



BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

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

**PRESENT : SRI MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

MONDAY THE THIRTIETH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

CMP No. 12 OF 2025-26

in

Appeal No. 53 of 2025-26

Between

Smt.Jetti Jayamma,w/o.Late Jetti Ramulu, # 10-2-10, Maturu Apartment, Flat No. 213,
AC Guards, Beside SBI Branch, Hyderabad-500057,Ph:No. 9032584956.

.....**Petitioner/Appellant**

AND

1. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Mothi Nagar/TGSPDCL/Banjara Hills.
2. The Assistant Divisional Engineer /Operation/Sanath Nagar /TGSPDCL/ Banjara Hills.
3. The Assistant Accounts Officer/ ERO/Sanath Nagar /TGSPDCL/ Banjara Hills.
4. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Greenlands/TGSPDCL/Banjara Hills.
5. The Superintending Engineer/Operation/Banjara Hills/TGSPDCL/Banjara Hills.

..... **Respondents/Respondents**

This petition is coming on before me for final hearing on this day in the presence of the petitioner, virtually and Sri J.L.M.Raju - AAE/OP/Mothi Nagar, Sri P.Vamshi Krishna - ADE/OP/Sanath Nagar, Smt. K.Vandhana- AAO/ERO/Sanath Nagar and Sri V. Krishna Rao - DE/OP/Greenlands for the respondents, virtually and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following:-

ORDER

This Review Petition is filed to review the Award passed by this Authority in
Appeal No. 53 of 2025-26 dt.12.03.2026 (in short 'the impugned Award').

2. In the Review Petition, it is inter-alia, submitted that this Authority has not considered the entire material on record submitted by the appellant. Sec.56 of the Electricity Act (in short 'the Act') was not followed for disconnection of the electricity. The seven points mentioned in para No.4 of the Review Petition are to be considered. The (15) day prior notice is mandatory before removing the meter which is not followed by the respondents. Therefore it is prayed to review the impugned Award.

3. No written submissions were filed by the respondents.

4. The appellant has submitted that all the points raised by her were not considered by this Authority in the Appeal; that Sec.56 of the Act was not followed by the respondents and that this Authority has not considered the 15-day prior notice before the removal of the installed meter and hence it is prayed to review the Award in Appeal No.53 of 2025-26, dt.12.03.2026.

5. On the other hand, the respondents have supported the impugned Award. It is accordingly prayed to dismiss the Review Petition.

6. The points that arise for consideration are:-

- i) Whether there are sufficient grounds to Review the impugned Award as prayed for ? and
- ii) To what relief.

Point (i)

7. The right of review has been conferred by Section 114 C.P.C and Order 47 Rule 1 of C.P.C.

8. In order to review the impugned Award, it is necessary to consider the following aspects:-

- i) Discovery of new and important matter or evidence.
- ii) Mistake or error apparent on the face of the record.
- iii) Any other sufficient reasons.

9. This Authority after considering the material on record and after hearing both sides passed the impugned Award. Now the petitioner has not discovered any new or important matter or evidence to review the impugned Award. What all the relevant factors put forth by the appellant in the appeal were considered and the appeal was rejected. The relevant points urged now by the Review Petitioner were already urged by her in the Appeal and the impugned Award was passed. Thus the first ground to review the impugned Award is not established.

10. Further there is no mistake or error apparent on the face of the record so as to review the impugned Award. Thus the petitioner has failed to establish the second ground also.

11. The last ground for review is "any other sufficient ground". This means at least analogous to those specified in the Rule. Even this ground is also not existing in the present petition to review the impugned Award.

12. It is important to note that the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana is the quasi-judicial Authority. There is no express provision in the Act or in the relevant Regulation to review its own Award. Therefore the maintainability of Review its Award or Order itself is doubtful.

13. The Review Petitioner has relied upon the judgement of our own Hon'ble High Court in Sri Allam Kumar v. The State of Telangana represented by its Principal Secretary, Power and Energy Department and (5) others (W.P.No.16046 of 2024 dt.26.06.2024) wherein it was held that rejecting the application for release of new Service Connection on the ground that a dispute is pending is not correct. There is no dispute about the said proposition. The facts in the said case are that a house was existing with specific number in Ilapur Village and there was no dispute about the existence of such house. Further similar houses at Ilapur Village were given power connection. In those circumstances, the Hon'ble High Court directed the respondents therein to grant power connection to the house of the petitioner therein without showing any discrimination. But in the present case where the electricity meter was installed, the existence of the property is not established by the petitioner herein as per the Civil Court Judgement. Therefore, this judgement is not helpful to the petitioner.

14. The Review Petitioner has also relied upon the judgement of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in M/s. Kakatiya Seva Trust and another v. The State of Andhra Pradesh represented by its Principal Secretary, Energy Department and 7 others (W.P.No.13415 of 2025 dt.12.02.2026) wherein it was held that merely basing on the complaint of a third party without notice power supply already released cannot be disconnected. In the said case, it appears that a plot was admittedly existing for which electricity connection was obtained. That plot was not disputed one. It appears that there was a dispute between the Chairman of the petitioner-Trust therein and others. Whereas in the instant case the facts were quite distinct. As argued by the respondents in the present case, the appellant has applied for new Service Connection to her alleged plot No.859/A, NRR Puram Colony. Initially, new Service Connection was

released. Thereafter there was an objection by a third party and then only the Service Connection was disconnected and the meter was removed. It is significant to note that the appellant in her complaint before the learned Forum has enclosed as many as (13) documents. But she has not disclosed any iota about the judgement and decree in O.S.No.1752 of 2011 dt.21.04.2014. According to the respondents the said suit was filed by the appellant herein against two defendants. The said suit was dismissed by the competent Civil Court on 21.04.2014 by holding that plot No.859/A is not existing as claimed by the plaintiff as per the boundaries mentioned in the plaint. Thus the petitioner sought electricity connection to Plot No.859/A which is not existing within the specific boundaries mentioned in the plaint by the petitioner herein who is the plaintiff therein. It was also held that the defendants therein are also not entitled for the relief in respect of plot No.3/A, as claimed by them. The appellant never disclosed the judgement and decree of the competent Civil Court to the respondents when she applied for the new Service Connection. Thus the petitioner has suppressed the material facts before the respondents.

15. Sec.56 of the Act is not at all relevant in the present matter. It has no applicability in the present matter. Further regarding the removal of unknown electricity meters, when once the party approaches the respondents for their removal or shifting the respondents may act accordingly. When the appellant lost her claim in the Civil Suit and when there is no indication that the findings of the Civil Court were set aside in the appeal etc., the appellant is not supposed to contend about any other material existing at the spot.

16. The contention of the appellant is that this Authority has pointed out only the appellant and but not the respondents. The petitioner knew that she lost her case in the competent Civil Court. It appears that the findings of the Civil Court attained finality. That being the case, she was not supposed to apply for a new Service Connection on the very same property, as she has no right over the said property. The petitioner kept the respondents in the dark. As rightly argued by the respondents the petitioner is not entitled for any electricity connection for the property she has applied. Thus though there is no dispute about the judgement of the Hon'ble High Court referred to supra, it has no application in the present case. Initially the appellant approached the Forum and the learned Forum has rejected the claim of the appellant. Thereafter this Authority has considered the relevant material on record and not considered the irrelevant material for the proper adjudication of the appeal. At this stage it is necessary to refer Clause 3.43 of Regulation 3 of 2015 of Hon'ble Telangana Electricity Regulatory Commission which reads as under:-

“The Ombudsman shall be guided by the principles of natural justice and subject to the other provisions of the Regulation. The Ombudsman shall have the powers to regulate his own procedure and shall dispose of any Complaint fairly and equitably.”

The above said Clauses makes it crystal clear that this Authority can pass an Award following the principles of natural justice and thus Authority has power to regulate its own procedure in disposing the appeal etc.,. It is for this Authority as to which relevant points are to be discussed in the appeal and which irrelevant points are to be discarded. At the cost of repetition the relevant factors were considered by this Authority and the appeal was disposed of accordingly. More-over, as already stated, the appellant has not established the existence of the property with specific boundaries indicated in the suit as held by the competent Civil Court where the Service Connection was released and

the meter was installed. In view of these factors, I hold that there are no sufficient grounds to review the impugned Award as prayed for. This point is accordingly decided against the Review Petitioner and in favour of the respondents.

POINT No. (ii)

17. In view of the findings on point No. (i) the Review Petition is liable to be dismissed.

Result.

18. In the result, the Review Petition is dismissed.

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 this the 30th day of March 2026

Sd/-

Vidyut Ombudsman

1. Smt.Jetti Jayamma,w/o.Late.Jetti.Ramulu,# 10-2-10, Maturu Apartment, Flat No. 213, AC Guards, Beside SBI Branch, Hyderabad-500057,Ph:No. 9032584956.
2. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Mothi Nagar/TGSPDCL/Banjara Hills.
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer /Operation/Sanath Nagar /TGSPDCL/ Banjara Hills.
4. The Assistant Accounts Officer/ ERO/Sanath Nagar /TGSPDCL/ Banjara Hills.
5. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Greenlands/TGSPDCL/Banjara Hills.
6. The Superintending Engineer/Operation/Banjara Hills/TGSPDCL/Banjara Hills.