

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN
O/o: ANDHRA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
4th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad – 500 004

Present

K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu
Vidyut Ombudsman

Dated 15 – 12 - 2011

Appeal No. 61 of 2011

Between
Sri K.Venkata Rao
Executive Engineer (Retd)
2-148, Sri Visakha Nagar colony
Jammu Narayana puram
Vizianagaram – 535 002.

... Appellant

And

1. Asst. Engineer / Operation / D2/EPDCL/ Vizianagaram
2. Assistant Divisional Engineer / operation / Town /EPDCL / Vizianagaram
3. Divisional Engineer / operation / EPDCL /Vizianagaram.

....Respondents

The appeal / representation dt.07.09.2011 (received on 12.09.2011) against the CGRF order of APEPDCL (in CG No.38/2010-11 dt.14.07.2010). The same has come up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 29-11-2011. Sri.K.Venkat Rao, on behalf of the appellant present and Sri G.Chiranjeevi Rao, DE/O/Vizianagaram, Sri B.V.Ramana ADE/O/Vizianagaram and G.Siva Kumar, AE//D2/Vizianagaram on behalf of respondents present, heard and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed/issued the following:

AWARD

The petitioner filed a complaint against the Respondents for Redressal of his Grievances and stated as hereunder:

“He has filed a complaint that the department changed the existing 100 KVA with 63 KVA and the connected loads of the services increased with A.C and Motors

during the last three years. Hence there is low voltage and interruptions and rectification of the problem is prayed for.”

2. The 2nd Respondent has filed his written submission as hereunder:

“the detailed report received from the concerned Asst. Engineer /D2/Vizianagaram the same is herewith submitted and the same is reproduced as hereunder:.

1. On receipt of the complaint, the Asst. Engineer/D2/Vizianagaram has inspected the area and found that voltage profile is 216 Volts at tail end of L.T. Lines, during peak load Hrs 7.00 PM.

2. Jumpers at various locations defective and at DTR structure were rectified and tree cutting was also done along with LT lines. The Peak load readings of existing 63 KVA DTR are as follows.

R	Y	B	N
27A	32A	42A	8A

3. At present there is no voltage problem. However, existing single phase 3 wire line to 3 phase 5W line of about 8 spans will be done for better voltage and 100KVA DTR will be erected in place of the existing 63 KVA DTR”.

3. After hearing both sides and after considering the material placed before the Forum, the Forum passed the impugned order as here under:

“In view of the findings above and deposition of the respondent-2, the respondents shall take up necessary improvement works as deposed by the respondent -2 for extending reliable supply to the complainant for better consumer servicing. However, the Forum treats the grievance is resolved.”

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that the department has changed the then existing 100 kVA transformer with 63 kVA and from that day onwards the problem started. Subsequently, some more load is added due to the new houses constructed and also by adding new electrical appliances. The power supply position was further deteriorated causing frequent voltage drops during use of electrical motors and ACs, etc and at times it being dropped to 100 to 120 volts causing interruption to the appliances usage and also causing physical damage and inspite of the direction given by the Forum, there is no change in the attitude of the department and inspite of the representation made to the CMD, there is no change in the attitude and finally requests this authority what is the fate of his representation whether redressed or rejected is not known to him so

far and the department officials are harassing him and the appeal is to be allowed by setting aside the impugned order.

5. Now, the point for consideration is, “whether any direction is to be issued to the respondents in consonance with the orders of the Forum? If so, in what manner?”

6. The appellant who attended before this authority categorically mentioned that he is suffering a lot on account of the department's inaction, inspite of the direction given by the Forum and the representation made by several people clearly disclosed about the low voltage problem and necessary directions are to be issued to the respondents to comply the grievances.

7. Whereas, the respondents are represented by Sri G.Chiranjeevi Rao, DE/O/Vizianagaram, Sri B.V.Ramana ADE/O/Vizianagaram and G.Siva Kumar, AE//D2/Vizianagaram stated that 100 kVA was replaced in place of 63 kVA at 3ph line was also erected and that they have been measuring voltage and there are no problems as such and the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

8. The Forum has clearly observed that the existing single phase 3 wire line will be converted into 3A 5W line and the 63 kVA DTR will be replaced with 100 kVA DTR and the respondents are further directed to improve the system to meet the demand of the appellant by completing the improvement works as stated by the respondent-2 in his written statement. The Forum has directed them to comply the same.

9. The very grievance on the part of the appellant is that he has been addressing letters to the department and he wants reply from the Forum or from this authority. There is no such procedure and there is no need for the Forum or to this authority to answer his grievances. Whether it is replied or not, it is for him to approach the concerned authorities under RTI Act but not to this authority.

10. So far as the grievance as such ventilated by the appellant is complied by the respondents. The same has been signed by the appellant on 25.07.2011. Still if any

voltage fluctuation is there, he can represent to the Forum or this authority time and again if there is any grievance he can as well approach the Forum or this authority but not by addressing letters to the department or to the CMD or to the concerned engineers expecting replies from them. Merely, because they have not replied, it cannot be projected before this authority as latches on the part of the department. He can workout his remedies for non-compliance to the letters addressed by him.

11. If at all damage is caused, he can as well approach concerned authorities or competent Civil Court for the damages caused to him either physically or mentally but not by insisting the Forum or this authority to obtain replies to his letters from the officials of the department.

12. In the light of the above said discussion, this authority feels that further direction has to be issued to the respondents as hereunder:

“The respondents are directed to workout the consumption of each and every consumer in that area and provide necessary feedback from the department side to comply the voltage problem time and again and it should be reported to this authority within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order about the voltage in that area.”

13. In the result, the appeal is disposed with the above said direction and the appellant is at liberty to represent before the Forum or this authority, when there is any voltage problem or for non-compliance of the orders.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 15th December 2011

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN