

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: 19-06-2012

Appeal No. 33 of 2012

Between

Smt. Pothuri. Vijaya Parvathi,
W/o. Venkata Subbaraju,
Kalagampudi,
Yelamanchili (M), W.G. Dist

... Appellant

And

1. Assistant Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Yelamanchili
2. Asst. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Narsapuram
3. Asst. Accounts Officer / ERO / APEPDCL / Palakol
4. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Bhimavaram

....Respondents

The appeal / representation dt.17.05.2012 received by this authority on 23.05.2012 against the CGRF order of APEPDCL in C.G. No. 553 / 2011-12 of West Godavari District Dt.27.03.2012. The same has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 11.06.2012. Sri. P. Ramakrishna Raju Son of the appellant present. Sri. K. Satyanarayana, AAE / O / Yelamanchili on behalf of respondents present. Heard both the parties 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:

“Smt. Pothuri Vijaya Parvathi, Kalagampudi, Yelamanchili Mandalam, West Godavari District has filed a complaint stating that the energy meter reading

are not recording properly by the billing agency due to which abnormal bill was issued against her service. Hence approached the Forum for justice”.

2. The 2nd respondent has filed his written submissions as hereunder :

“The information regarding the consumer’s SC.No. 1669/Y.V. Lanka Village is in the name of Smt. Pothuri Vijaya Parvathi, W/o. Venkata Subbaraju, Y.V.Lanka Village, Yelamanchili Mandalam.

Contracted load of 9.5HP/Category – III (Pisces and Prawn culture)

As per the meter reading register, the energy meter was stuck up in the month of July – 2011. The defective meter was replaced on 12.01.2012. The New meter particulars were updated on 18.01.2012 in EPIMRS. But the same information was not updated in RAS immediately. Now the meter changed status is updated in the RAS.”

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

- The Grievance of complainant has been resolved duly updating the Meter change particulars against SC.No. 1669, Enuguvari Lanka Village, Yelamanchili Mandalam, West Godavari District in RAS of ERO Records utsupra.*

Accordingly, the CG.No.553/11-12 is disposed off.

4. When the order of the Forum is not implemented, the appellant approached this authority to pass an order directing the respondents for revision of the bills.

5. Now the point for consideration is, whether any direction is necessary to be issued? If so in what manner?

6. Sri. P. Ramakrishna Raju son of the appellant appeared before this authority and reiterated the same grounds and requested this authority to direct the respondents to implement the same.

7. Sri. K. Satyanarayana, AAE / O / Yelamanchili, Narasapuram Division appeared and stated that they are taking steps to implement the order passed the Forum.

8. It is an admitted fact that the CC bills for the months for the period from July, 2011 to January, 2012 in respect of S.C. No. 1669 Category – III, Y.V. Lanka of Elamanchili Section were issued on average basis by taking 3264 units per month due to meter stuck up and the defective meter in respect of this service was replaced during January, 2012 with final reading 28893.
9. The consumer on the otherhand approached the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, APEPDCL on the plea that the old meter was not a healthy one and the CC bills were issued for an average of 3264 per month by considering the meter as stuck up for the period from July, 2011 to January, 2012.
10. The CC bills for the months of July, 2011 to January, 2012 are to be revised, as they are issued on average basis. This aspect has already been accepted by the respondents in the very counter filed by the respondents.
11. At the time of hearing, the Chairperson, CGRF was also present and he intervened and directed the respondents for compliance of the order. On the very next day a copy of the proceedings of revision addressed by DE / O to AAO / ERO / Palakol to withdraw the excess amount of Rs. 36,561/- against the said service is filed before this authority.
12. In view of the above said proceedings the dispute of the appellant is treated as resolved.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 19th June, 2012

Sd/-
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN