

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

Present

**K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu**  
Vidyut Ombudsman

**Dated 16– 02 - 2012**

**Appeal No. 85 of 2011**

Between  
Sri G.Ramanayya  
S/o.Kamma Laxmamma  
D.No.12/57-D, Near Railway Well  
Sathyanarayanapet, Guntakal.

**... Appellant**

**And**

1. Addl. Asst. Engineer /Operation/Guntakal/ APCPDCL/Anantapur
2. Asst. Divisional Engineer/operation / Guntakal/ APCPDCL/Anantapur
3. Asst.Accounts Officer/ERO/ Guntakal/ APCPDCL/Anantapur
4. Divisional Engineer/operation/Gooty/APCPDCL/Anantapur

**....Respondents**

The appeal / representation received on 21.12.2011 against the CGRF order of APCPDCL (C.G. No. ATP-157/2011-12 of Anantapur circle dt.14.09.2011). The same has come up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 31-01-2012. Sri G.Ramanayya, appellant present and Sri M.Prasad, ADE/O/Guntakal, and Sri P.M.D Sasi, JAO/ERO/Guntakal 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 before the CGRF against the Respondents for Redressal of his Grievances stated as hereunder:

*“He had applied for the change of title as regards four services on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2011 and paid the necessary amounts. But so far the names have not been changed.”*

2. The respondents did not submit their written submissions even after receiving the notice from the Forum. But Sri K.Prasanna Kumar

*“AE/O/Guntakal deposed that the name transfer would be effected soon after the Complainant paid the required amounts.”*

3. After hearing both sides and after considering the material placed before the Forum, the Forum passed the following order:

*“the Complainant is advised to remit the necessary amounts and documents at the Concerned Customer Service Centre for the remaining House Service Connections.*

*The Respondents are directed to effect the title change within the time allotted for the House Service Connections for which the necessary documents have been submitted and the amounts paid.*

*After the receipt of the necessary amount and relevant documents, the name changes may be effected thereafter.*

*The complaint is disposed off accordingly.”*

4. Aggrieved by the non-implementation of the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that the respondents are not taking steps to transfer the premises and that he has made a request on 01.12.2011 and asked the ADE/O/Guntakal to change the premises in his name but he rejected the same and the Forum has ordered him to pay the amount and produce the documents and inspite of the payment made by him they have not attended the same.

5. Now, the point for consideration is, “whether the order of the Forum is liable to be modified? If so, in what manner?”

6. The contention of the appellant is that he has applied for name transfer and he was asked to pay the required amounts in the call centre.

7. Whereas, the respondents are represented by Sri M.Prasad, ADE/O/Guntakal before this authority and stated that he has paid by way of DD for

one service connection and the same is acted upon. But for the other premises, the same is not entertained on the ground that the Sri S.A.Rahim is in possession of the property and produced all the relevant documents before the respondents and copies of the documents are also filed before this authority. These documents are also with regard to the same property under which the appellant is claiming name transfer.

8. So, it is evident from the above said record placed before this authority that there is a dispute with regard to title and this authority is not competent to decide the title over the property. If there is any record of the appellant to show that he is the owner of the property he has to get his title declared first to the above said premises on which he made a claim before this authority in a competent civil court but not by approaching this authority or the Forum. Even if he has paid the amounts for the others premises and if it is not in his possession and when other persons are also claiming title over the said property, the department cannot change the names in their records. It is for the appellant to work out his remedy in a competent civil court, but not by approaching this authority and the appeal preferred by the appellant is not sustainable and the same is liable to be dismissed.

9. In the result, the appeal is dismissed. No order as to costs.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 16<sup>th</sup> February 2012

**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**