

**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: 07-09-2012**

**Appeal No. 54 of 2012**

Between

Sri.N.P. Subba Rao,  
D. No. 12-3-42, Sarada Colony, 3<sup>rd</sup> Lane, Anakapalle – 531 001.     ... **Appellant**

**And**

1. Assistant Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL/ Anakapalle / VSP Dist
2. Asst. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Yellamanchalli / VSP Dist
3. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APEPDCL / Nidanam Doddi / Anakapalle

**.....Respondents**

The appeal / representation dt. 18.07.2012 received by this authority on 20.07.2012 against the CGRF of APEPDCL in acknowledgement of C.G. No. 89 / 2012-13 of Visakhapatnam District. The same has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 05.09.2012. Appellant absent but he filed written submissions. Sri. G. Sudhakara Rao, AE / O / Anakapalli on behalf of the respondents present. Heard both the representative of the respondents 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.

2. The complainant filed a complaint before this authority stating that the service connections of his house and service connections of others are hanging in front of his house and that he is facing lot of inconvenience to enter into his house through his main door and also facing difficulty to attend the repairs and in spite of the several requests made to the respondents they did not make any effort to take appropriate action. He has submitted copies of photograph to this authority and also copies of the applications submitted under RTI Act.

3. The matter is posted for hearing by this authority on 09.08.2012 at Visakhapatnam and he failed to attend that hearing and again hearing is posted on 05.09.2012 at Hyderabad. For this he expressed his inability to appear but submitted his written submissions narrating the same grounds as mentioned in the complaint.

4. The respondents are represented by Sri.G. Sudakara Rao, AE Anakapalli. He stated that there are two service connections to his house and they are in front of his house and there are no other service connections in front of his house; and that the complainant is insisting and requested them to replace the service wires to his house and he himself cut the service wire throwing the blame on others and there is nothing to attend by the authorities and the appeal filed by the complainant is liable to be dismissed.

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

6. The contentions of the complaint are quite different from the reply given by the AE who appeared before this authority. It is the duty of the consumer to replace his service wire of his house and the department is not expected to supply the same, if really the version narrated by the respondents is true. So far the other allegation narrated by the appellant that the service connections are hanging in front his house is concerned, it is the bounden duty of the officials to remove the wires of other house owners hanging in front of his house to avoid inconvenience to the inmates of the house.

7. In the result, the respondents are directed to inspect the house once again and remove any service connections of others hanging in front of his house within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.

8. With this observations the appeal is disposed. No order as to costs. The compliance of this order is to be reported to this authority within a week immediately after expiry of the said 15 days time granted for removal.

9. This order is corrected and signed on this day of 7<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2012.

Sd/-  
**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**