

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: 05-05-2012

Appeal No. 13 of 2012

Between

Sri. T. Veera Ragha Reddy
S/o. Appa Reddy,
Anaparthi Village & Madal,
Rajahmundry, E.G. District.

... Appellant

And

1. Asst. Engineer /Operation / APEPDCL / Ragampeta
2. Asst. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Jaggampeta
3. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Jaggampeta
4. Asst. Engineer /Operation / APEPDCL / Biccavolu
5. Asst. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Anaparthi
6. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Ramachandrapuram

....Respondents

The appeal / representation dt. 13.01.2012 received by this authority on 20.01.2012 against the CGRF order of APEPDCL C.G. No. 115 / 2011-12 of East Godavari District dt. 19.08.2010. The same has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 24.04.2012. Sri. T. Veera Ragha Reddy of the appellant present. Sri. M. Rajasekharam, ADE, Jagga,peta and Sri Y. Vijayanand, ADE, Anaparthi 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 complaint before the CGRF against the Respondents for Redressal of his Grievances. In the complaint he has mentioned about his grievances as hereunder:

(1) Service No. 11 / Nallamilli Village, Ramgampeta, Jaggampeta Division records is to be shifted to Biccavolu in Ramachandrapuram Division as Ramgampeta is farway from Nallamilli and no body is attending in case of any defect and also difficulty in paying the bills.

(2) Regularization of additional load of 5 HP over the existing 20 HP for which charges were paid by him 5 Years ago and providing of an individual DTR to his service.

(3) Maintenance of lines properly for reliable supply and to avert accidents.

2. The second respondent submitted his written submissions as hereunder :

"He has is submitted that I have inspected the Agl. Service connection, SC. No. 11/Nallamilli of Sri T. Veera Raghava Reddy resident of Anaparthi (V) on 27.07.2010 and the following few points are here with submitted.

1) a) The service was inspected by me and found that there is 1 No. 50 KVA DTR(SS-9 Nallamilli) with 2 Nos. Agl. Services (15 HP and 20 HP + 5 HP, SC. No. 11 Nallamilli). The 1st service connection is at 2nd pole from the DTR and the 2nd service i.e.SC. No. 11/Cat-V/Nallamilli (V) (20 HP + 5 HP) of Tetali Veera Raghava Reddy is at 14th pole i.e. the pump set of the above complaint is at 500 Mts. distance (LT line) from the DTR.

For the 40 years the consumers has been utilizing the supply with the existing setup. The 50 KVA DTR is on 11 KV Bikkavolu – Kapavaram Feeder and I have taken supply from Bikkavolu SS and measured the voltages & currents at 16:00 Hrs. and they are 250.5V, 255V, 250.5V and 27A, 28A, 26A respectively on 27.7.10.

b) The LT line connected to the SC. No. 11 is of loose spans and the ground clearance to the 3-Ph, 4 wire line at 4 locations is less. At present there is paddy crop (just started) and 4 Nos. inline poles to be erected to rectify the problem.

c) The consumer's main concern is to get separate 25 KVA DTR to his service SC. No. 11/Nallamilli with Department cost, to his convenience under HVDS scheme. But HVDS works are not going on at present.

d) It is learnt that a 11 KV spur line has come up nearer to SC. No. 11/Nallamilli (200 Mts. Distance), during recent times and the consumer started representing the Department to get individual Distribution Transformer to his pump set from the spur line with 4 poles of KV line.

For that matter either the consumer has to wait till the next stage of HVDS work commences or to bear the cost of the line & DTR to solve his problem. The third option is to provide separate DTYR with 4 Nos. 11 KV poles under improvements if there is a provision.

2) The consumer stated that he has applied for 5 HP Addl. Load in addition to existing load of 20 HP to SC. No. 11/Nallamilli (Agl. Free category) The payment particulars of additional load were received in this office and revised Test report also collected in the month of 06/2010. But, it can not be updated through EP-IMRS unless registration is done. Even if we get it registered now, the EP-IMRS does not accept the old DD particulars. Hence, the issue remains unsettled till now. This problem can be solved now as some changes are made in EP-IMRS.

3) The consumer wants to Transfer the record of SC. No. 11/Nallamilli to Bikkavolu (M) from Rangampeta (M) including the change of Distribution name because he is facing lot of hardship to go to Rangampeta or Jaggampeta for bills payments etc., by staying at Anaparthi. For which the consumer has to get his application registered in call center/Jaggampeta with all relevant documents like certificate from MRO, and Pattadar Pass Book stating location of land and it's survey Nos. in Bikkavolu Mandal.

4) The consumer stated that the lines are old and the conductor cut problems and the interruptions are frequent. If any such problem it will be sorted out immediately."

3. After hearing both sides and after considering the material on record the Forum passed the following order :

- A. The required application with proof of documents are to be registered at Call Centre, Jaggampeta for transfer of service records from ERO/Jaggampeta to ERO/ Ramachadrapuram as well as from Rangampeta Section to Biccavolu Section.
- B. Necessary estimate charges for 11 KV Line and DTR have to be paid to solve the problem as requested or he has to wait till the next stage of HVDS works under HVDS Scheme.
- C. The First and Second Respondents and Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/ Jaggampeta are directed that the additional Load particulars should be regularized on war foot basis as per the New System penetrated.
- D. The respondents shall resolve the above grievances if the complainant follows the directions as above duly observing the guidelines in regulation 7 of 2004.

The CG.No. 115/10 is disposed accordingly.

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that in spite of his best efforts to resolve his grievance, the respondents are not making any effort to resolve the same. It is also claimed by him that the village Rangampeta in Jagampeta Mandal is far away from his native place and it is very difficult for him to pay the bills and also difficult for the respondents to attend the repairs etc and this has not been considered by the Forum and other officials of the departments and he has been put to lot of inconvenience and on account of the

attitude of the respondents; and that the impugned order is liable to be modified by giving suitable directions to the respondents to attend the same.

5. Now the point for consideration is, whether the impugned order is liable to modified? If so in what manner?

6. The appellant attended before this authority at visakhapatnam and stated that his land is within the limits of Biccavolu Mandal but the service connection is in Rangampeta and in Jagampeta section and they are far away from his place and he has represented the same to the AE and other higher officials to change the same to Biccavolu Mandal instead of Jagampeta section which is more than 12 Kms from his place and he has been facing lot of inconvenience in paying the bills and also in attending the power supply in case of failure etc and if it is shifted to Biccavolu Mandal, it will be more convenient than the existing pattern of supply.

7. Sri. M. Rajashekar Rao A.DE Jagampeta and Y. V. Vijayanand ADE Anaparti attended before this authority at Visakapatnam and represented that the sources of connections are computerized and it is very difficult to change the Mandal and it is not a difficult thing for the appellant in paying the bill as the payment is once in 6 months and the impugned order is liable to reaffirmed and there is no need to modify the same.

8. It is an admitted fact that the Jagampeta is far away from Biccavolu Mandal Biccavolu is near by to the service connection of the appellant. It is an admitted fact that the payment of the bill is once in 6 months. The inconvenience which is being faced by the appellant in securing the line man is apparent in case of failure of supply on account of technical defects in the wiring etc. In case of frequent failure on the above said lines, he has to rush up to Jagampeta section to secure the presence of the line mane and attend the same. In fact, the other service connections are within the Biccavolu Mandal and there is no inconvenience to other villagers and it is also difficult for the line man to attend one service connection incase of any difficulty . This clearly shows that there is lot of inconvenience to the appellant. It is also necessary for the department to raise to the occasion by setting right the things in a proper manner.

9. So far as the other grievance mentioned in the complaint are concerned, the appellant has clearly mentioned in the appeal grounds that the respondents have attend the same. The only inconvenience projected is shifting of the service line to the Biccavolu Mandal, for which this appeal is preferred. So there is no need for this authority to look into the other grounds raised by the appellant.

10. So far as the shifting of the service connection is concerned, the appellant has clearly stated that he has approached the SE on previous occasions, but the problem is not resolved. Hence it is necessary at this stage to direct the appellant to approach the SE once again to resolve the problem and I hope and trust that the SE Rajahmundry will attend the same on humanitarian grounds apart from resolving the deficiency of service.

11. With this observation, the appeal is disposed with a direction to the appellant to approach the SE along with copy of this order. No order as to costs.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 5th May, 2012

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN