

BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

Present

K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu
Vidyut Ombudsman

Dated: 05 -07-2011

Appeal No. 27 of 2011

Between

Sri G.Veera Reddy
S/o.Hanmi Reddy
Khajipur (V), Maddur (M)
Mahaboobnagar Dist

... Appellant

And

1. Asst.Engineer/operation/Maddur
2. Asst.Divisional Engineer/operation/Kodangal
3. Divisional Engineer/operation/Mahaboobnagar
4. Superintending Engineer/operation Circle / Mahaboobnagar

....Respondents

The appeal / representation filed dt 25.06.2011 of the appellant has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 01.07.2011 at Hyderabad Sri G.Veera Reddy, appellant present Sri K.Rajashekar, AE/O/Maddur and Sri M.Vinay Kumar, ADE/O/Kondangal for the respondents present and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed / issued the following :

AWARD

The appellant filed a complaint on 20.05.2011 before the Forum stating that there is a low voltage problem in the village and the electricity department has sanctioned additional 3 x 25 kVA transformers, but they have not installed the same. The same has been reported to the SE/O/Mahaboobnagar, but no action was taken

in this regard and requested the Forum to do justice by ordering erection of 3 transformers at an early date.

2. The respondent No.1 submitted his written submissions as hereunder:

“The agricultural service Nos. 42 & 43 were extended through 25 kVA transformers (Veera Reddy Agricultural field). There are 6 Nos. services connection on this transformer. Out of 6 nos. of service connections, two connections are unauthorized. The unauthorized services will be disconnected and low voltage problem will be solved.”

3. The appellant did not attend the enquiry before the Forum. Whereas, Sri M.Vinay Kumar, ADE/O/Kodangal attended before the Forum and his statement was recorded by the Forum.

4. After hearing, the Forum passed an order as hereunder:

“As deposed by the 1st respondent, the two number of unauthorized agricultural services should be disconnected by 31.05.2011 unless these services are regularized duly paying the necessary charges so that the complainant does not suffer from low voltage.”

5. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that the appellant is representing on behalf of the Khajipur (V) consumers but the Forum erroneously discussed about his personal case and that he being a social worker experimentally filed a petition before SE/Op circle / Mahaboobnagar and as per departmental information in his own village out of 9 transformers of 25 kVA, they have installed 6 transformers. No reply was given to the representation and the impugned order was passed behind his back and no notice was served on him to attend before the Forum and the order is liable to be set aside and requested this authority to enquire with vigilance on transformers scam in Maddur mandal of Mahaboobnagar district and to save public property and also requested this authority to appoint a committee to enquire in this serious injustice.

6. Now, the point for consideration is, “whether the impugned order dt.20.05.2011 is liable to set aside or modified? If so, on what grounds?”

7. The appellant who attended before this authority stated that 3 transformers were not installed in their village, though 6 transformers were installed and there was low voltage problem in the entire village and the same is to be rectified. Sri M.Vinay Kumar, ADE/O/Kondangal represented that after removing unauthorized service connections, there is no low voltage problem to the appellant.

8. Sanctioning of transformers is the outlook of the CMD and the appellant ought to have approached the CMD of CPDCL and he can represent his grievance on behalf of the entire village by making his representation to the CMD. The CMD may verify the records and pass appropriate orders as requested by the appellant. Whereas the Forum is not competent to pass an order on behalf of the entire villagers and it is not a consumer dispute, since supply of transformers is not a consumer dispute.

9. No doubt, rectifying low voltage problem is a consumer dispute and the Forum is competent to entertain the same. The Forum has already ordered to remove 2 unauthorised connections from the transformer through which the appellant is getting the supply to his motor. The department is also directed to furnish the names of the persons who are unauthorisedly using the power from the said transformer by giving a notice in the form of reply to the appellant in person. The respondents are directed to rectify the low voltage problem by taking appropriate steps in the presence of the appellant and to his satisfaction.

10. This authority is not competent to enquire with vigilance on transformers scam in Maddur mandal of Mahaboobnagar district. The request made by the appellant in his appeal is unsustainable. This authority is not having the jurisdiction / power to entertain the same. He has also requested this authority to verify the record with regard to installation of transformers and sanctioning of transformers by appointing a committee to enquire into the serious injustice is also not within the purview of this authority. If at all if it is to be entertained, it is the duty of the CMD to look after the issue of fixing or sanctioning of the transformer to the said village, to

rectify the low voltage for the entire village. The department can take appropriate action in complying the same by informing about details of sanctioning of transformers etc. to the representation if made by the appellant.

11. In the result, the respondents are directed to rectify the low voltage problem to the appellant by furnishing the details of the disconnected unauthorized personal services attached to the said transformer and comply the deficiency of the low voltage problem within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order. The appeal is disposed accordingly. The appellant may approach the CMD or SE for the other relief's claimed in the appeal grounds.

12. The compliance of the order may be reported within 20 days from the date of receipt of this order.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 5th July 2011

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN