



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 Fourteenth Day of December 2016

Appeal No. 53 of 2016

Preferred against Order Dt. 17-12-2015 of CGRF In

CG.No: 421/2015 of Hyderabad South Circle

Between

Sri. Saibaba, H.No. 18-6-623/1, Lal Darwaza, Hyderabad.
Cell No. 8019014924.

... Appellant

AND

1. The AE/OP/Chatrinaka/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
2. The ADE/OP/Falaknuma/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The AAO/ERO/Charminar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The DE/OP/Charminar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
5. The SE/OP/Hyd.South Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 16.09.2016 coming up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 14.12.2016 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. T. Saibaba - Appellant and Sri. K. Shiva Kumar - ADE/OP/Falaknuma, Sri. G. Nageswara Rao - JAO/ERO-III/Charminar for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both the parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;

AWARD

The Appellant has SC No. X2909584 Category III released in the year 1999. The Category of the service was changed to Category I in July,2014 and further changed to Category II in March,2015. The Appellant sought change of Category from LT III to LT I through applications dt.29.4.2014, 21.6.2014 and 15.6.2015. When the Category change was kept pending, the Appellant lodged a complaint seeking rectification of bills and change of category.

2. The 3rd Respondent/AAO/ERO/Charminar addressed a letter to the AAE/O/Chatrinaka on 15.6.2015 for category change proposal. The 3rd Respondent stated that there was a case of unauthorised use of electricity booked against the Appellant service and that he was asked to pay Rs 1,100/- and when this amount was not paid, the category change was not affected. Before the CGRF, the Appellant did not personally appear and whereas, the 3rd Respondent repeated what he stated in his letter dt.15.06.2015.

3. After consideration of material on record, the CGRF directed the Respondents to effect the category change from II to I w.e.f 19.5.2015 (date of application), revise the bills accordingly and issue bills to the Appellant for payment, through the impugned orders.

4. Aggrieved and not satisfied with the impugned orders, the Appellant preferred the present Appeal alleging that in his house there was a leaf plate industry with 3 phase electricity and that the unit was closed about 6 months prior to 19.4.2014 and that even thereafter, without any consumption, he has been getting excess bills and requested change of category.

5. The 3rd Respondent filed written submission dt.10.10.2016 stating that as directed by the CGRF, the bill was revised from 19.5.2015 duly changing the category from II to I i.e. from Commercial to Domestic and that an amount of Rs 4,829/- has been credited to the service vide JE No. 5587 of December,2015.

6. The 2nd Respondent/ADE/Falaknuma submitted detailed submission dt.17.10.2016 explaining the allegation of excess bill to state that the Appellant has consumed less than 30 units from Dec,2013 to Sep,2014 and that the bills were being issued in the range of Rs 500 to Rs 1000/- in the name of Fuel Surcharge additional consumption amount for the period from 31.7.2011 to 30.4.2012 and during the period from October,2014 to Feb,2015 the bills were issued in Category I as the consumption was domestic. The 2nd Respondent further stated that since the Appellant was using the power for a ration shop, the existing domestic service X2909584 was converted to Commercial Category from March,2015 to April,2015 and during this period, the Appellant was charged higher rate tariff mainly due to commercial category and fixed charges amount of Rs 250/- per month, which is not charged in the domestic category.

7. When the Appellant made an oral representation for dismantlement of the service on 20.10.2016 in this Appeal, the 2nd Respondent ordered dismantlement

through letter dt.26.10.2016 by adjusting the available security deposit. The AAO/ERO/III/Salarjung addressed a letter dt.13.12.2016 to the AAO (Exp and Rev) a copy of which is filed, stating that the Appellant submitted a representation and accordingly, Security Deposit was adjusted against the service X2909584 and after proper verification, the service was dismantled and out of the security deposit of Rs 6880/- against the service, the pending CC bill of Rs 2350/- was adjusted and the balance amount of Rs 4,530/- was agreed to be adjusted to another Service Connection No. X2011277 of the Appellant at his request and sought authorisation from the corporate office. During the hearing, the appellant sought adjustment of Rs 4,350/- into another of his service connection, which he wanted to indicate to the 2nd Respondent/ADE later and accordingly, the 2nd Respondent is directed to takedown the Service Connection number to be given by the Appellant for adjustment of Rs 4,530/-, which would settle the matter once for all.

8. In view of the letter dt.13.12.2016 of the AAO submitted by the 2nd Respondent, the matter is settled by way of mediation and disposed of as settled accordingly.

9. This award shall be implemented within 15 days of its receipt at the risk of penalties as indicated in Clauses 3.38, 3.39 and 3.42 of the Regulation No. 3/2015 of TSERC.

TYPED BY CCO, Corrected, Signed and Pronounced by me on this the 14th day of December, 2016.

Sd/-

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

1. Sri. Saibaba, H.No. 18-6-623/1, Lal Darwaza, Hyderabad.
Cell No. 8019014924.
2. The AE/OP/Chatrinaka/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The ADE/OP/Falaknuma/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The AAO/ERO/Charminar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
5. The DE/OP/Charminar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
6. The SE/OP/Hyd.South Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

Copy to:

7. The Chairperson, CGRF, Greater Hyderabad Area, TSSPDCL, Vengal Rao Nagar,
Erragadda, Hyderabad.
8. The Secretary, TSERC, 5th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad.