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: 06-12-2012

Appeal No. 71 of 2012

Between

Dr. P. Raghu Rami Reddy,
Senior Scientist & Head,
Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University,
Agricultural Research Station, Kampasagar,
Nalgonda Dist – 508 207. ***… Appellant***

And

1. Addl. Assistant Engineer / Operation / APCPDCL/ Tripuraram / Nalgonda Dist
2. Asst. Divisional Engineer / Operation / APCPDCL / Halia / Nalgonda Dist
3. Junior Accounts Officer / Sub-ERO / APCPDCL / Halia / Nalgonda Dist
4. Divisional Engineer / Operation APCPDCL / Miryalaguda / Nalgonda Dist
5. Superintending Engineer / Operation APCPDCL / Nalgonda Circle / Nalgonda

…..Respondents

The appeal / representation dt.16.07.2012 received by this authority on 21.07.2012 against the CGRF order of APCPDCL C.G. No. NLG-108 / Dt. 29.05.2012 / Nalgonda Circle dated 23.06.2012. The same has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 05.12.2012 at Hyderabad. Dr. D. Madhusudhan Reddy, Asst. Professor and Sri. L. Krishna Asst. Professor for the appellant present. Sri. Y. Laxmi Narsimha, JAO / Sub-ERO / Halia and Sri. Md.E.Huck, ADE / O / Halia on behalf of the respondents present. Heard the arguments of the parties 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 the Grievances. In the complaint, the appellant has mentioned about the grievances as hereunder:

"It was brought to the notice of the Superintending Engineer, Nalgonda regarding disparity in laying of 11 KV line with 24 hours supply to Agricultural Research Station, Kampasagar. With reference to this, Divisional Engineer Electrical, Operation, Miryalaguda informed that, 11 KV line is not a dedicated feeder but the engineer not explained regarding deviation in laying of line because of which substantial amount of material was saved ultimately money which was not returned to this institute. Further, instructions may be given to Junior Accounts Officer, Sub-ERO, Halia to convert the Category from LT Category-IIA to LT Category-VII as recommended by Divisional Engineer Electrical, Operation, Miryalaguda.

Anticipating positive early orders".

2. No respondents furnished written submissions before CGRF.

3. The Forum passed the following order on 23.06.2012.

"The DE, Operation, Miryalaguda had directed the JAO/Sub-ERO/ Halia on 14-07-2010 itself to change the Complainant's service from Category LT-II to LT-VII. The SE, Operation, Nalgonda is directed to find out why there was a delay of nearly two years in changing the Category.

The Respondents are directed to effect a change in the Category after due verification.

The complaint is disposed accordingly.

The Order shall be implemented within 15 days from the date of its receipt and compliance furnished to the Forum within a week thereafter".

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant filed the above said appeal questioning the impugned order by projecting the following grounds:

i) As per the estimate, they have paid Rs.5,80,430/- to provide 11 kv line from 33/11 kv substation Tripuraram to the research station Kampsagar. But the department has taken line from the Miryalaguda, drinking water supply lift situated at Kampsagar tank.

ii) The deviation is sketched reduced 11 poles instead of using 50 poles for which they paid the amount.

iii) The department did not return the value of the 11 poles unused and the other material unused.

iv) They have also addressed a letter to SE, Nalgonda for separate feeder breaker as they are not receiving 24 hrs electricity supply and the supply of quality is also very poor. Though he requested to rectify the same but they did not consider the same.

v) The Forum has simply changed the category, but they have not rectified the defect.

vi) Hence, the impugned order is liable to 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. Sri. V.Madhusudhan Reddy, head of station, Sri. L.Krishna, Asst. Prof appeared on behalf of appellant and Sri.Lakshmi Narasimha, JAO / Sub-ERO, Halia, Sri. Mohd. Ehak, ADE/O, Halia present on behalf of the respondents.

7. The respondents have stated that they have taken the supply from Miryalaguda, Drinking water supply but not from 33 kv substation, Tripuraram. They have also stated that they used 39 poles but not 50 poles. It is also stated that for a separate kv line it requires 11 kv Bay and Bay extension breaker. The cost of the same would be 1 lakh + 3,08,000/- and they were not included in the original estimate.

8. When they were asked for a separate line from 33/11 kv substation, it is the duty of the department to make the entire estimate including the above said items. When they have taken from Miryalaguda water supply, they would have to estimate the same to that level but not the matter as via media i.e., taking estimate for 33 / 11 kv and providing in the middle. The appellant has submitted that they are not getting 24 hrs supply since the supply is not given from 33/11 kv and they are facing lot of problems for the same.

9. In the light of the above said discussion and the material on the record, this authority passed the following order:

i) The appellant is directed to pay the above said amounts to take separate feeder from 33/11 kv substation as they have already paid for the rest of the estimated amount.

ii) If the appellant do not want, the respondents are directed to refund the value of the material unused to the appellant.

iii) If the appellant wants separate feeder, it can apply within 15 days from the date of this order and the respondents are directed to provide separate feeder within 15 days from the date of receipt of the order.

10. The appeal is disposed with the above said direction. No order as to costs.

This order is corrected and signed on this 6th day of December, 2012.

Sd/-

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN