

BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

Present

K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu
Vidyut Ombudsman

Dated: 07 -02-2013

Appeal No. 11 of 2013

Between

Sri Pedaballe Prabhakar Reddy

S/o Siva Reddy

D.No. 10/7, Chennur Village, Post & Mandal

Kadapa Dist.

... Appellant

And

- 1 .Asst.Engineer/operation/ APSPDCL/Chennur
2. Asst.Divisional Engineer/operation/ APSPDCL/Rural-2/Kadapa
3. Divisional Engineer/Operation/ APSPDCL/Kadapa
4. Superintending Engineer/operation/APSPDCL/Kadapa

....Respondents

The appeal / representation filed on 10.01.2013 of the appellant has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman. Sri P.Prabhakar Reddy, appellant present on 05.02.2013 at Tirupathi and Sri M.Surendra Nath, ADE/Rural-II/Kadapa and Sri S.Uday Kumar, AE/O/Chennur for respondents present on 04.02.2013 and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed / issued the following :

AWARD

The appellant filed a complaint against the Respondents for Redressal of his Grievances and stated as hereunder:

1. *They are agl consumers under 2 number 11KV feeders fed from Kanuparthi substation.*
2. *Because of the insufficiency of the Power transformer capacity at the above said substation, the department is not giving supply to the agl. consumers simultaneously on both the 11KV feeders to facilitate the consumers to avail supply only during the day times.*

3. *Requested for enhancement of the power transformer capacity or erection of additional power transformer to overcome the above problem.*
4. *Requested for continuous power supply to the agl. services only during day times.*
5. *They are suffering with low voltage, since all the motors will put on simultaneously and the motors are burning resulting in crop loss.*

2. The respondent-1 i.e. the Assistant Engineer/Operation/Chennuru submitted his written submissions as hereunder:

1. *At 33/11KV Kanaparthi SS existing 1No. 5MVA power transformer and 4 nos. 11KV feeders. Feeder wise max demand as follows.*
 - a. 11KV Kondapeta Feeder (Agrl) : 180 A
 - b. 11KV Balasingaya Palli feeder (Agrl) : 120 A
 - c. 11KV Rural feeder (domestic) : 35 A
 - d. 11KV Sugar Factory feeder (24 hours) : 2 A

2. *Agricultural supply feeding in 2 groups and the timings as follows:*

SL.No.	Feder Name	A Group	B Group
1	Balasingaya Palli	4:00 to 9:00 & 22:00 to 24:00	---
2	Kondapeta	----	9:00 to 4:00 & 0:00 to 2:00

3. *As per the consumer representation it is not possible to give Agrl. Supply 2 feeders at a time because 5MVA Power transformer get over loaded. Due to E..L.R's it is not possible to give continuously 7 hours supply at day time.*

3. After hearing both sides and after considering the material placed before the Forum, the Forum passed the impugned order as here under:

The complainant is informed that his request of for extension of supply to the agl. feeders only during day times is not a grievance in accordance with the Guaranteed Standards of Performance and hence is set aside.

Accordingly the case is allowed and disposed off.

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same by projecting the following grounds:

(i) The department has informed that the feeders are fed from Kanuparthi substation. They are supplying 5 hours in day time and 2 hours during night time as

per the load relief time. The department has also informed that the transformer capacity is less and they are unable to supply power through 2 feeders at a time.

(ii) The department may be directed to supply power at a stretch 7 hours during day time but they are supplying 5 hours supply at different timings during day time; and that they are not providing supply 2 hours supply during night time. They are also facing low voltage problem during summer season and the same may be rectified by ordering respondents to avoid low voltage problem.

(iii) The department may be directed to enhance the transformer capacity to provide supply to the 2 feeders at a time. Hence, the respondents may be directed to supply the power as requested by the appellant.

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

6. The appellant has attended before this authority on 05.02.2013 and submitted a representation reiterating the same grounds mentioned in the grounds of appeal.

7. Whereas, the respondents are represented by Sri M.Surendra Nath, ADE/Rural-II/Kadapa and Sri S.Uday Kumar, AE/O/Chennur are present before this authority and they have categorically stated that they are unable to provide the supply at a stretch through the 2 feeders at one time as the instructions are different and as per the emergency load relief they are distributing the power and giving the supply to the agriculturists through the 2 feeders one after the other and the Forum has rightly considered the said aspect and the appeal preferred by the appellant is liable to be dismissed.

8. It is clear from the representation made by the appellant, that the 7hours supply is not made during the day time and the same may be modified by ordering the respondents to supply 7 hours at a stretch during day time. It is also clear from

the representation that they are not providing supply even 2 hours during night time. It is also clear from the representation that the supply has to be given at a time through the 2 feeders.

9. So far as the relief sought by the appellant is concerned it is not a consumer dispute. It is neither within the scope of the Forum nor within the scope of this authority. The supply of 7 hours is a policy decision taken by the Government and also as per the instructions of the Commission. The respective Discoms are providing supply to the agriculturists as per the Government scheme by looking into the emergency load relief etc., The appellant ought to have approached either the Commission or the Discom to ventilate his grievance or the grievances of other agriculturists. It appears that the respondents are not providing 2 hours supply to the appellant during night times. It is stated that it is according to the schedule fixed by the department. If that is the instruction they have to adhere to the same and they are not expected to deviate from the same. Hence, the respondents are directed to supply 2 hours during night time as prescribed and instructed by the Discom.

10. In the light of the above said observation this authority is directing the respondents to provide 2 hours supply during night time as requested, if it is not released. The appellant is at liberty to approach the Commission through its Secretary or the Discom to ventilate his grievance on the method of supply and this authority is not competent to pass any order on fixation of timings of supply to the appellant or to other consumers.

11. With this observation, the appeal is disposed.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 7th February 2013

Sd/-
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN