



BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN
Andhra Pradesh :: Hyderabad



:: Present ::

N. Basavaiah, B.Sc, B.L.

Date: 27-10-2016

Appeal/Representation No. 03 of 2016



Between

Sri. Asapu. Ravi Kumar, S/o Veerraju, D.No. 1-429, Diwancheruvu,
Rajanagaram (M), East Godavari District.

... Complainant

And

1. The AE/Operation/APEPDCL/Rajanagaram
2. The ADE/Operation/APEPDCL/Rajahmundry-Rural
3. The DE/Operation/APEPDCL/Rajahmundry

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 30-04-2016 has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 17-10-2016 at Rajahmundry. The complainant, as well as respondents 1 to 3 above were present. Having considered the appeal, the written and oral submissions made by the Complainant and the respondents, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following:

ORDER

1. This appeal-representation has been made by the above complainant under Sec.42 (6) of the Electricity Act 2003 against the order dated: 27.4.2016 in CG No.502/2015 of East Godavari District passed by the consumer grievances redressal forum, A.P.E.P.D.C.L., dismissing the complaint of the complainant/appellant about non-releasing of a domestic service connection to the complainant by observing that the building was constructed by the complainant in an un-authorized layout as contended by the respondents.



2. The complainant preferred this appeal-representation enclosing a copy of the approved plan.

4. The point for consideration is:

“Whether the representation can be upheld?”

No oral or documentary evidence has been adduced either before the forum or the ombudsman.

Point: A memo is filed by the respondents stating that the consumer was intimated to pay the necessary charges of Rs.1,70,110/- as per the letter dated.15-10-2016 for releasing service connection as requested by the consumer in this case, but, he did not pay the amount so far. The consumer-complainant had submitted that the appeal could be closed and that he would pay the above amount and obtain service connection. Considering the memo filed on behalf of the appellant/complainant, I am of the view that there is no need to decide the above point or anything in this appeal. This point is thus answered.

5. In the result, the appeal/representation is closed by recording the memo filed on behalf of the respondents.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to direct both parties to bear their respective costs.

7. This order corrected and signed on this 27th day of October, 2016.

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



Baranavath
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN
27/10/16

To

1. Sri. Asapu. Ravi Kumar, S/o Veerraju, D.No. 1-429, Diwancheruvu, Rajanagaram (M), East Godavari District - 533 296, Contact : 9160405040
2. The Assistant Engineer, Operation, APEPDCL, Rajanagaram Village & Mandal, East Godavai District - 533 294
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer, Operation, APEPDCL, Rajahmundry Rural, Mallayyapeta, 33/11 kV Sub-station, Rajahmundry - 533 105
4. The Divisional Engineer, Operation, APEPDCL, Ullithota Street, Near Godavari Bund, Rajahmundry - 533 101

Copy to:

5. The Chairman, C.G.R.F., APEPDCL, P&T Colony, Seethammadhara, Near Gurudwara Junction, Visakhapatnam - 530 013.
6. The Secretary, APERC, 11-4-660, 4th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad - 500 004.



1. The first part of the document is a letter from the Secretary of the State of New York to the Governor, dated January 1, 1912. The letter is addressed to the Governor and is signed by the Secretary.

2. The second part of the document is a letter from the Governor to the Secretary, dated January 1, 1912. The letter is addressed to the Secretary and is signed by the Governor.

3. The third part of the document is a letter from the Secretary to the Governor, dated January 1, 1912. The letter is addressed to the Governor and is signed by the Secretary.

4. The fourth part of the document is a letter from the Governor to the Secretary, dated January 1, 1912. The letter is addressed to the Secretary and is signed by the Governor.

5. The fifth part of the document is a letter from the Secretary to the Governor, dated January 1, 1912. The letter is addressed to the Governor and is signed by the Secretary.

6. The sixth part of the document is a letter from the Governor to the Secretary, dated January 1, 1912. The letter is addressed to the Secretary and is signed by the Governor.

7. The seventh part of the document is a letter from the Secretary to the Governor, dated January 1, 1912. The letter is addressed to the Governor and is signed by the Secretary.

8. The eighth part of the document is a letter from the Governor to the Secretary, dated January 1, 1912. The letter is addressed to the Secretary and is signed by the Governor.

9. The ninth part of the document is a letter from the Secretary to the Governor, dated January 1, 1912. The letter is addressed to the Governor and is signed by the Secretary.

10. The tenth part of the document is a letter from the Governor to the Secretary, dated January 1, 1912. The letter is addressed to the Secretary and is signed by the Governor.



Secretary