



## **VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA**

First Floor 33/11 kV substation, Hyderabad Boats Club Lane  
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

**:: Present :: R. DAMODAR**

Thursday, The Twelfth Day of June 2015

Appeal No. 20 of 2015

(Old Appeal No. 46 of 2013)

Preferred against Order Dt. 18-02-2013 of CGRF In

CG.No: 318/2013 of Warangal Circle

Smt. Sunitha Reddy,  
W/o Shiva prasad Reddy,  
H.No. 2-1-159, Road No. 3,  
Mahadevanagar,  
Gopalpuram Road, Hanamkonda,  
Warangal District.

...

### **Appellant**

1. The AE/Distribution/TSNPDCL/Gopalpur/Warangal Dist.
2. The ADE/Distribution/TSNPDCL/Town/Hanamkonda/warangal Dist.
3. The DE/Operation/TSNPDCL/Warangal/Warangal Dist.

...

### **Respondents**

The above appeal originally filed on 14.03.2013 is coming up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 11.06.2015 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. A Vijender Reddy, DE/OP/TSNPDCL/Warangal and Sri. N. Subramanyeshwara Rao, ADE/Distribution/Hanamkonda for the Respondents, while the Appellant is absent in spite of notice and intimation by phone, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;

## AWARD

The Appellant is owner of a house at Road No.3, Madhav Nagar, Gopalpur Road, Hanamkonda. She claims that a transformer of 100kVA was erected exactly in front of her main gate, which is causing a lot of inconvenience for the movement of vehicles in and out of her house. The road in front of her house, as per plan is 30 feet width. The transformer was fixed about 20 feet from the compound wall of her house. The road is a congested one with drainage and ramps.

2. The Appellant claims that she is a member of Madhava Nagar Colony welfare association. She claims that it was the responsibility of the society, when her husband made a request to shift the transformer and also made a request to AE/Electrical of Gopalpur area to shift the transformer. Later the Appellant preferred a complaint before the CGRF. The Appellant also brought the matter to the notice of CMD on 5/2/2013. The concerned authorities visited the site on 8/2/2013 and noted the matter. It is clear according to the Appellant, that nobody wants transformers in front of their premises, as it was deliberately fixed at the present place. Her husband expired on 06/09/2013.

3. The Respondents claimed that While the Appellant was pressing for shifting of the transformer, the society office bearers were claiming that if the transformer is shifted to the corner of two roads or even by 5 feet from the main gate of the Appellant, the open plot of the society loses its vastu compliance. Since the width of the road is 30 feet, there could be no inconvenience to the Appellant. DTR was erected in the location chosen by the society members. The location of DTR is a load centre to give overload relief to the existing 315 kVA DTR.

4. CGRF considered the plea of the Appellant, the written submissions of the respondents who claimed that the location of the new DTR gives sufficient clearance to the premises of the complainant, which is located on the opposite side to the house of the complainant, observed that the road at the place is 30 feet wide and there is no inconvenience to the complainant due to the plinth of the DTR and also considered the fact that the location of the new DTR was suggested by the members of the society.

5. The members of CGRF had inspected the premises of the DTR plinth at the request of the Appellant and came to the conclusion that the DTR is located in the open

plot of the society premises and between this DTR and the house of the Appellant, there is 30 feet wide road. CGRF thus opined that there could be no inconvenience to the Appellant caused by the location of DTR.

6. On the basis of the spot inspection and the facts, CGRF refused any relief and directed the respondents to carry out the works as per the scheme approved by the licensee for overload relief to the existing 315 kVA DTR.

7. Aggrieved and not satisfied with the impugned orders, the Appellant preferred the present Appeal.

8. In Spite of notice and information on phone, the Appellant pleaded her inability to appear in person. The respondents filed written submission and documents.

9. The point for determination is whether the Appellant is entitled to shifting of DTR from the present location to another location.

**POINT:**

10. The Appellant is seeking shifting of DTR from the present location, which is on the other side of 30 Feet road opposite to the house of the Appellant. The respondents claimed that the society office bearers are against the shifting of DTR from the present location and they claimed that this DTR was erected at the request of the society members for the benefit of the residents for overload protection and it is neither an obstruction to the passing traffic on the 30 feet road nor it is in any way affecting the rights of the Appellant.

11. The Appellant filed complaint on the pretext that the society members and also the people who use the 30 feet road are opposed to the location of DTR which is found to be not correct.

12. The newspaper cuttings filed by the respondents show that Madhava Nagar residents were agitating against shifting of DTR and they were conducting dharnas. The Appellant's claim that the colony people were seeking shifting of DTR is not correct. The CGRF has correctly examined the issue in the dispute and refused the relief sought by the Appellant.

13. The Appellant, it appears is unhappy due to the location of the DTR in front of her gate on the opposite side of the 30 feet road, when she claimed that her husband

expired on 6/9/2013. May be she has her own reasons to claim the present relief, which is neither rational nor in public interest. The location of DTR plinth on the opposite side of the road, gives no right to the Appellant to demand shifting of the DTR. There are no grounds to interfere with the impugned orders. The Appeal is dismissed as having no merits.

Corrected, signed and pronounced on this the 12th day of June 2015.

## VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

1. Smt. Sunitha Reddy  
W/o Shiva prasad Reddy,  
H.No. 2-1-159, Road No. 3  
Mahadevanagar,  
Gopalpuram Road,  
Warangal District.
2. The Assistant Engineer, Distribution, TSNPDCL, Gopalapur, Warangal Dist.
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer, Distribution, TSNPDCL, Town, Hanamkonda,  
Warangal Dist.
4. The Divisional Engineer, Operation, TSNPDCL, Warangal Dist.

### Copy to:

5. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum , TSNPDCL,  
Nakkalagutta,  
Warangal Dist.
6. The Secretary, TSERC, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapool,  
Hyderabad.

