



**BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN  
Andhra Pradesh & Telangana**

:: Present ::

**C. Ramakrishna**

Date: 20-12-2014

Appeal No. 66 of 2011

Between

Sri. B. Sadanandam, S/o. Sailu, S.C. No. 15127 - 16534, H.No. 101-114,  
Govindarajulu Swamy Bodrai, Warangal District.

**... Appellant**

**And**

1. AE/Distribution/Station Road/TSNPDCL/Warangal
2. ADE/Operation/TSNPDCL/Warangal
3. AAO/ERO/TSNPDCL/Warangal

**... Respondents**

The above appeal filed on 16-09-2011 has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 15-12-2014 at Warangal. The appellant, as well as respondents 1 to 3 above were present. Having considered the appeal, the written and oral submissions made by the appellant and the respondents, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following:

**AWARD**

2. The appeal arose out of the complaint of the consumer about

non-release of service connection.

3. Before delving into the appeal proper, it is felt necessary by this authority to put on record the reasons for the extraordinary delay in the disposal of the appeal. The appeal was filed on 16-09-2011. For inexplicable reasons, no notice was issued from this office all along when the institution of Ombudsman was operating out of the premises of the Commission. Ultimately when the institution of Ombudsman started functioning in an independent office all the old record pertaining to the institution was transferred to the new premises. It is in the process of such transferring of record that the pendency of the appeal has come to light. Soon after noticing that the appeal had not been acted upon, a notice was issued for hearing the matter.

4. The appellant stated in his appeal that he applied for a new service connection on 30-06-2010; that during the inspection by the AE, he stated that an old service bearing number 15127-16534 was there in his premises, that the house was not habitable as it was in a collapsed condition, that he had handed over the meter to the then Asst. Engineer in the year 2002-2003 along with application and S.C certificate and that the Government had announced waiver of outstanding arrears in respect of SC/ST consumers of rural and city areas; that in spite of his submissions to the AE, the AE still demanded registration of a fresh application for release of service; that subsequently the AE demanded that he pay the outstanding arrears of Rs. 9,042/- relating to his old service bearing number 15127-16534; that as the AE did not furnish the full details of the arrears, he approached the CGRF; and that he is aggrieved with the orders of the CGRF.

5. Notices were issued for hearing the matter. The respondent AAO filed written submission narrating the events that unfolded after the CGRF passed its orders, showing that the consumer desired to continue his agreement and utilize the service connection bearing number 15127-16534; and that the consumer had approached the Vidyut Ombudsman on 15-02-2011 i.e., well after the time limit provided to make an appeal.

6. During the course of the hearing, the appellant did not lay stress on any of his original contentions and instead wanted that some stringent action be taken against the then AE who had misbehaved with him by calling him names and belittling him. The respondents on their part while affirming what was stated in their written submission showed records to the effect that the outstanding arrears have since been waived in accordance with the Government Orders. They further submitted that there are no outstanding arrears as of today and that the issue is long settled.

7. The appellant laboured hard to keep on impressing upon this authority the need to initiate strong action against the then AE who caused him all the trouble. As the issue of arrears is no longer there and is treated as settled both by the appellant and the respondents, the core issue in the appeal is treated as settled. Coming to the issue of ordering action against the then AE, this authority does not find the demand sustainable on more counts than one. For one, the appeal of the appellant did not clearly mention the allegations being levelled by the appellant in his appeal. Secondly, he never brought them on to record at any stage. When the appeal itself was not taken up by this authority for all these years, he kept quiet giving an impression that the issue is amicably settled. Thirdly, there is no proper

defence from the appellant for the delay in filing the appeal. Lastly, the appellant should recognize that this authority is there to settle the grievances of the consumers in so far as they relate to the rendering of services by the DISCOM to the people. If any citizen has a grievance about an employee's behaviour, the proper forum for airing such grievances is the higher authorities concerned of the employee being complained against. This is not the forum to hear such matters and take a decision.

8. Therefore, the appeal is disposed of as a settled matter.

9. This order is corrected and signed on this 20<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2014.

10. A digitally signed copy of this order is made available at [www.vidyutombudsman.ap.gov.in](http://www.vidyutombudsman.ap.gov.in).

#### **VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

##### **To**

1. Sri. B.Sadanandam, S/o. Sailu, S.C. No. 15127 - 16534, H.No. 101-114,  
Govindarajulu Swamy Bodrai, Warangal District.
2. Assistant Engineer, Distribution, Station Road, TSNPDCL, Warangal -  
506002
3. Assistant Divisional Engineer, Operation, TSNPDCL, Warangal - 506 002
4. Assistant Accounts Officer, ERO, TSNPDCL, Warangal - 506 002

**Copy to:**

5. The Chairman, C.G.R.F., TSNPDCL, 'Vidyut Bhavan', Nakkalagutta,  
Hanamkonda, Warangal - 506 001.
6. The Secretary, TSERC, 11-4-660, 5th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills,  
Hyderabad - 500 004