



VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
First Floor 33/11 kV substation, Hyderabad Boats Club Lane
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

:: Present:: R. DAMODAR

Wednesday, the Thirteenth Day of September 2017

Appeal No.13 of 2017

Preferred against Order Dt.02.01.2017 of CGRF In

C.G.No. 357/2016-17 of Medak Circle

Between

M/s. Electro Cables, represented by Sri. Shiva Shankar Rao, Shed No.3,
Plot No. 73A, Survey No. 84, Anrich Industrial Estate, Bollaram (V), Jinnaram (M),
Medak Dist. - 502 325. Cell No. : 9963005859 and 9848653390.

... Appellant

AND

1. The AE/OP/Bollaram/TSSPDCL/Medak Dist.
2. The ADE/OP/Bollaram/TSSPDCL/Medak Dist.
3. The AAO/ERO/Patancheru/TSSPDCL/Medak Dist.
4. The DE/OP/Sangareddy/TSSPDCL/Medak Dist.
5. The SE/OP/Medak Circle/TSSPDCL/Medak.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 22.03.2017, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 09.08.2017 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. K.S.Varma on behalf of the Appellant and Sri. G. Praveen Kumar - AAE/OP/Bollaram, Sri. Satyanarayana Raju - ADE/OP/Bollaram, Sri. K. Dasharath - AAO/ERO/Patancheru for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both the parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;

AWARD

The DE/DPE has inspected the premises of the Appellant/Consumer on 1.9.2016 at 11.25 AM and found that SC No. 020109402 and SC No. 020109401 LT-III Connections with Contracted Load of 190 HP are being used. In view of discovery of the two Service Connections in one premises for one unit, he issued a Preliminary Assessment notice for Rs 3,74,562/-. The Appellant submitted a representation dt. 13.9.2016 stating that the two Service Connections are separate and they relate to two different firms namely M/s. Electro Cables and M/s. Vidyut Wires, which have

taken the premises on lease from the owner of the property Sri. K.S. Varma through two registered lease deeds. He claimed that the two entities have two different processes, one for Drawing cable and another for Stranding operations. That they have two separate registrations for SSI, Excise, Sales Tax etc. The Appellant claimed that he has not received any notice from MRT on meter function and there is no scope for short billing and submitted a representation and also informed the 4th Respondent on 27.10.2016 on which date, the 4th Respondent along with R1 and R2 inspected the premises and issued FAO dt.5.11.2016 for Rs 3,74,562/- while observing that the two services belong to one single person and the activities of the two separate firms are in fact of one firm and therefore, he (R4) clubbed both the services.

2. The Appellant claimed that there was no defect in the meter, that both the services belong to different persons, premises, activities and clubbing of both the services is unjustified. He further claimed that M/s. Electro Cables is making Aluminium Drawing and whereas, M/s. Vidyuth Wires is Stranding of Aluminium wires, which are two different final products made with different processes, which is acknowledged by the other authorities. He further claimed that each of these entities is located in different sheds, shed No.3 and shed No.4.

3. The 4th Respondent DE/O/Sangareddy through letter dt.23.12.2016 claimed that he has inspected the premises of the Appellant on 27.10.2016 and found two services existing in the premises i.e Plot No. 73 A in survey No. 84 with the following details:

a) M/s. Electro Cables in Shed No.3 with SC No. 0201 09402 with contracted load of 95 HP is manufacturing Aluminium cables without insulation. This firm is a partnership with managing partner Smt. K. Vijayalakshmi, who had taken the premises on lease from Sri. K. S Varma.

b) M/s. Vidyuth Wires is in shed No. 4 with SC No. 0201 09401 with contracted load of 95 HP manufacturing Aluminium stranded wires without insulation. He found it as a partnership with Smt. K. Vijayalakshmi as Managing partner, who had taken the premises on lease from Sri. K. S Varma.

c) Found another service relating to M/s. Teja Ammonia with Sc No. 0201 09000 with contracted load of 15 HP, engaged in manufacture of ammonia gas and liquid ammonia (not subject matter of the present dispute).

4. The 4th Respondent/DE/O/Sangareddy asserted that from the information he gathered, M/s. Electro Cables is drawing Aluminium cable(without insulation) and M/s. Vidyut Wires is stranding Aluminium cable (without insulation), which is the final product from M/s. Electro Cables and for both the services, the Managing Partner is Smt. K. Vijaya Lakshmi, wife of Sri. K.S. Varma and both the premises were leased to her by Sri. K.S.Varma S/o. KVK Raju. He claimed that in view of these facts, he passed FAO as per Clause 3.5.3 of GTCS.

5. Before the CGRF, the Appellant Sri. K.S. Varma (who came into the picture) pleaded that M/s. Electro Cables has been drawing Aluminum with NEI wires and selling to different parties and whereas, M/s. Vidyuth Wires has different activity of stranding, located in different shed with different activities. He claimed that the Service Connections were given separately to two units, which have separate permissions, SSI, Excise, Sales Tax etc. He further claimed that M/s. Electro cables is a micro unit and M/s. Vidyuth Wires is a Small scale unit and that at the time of securing the service connections, these facts were notified to the DISCOM.

6. The 4th Respondent/DE/O/Sanga Reddy represented before the CGRF that M/s. Electro Cables and M/s. Vidyut Wires belong to the same family group and the product from M/s. Electro Cables is going to M/s. Vidyuth Wires for stranding, and the product is being sold to power utilities and these two sheds are connected through a ramp to transfer goods from Electro Cables to Vidyuth wires, which clearly establish that the two units have been set up to split the consumption.

7. On consideration of the material on record and rival contentions, the majority of the members headed by the Chairman (with consumer affairs member dissenting) accepted the contention of the Respondents that both the services are located in the same premises, secured from the same lessee, the inspection of the service connections revealed that the two service connections are existing in the same premises, but in different sheds under the same managing partner, the product manufactured by one unit is raw material for the another unit manufacturing the finished product, the two sheds are connected through a ramp to transfer goods from M/s. Electro Cables to M/s. Vidyuth Wires and that both the services were clubbed under Clause 3.5.3 of GTCS and a single bill was issued since the consumers of the same group or family or firm or company who are availing supply under different service

connections situated in a single premises by splitting the units, the DISCOM may treat such multiple service connections existing in the single premises as a single service connection and charge the total consumption of all the service connections at the appropriate tariff applicable for a single service connection and upheld the short billing proceedings leading to Final Assessment Order through the impugned orders, directing the Respondents to continue the billing from 1.9.2015 to 1.9.2016 and to bill the two services independently under LT Category III till the two services are clubbed, after following the required formalities.

8. Aggrieved and not satisfied with the impugned orders, the Appellant preferred the present Appeal, reiterating that the unit has been set up on the land taken on lease from Mr. K.S.Varma under a registered deed dt.11.12.2013 and M/s. Electro Cables is a micro firm which started commercial production from 26.3.2014 after taking approvals from various departments and that the partners of two firms M/s. Electro Cables and Ms. Vidyuth Wires are the same, but they have two different processes, one firm involved in drawing and another involved in stranding operations and that they have two separate micro (SSI) status certificates from the DISTRICT INDUSTRIES CENTRE (DIC) Sangareddy with separate Excise and Sales Tax registrations and that no notice was received by them about the MRT report saying that the meter was not functioning and that there was reduced operations from 15.8.2016 to 31.8.2016 in SC No. 020 109402 and therefore, there is no question of short billing in this case and that the preliminary as well as the final assessments are not correct, clubbing of two services belonging to two firms is not legal even when the case is pending, the Respondents have indulged in disconnection of the services, no MRT report was given to the Appellant, the consumer have no role in the non functioning of the meter, which should be inspected and rectified by the MRT, and even though the partners of the two firms are the same, the activity of the two firms is separate and therefore, clubbing of the two services is unjustified. At the time of setting up of the units, he claimed that two separate applications for LT connections were submitted and approval was granted and no objection was taken at that time and that separate estimates were prepared at that time and no objections were raised when the power was released, certificates were given and the bills were generated for a period of two years, without any objection. He contended that no separate notices were issued for the two service connections and no fair opportunity was given to the Appellant by following the guidelines under GTCS. The Appellant has been prompt in paying the bills and had the Respondents taken objection at the time of release of the service connections, the

Appellant would have taken alternative steps and would have saved a lot of money and pleaded for setting aside the impugned orders, for a direction not to disconnect the power supply and direct the Respondents to continue the two separate LT connections.

9. Pending Appeal, the 4th Respondent/DE/O/Sangareddy filed a written submission on 25.5.2017 reiterating that both the service connections belong to the same partners of the firm and M/s. Electro Cables is being used for drawing Aluminium cables (without insulation) and M/s. Vidyuth Wires is involved in stranding of Aluminum cables (without insulation) which is the final product and the inspection team, after visiting the premises, came to a conclusion that the production process between M/s. Electro cables and M/s. Vidyuth Wires is interlinked and both the units are continuous process industries, which belong to the same family/group and the two sheds located in the premises are connected through a ramp to transfer goods from M/s. Electro Cables to M/s. Vidyuth Wires, which clearly establish that the two units are setup to split the consumption and hence both the services are clubbed as per Clause 3.5.3 of GTCS which says :

“ Notwithstanding the above provisions, the company reserves the right, where it is reasonably established, that the consumers of the same group or family or firm or company who are availing supply under different service connections situated within a single premises by splitting the units, the company may treat such multiple connections existing in the single premises as a single service connection and charge the total consumption of all the consumers at the appropriate tariffs applicable for a single connection. Any officer authorised by the company shall issue notices to the concerned consumers asking them to furnish a single application for all such services and to pay requires charges for merging the services into a single service.”

10. The Appellant too submitted a representation dt.20.6.2017 asserting that the two different service connections are located within a single premises, but for two different units, with clearly identified boundaries and both are different legal entities with separate licenses and that the registration of the lease is always in respect of a particular premises and not in respect of a particular person and that is why, the premises was taken on lease in which two separate units were set up for two different purposes with two separate service connections. He claimed that the registration with the District Industries Center,

Certificates and permissions from the Inspector of Factories, Electrical Inspectorate, Sales Tax Department, Fire Services Department and Pollution Control Board etc. would establish that the two units are separate and distinct.

11. In view of the nature of the dispute, facts, mediation has not been successful and therefore, the matter is being disposed of on merits.

12. Based on the rival contentions and facts, the following issues arise for determination:

a. Whether M/s. Electro Cables located in shed No.3 with SC No. 020109402 manufacturing aluminum cables (without insulation) and M/s. Vidyuth Wires located in shed No.4 with SC No. 020109401 stranding the wires, in Plot No. 73/A are two separate units entitled to two separate service connections or both units are one unit, liable to have one service connection, after clubbing both the service connections?

b. Whether the Appellant is liable to pay the short billing amount and from what date?

c. Whether the impugned orders are liable to be set aside?

Issues a to c

Arguments heard

13. The Appellant M/s. Electro Cables represented by Sri. Siva Shankar Rao pleaded for withdrawal of the short billing case booked by DE/DPE/Medak on 01.09.2016, on the ground of having two LT connections SC No. 0201 09402 and SC No. 0201 09401 in the same premises being used for the same activity, having Contracted Load of 190 HP which would in such a case become a HT Connection and who issued short billing notice for recovery of the revenue loss towards TOD charges and demand charges. The loss assessment was made for an amount of Rs 3,74,562/- and a Preliminary Assessment Notice has been issued to the Appellant.

14. The CGRF through the impugned orders directed the Respondents to bill the two services independently, until the procedure to be followed by giving a notice to the Appellant and offering a fair opportunity for hearing in person as per the GTCS guidelines. However the CGRF has confined the short billing from 1.9.2015 to

1.10.2016 for an amount of Rs 3,74,562/- was directed to be paid by the Appellant.

15. The Appellant has opposed the short billing and clubbing of the two Service Connections on the following grounds:

- a. The SC No. 0201 09402 and SC No. 0201 09401 are two separate LT Connections taken for two different firms Viz. M/s Electro Cables and M/s Vidyut Wires.
- b. Both these units have obtained the premises sheds 3 & 4 on lease from Mr. K.S.Varma, the owner of the property under two registered lease deeds. The partners of the two firms are however the same Mrs. K. Vijaya Lakshmi and Mrs. K. Divya.
- c. The two firms have two different processes i.e. drawing and stranding operations.
- d. They have two separate micro (SSI) status certificates from the DISTRICT INDUSTRIES CENTRE, Sangareddy with separate Excise and Sales Tax Registrations.

16. The Appellant further claimed that the activity of M/s. Electro Cables is regarding aluminium drawing and manufacture of aluminium cables (NEI) which is an independent marketable product (Copies of invoices are also produced to show that the product is also sold to outside parties) and whereas, the activity of M/s. Vidyut Wires is stranding of aluminium wires and manufacture of aluminium stranded wires (NEI), which again is a different and independent marketable product and both the firms have different final products. He asserted that the two units are undertaking separate processes and activities which is also acknowledged and assessed by the Excise Officials, the Sales Tax Officials through separate registrations and orders/assessments. He claimed that this separate nature of activity was also acknowledged by DIC by giving two different registrations. He claimed that it is not logical or illegal to say that the both units have the same/related activities as the products of one unit is usable in other unit, which is billed and all statutory taxes are paid for each product. According to him the DISCOM is not competent to decide about the activities being the same or related to each other when DIC, Excise and Sales Tax departments have identified them as separate activities.

17. The Appellant further raised the following grounds:
- a. When applications were made for two separate LT connections during the opening of the unit, approvals were given separately and no objections were raised at that time.
 - b. Estimates were prepared for two separate LT connections for about Rs 5 Lakhs each.
 - c. CIEG has given approval for two LT Connections after their thorough inspections and no objections were raised.
 - d. MRT has installed meters and request for power release made for two separate LT connections. No objections were also raised and even when the Power was released and certificates were given, No objections were raised.
 - e. Power bill was generated each month by taking readings regularly since the last 2 years and no objections were raised.
 - f. The CGRF has issued orders on 17.03.2017 with back date of 02.01.2017.
 - g. CGRF confined the short billing amount for a period from 01.09.2015 to 01.10.2016 only and only the case amount of Rs 3,74,561/ is asked to be collected. No separate notice was given for clubbing the connections and short billing. CGRF directed billing separately till the clubbing procedure is followed. The direction for the procedure to be followed for clubbing of connections and ordering to pay the amount is a contradiction.

18. The appellant in support of his claim that there are two separate units has relied on the following copies of documents pertaining to M/s. Electro cables and they are:-

- a) Acknowledgement: Part II of district industries center sangareddy.
- b) Form No 4: Licensee to work a factory issued by the Inspector of factories.
- c) Central excises registration certificate from commercial taxes department.
- d) C.E.I.G certificate
- e) NOC from the District Fire Officer
- f) Acknowledgement from the Pollution Control Board
- g) Deed of Lease
- h) Partnership Deed
- i) Delivery Challans issued to various industries

19. The Respondents claimed that there are 3 services existing in Plot No.73/A, in Sy.No. 84 of Anrich Bollaram. One is a) “M/s. Electro Cables in shed No.3 with SC No. 0201 09402 with a contracted load of 95 HP manufacturing Aluminium cables without insulation which is a partnership firm with managing partner Smt. K. Vijayalakshmi W/o. K.S.Varma leased out by Sri.K.S. Varma S/o. Sri. V.K.Raju, b) M/s. Vidyuth Wires in shed No. 4 with SC No. 0201 09401 with a contracted load of 95 HP manufacturing Aluminium stranded wires without insulation, which is a partnership firm with managing partner Smt. K. Vijayalakshmi W/o. K.S.Varma leased out by Sri.K.S. Varma S/o. Sri. V.K.Raju and c) M/s. Teja Ammonia with SC No. 0201 09000 with a contracted load of 15 HP engaged in manufacturing of Ammonia Gas and Liquid Ammonia. It is their stand that during the inspection of the premises, on finding three services existing in the premises and came to a conclusion that the production process between M/s. Electro Cables and M/s. Vidyuth Wires is interlinked and both the units are continuous process industries. The inspection team thus came to a conclusion that the two units namely M/s. Electro Cables and M/s. Vidyut Wires belong to the same family/group/(ii) The product from M/s. Electro Cables is going to M/s. Vidyuth Wires for stranding, and after the process, the product is being sold to the power utilities. (iii) Two sheds are connected through a ramp to transfer goods from M/s. Electro Cables to M/s. Vidyut Wires, which clearly establish that the two units are setup to split the consumption.

20. In view of the stated position of the Respondents both the services were clubbed in accordance with the Clause 3.5.3 of the General Terms and Conditions of supply, which reads as follows:-

“Notwithstanding the above provisions, the company reserves the right, where it is reasonably established, that the consumers of the same group or family or firm or company who are availing supply under different service connections situated within a single premises by splitting the units, the company may treat such multiple connections of all the single premises as a single service connection and charge the total consumption of all the consumers at the appropriate tariffs applicable for a single service connection. Any officer authorised by the Company shall issue notices to the concerned consumers asking them to furnish a single application for all such services and to pay required charges for merging the services into a single service”.

Hence, the clubbing of the two services (i.e. M/s. Electro Cables and M/s. Vidyut Wires) according to the Respondents is found justified.

21. The main dispute is whether the two units fall under separate establishment or not. The meaning of separate establishment is clearly defined in Clause 3.5.1 of GTCS :

“For the purpose of the GTCS, Separate establishments shall include the following types of establishments:

- i. Having distinct set-up and staff;
- ii. Owned or leased by different persons;
- iii. Covered by different licenses or registrations under any law where such procedures are applicable; and
- iv. For domestic Category, the households having a separate kitchen.”

22. The total plot area of the premises is 12,155 Sq Yards which includes 4306.50 Sq.Yrds pertaining to M/s. Electro Cables, 3249 Sq yrds pertaining to M/s. Vidyuth Wires (based on copy of the lease deed). The Appellant’s contention is that M/s. Electro Cables manufactures aluminium cables (NEI) which is an independent marketable product (Copies of invoices are also produced to show that the product is also sold to outside parties) and whereas, M/s. Vidyut Wires manufactures aluminium stranded wires (NEI), which again is a different and independent marketable product. In order to understand the process undertaken in these two units, the activities can be understood by reading the following terms:

- a. **Drawing:** Wire drawing is a metalworking process used to reduce the cross- section of a wire by pulling the wire through a single, or series of, drawing die(s).
- b. **Stranding:** is the process where a particular number of stranding elements are joined together while winding them round a common axis. In the production of most bare cable, stranding is the final operation.

23. Apart from the Aluminium Drawing M/s. Electro Cables is also engaged in the production of Aluminium Cables - NEI (Not Electrically Insulated). Though the Appellant stated that it is an independent marketable product, the Aluminium cable - NEI is not a final product with respect to the utilisation at the ground level. The Appellant has produced all the documents as stated in para 18, pertaining to M/s. Electro Cables only and whereas, he has not filed any documents regarding M/s. Vidyut Wires. The product of M/s. Vidyuth Wires has been stated as

“stranding”. The Respondents, in support of their claim that the units are not independent, have produced photographs depicting a connecting RAMP between the two units to transfer the goods from M/s. Electro Cables to M/s. Vidyut Wires. This shows that the output of M/s. Electro Cables is being transferred to M/s. Vidyut Wires for final product. Hence it can be considered to be in continuous process between two sheds and not between two distinct units.

24. The requirement to claim separate establishments is guided by Clause 3.5.1 of the GTCS, which is not fulfilled by the Appellant, where the Staff set up is not shown as distinct and the land is not shown leased by different persons. Apart from this, the Appellant has not produced the licenses or registrations of M/s. Vidyut Wires. Thus, the claim of the Appellant to consider the units as independent and separate units, consequently to bill separately, is found not tenable and acceptable.

25. When the Appellant has failed to support his claim that the units are distinct and separate, the stand of the Respondents that both the units are one establishment and not separate, remains fortified and it is upheld. In such a case, the Respondents are justified in billing the two units as one and resorting to short billing from the date of inspection 1.9.2016, because with wide open eyes, the Service Connections were released by the officials of the DISCOM knowing very well that only one unit has been functioning in the premises. Further, in the Provisional and Final Assessment notices, the basis for assessment for one year back billing was stated to be Clause 7.5.1 of GTCS, which in fact relates to Assessment through back billing in cases where the meters are defective, which is not the case in the present matter. The officials who issued these orders appear to have been misled or they were ignorant of this aspect.

26. The two said service connections are being billed under LT-III Category. The applicable tariff rates as per Tariff Order 2016-17, 2017-18 are as follows:

Fixed Rate- Rs.60/KW. Energy Charge- Rs.6.70/KVAH.

It is clear that the billing under LT-III is based mainly on Energy consumption in KVAH Units. Consequent to clubbing of these two services, the total contracted load would come to 190 HP (95+95 HP). The tariffs applicable for the supply of electricity to consumers having loads with a contracted load exceeding 56KW/75HP is HT Tariff.

The relevant billing category as per the Tariff Order 2016-17 and 2017-18 fall under HT-I: INDUSTRY Tariffs.

The Applicable tariff rates to the present matter are:

The normal energy charges applicable (for this category other than Poultry farms) between 10:00 am and 06:00 pm as follows.

Clause 8.7 of Part B. HT Tariff of Tariff Order 2017-18

Category	Demand Charge*		Demand Charge* (INR/month)
	Unit	Rate	
HT I(A): Industry General			
11 kV	KVA	390	6.65
33 kV	KVA	390	6.15
132 kV and above	kVA	390	5.65
* Demand charge is calculated at INR/ kVA/ month of the Billing Demand			

Clause 8.88 of Part B. HT Tariff of Tariff Order 2017-18

The energy charges applicable (for this category other than Poultry farms) during the peak hours and nighttime hours are shown below.

Category	Demand Charge* (INR/month)		Demand Charge* (INR/month)
	Unit	Rate	
HT I: Time of Day Tariffs (6 AM to 10 AM)			
11 kV			7.65
33 kV			7.15
132 kV and above			6.65
HT I: Time of Day Tariffs (6 PM to 10 PM)			

11 kV			7.65
33 kV			7.15
132 kV and above			6.65
HT I: Time of Day Tariffs (10 PM to 6 AM)			
11 Kv			5.65
33 Kv			5.15
132 kV and above			4.65

27. In view of the pattern of Tariff shown above, two part tariff will come into play i.e. Demand billing in KVA and Energy billing in KVAH. Since the individual RMD's attained during every month of both the services through different existing meters may not be of the same duration of time (30 mins time block), adding of individual RMD does not hold good .

28. Therefore, the billing of the two services shall be done by clubbing the recorded units based on the MRI dumps from the date of the inspection i.e, 01-09-2016, in the following manner:

- a. Energy charges shall be billed by adding the recorded units of both the meters for the same duration of the month, based on the MRI dumps. The applicable rates as prescribed in the relevant Tariff Orders shall be applied.
- b. Demand charges shall be billed by arriving at the Maximum Recorded Demand. This shall be arrived at based on the MRI dumps i.e, the 30 minutes time blocks of the same month of both the services shall be reckoned and the recorded power/energy of the respective time blocks shall be added. The Maximum Recorded Demand so arrived at shall be reckoned as RMD for that month. The applicable rates as prescribed in the relevant Tariff Orders shall be applied.

29. Thus, the AAO/ERO/Patancheru and the concerned SAO shall revise the bills for the periods given below, (in coordination with the M&P wing, for obtaining required data) in accordance with the **procedure stated above** and at the relevant tariff rates.

- a. All the bills raised earlier, consequent to clubbing of the two services under SC. No. 0201 09402 during the months of Dec-16, Jan and Feb-17 for an amounts Rs.1,02,983/- ,Rs.51,404/- & Rs.63,424/- respectively, shall be revised accordingly.
- b. All the bills shall be revised from the month of March-2017 raising the amounts by clubbing of the two services.
- c. Further, AAO/SAO is directed to issue the bills against the services by clubbing the consumption of both the meters until the single HT service setup is established.

A time bound notice shall be served on the Appellant for making the arrangements to convert the existing individual metering set up into single HT metering service.

The Appellant is directed to make the said arrangements, under the supervision of the concerned officials.

The concerned SE/Operation shall issue necessary directions to the concerned officials, which are found necessary to prepare such billing.

30. The impugned orders are partly confirmed to the extent indicated above. The issues are answered accordingly.

31. In the result, the Appeal is disposed of directing as follows:

- a. The Respondents are directed to revise the bills and take steps as indicated in para 29 supra w.e.f. 1.9.2016.
- b. The back billing demand for Rs 3,74,562/- for the period from 1.9.2015 to 1.9.2016 is set aside.
- c. The impugned orders are partly confirmed.

32. The licensee shall comply with and implement this order within 15 days for the date of receipt of this order under clause 3.38 of the Regulation 3 of 2015 of TSERC.

TYPED BY Clerk Computer Operator, Corrected, Signed and Pronounced by me on this the 13th day of September, 2017.

Sd/-

Vidyut Ombudsman

1. M/s. Electro Cables, represented by Sri. Shiva Shankar Rao, Shed No.3, Plot No. 73A, Survey No. 84, Anrich Industrial Estate, Bollaram (V), Jinnaram (M), Medak Dist. - 502 325. Cell No. : 9963005859 and 9848653390.
2. The AE/OP/Bollaram/TSSPDCL/Medak Dist.
3. The ADE/OP/Bollaram/TSSPDCL/Medak Dist.
4. The AAO/ERO/Patancheru/TSSPDCL/Medak Dist.
5. The DE/OP/Sangareddy/TSSPDCL/Medak Dist.
6. The SE/OP/Medak Circle/TSSPDCL/Medak.

Copy to :

7. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Rural, TSSPDCL, Vengal Rao Nagar, Erragadda, Hyderabad - 500 045.
8. The Secretary, TSERC, 5th Floor Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapool,Hyd.