

# VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad - 500 004

Present: R. Damodar

Date: 07-04-2015

Appeal No.6 of 2015

Smt. V. Sharada,  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Anasuya Complex,  
S.J.B. Builders, Opp. TTD, Himayatnagar,  
Hyderabad - 500 027

..... Appellant / Complainant

AND

1. The AE/Operation/Himayatnagar, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad
2. The AAO/ERO/Mint Compound, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad
3. The ADE/Operation/Hyderguda, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad
4. The DE/Operation/Saifabad, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad
5. The SE/Operation/Hyderabad Central Circle, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad

..... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 20-03-2015 coming up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 31-03-2015 at Hyderabad in the presence of Smt.V. Sharada for the Appellant/Complainant and Sri. B.Muralinath, AE/Operation/Himayatnagar (R1), Sri. P.Srinivas Reddy, AAO/ERO/Mint Compound (R2) for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both the parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following:

## AWARD

The Appellant/Complainant has two Service Connections, one is D1003718 and another is D1003719. She has no grievance regarding Service Connection No. D1003718. She claimed that the Service Connection No.D1003719 was disconnected showing 'zero' consumption and it was not in use since June, 2011. The Appellant/Complainant claimed that in the notice served on her by the Respondents, she was informed that there was an excess of connected load over contracted load by 7 KW and she was billed `19,600/- as development charges.

The Appellant/Complainant further claimed that the two service connections were clubbed in one bill showing development charges and fixed charges separately as follows:

S.C.No. D 1003718 - ₹.16,800/-

S.C.No. D 1003719 - ₹.19,600/-

The Appellant/Complainant is questioning the demand of ₹.19,600/- representing development and fixed charges to S.C.No.D1003719, when the service connection was disconnected right from June, 2011 showing 'zero' consumption.

2. On the above complaint, the CGRF registered C.G.No.15/2015 and after giving Notice of hearing passed the impugned order dated 23-02-2015 regarding Service Connection No.D1003719 finding:

- a) That the Appellant/Complainant has not been availing power supply from June, 2011 onwards.
- b) The Appellant/Complainant, having paid the charges (development and fixed charges on S.C.No.D1003719) had not raised any objection within 15 days of issue of Notice and therefore, she is not entitled to any relief on this aspect.

3. Aggrieved, the Appellant/Complainant preferred the present appeal.

4. The second Respondent filed reply stating that both the service connections were booked for additional usage than the Contracted Load and the consumer has paid development charges and security deposit, but has not paid the fixed charges.

5. It is further case of the Respondents that Sri. B.Muralinath AE/Operation/ Himayatnagar had inspected S.C.No.D1003719 on 19-02-2013, found the total Contracted Load as 1 KV and Connected Load as 7.64 KV and submitted his report and on its basis a demand notice was sent for ₹.19,600/- representing development charges ₹.14,000/- plus security deposit ₹.5,600/-.

6. Efforts to get the parties to reach an agreement failed on 31-03-2015 though the process of conciliation and mediation.

7. Heard both sides.

8. Keeping in view the allegation of the Appellant/Complainant and reply of the Respondents, the following points arise for determination.

- 1) Whether the Respondents, are justified in raising a bill for `19,600/- against S.C.No.D1003719 of the Appellant/Complainant?
- 2) Whether the inspection of S.C.No.D1003719 of the Appellant/Complainant by the Respondent No.1 on 19-02-2013 has any bearing on the facts when the service was disconnected right from June, 2011?

**Points No.1&2:**

9. The Appellant/Complainant is aggrieved by the demand of the Respondents for `19,600/- raised on S.C.No.D1003719 which is admittedly in a disconnected position. The 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent, when pointed out the fact that the service connection was disconnected and 'zero' reading has been shown right from June, 2011 onwards as per the consumption, Billing, Collection and Arrears History during the period from January, 2000 to January, 2015, has pointed out that during November, 2012 a consumption of 24 units was shown and hence, service connection was in operation and therefore, he inspected the service connection and gave his report.

10. A reading of this report shows that from June, 2011 till December, 2014 the meter reading showed 'zero' except during the month of November, 2012 showing a reading of 24 units. The 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent admitted that this reading may relate to the last consumption reading for the month of May, 2011. Such position cannot be ruled out in view of 'zero' consumption right from June, 2011 to December, 2014 except for November, 2012. Thus, it is clear from the record that when the S.C.No.D1003719 was disconnected and the reading has been a consistent 'zero', his finding of excess load than Contracted Load regarding a disconnected service connection would lose relevance.

11. The Appellant/Complainant claimed that on the threat of disconnection of the other connection, her son paid the amount of `19,600/- as per demand raised on S.C.No.D1003719, which the Respondents should refund. The Respondents, in view of

the facts, are not justified in raising demand for `19,600/- on S.C.No.D1003719 on a long disconnected connection. Both the points are answered accordingly.

**15. Conclusion:**

- a) The Respondents are not justified in raising the bill for `19,600/- against S.C.No.D1003719 of the Appellant/Complainant.
- b) The Respondents are directed to adjust the amount of `19,600/- towards the current consumption bills of the Appellant/Complainant on S.C.No.D1003718 immediately.
- c) The CGRF having observed that booking additional load was against the service which is not in use since two years, had unjustly denied the main relief, which lead to unnecessary litigation and harassment to the Appellant/Complainant.

*This Award is corrected, signed and pronounced on this the <sup>th</sup> day of April 2015.*

Sd/-

**VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

Smt. V. Sharada,  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Anasuya Complex,  
S.J.B. Builders, Opp. TTD, Himayatnagar,  
Hyderabad - 500 027

The AE/Operation/Himayatnagar, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad  
The AAO/ERO/Mint Compound, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad  
The ADE/Operation/Hyderguda, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad  
The DE/Operation/Saifabad, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad  
The SE/Operation/Hyderabad Central Circle, TSSPDCL, Hyderabad

Copy to

1. **The Chairperson**, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum -2 (Rural),  
Hyderabad - 500045.
2. **The Secretary**, TSERC, Hyderabad