

BEFORE THE FORUM
FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
IN SOUTHERN POWER DISTRIBUTION COMPANY OF A.P LIMITED
TIRUPATI

On this, the 19th day of December 2013

In C.G.No: 135/ 2013-14/ Ongole Circle

Present

Sri K. Paul
Sri A. Venugopal
Sri T. Rajeswara Rao
Sri A. Satish Kumar

Chairperson
Member (Accounts)
Member (Legal)
Member (Consumer Affairs)

Between

Sri. A.Pitchi Reddy
Pamurupalle,
Bramhanapalle Post,
Komarolu,
Prakasam-Dist

Complainant

And

1. Assistant Engineer/Operation/Komarolu
2. Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Giddalur
3. Divisional Engineer/Operation/Markapur
4. Senior Accounts Officer/Operation/Ongole
5. Superintending Engineer/Operation/Ongole

Respondents

Sri.A.Pitchi Reddy resident of Pamurupalle, Bramhanapalle Post, Komarolu, Prakasam-Dist herein called the complainant, in his complaint dt: 17-09-2013 filed in the Forum on dt: 17-09-2013 under clause 5 (7) of APERC regulation 1/2004 read with section 42 (5) of I.E. Act 2003 had stated that

1. He is an agl. consumer with ScNo:4 for a load of 7.5 HP under SS-5 of Pamurupalli village, Komarolu mandal of Prakasam-Dist.
2. The service was released in the year 1986 in the recent the department had proposed to lay 11KV line passing over his above borewell which causes hindrance in future to his attempts for re-boring and replacement of pipes and finally he requested them to lay the line from a different pole,

but the team denied his request under the plea that line cannot be laid for his service below 20 mts and hence his service 04 was not provided with line. The matter was reported from line man to the ADE by him, but there was no result.

3. Finally he decided to get the works done to the contractor and requested him to lay the line under the condition that he will bear the cost. The contractor demanded Rs.3000/- from him to rearrange the line as the required pole and other material was available.
4. Accordingly he paid an amount Rs.2500/- to the contractor and the Rs.500/- balance will be paid after completion of the work. The contractor again demanded Rs.3000/- additionally to lay the service cable of 70Mts for the balance work which was already completed with the available material.
5. He has sustained a financial loss to a tune of about 1.5 lakhs because of the incomplete works and his fields left barren.
6. Requested to shift the transformer and provide lines to his two number services.

Notices were served upon the respondents duly enclosing a copy of complaint.

The respondent-1 and 2, i.e. the Assistant Engineer/Operation/Komarolu and Assistant Divisional Engineer/ Operation/Giddalur in their similar written submissions dt:15-11-2013 and dt: 12-11-2013, received in this office on 19-11-2013 and 27-11-2013 stated that:

1. The notice was received on 21-10-2013 regarding complaint of Sri Ambavarapu Pitchi reddy of Pamurpalli Village in Komarolu mandal. The report and action taken on the complaint is herewith submitted for favour of consideration please.

2. The consumer Sri.Ambavarapu Pitchi reddy, Pamurpalli village in Komarolu mandal has two agriculture connection (1) no. 4 in the name of A.Pichi reddy (2) Agl.No:305 in the name of A.Eswaramma W/o Pitchi reddy.
- a. Regarding Agl No.4, this is old service one 25KVA transformer was erected by construction wing under HVDS scheme. The distance between bore and transformer is about 20 meters. But there was small rastha between bore and transformer. There is no problem for utilising power supply to his bore. His request for providing cable to the idle pole near to his bore is brought to the notice of construction wing and erected as shown in the sketch (1) to avoid unwanted incidents.
 - b. Regarding Agl. No:305, this is new service, one 25KVA transformer was erected by construction wing under HVDS scheme. The distance between bore and nearest LT pole is about 30 meters. There is no problem for utilizing power supply to his bore. His request for providing it cable near to his bore is brought to the notice of construction wing and erected as shown in the sketch (2) to avoid unwanted incidents.
 - c. Regarding shifting of newly erected transformer is not necessary to the present existing condition.
 - d. Regarding corruption nature of Sri.V.Narasimha Reddy HVDS works supervisor was brought to the notice of HVDS contractor and ADE construction Markapur for taking necessary action.
 - e. As there was "PYLON" Cyclone occurred during 10/2013 and attended the cyclone damage works so delay occurred in

submitting reply. Hence the delay in submitting reply may please be excused.

Findings of the Forum:

1. The grievance of the complainant is that his agl. service bearing ScNo:04 at Pamurupalli distribution, Komarolu Mandal of Prakasam-Dist was left without providing the necessary lines during implementation of HVDS by erecting a 25KVA transformer by the construction wing, who while questioned replied that, since the distance between the bore-well and the transformer is about 20 mts, the line was not provided and is in accordance with the norms.
2. As could be seen from the sketch submitted by the ADE/Opn/Giddaluru the respondent-2 the distance between the transformer and the complainants service No:4 is only 20mts, but is crossing the passage provided for cart movement in the fields. AS per the norms the service wire is to be procured by the consumer and shall be not more than 30 mts, but here in this case it is only 20mts and hence there is no necessity to provide a pole and service in addition to the existing. It is the responsibility of the consumer to raise the height of the service wire to provide necessary clearance in the said passage.
3. Though the complainant not mentioned about the second service the respondents replied that the complainant is having another service bearing ScNo:305 which is a new service. One 25KVA transformer was erected by the construction wing under HVDS and the distance between the bore-well and the nearest LT pole was only 30mts and hence there is no necessity to provide the cable, but however in view of the safety a cable was erected.

4. Regarding corruption charges that the contractor demanded bribe for altering the lines to suit the requirement and convenience of the complainant, the complainant did not produce any evidence to that effect and hence is not considered. Moreover the complainant stated that he had paid Rs.2500/- as bribe to the contractor for laying of the lines which is a crime on his part since paying bribe is equally punishable as in the case of accepting bribe.
5. As such it is felt by the Forum that there is no deficiency of service on the part of the respondents in the said matter.

In view of the above, the Forum passed the following order.

ORDER

“No separate order need to be issued.”

Accordingly the case is allowed and disposed off

If aggrieved by this order, the complainant may represent to the Vidyut Ombudsman, O/o the APERC, 5th floor, Singarenibhavan, Redhills, Hyderabad-500004, within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.

Signed on this the 19th day of December 2013.

Sd/-
Member (Legal)

Sd/-
Member (C.A)

Sd/-
Member (Accounts)

Sd/-
Chairperson

Forwarded by Orders

Secretary to the Forum

To
The Complainant
The Respondents
Copy to the General Manager/ CSC/ Corporate office/ Tirupati for pursuance in this matter.