



BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

First Floor 33/11 kV Substation, Beside Hyderabad Boat Club
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

**PRESENT : SRI MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

WEDNESDAY THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

Appeal No. 08 of 2025-26

Between

Sri Medi Lingaiah, s/o.Narsaiah, H.No.354, Chandragiri Villas, Cherlapally,
Nalgonda District - 508 001.

..... Appellant

AND

1. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda Rural/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
2. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/M&P/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
4. The Accounts Assistant Officer/ERO/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
5. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
6. The Superintending Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda

.....Respondents

This appeal is coming on before me for final hearing on 27.05.2025, in the presence of the appellant, virtually and Sri M. Venugopala Charyulu - ADE/OP/Nalgonda, Sri G. Satish Kumar - ADE/M&P/Nalgonda, Sri P. Somaiah - AAO/ERO/Nalgonda and Sri UCV. Annaiah - DE/OP/Nalgonda for the respondents and having stood over for consideration, this Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following:-

AWARD

This appeal is preferred aggrieved by the Award passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum - I (Rural) (in short 'the Forum') of Telangana State Southern Power Distribution Company Limited (in short 'TGSPDCL') in C.G.No 02/2024-25 /Nalgonda circle dt.17.08.2024, rejecting the complaint.

CASE OF THE APPELLANT BEFORE THE FORUM

2. The case of the appellant is that the respondents have released domestic Service Connection No.4022902486 (in short 'the subject Service Connection') to the appellant under Category-I. He got abnormal bills since 2014 onwards. Though the appellant paid Demand Drafts towards testing of meter, the respondents have misplaced them. The appellant requested the respondents to change the meter and revise the bill, but they are not doing the same. Therefore, it was prayed to direct the respondents to revise the bill and to do justice to the appellant.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS

3. In the written reply filed by respondent No. 4 before the learned Forum, it is, inter-alia, submitted that the meter of the subject Service Connection was tested thrice. In the first two meter testings the report was that it was working satisfactorily. As per the final test report dt.23.03.2023, the meter was defective i.e., RTC disturbed. Basing on the final third report an

amount of Rs.5,902/- was withdrawn on 27.03.2024 after replacing the meter.

AWARD OF THE FORUM

4. After considering the material on record and after hearing both sides, the learned Forum has rejected the complaint.

5. Aggrieved by the said Award of the learned Forum, the present appeal is preferred reiterating the contents of the complaint filed by the appellant before the learned Forum. It is accordingly prayed to do justice.

WRITTEN SUBMISSION OF THE RESPONDENTS

6. In the written reply filed by respondent No. 2, before this Authority, it is, inter-alia, submitted that the subject Service Connection was released on 22.11.2012. The consumer is irregular in paying the CC bills. The last payment was made by the appellant in June 2019 and he has not paid any amount till date. He has also stated about the testing of the meter thrice. The learned Forum ordered the appellant to pay Rs.1,47,209/- on 17.08.2024.

7. In the written reply filed by respondent No. 3, before this Authority, it is, inter-alia, submitted that for the first time, the subject meter was tested on 30.12.2015 and it was found OK. Like-wise, the subject meter was tested again on 07.11.2022 and it was found OK, but finally when the said meter was tested for the third time on 27.03.2023, it was found defective as no loads Amps were recorded as (R-0.007, Y-0.007, B-0.0007).

ARGUMENTS

8. It is argued by the appellant that the subject meter was defective and though he paid an amount through Demand Drafts for testing the meter, those Demand Drafts were misplaced and also submitted that excess bills were issued to him. Accordingly it is prayed to direct the respondents to revise the bills.

9. On the other hand, it is submitted by the respondents that the subject meter was defective as per the third test report and accordingly the bill was revised by giving benefit of Rs.5,902/- to the appellant and hence it is prayed to reject the appeal.

POINTS

10. The points that arise for consideration are:-

- i) Whether the amount claimed by the respondents towards arrears is not correct?
- ii) Whether the Award of the learned Forum is liable to be set aside? and
- iii) To what relief?

POINT Nos. (i) and (ii)

ADMITTED FACTS

11. It is an admitted fact that initially the respondents have released the subject Service Connection on 22.11.2012 under Category-I. It is also an admitted fact that basing on the third testing report an amount of Rs.5,902/-

was withdrawn from the total arrears.

SETTLEMENT BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT

12. Both the parties have appeared before this Authority. Efforts were made to reach a settlement between the parties through the process of conciliation and mediation. However, no settlement could be reached. The hearing, therefore, continued to provide reasonable opportunity to both the parties to put-forth their case and they were heard.

REASONS FOR DELAY IN DISPOSING OF THE APPEAL

13. The present appeal was filed on 23.04.2024. This appeal is being disposed of within the period of (60) days as required.

CRUX OF THE MATTER

14. The material on record goes to show that since June 2019 the appellant is not at all paying electricity bills to the respondents in spite of consuming electricity. The liability to pay electricity charges is a statutory liability. The record also goes to show that the respondents have been showing the arrears since they became due. The appellant was paying the electricity bills now and then which are not regular. Sec.56 of the Electricity Act clearly authorises the respondents to disconnect power supply of any consumer, if he neglects to pay any energy charges, how-ever by issuing proper notice, within the time specified. Electrical energy is a salable goods,

which is usually sold on credit. Thus first the respondents supply electricity to the consumers then they raise the bill. On failure, the respondents are at liberty to proceed against the consumer as per law.

15. In the present case, when the meter of the subject Service Connection was tested twice, it was found satisfactory. On the third test it was found defective. The respondents gave benefit to the appellant to that effect. There is no reason for the appellant for not paying the arrears upto date and regular bills. The learned Forum has discussed the issue involved in this case properly and came to the correct conclusion. Therefore, I do not see any reason to interfere with the same. For these reasons, I hold that the amount claimed by the respondents towards arrears is correct and the appellant is liable to pay the arrears of electricity bills pending as on today and the Award of the learned Forum is not liable to be set aside. These points are accordingly decided against the appellant and in favour of the respondents.

POINT No.(iii)

16. In view of the findings on point Nos.(i) and (ii) the appeal is liable to be rejected. However in view of the facts and circumstances of the case, instalments are to be granted to the appellant to pay the due amount.

RESULT

17. In the result, the appeal is rejected confirming the Award passed by the learned Forum. The appellant is granted (4) monthly instalments to pay the arrears pending as on today as under:-

1. Rs.50,000/- on or before 15.06.2025
2. Rs.50,000/- on or before 15.07.2025
3. Rs.50,000/- on or before 15.08.2025
4. Balance due if any on or before 15.09.2025

If the appellant fails to pay any of the instalments as directed above, the respondents are at liberty to proceed against the appellant as per law. The appellant shall continue to pay the regular bills promptly.

A copy of this Award is made available at <https://vidyutombudsman-tserc.gov.in>.

Typed to my dictation by Office Executive cum Computer Operator, corrected and pronounced by me on the 28th day of May 2025.

Sd/-

Vidyut Ombudsman

1. Sri Medi Lingaiah, s/o.Narsaiah, H.No.354, Chandragiri Villas, Cherlapally, Nalgonda District - 508 001.
2. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda Rural/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda.

3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
4. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/M&P/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
5. The Accounts Assistant Officer/ERO/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
6. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
7. The Superintending Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda

Copy to

8. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum of TSSPDCL-Rural, H.No.8-03-167/14, GTS Colony, Yousufguda, Hyderabad.

