



BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN
Andhra Pradesh :: Amaravati

:: Present ::

Vinnakota Venkata Prasad
Former District & Sessions Judge
Vidyut Ombudsman
Date: 01-09-2022

Representation No12 of 2022-23

Between

Shaik Mahammed Sharif, S/o. Shaik Khaleel, D.No.3/992-A, G.V.P. Colony,
Tadipatri, Anantapur Dt. Complainant

AND

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Tadipatri
2. Dy. Executive Engineer/O/Tadipatri
3. Executive Engineer/O/Gooty Respondents

@@@

This representation having come up for final hearing before me on 26-08-2022 through Video Conferencing in the presence of the complainant and the respondents 1 and 2 and the 3rd respondent having remained absent on all the dates of hearing, stood over for consideration till this day and the Vidyut Ombudsman delivered the following:

ORDER

1. Having been aggrieved by the orders dated 19-07-2022 rendered by the Forum for Redressal of Grievances of the Consumers in Southern Power Distribution Company of A.P Limited, Tirupati in C.G.No.13/2022-23/Anantapur Circle, the complainant therein directed this present representation seeking to absolve him from the liability to pay a sum of Rs.1,859/- which was directed to be paid by the respondents for regularization of the additional load said to have been detected at the time of inspection of his residential premises made by AE Tadipatri-D2, Sri D. Veeranjanya Reddy on 25-04-2022.
2. The averments in the representation are as follows: IN NUSE
 - (a) The representationist alleged that he was possessing domestic service connection No.7231304016897 and that he submitted a complaint to the CGRF, APSPDCL, Tirupati for exclusion of a sum of Rs.1,859/- which was

included in his electrical consumption bill by the Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Tadipatri. His complaint to CGRF, APSPDCL, Tirupati in the aforesaid number was said to have been dismissed by the CGRF, APSPDCL, Tirupati. Along with this representation, the representationist submitted printed proforma. He also submitted an addenda with the following averments in epitome:

(i) The representationist submitted his written arguments on 10-07-2022 to the CGRF by email opposing the written submissions made by the respondents on 01-06-2022 and 06-07-2022. But the CGRF, APSPDCL, Tirupati did not consider his written arguments and dismissed his complaint with a direction to the respondents to collect the disputed amount of Rs.1,859/- from him in violation of the principles of natural justice.

(ii) When the CGRF, APSPDCL, Tirupati directed him to file written arguments, he sent a request letter to the Dy. EE/O/Tadipatri seeking copy of the written submissions made by them and on receipt of the same, he sent written arguments to the CGRF, APSPDCL, Tirupati through email.

(iii) The Order delivered by the CGRF, APSPDCL, Tirupati is not a speaking order. There was no technical report of AEE/O/Tadipatri and there was also no prior notice from the respondents before adding the disputed amount into the CC bill. The representationist informed about his house during personal hearing on 05-07-2022. The impugned notice from (PAO) with the letter of AAO was received by him on 23-05-2022. But the inspection report said to have been issued by D2/AEE/Tadipatri was not served on him. As such, the PAO notice issued, in the absence of annexing the inspection report is invalid.

(iv) The representationist before the Forum informed only that he was having one ceiling fan (90 watts) and 5 LED lights (each 20 watts) and that he did not mention any other additional fixtures before the Forum. The mention in the order of CGRF that the representationist stated to have been possessing TV, Fridge and motor in his house is incorrect and those electrical fixtures do not exist in his house.

(v) As such, this representationist is not liable to pay the said sum of Rs.1,859/- incorporated in the electrical consumption bill. Therefore, he seeks exclusion of the said amount from his electrical consumption bill.

3. The matter was taken on file on 02-08-2022 and notices were issued to both sides for their appearance and hearing on 11-08-2022.
4. It is the contention of the complainant/representationist that the department did not cause service of the inspection report and as such, the notice sent by the department for payment of additional amount in a sum of Rs.1,859/- is invalid, and that the CGRF did not consider his written arguments submitted in reply to the written arguments submitted by the respondents and that the order of the CGRF is not a speaking order and that the same was delivered without considering any record and thereby the complainant/representationist sought for rendering justice. It is also contended that for the absence of technical report, the impugned charges are unsustainable.
5. The respondents 1 and 2 contended that the complainant/representationist was found on inspection to have been using more than 1 KV load against his contract load of 0.26 kW and as such, it amounts to unauthorized use of electricity and as such, assessment was made under GTCS No.9.1, and that the complainant/representationist was served with the notice once again when he contended that the notice sent by the respondents was not served on him, and that the complainant/representationist also admitted before the CGRF as to the number of the electrical gadgets available in his house the capacity of which exceed 1.5k.W, and as such, the complainant/representationist is bound to pay the said amount of Rs.1,859/- levied for unauthorized usage of electricity and thereby sought for dismissal of this representation.
6. When the respondents were brought to the notice of GCTS No.12.3, they vehemently contended that it is applicable only to the industries and not to the domestic connections, and further contended that GTCS No.9 alone is applicable to the domestic services, and its application to the cases where additional load has been detected has been in practice.
7. When they were brought to the notice of definition of 'unauthorized use of electricity' as is defined under section 126 of the Electricity Act which is adopted by GCTS No.2.2.53, they requested time for further arguments. Accordingly, time was granted upto 26-08-2022 as desired by them. On 26-08-2022, also the respondents reiterated their contention that the representationist admitted before the CGRF the availment of additional load and the electrical gadgets admittedly available in the house of the representationist are to a load of 1.5 K.W, but the inspecting authority assessed the total connected load to the electrical service connection at the residence of

representationist only at 1 KW load,. and that on application of GTCS No.9, the department assessed the development charges etc., at Rs.1,859/- and the said sum is payable by the representationist even in case of removal of additional load, and that the department inspected the premises once again but there was no reduction in the load connected by the representationist and that the GTCS No.12.3 has no application as regards use of additional load.

8. Now the points for consideration are

- i) **Whether the representationist availed additional load in his premises as alleged by the respondents?**
- ii) **Whether the representationist is not liable to make payment of the said sum of Rs.1,859/- charged under GTCS No.9 by the respondents under caption of 'Unauthorised Use of Electricity' on detection of use of additional load?**

Point No.1: AVAILMENT OF ADDITIONAL LOAD

9. It is the contention of the respondents that the representationist is having LT Category I electrical service connection under S.C.No.7231304016897 with a contracted load of 0.26 KW, but when his premises was inspected by the authorities on 25-04-2022, electrical gadgets such as water Motor, Fan, Television, Tube light, CFL, Led Bulb, were found connected and the power that may be consumed by all of them was assessed at 1 KW and hence the respondents proceeded under GTCS No.9 and required the representationist to pay a sum of Rs.1,859/- towards development charges and the representationist disputed with the availment of additional load and also with his liability for payment of the said amount of Rs.1,859/- and did not pay the same and that he is liable to pay the said amount levied for use of additional load as it falls under unauthorized use of electricity.

10. It is the contention of the complainant/representationist that the department did not cause service of the inspection report, and as such the notice sent by the department for payment of additional amount in a sum of Rs.1,859/- is invalid, and that the CGRF did not consider his written arguments submitted in reply to the written arguments submitted by the respondents, and that the order of the CGRF is not a speaking order, and that the same was delivered without considering any record and thereby the complainant/representationist sought for rendering justice. It is also contended that for the absence of technical report, the impugned charges are unsustainable.

11. When the representationist approached CGRF, his complaint ended in dismissal.

12. During the enquiry before CGRF, as seen from its order, CGRF appears to have ascertained from the complainant/representationist the electrical gadgets available in his premises and arrived at the load that was connected to his service connection at 1.5 KW and found that the premises was connected with load in excess of the contracted load.

13. Vidyut Ombudsman is not concerned with the manner of enquiry that was conducted by the learned CGRF or with the merits or demerits of its order, as this Vidyut Ombudsman is now not sitting in appeal on the orders of CGRF. Previously, there used to be an appeal against the orders of CGRF and later, it was converted into only a representation.

14. As a consequence there of, now the consumer is provided with another forum namely Vidyut Ombudsman or further opportunity, when he fails to succeed before the CGRF.

15. Clause 21.1 of Regulation 3 of 2016 which deals with the procedure for enquiry/hearing envisages that the Vidyut Ombudsman may proceed to give a reasonable opportunity to both parties to produce such **FURTHER** evidence they may desire to produce. Thus, this opportunity provided under the said clause to produce **further** evidence would lead to deduce that the evidence adduced before the CGRF would also fall for consideration before the Vidyut Ombudsman, and he may also receive additional evidence if any produced by the parties.

16. Thus, as seen from the procedure established under clause 21 of Regulation 3 of 2016, what can be deduced in my humble view, is that the dispute shall have to be settled by the Vidyut Ombudsman afresh considering the evidence already adduced before the CGRF and also the further evidence if produced before Vidyut Ombudsman, but without reference to the merits or demerits of the order of the CGRF since the Vidyut Ombudsman is not sitting in appeal on the orders of the CGRF.

17. Further, Admissions would also tantamount to evidence. In the instant case though there does not appear any admission in the pleadings or by way of any document, the learned CGRF recorded in its order that the complainant therein who is the representationist before this Vidyut Ombudsman revealed the

electrical fixtures available in his premises, the capacity of which would exceed 1 kW which is in excess of the contracted load. However, it is not revealed from the order of learned CGRF that any statement of the representationist /complainant was recorded in evidence of the admission as regards electrical equipment available in his residence.

18. The representationist specifically denied to have revealed before the CGRF some of the electrical fixtures available in his premises as recorded in the order of CGRF and also contended that it was not a speaking order.

19. However, whether or not the order of the learned CGRF is based on any sound reasoning, or the merits and demerits of the order are inconsequential for a decision by the Vidyut Ombudsman on this representation. As such the contention raised by the representationist questioning the order of learned CGRF that the said order of CGRF is not a speaking order does not fall for consideration of the Vidyut Ombudsman.

20. It is contended by the representationist that the notice issued by the respondents for payment of amount is illegal for want of communication of inspection report. But the copies of the documents submitted by the complainant disclose that he also submitted the copy of assessment report which discloses the electrical gadgets allegedly present in his premises at the time of inspection. Further, it does not disclose any material on record that the complainant at any time issued any notice or made any demand to the authorities seeking communication of such inspection report. Even his letter to the E.E. does not disclose that he made any demand or request for the said inspection report nor there appears any contention prior to filing complaint before CGRF as regards the non-communication of the inspection report.

21. Of course the respondents also failed to submit any record in proof of service of the inspection report on the representationist. Of course whether or not the inspection report is served on the representationist, evidently the notice sent by the department to him calling upon him to pay the additional amount is served on him under his acknowledgment, and the said notice contains the details of the electrical gadgets found in his house during inspection. As such evidently, he is apprised of the information for which the department required him to pay the development charges etc. Therefore, whether or not the inspection report is served on him, as he was apprised of the electrical gadgets which were said to have been found in his premises at the time of the

inspection of the premises, and since there does not appear any demand or request from the representationist prior to filing this complaint before the CGRF, for communication of such inspection report, this contention of the representationist that he was not served with the inspection report and as such the notice issued to him is illegal shall wither to the ground.

22. When directed by this Vidyut Ombudsman, the respondents submitted the copy of report as regards the assessment of developmental charges, copy of Assessment Calculation for Developmental Charges, copy of written submissions made by E.E./OPN/Gooty made before CGRF, copy of written submissions made by Dy.E.E./O/Tadipatri where under the department asserted availment of additional load and assessed an amount of Rs.1,859/- towards development charges and additional security deposit etc.

23. As far as the contention of additional load is concerned, on behalf of the respondents, there is inspection report and the order of the CGRF which contains the admission made by the representationist as regards the electrical gadgets available in his residential premises the capacity of which is in excess of the contract load. But except his own assertion, there does not appear any material in support of his contention or to disprove the version of the respondents which is corroborated by the admission said to have been made by the representationist before the Learned CGRF as referred in its order.

24. No doubt it is difficult to produce negative evidence. The department could have taken some photographs of the gadgets available in the house of consumer at the time of inspection, through some mobile which is being found in every one's hand now a day, so as to forestall the denial from the consumers.

25. There is no dispute with the fact that during enquiry before the CGRF the representationist revealed certain electrical gadgets available at his house. However, he disputes to have stated some of the electrical gadgets mentioned in the order of CGRF which are said to be available in his house. Therefore, in the presence of categorical statement in the order of the learned CGRF as regards the admission made by the representationist about the electrical gadgets connected in his residential house, the contention of the representationist that he did not reveal some of those electrical gadgets fixed in his house referred in the order of CGRF, cannot be given any credence, and the admission said to have been made before the learned CGRF cannot be set at naught. Thus, in the light of the categorical statement in the order of the CGRF

that the representationist admitted the available electrical gadgets the capacity of which exceed 0.26 KW, it cannot but be held that the representationist attached electrical gadgets to his service connection in excess of the contract load.

26. Therefore, it is held that the respondents established that the representationist attached electrical gadgets the load of which is in excess of the contract load.

27. This point is accordingly answered against the representationist and in favour of the respondents.

Point No.2. LIABILITY OF THE REPRESENTATIONIST FOR PAYMENT OF THE AMOUNT ASSESSED AND DEMANDED UNDER THE IMPUGNED ELECTRICAL BILL AND NOTICE:

28. It is the contention of the respondents that availment of additional load amounts to unauthorized use of electricity and as such the department made assessment under GTCS No.9, and they made assessment under the said provision and that the representationist is liable to pay the same.

29. Unauthorized use of Electricity is defined under section 126 of Electricity Act. GTCS No.2.2.53 also envisages that unauthorized use of electricity shall have the same meaning ascribed to it under Explanation to section 126 of the Act. Explanation (b) to section 126 of Electricity Act reads as follows:

"For the purposes of this section,---

b) "unauthorised use of electricity" means the usage of electricity—

i) by any artificial means; or

ii) by a means not authorised by the concerned person or authority or licensee; or

iii) through a tampered meter; or

iv) for the purpose other than for which the usage of electricity was authorised; or

v) for the premises or areas other than those for which the supply of electricity was authorised".

30. Thus, unauthorized use of electricity shall be construed only in the occasions as contemplated in the aforesaid explanation to Section 126 of the Act.

31. Evidently, the 'use of load in excess of the contracted load' or 'additional load' does not find place under the definition of 'unauthorized use of Electricity' under section 126 of Electricity Act or GTCS, and **as such the perspicuous comprehension there from cannot but be that use of additional load does not fall within the definition of 'Unauthorized use of Electricity'**.

32. When the use of load in excess of contract load does not fall within the ambit of 'Unauthorized use of Electricity' as is defined under section 126 of Electricity Act or GTCS, the respondents are not competent to make any assessment under GTCS No.9 or calling upon the respondent to pay the same in the impugned bill by misconstruing the definition of 'unauthorized use of electricity'.

33. In fact, GTCS No.12.3.3 deals with Additional Connected Loads detected in LT Service Cases.

34. During course of hearing the respondents strenuously contended that GTCS No.12.3 applies only to the industrial connections and not to the domestic connections since LT Cat III (B) is couched in the said provision.

35. Therefore, examination of the said provision is of impending necessity. Consequently, it is beneficial to import what is laid down in GTCS No.12.3.3 which is as follows:

"12.3.3 Additional Connected Loads detected in LT Services Cases

12.3.3.1 Where the total Connected Load is 75 HP/56 kW or 150HP in cases of LT Cat III (B) or below at the time of detection:

i. One Month notice shall be given to regularise the additional Connected Load or part of additional load as per the requirement of the Consumer or to remove the additional connected load. If the consumer desires to continue with the additional connected load, he shall pay the required service line charges, development charges and consumption deposit, in accordance with the format prescribed in Appendix IX.

However, if the consumer opts to remove the additional connected load and if the additional load is found connected during subsequent inspection, penal provisions shall be invoked as per the rules in vogue.

ii. Service of consumers who do not get the additional loads regularised, shall be disconnected immediately on expiry of notice period and these services shall remain under disconnection, until they are regularised.

12.3.3.2 Cases where the total Connected Load is above 75 HP/56kW or

i. These services shall be billed at the respective HT tariff rates from the consumption month in which the un-authorized additional load is detected. For this purpose, 80% of Connected Load shall be taken as billing demand. The quantity of electricity consumed in any Month shall be computed by adding 3% extra on account of transformation losses to 1 Subject to sub-section 2 (a) of Section 185 of the Act. 2 Modified as per proceedings No. Secy/01/2012, dated 07-03-2012 42 the energy recorded in LT Meter.

ii. The Company may at its discretion, for the reasons to be recorded and in cases where no loss of revenue is involved, continue LT supply. If the consumer, however, makes arrangements for switchover to HT supply, the Company shall release HT supply as per the rules.

iii. One Month notice shall be given to regularise the additional Connected Load or part of additional load as per the requirement of the Consumer or to remove the additional connected load. If the consumer desires to continue with the additional connected load, he shall pay the required service line charges, development charges and consumption deposit required for conversion of LT service into LT 3(B) or HT service depending upon the connected load. However, if the consumer opts to remove the additional connected load and if the additional load is found connected during subsequent inspection, penal provisions shall be invoked as per the rules in vogue.

iv. Service of such consumers who do not pay HT tariff rates or who do not pay the required service line charges, development charges and consumption deposit, shall be disconnected immediately on expiry of notice period and these services shall remain under disconnection unless the required service line charges, development charges and consumption deposit are paid for regularising such services by conversion from LT to HT category.

v. If the consumer where required, does not get the LT services converted to HT supply and regularised as per procedure indicated above within three months from the date of issue of the notice, the Company is entitled to terminate the Agreement by giving required notice as per

clause 5.9.4 of the GTCS, notwithstanding that the consumer is paying bills at HT tariff rates prescribed in clause 12.3.3.2 (i) above.

12.3.3.3 Cases where the total Connected Load is above 75 HP/56kW or Cases where the total connected load is above 150 HP under LT Category III (B). These services will be billed at the HT category I tariff rates from the consumption month in which the un-authorized additional load is detected till such additional load is removed and got inspected by the designated officer of the Company."

36. Thus, evidently certain procedure is contemplated under GTCS No.12.3.3.1 for certain category of LT consumers. It is contended for the respondents that the said procedure is contemplated for the industries of LT Category but not for domestic connections. As such the pivotal issue falls for consideration is to which category of consumers, the said GTCS No.12.3.3.1 is applicable.

37. The said GTCS No.12.3.3.1 commences with the words, 'where the total connected Load is 75 HP/56 kW or 150 HP in cases of LT Cat III (B) or below at the time of detection'.

38. It necessitates further examination as to the application of the words 'or below' couched in the said provision. If these words 'or below' occurred between '150 HP' and 'in cases of LT Cat III (B)', it shall mean that the said provision applies only to LT category III (B) cases. But these words 'or below' follow the words 'category III' and as such the word 'or below' refers to the words 'category III (B)' and therefore, it means whether it is the connection with a load of 75 or 150 HP under Category III (B) or the categories below the Category III (B).

39. Thus, if it is ratiocinated, where additional Load is detected in any of the categories below the category III (B) or to the category III (B) with the capacity of 75HP/56HP, the procedure that is narrated under GTCS No.12.3.3.1 shall have to be followed.

40. Where such use of additional load is detected in the service connections with the load above the said Load of 75/56kW under category III (B) or above, the procedure contemplated under GTCS No.12.3.3.2 shall have to be followed.

41. In fact there does not lie any ambiguity in its understanding and the respondents just missed to find out the exact meaning of user of the words 'or

below' occurred after 'category III (B)' in the said GTCS No.12.3.3.1, and it led them to opine that the said provision was not applicable to the LT consumers of the categories below Category III (B).

42. As stated supra, GTCS No.12.3.3.2 deals with the cases where the LT connections are fitted with load in excess of 75HP/56kW and in such cases the tariff applicable is HT Tariff.

43. Further, I am afraid if any other kind of understanding of the said provision under GTCS No.12.3.3.1 is given, it would lead to chaos and there would be absence of procedure to deal with the users of additional load by the LT consumers under category I or II or category III (B) with load less than 75HP/56kW.

44. Thus, in the light of the aforesaid reasoning, when use of additional load is detected, the department shall follow the procedure contemplated under GTCS No.12.3. In the instant case, the applicable clause is GTCS No.12.3.3.1 since the contracted load is less than LT Category III (B), but the respondents committed error in contending that they have been adopting the procedure contemplated under GTCS No.9 for unauthorized use of electricity.

45. In fact, the assessment contemplated under GTCS No.9 is for the consumption of electricity made by unauthorized use of electricity whereas GTCS No.12.3 contemplates the assessment of development charges and consumption deposit or security deposit etcetera, and such assessment is for regularization of additional load at the option of the consumer.

46. Further, as seen from the said clause No.12.3.3.1, the department shall have to issue one month notice to the consumer who is detected to have been using electricity load in excess of the contracted load, to regularize the additional connected load or its part depending upon his need, **or to remove such additional load.**

47. **Thus, there lies an option to the consumer who is availing load in excess of the contract load either to remove such additional load, or to get such load or part of it regularized by following the procedure envisaged there under.**

48. **Of course if any consumer who is issued with such notice fails to follow either of the options at which he is placed and is found on subsequent inspection to have been continuing with additional load, he would be liable**

for invocation of penal provisions and would also face the threat of disconnection as is enumerated under Clause No.12.3.3.1 of GTCS.

49. Therefore, it is evident that the respondents erroneously contended that the clause No.9.4 of GTCS is applicable instead of clause No.12.3.3.1 of GTCS on detection of additional load connected in the premises of the representationist.

50. The department also contended that they made certain assessment as contemplated under Clause No.9.4 of GTCS and directed the consumer for payment of a sum of Rs.1,859/-. **The said sum is the subject matter of this representation. In fact a perusal of assessment order made by the respondents is examined, it is evident that they have only assessed development charges, additional security deposit etc and demanded its payment.** Assessment of development charges and additional security depending on the load connected is nothing but the procedure contemplated under GTCS No.12.3.3.1, but not GTCS No.9.

51. In fact though the department contends to have made an assessment under GTCS No.9, a perusal of the notice issued by the department to the representationist discloses, the respondents made assessment of development charges, security deposit etc., as is contemplated under GTCS No.12.3.3.1. In fact under the notice, they have asked the representationist to remove the additional load under intimation to them but such direction to the consumer seeking intimation as to the removal of the additional load is absent in the GTCS No.12.3.3.1 which is the appropriate clause to be followed in the instant case. In connection with the procedure contemplated as regards the additional load, the notice format is provided under Appendix IX of GTCS as intimated by the respondents. No doubt, it is the format of the notice calling upon the consumer who is found to have connected additional load to get such additional load regularized.

52. In fact, when the additional load is connected by the consumer, he is having option under clause No.12.3.3.1 to remove the same or to get the entire or part of additional load. If the consumer removes the additional load pursuant to the notice, he is not liable to pay any amount for getting the additional load regularized. In case, during further inspection, if the consumer is found utilizing additional load, he is liable to the penal action which is in vogue, as is envisaged under GTCS No.12.3.3.1.

53. As such, the representationist is not liable to pay the amount of Rs.1,859/- in case he is not intending to regularize the additional load connected to his service connection. Of course he is bound to remove the same in case he is not inclined to regularize the additional load else he would have to face the penal provisions and also threat of disconnection.

RESULT:

54. In the result, it is ordered that the respondents shall omit the said amount of Rs.1,859/- from the impugned bill and shall have to issue a revised bill in place of the impugned bill, and he shall be given notice of one month for removal of additional load or to regularize the additional load connected to his service connection or part of it as desired by him. The respondents shall have to intimate the Vidyut Ombudsman the compliance of this order within 15 days from this day.

It is not inapposite to clarify that after expiry of 30 days period from the date of such service of notice, the respondent authorities are at liberty to find out whether or not, the representationist removed the additional load and at the time of such examination, if they find continuation of additional load, they shall have to take some photographs of such electrical gadgets available at the house of the representationist to secure evidence of availability of such instruments, and to proceed with the procedure contemplated under GTCS No.12.3.3.1.

A copy of this order is made available at www.vidyutombudsman.ap.gov.in

Part of this order is dictated to the Private Secretary and transcribed by him and the rest is typed to my dictation by the Private Secretary, corrected, signed and pronounced by me on this the 1st day of September, 2022.

Sd/- Vinnakota Venkata Prasad
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN-AP

Copy to

1. Shaik Mahammed Sharif, S/o. Shaik Khaleel, D.No.3/992-A, G.V.P. Colony, Tadipatri, Anantapur Dt.
2. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Tadipatri
3. Dy. Executive Engineer/O/Tadipatri
4. Executive Engineer/O/Gooty

Copy to

5. The Chairperson, C.G.R.F., APSPDCL, 19/13/65/A, Srinivasapuram, Near 132 kV Sub-station, Tirchanoor Road, Tirupati- 517 503.
6. The Secretary, Hon'ble APERC, 11-4-660, 4th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad - 500 004.