

**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: 02-06-2012**

**Appeal No. 21 of 2012**

Between

Smt. D.Sailaja,  
M/s. Sri Vinayaka Enterprises,  
D. No. 5-2-1, Plot No. 7,  
Ballari Road, Near Industrial Estate,  
Anantapur – 515 004.

**... Appellant**

**And**

1. Assistant Engineer / Operation/D-V / APCPDCL / Anantapur
2. Assistant Divisional Engineer/ Operation /Town – II / APCPDCL/ Anantapur
3. Asst. Accounts Officer / ERO /APCPDCL / Anantapur Town / Anantapur
4. Divisional Engineer / Operation/APCPDCL / Anantapur
5. Superintending Engineer / Operation/APCPDCL/Anantapur Circle / Anantapur

**....Respondents**

The appeal / representation dt. 02.02.2012 received by this authority on 06.02.2012 against the CGRF order of APCPDCL in C.G. No. ATP-152 / Dt. 22.12.2012 / Anantapur Circle. The same has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 30.05.2012. Appellant absent. Sri. Chandra Mohana Reddy / AE / Distribution / Anantapur, Sri. J.V. Ramesh and Sri. G.V. Ramana / AAO / ERO 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 she has mentioned about her grievances as hereunder:

*She is running an Industry for manufacture of Paper Glasses in the name of M/s. Sri Vinayaka Enterprises from 2005 onwards duly taking the Industrial shed on lease at D.No.5-2-1, I.D.E.A. Narayanapuram, Ballari Road, Near Industrial Estate, Anantapur, bearing ISC.No.0005052648.*

*She is paying Electricity bills promptly during all these days. She never paid bill in part and hence no penalty is levied ever. But, the supply was disconnected on 3-12-2011 to the above said service, without giving any notice in writing. She made a complaint in the matter. But there is no result as on date. I made an appeal to the higher officials in writing on 12-12-2011 and send the same through Indian Postal Service. She met the higher officials personally, the very next day. There is no result though 14 days period has been elapsed.*

*The Industry is facing losses due to power cuts. She could not dispatch the stocks to her Customers due to non availability of the electricity. She is sending this representation through Indian Postal Service with a hope that the justice will be restored her.*

2. The respondents have not submitted any written submissions before the CGRF.

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

*If the Complainant failed to provide the required cable, the Respondents are at the liberty to stop the supply. There after, the supply is to be extended through LT Trivector Meter, only.*

*The Respondents should inform the above to the Complainant before hand, under intimation to the Forum.*

*The complaint is disposed off accordingly.*

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that the Forum has failed to observe that the electricity and the meter belong to the respondents and it is also the responsibility of the respondents to provide the cable and the Forum has failed to assign reasons under what provision, they are not liable to provide the service wire to the premises and 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. The appellant failed to attend before this authority. The respondents namely M. Chandra Mohan, AE, JV. Ramesh, GV, Ramana AO, appeared before this authority and stated that the billing is converted into KVH and it is the owner or the occupier has to change the service cable. The appellant is no other than a tenant in the said premises. She has vacated the premises. The owner has changed the cable.

7. In the light of the above said discussion, the dispute brought to this authority under this appeal is resolved.

8. With this observation, the appeal is dismissed.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2012

**Sd/-**  
**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**