

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

First Floor 33/11 kV substation, Hyderabad Boats Club Lane Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

> :: Present:: Smt. UDAYA GOURI Thursday the Twenty Third Day of January 2020

Appeal No. 32 of 2019-20

Preferred against Order dt.27.08.2019 of CGRF in CG No.435/2018-19 of Warangal Urban Circle

Between

Sri. B. Janardhan, H.No.55-2-568, Bheemaram (V), Hasanparthy - (M), Warangal Urban - Dist. Cell: 9948888500.

... Appellant

<u>and</u>

- 1. The AE/OP/T/Chinthagattu 9440811357
- 2. The ADE/OP/R/Hanamkonda 9440811332
- 3. The AAO/ERO/R/Hanamkonda 9440811282
- 4. The DE/OP/R/Hanamkonda 9440811315.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 21.12.2019, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 22.01.2020 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. B. Janardhan - Appellant and Sri. D.Pradeep Kumar -AAE/OP/Chinthagattu and Sri. K. Hanumanth Rao - AAO/ERO/R/Hanamkonda for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;

<u>AWARD</u>

This is an Appeal against the orders of the CGRF in CG No. 435 of 2018-19, Warangal Urban Circle dt: 27.08.2019.

2. The Appellant namely Sri. B. Janardhan, who is allotted SC No. 12307-02814 stated that he filed a complaint before the CGRF alleging abnormal bills issued to his service number and sought for rectifying the said bills and that the said CGRF appreciated his contentions and directed the Respondents to withdraw the

audit shortfall raised against his service connection after taking approval from the concerned authorities within 10 days as otherwise to face penalties indicated in the clause 2.54, 2.55 and 2.56 of the Regulation No. 3 of 2015 of TSERC, but the Respondents failed to comply with the said orders. Hence filed the present Appeal against the Respondents.

3. A perusal of the Appeal shows that the Appellant contended that he is a resident of Bheemaram (V), Hasanparthy (M), Warangal Dist. and that he has been allotted a service connection bearing No. 12307-02814 and that in view of abnormal bills issued against his service connection he has lodged a complaint to the CGRF against the audit shortfall amount levied against his service connection and the learned CGRF vide its orders in CG No. 435/2018-19 issued orders in his favour by directing the Respondents to withdraw the audit shortfall amounts raised by them, but the AE/Chinthagattu, ADE/Hanamkonda, AAO/Hanamkonda and DE/Hanamkonda did not obey the orders of the Hon'ble CGRF and threatened to disconnect the electricity supply to his service connection. Hence prayed for compensation from the Respondents.

4. The Respondent No.3, i.e. AAO/ERO/R/Hanamkonda submitted the reply on behalf of the Respondents as follows:-

- a. An amount of Rs 29673.64 was raised in CC bills to SC.No 12307-02814, Cat-I of Sri Bairagoni Janradhan at H.No 55-2-568, Bheemram of Chinthagattu Town section of Hasanparthy Mandal, Warangal District.
- b. An amount of Rs 29673.64 Ps was raised as per Audit Shortfall vide Para No. V of internal Audit during 05/2015.
- c. As per the representation of the consumer, the AAE/OP/Chinthagattu town have given a proposal for withdrawal and an amount of Rs.15820/- was withdrawn in 2/2018.
- d. The party has not agreed above and approached the consumer Grievance Redressal forum, Warangal in 3/2019.
- e. Based on the consumer representation to the CGRF, Warangal to withdraw the balance amount i.e Rs.13853/- proposal was submitted to higher authorities for approval.

- f. The proposals are approved vide reference 4th cited above and an amount of Rs 13853/- was withdrawn in 12/2019.
- g. Total Audit submit amount of Rs 29673.64 was withdrawn in two phases. i.e in 02/2018: Rs.15820/- in 12/2019:Rs.13853/- total Rs 29673.64.
- h. As on 01/01/2020 after withdrawn of above amount i.e an amount of Rs 29673.64. party has to pay and amount of Rs 12446/- (excluding already paid amount) i.e monthly CC charges accumulated from 02/2017 to 12/2019.
- i. The party has not paying the CC changes regularly from 02/2017 onwards.

5. Rejoinder of the Appellant

The Appellant submitted his rejoinder as follows:-

That the Appellant has purchased the house bearing No. 2-249/1 on 29.10.2015, at that time there were no dues pending on the service connection 12307-02814. He had applied for the change of name on dt.04.03.2016, an amount of Rs 29,673.64 Ps was shown as due in the bill for the month of Feb'2017, on enquiry about how such a bill was levied, it was told that Dec'2014 bill was levied in the month of Feb'2017, as on that date he has not purchased the house and the same was submitted to the AE, but there was no response. Subsequently he has met various officers, ADE/Warangal Rural, AAO/Warangal Rural and DE, but there was no reply on the withdrawal of the amount Rs 29,673.64 Ps and moreover several times they have disconnected power supply resulting in a lot of trouble to him and his family. Subsequently he has preferred an Appeal for withdrawal of the said amount in the CGRF. Even though the CGRF directed to withdraw the Respondents had not withdrawn the amount, thereby he has preferred this Appeal before the Vidyut Ombudsman. During the course of hearing, the Respondents submitted that on 06.01.2020 total disputed amount of Rs 29,273.64 ps was withdrawn. During this period i.e. from Feb'2017 to Jan'2020 i.e. 35 months, he has suffered mental agony and hence I request for compensation to be levied upon the officials responsible for the above. Apart from the above Appeal the Appellant pleaded that an amount of Rs 1500/- was excess levied in view of the struckup of the meter in the month of Dec'2019, the Respondents are forcing him to pay the said amount. Hence claimed to withdraw the same.

Heard both sides.

6. In the face of the said averments by both sides, the following issues are framed:-

lssues

- Whether the Respondents failed to comply with the orders of the CGRF in CG No.
 435/2018-19 and if so, whether the Appellant is entitled for compensation?
- 2. To what relief?

Issue No.1

7. A perusal of the evidence on record and the contentions of both sides show that the Appellant Sri.B. Janardhan, who is a resident of Bheemaram (V), Hasanparthy (M) in Warangal Dist. is allotted the service connection No. 12307- 02814 and that in the month of Feb'2017 the Respondents have issued a bill for an amount of Rs 29,673.64 Ps, as such he filed a complaint before the CGRF for the withdrawal of the said bill amount claiming the same to be audit shortfall. And as such the CGRF directed the Respondents to withdraw the said amount of Rs 29,673.64 Ps levied by the Respondents in view of the audit shortfall, but directed the Respondents to take prior approval from the concerned authorities. As per the contentions of the Appellant, the said directions for withdrawal of the said amount of Rs 29,673.64 Ps by the Respondents is not complied.

8. A perusal of the record shows that during the internal audit by the Respondents it was found that an amount of Rs 29,673.64 Ps was short billed and hence raised vide audit Para-v of 05/2015 and as such the same was levied in the bill for the month of Feb'2017 and as such the Appellant opposed the said audit shortfall raised and approached the Respondents for withdrawal of the same. During the course of hearing before the CGRF it was found that the spot billing was wrongly issued without taking actual readings and as such the Respondents were directed to withdraw the audit shortfall amount with prior approval from the competent authority. Hence the Respondents have withdrawn initially an amount of Rs 15,820/-vide JE No. 55 of 2/2018 instead of total amount of Rs 29,673.64 Ps. As such the Appellant filed an Appeal for withdrawal of the total disputed amount.

9. In the face of the said appeal from the Appellant the Respondent No.3, AAO/ERO/Rural/Hanamkonda vide Lr.No.276 dt.06.01.2020 has submitted that the

audit shortfall amount of Rs 29,673.64 Ps was withdrawn in two phases as per the directions of the CGRF and after approval from the competent authority. He claimed that the balance amount of Rs 13,853/- was withdrawn in the month of Dec'2019. The said contentions of the Respondents that they have withdrawn the audit shortfall amount of Rs 29,673.64 Ps in two phases i.e. Rs 15,820/- in the month of Feb'2018 and Rs 13,853/- in the month of Dec'2019 is not denied by the Appellant, which goes to show that the entire shortfall amount has been withdrawn by the Respondents as per the directions of the CGRF and the same goes to show that the pleadings of the Appellant are complied with and hence the Appeal can be closed.

10. The contentions of the Respondents that the Appellant is not paying the CC charges regularly from Feb'2017 onwards and as such an amount of Rs 12,446/-which accrued between Feb'2017 to Dec'2019 and the contentions of the Appellant that an amount of Rs 1500/- was levied in excess in the month of Dec'2019 in view of the meter getting struck cannot be considered in the present appeal as the same is not the subject matter. However the Respondents are at liberty to act against the Appellant as per their rules if normal current consumption charges is not paid as the Appellant being a consumer has to abide by the existing rules without any exception. Hence the Appeal is accordingly disposed.

Issue No.2

11. In the result the Appeal is accordingly disposed.

TYPED BY Office Executive cum Computer Operator, Corrected, Signed and Pronounced by me on this, the 23rd day of January'2020.

Sd/-

Vidyut Ombudsman

- 1. Sri. B. Janardhan, H.No.55-2-568, Bheemaram (V), Hasanparthy (M), Warangal Urban - Dist. Cell: 9948888500.
- 2. The AE/OP/T/Chinthagattu 9440811357
- 3. The ADE/OP/R/Hanamkonda 9440811332

- 4. The AAO/ERO/R/Hanamkonda 9440811282
- 5. The DE/OP/R/Hanamkonda 9440811315.

Copy to :

- 6. The Chairperson, CGRF I, TSNPDCL, Nakkalagutta, Hanamkonda, Warangal
- 7. The Secretary, TSERC, 5th Floor Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapul, Hyd.