hyderabad. Appellant absent and no representation from the Appellant and Sri V.Madhu AAO/ERO/West/Visakhapatnam 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 has filed a complaint stating that the CC bills were not claimed by the APEPDCL for the months of August, September, October and November 2012 as per his bank account and requested to do the needful to collect the same..”

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

“The payments were received from the petitioner up to 7/12. On verification it was found from the HDFC Bank authority that ECS mandate not received from customer of Sri V.Venkateswara Rao. Thus the recovery of ECS was not done for the above said months. The consumer has paid the amounts and stated that he has issued a letter to SBI Malkapuram Refinery Branch for incorporating the ECS flat to the A/c of Sri V.Venkateswara Rao and the amount will be recovered from December 2012.”

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

- **The Forum really appreciated the effort put forth by the petitioner in bringing the inconvenience caused to him.**
- **The grievance is redressed since, the 1st respondent has taken steps to recover the amount from December 2012 onwards.**
- **The petitioner is hereby advised to intimate the 1st respondent if the problem recurs, immediately.**
- **The respondents are hereby directed to act swiftly on such representations to avoid inconvenience to the consumers.**

With the above direction, CG.No.592/12-13 is disposed off with no costs.

4. Aggrieved by the said order the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same by narrating the grounds as hereunder:

He submitted the ECS authorization letter with SBI, Branch Manager's attestation to the AO, West , APEPDCL (Mr.P.Ganesh Kumar) at about 18.30 hours on January 7, 2009 (Thursday) in person along with all the relevant documents. On basing that only all these years the recovery of ECS was done up to July 2012 and was not withdrawn by the undersigned. On basing that only on complaint again the recovery of ECS was done from December 2012. No fresh mandate was submitted. Which shows that the statement of the 1st respondent is fully wrong and misleading. The indifferent attitude of the APEPDCL Accounts Department this type of inconvenience caused to the undersigned in June 2011 also. [The bank mandate belongs to SBI, HPCL Refinery Branch, Malkapuram, Visakhapatnam -11 as ref.1], But the APEPDCL through HDFC Bank referred wrongly to the Andhra Bank then

the Andhra Bank stated that **NO SUCH ACCOUNT** WITH THEM Ref. letter no. CGM(Expr)/GM(R)/SAO(R)/AAO(R)/ D.No.618/11, dt.08.06.2011 along with Bank statement dated 31.01.2011 mentioning that the reason 2 indicated of un-debited consumers list and disconnected the power supply to the above ref. service no. 11242-M025-111792] On approaching the Hon'ble Forum / CMD and with their intervention only the power supply was restored.

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

6. The appellant failed to attend before this authority. But the respondent is represented by Sri V.Madhu, AAO/ERO/West/Visakhapatnam and submitted his written submissions in person as hereunder:

"Every month this office is being issued service wise demand to the HDFC Bank for ECS Recovery from various banks. As seen from the statement of debit clearing report issued by the HDFC Bank authority on 05.09.2012, 28.09.2012, 29.10.2012 and 30.11.2012 that remarked as "**ECS Mandate not received from the customer**" of **Sri V.V.Rao**. The recovery of electricity charges through ECS was not done for 8/12 to 11/12 to the SC No.M025/111792. To avoid disconnection, the consumer has paid an amount of Rs.784/- along with RC Rs.75/- on 03.12.2012 vide P.R.No.223103520288.

However, this office issued a letter to the SBI/Malkapuram/ Refinery Branch for incorporating the ECS flag to the A/c of Sri V.V.Rao and the electricity bill payments are receiving from 12/2012 onwards. Now there is no discrepancy in recovery of electricity bills of Sri V.V.Rao."

7. The very written submissions made by the respondent clearly discloses that the appellant has paid the amount of Rs.784/- along with RC Rs.75/- on 03.12.2012. It appears that payment being received every month from December 2012 onwards and that there is no discrepancy in recovery of electricity bills from the appellant.

Probably that may be the reason for the appellant for his failure to attend before this authority. Even though he is absent he has not opted to send his written submissions projecting his grievance if any; and that this authority feels that the dispute is resolved and there is nothing to interfere with the order of the Forum.

8. With this observation, the appeal is dismissed, as the dispute is resolved.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 25th March 2013

Sd/-
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN