

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 02 – 02 - 2012

Appeal No. 84 of 2011

Between
Sri V.Subbayya Lingam
D.No. 1-35/1, Sai Krupa
Parvathi nagar, Mandapeta – 533308
EG Dist.

... Appellant

And

1. Asst. Engineer / Operation / EPDCL/ Mandapeta
2. Assistant Divisional Engineer / operation / EPDCL / Mandapeta
3. Asst.Accounts Officer/ERO/EPDCL/Ramachandrapuram
4. Divisional Engineer / operation / EPDCL / Ramachandrapuram

....Respondents

The appeal / representation dt.30.11.2011 (received on 05.12.2011) against the CGRF order of APEPDCL (in CG No.269/2011-12 dt.20.10.2011). The same has come up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 28-01-2012. No representation on behalf of the appellant and respondents. 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 stating that CC bills are not being issued to the consumer regularly. Hence, he requested the Forum to instruct the concerned local authority to issue the CC bills as per stipulated time.”

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

“The Service Number 001248, 001249 of Maredubaka Villages in Mandapeta Section, the bills were served to the consumer and took dated acknowledgement from the consumer.

Hence it is requested to you the complaint CG.No. 269/11-12 was resolved and please be drop the proceedings please.”

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

“The Grievance of complainant is resolved duly serving the demand notices for the SC.Nos. 1248 and 1249, Maredubaka Village, Mandapeta Mandal and complainant expressed his satisfaction.

Accordingly, the CG.No.269/10-11 is disposed off.”

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that the Forum simply resolved the dispute as if the demand notices are served to the complainant and obtained the acknowledgments but his grievance is for the month of 7/11 only and that the service was made in the month of 9/11 for the previous months of May and June and it does not serve any useful purpose and that the department has not corrected his surname inspite of the demand made by him and the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

5. Now, the point for consideration is, “whether the impugned order is liable to be set aside? If so, on what grounds?”

6. Both the appellant and the respondents failed to attend before this authority inspite of the information furnished over phone to attend before this authority on 28.01.2012. There is no other option except to dispose of the matter basing on the material available on record as it is not proper to dismiss the complaint / appeal for non-appearance of the appellant.

7. The appellant has submitted as many as 7 exhibits including the complaint furnished to the Forum. In all the documents, the grievance is ventilated that the demand notices were not served on him enabling him to pay the amounts in time. There may be a possibility of disconnection for non-payment of the amounts in time and there may be a possibility of imposing penalty/interest, etc.

8. The Forum has simply stated that the demand notices were served on the complainant and obtained the dated acknowledgments on 20.09.2011. But this

acknowledgment was obtained after a lapse of 3-4 months. His grievance is only the delivery of demand notices in time i.e, 21st of every month as the meter reader is coming on 21st and taking the meter reading.

9. The demand notices served on him his name is printed as VASA VASA SUBBAYYA LINGAM but his contention is VASA SUBBAYYA LINGAM, whatever it may be, the name is to be corrected as present on the document produced by the appellant before the respondents.

10. In the light of the above said discussion, the impugned order is set aside directing the respondents to issue demand notices every month regularly by the meter reader on 21st every month or even after 2 or 3 days thereon after obtaining the acknowledgments for the said service. The respondents are directed to change the surname of the appellant in the records of the respondent on production of proof of his surname before the respondent No.3. The compliance of the order shall be reported to this authority within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 2nd February 2012

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN