

BEFORE THE FORUM
FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
IN SOUTHERN POWER DISTRIBUTION COMPANY OF A.P LIMITED TIRUPATI
On this the 29th day of February 2020
C.G.No:66/2019-20/Nellore Circle

Present

Sri. Dr. A. Jagadeesh Chandra Rao
Sri. Dr. R. Surendra Kumar

Chairperson
Independent Member

Between

P.Sampath Reddy,
Muttembak,
Vakadu,
Kota (M)
Nellore –Dist.

Complainant

AND

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Kota
2. Assistant Executive Engineer/O/Vakadu
3. Deputy Executive Engineer/O/Kota
4. Executive Engineer/O/Gudur

Respondents

ORDER

1. The case of the complainant is that the property related to service No. 3121249002177 and 3121249002950 was purchased by P. Sampath Reddy (complainant herein) and his son on 30.01.2019. After purchase they contacted respondents No.2 and 3 and enquired about the amount due on the above two services .The arrears were cleared as on 31.01.2019. Charges for current demand were also paid. Subsequently in the month of February'2019 he received another consumer bill for the same service wherein it is indicated that Rs. 31,856/- as arrears and Rs. 2,371/- as current demand. The total amount of Rs. 34,227/- was paid but they are disputing the calculations and the same was not resolved.

Respondents provided details of the existing transformers wherein it is mentioned that the capacity of the services as 57 HP for service No. 3121249002177 and 45 HP for service No. 3121249002950. But on enquiry it came to light that service No. 3121249002177 is being billed at a capacity of 123 HP the arrears of the bill for Rs.27,808/- was for the period from October'18 to December'18.

On enquiry with AAO, Gudur i.e. Respondent No.1 informed that the service No.2177 is billed for 166 HP and an amount of Rs.1,53,000/- was collected as development charges for

DESPATCHED

DATE C.G.No.66/2019-20/Nellore Circle

Page 1

03/03

additional load in October '18. The service was changed to HT category without any notice. The infrastructure at the property has remained at the same level when the load exceeded 55 HP, the demand could not be supported and fuses were blown at least on two occasions. They were informed that the total demand at the site is around 200 HP and advised to apply for two new services each with 49 HP capacity. A payment of around Rs.2,40,000/- was made towards installation of new transformers on 14.02.2019. Lack of communication from the respondents about the change in capacity or billing slab charges resulted in additional charges for underutilized capacity for more than 7 months. No infrastructure upgrades have taken place at the site and no service is provided for 166 HP. So he is requesting for refund of the amount paid towards development charges for additional load. Actual infrastructure installed is only 102 HP. Hence he is requesting to upgrade infrastructure for account No. 3121249002177 to support 99 HP and convert it to LT service. Due to inadequate service at the site his tenant is unable to utilize the service, only around 50 % of the site fully for aqua culture resulting losses on lease amounts and in addition to it, he was forced to use generators to meet current load.

Therefore the complainant prays:

1. Settle all the discrepancies for this account and make sure that future bills reflect actual usage and infra structure under the right tariff.
 2. Licensee should bear financial losses caused to them around Rs.10,00,000/- between October '18 and May' 19.
 3. Pay compensation amount of Rs.200/- per day for 240 days.
 4. Pay compensation amount of Rs.100/- per day for not releasing new service within 5 days.
 5. Service is billed under 109 HP since October '18 on the ground that he used excess load once in May'18 and it came to their knowledge in March bill though he is getting 57 HP for the past 8 months, but has been paying excess load arrears all along. Hence direct the department to refund the arrears payment made by them for the past 8 months.
2. Respondent No. 4 filed written submission stating that the property related to service No.3121249002177 was purchased by P. Sampath Reddy and his son P. Balaji and applied for name transfer on 16.02.2019 at mee - seva vide Reg.No.31212CO38802019

FEB19. Complainant became registered consumer of the Licensee only with effect from 16.02.2019 only. Consumer accepting the facts in respect of the revised bills for HT billing, paid the same and cleared all the arrears. Consumer himself stated that the service connection No. 3121249002177 is billed with capacity 123 KW or 166 HP. It clearly shows that consumer was given detailed information. A notice was served to the lease holder who is doing the aqua culture by that time for registration of HT application at mee – seva Vide Lr No. ADE/O/Kota/F.DOC/D.No.1422/18 Dt: 17.10.2018. But he has not registered any application for conversion from LT service to HT service at mee - seva till to date. A notice was served to lease holder for payment of additional load amount of Rs. 1,53,000/- which was generated through software vide Case No. NLR/Gudur/Kota/ AG 525/18 Dt: 28.05.2018 due to exceeding contracted load and obtained acknowledgment. Regarding Distribution Transformer capacity as per Technical Standards oil and winding temperature are within limits as long as the Distribution Transformer can be over loaded at any extent. The Distribution Transformer capacity at the location is 100 KVA, it can cater the loads to the extent load utilized by the consumer. But consumer is not willing to hear the technical data of difference between contracted load and infra-structure. The infrastructure means Distribution Transformer, Meter etc,.. The existing Distribution Transformer can cater the loads. On observation of the billing data the consumer utilized the MD as follows:

Month	RMD in KW	Month	RMD in KW
02/2017	87.20	06/2018	154.20
03/2017	91.60	07/2018	95.80
04/2017	163.40	08/2018	114.80
05/2017	0.00	09/2018	121.40
06/2017	0.00	10/2018	107.60
07/2017	98.20	11/2018	73.80
08/2017	69.20	12/2018	61.80
09/2017	61.80	01/2019	27.60
10/2017	54.00	02/2019	6.00
11/2017	47.40	03/2019	0.00
12/2017	30.60	04/2019	93.00

01/2018	47.20	05/2019	85.00
02/2018	66.20	06/2019	113.00
03/2018	101.20	07/2019	88.00
04/2018	118.00		
05/2018	123.80		

On observation of the above history shows that the consumer regularly exceeded contracted demand from 02/2017. It is not true that fuses are blowing out for exceeding load of 57 HP.

Consumer himself accepting his site demand is 200 HP. Consumer who is exceeding load of 100 HP or 74 KW has to go for HT service only as per General Terms and Conditions of Supply. The same was brought to the notice of the consumer and suggested to register an HT application at mee -seva , but consumer is not willing to register for HT application at mee- seva stating that he had applied 2 No's new services with 49 HP each capacity .The estimate was approved by the AEE/O/Vakadu as there were no other services on his name. After sanctioning of the estimate, name transfer was effected for service No.3121249002177. Only one service can be released in one premises and multiple services cannot be allowed as per General Terms and Conditions of Supply.

All the notices regarding additional load HT billing were served to the lease holder in time. Consumer registered application for name transfer in February'19. HT consumers have to purchase the Distribution transformer and provide concerned infrastructure by themselves. There is no inadequate service by the department as alleged by the consumer. The request of the consumer to convert the service to LT from HT billing could not be considered as consumer is continuously exceeding his load more than 100 HP. It is not possible to indicate LT service as HT billed service. Technically the billing is calculated manually (i.e. difference between LT and HT billing) and included in CC bills regularly and the same is explained to the consumer when he approached the departmental officials. Complainant has no right for demanding to refund the amount as he applied for name transfer in February'2019 the amount could not be refunded or adjusted in future bills due to legal procedure regarding HT billing is done with previous consumer/ lease holder.

There is no possibility to revise the bill as the bills were issued under right tariff. Consumer registered with the department from 16.02.2019 onwards only. But he is claiming losses from October '2018 onwards hiding the facts that entire process was done legally. Hence question of bearing financial loss by the department does not arise. Consumer is claiming

compensation for the works to be taken up by his own and with his cost. Consumer obstructed the department for charging the Distribution transformer without AB switch and as per citizen charter 30 days time is given for releasing new service with an extension and not 5 days as claimed by the complainant. Hence question of awarding compensation does not arise. The history of the service regarding billing is well known to the consumer as they intimated everything to the previous consumer through notices.

3. Points for determination are :

1. Whether respondents are entitled to collect additional load amount on auto generated case without conducting physical inspection and issuing notice as per Clause. No. 12.3.3 of GTCS?
2. Whether respondents are entitled to issue bills under HT category on the ground that RMD of the complainant's service connection has exceeded the limits of LT category?
3. Whether the service connection which is billed under HT category on account of exceeding of RMD of the limits of LT category requires minimum period of 1 year for changing it to LT Category?
4. Whether there is delay in releasing of new service connections and if so whether the complainant is entitled for compensation as per Regulation. No. 07/2004 as amended by Reg. No. 09/2013?
5. Whether the complainant is entitled for multiple services in one premises?

Point No.1.

Respondents in their written submission dt : 03.08.2019 in Para 3 (B) admitted that additional load case was generated through software vide Case No. NLR/Gudur/ Kota/ AG 525/18 Dt: 28.05.2018. This amount said to have been included in the August'2018 CC bill and paid in the month of September'18. Respondents though stated that they have served the notice to the lessee of vendor of complainant the copy of the same was not filed before the Forum.

Respondents did not state specifically whether the inspection was carried out as per the provisions of Clause No. 12.3.3 of GTCS before issuing notice to pay Rs.1,53,000/- towards additional load charges. Physical inspection of the load and issuing of one month notice is mandatory to regularize the additional load or giving an option to the consumer to remove

the additional load with a request for re inspection to show that the load is removed and is within the limits of contracted load.

According to the respondents, consumer exceeded LT limits on several occasions. Hence he is liable to pay additional load amount and the service connection has to be billed under HT category. Respondents also filed data sheet from May'18 to August'19 for 16 months which shows that consumer had exceeded RMD of LT category limits in 13 months out of 16 months Respondents did not give any explanation as to why they have not proceeded as per Clause No. 12.3.3.1 (ii) and 12.3.3.2 (v) of GTCS when the lessee failed to respond to the alleged notice said to have been issued against him. Respondents are not expected to allow the consumer to utilize the power exceeding LT limits and to have benefit of paying amount only for the excess RMD over the LT limits when they came to know that consumer is constantly exceeding LT limits. In the absence of any authority, respondents are not entitled to levy additional load amount only on the premise of exceeding RMD of LT limits by way of auto generated case and include it in the bill and collect it. Mere payment of amount towards additional load which is included in the CC bill is itself does not amounts to admission that consumer is having additional load exceeding LT limits and regularized it by paying the amount. Since respondents failed to follow provisions of Clause No. 12.3.3 of GTCS in letter and spirit, they are not entitled to collect additional load amount of Rs.1,53,000/- by registering an auto generated case and including it in the CC bills. The point No.1 is answered accordingly.

Point No. 2 :

The contention of the complainant is that the capacity of DTR is only 100 KVA but respondents stating that RMD of the service connection is exceeding 166 HP or 123 KW . It is not possible for the DTR to withhold the load. So the data given by the respondents is not correct and the DTR is a defective one. Hence no reliance can be placed on the RMD recorded in the service meter.

According to the respondents though the capacity of the DTR is 100 KVA, as per technical standards oil and winding temperature are within limits as long as the Distribution transformer can be over loaded at any extent, it can cater the loads utilized by the consumer and it never failed till today.

Maximum demand is defined in Clause No. 2.2.35 of GTCS and it is as follows:

“Maximum demand” means twice the maximum number of Kilo volt-ampere hours (KVAH) delivered at the point of supply to the consumer during any consecutive 30 minutes

during the month in respect of consumer having contracted demand of less than 4000 KVA. However for the consumer having contracted demand of 4000 KVA and above the maximum demand means four times the maximum number of Kilo volt ampere hours (KVAH) delivered at the point of supply to the consumer during any consecutive 15 minutes during the Month”

Respondents further stated that if more aerators are pressed into service by the consumer in case of exigencies to cater his needs for some time, its load will increase the utilization of energy resulting in exceeding of RMD in the meter.

Complainant himself admitted in his pleadings as well as in his written arguments that due to inadequate capacity of his service connection tenant was unable to utilize the service and only 50% site is used for aqua culture resulting losses on lease amount and in addition to it his tenant was forced to use generators to meet current load. Complainant himself applied for two new service connections with 49 HP each . So all these facts clearly proves that the load required by the consumer is more the LT limits . It appears since the lessee used the service exceeding LT limits RMD shooted up. If really the transformer could not with stand to over load, it would have been failed. Merely because the consumer is stating that 100 KVA Distribution transformer will not withstand excess load is itself is not sufficient to conclude that RMD recorded in the energy meter provided to the service meter of the consumer is not correct and there is a defect in the DTR. It is also pertinent to note that the same DTR is being in use for the same service connection till today.

Respondent No.4 is a Executive Engineer having vast experience categorically stated in written submissions and also in personal hearing that the transformer will withhold the load. Complainant did not place any authority before the Forum that the transformer in the premises will not withstand the load. Burden is on the complainant to prove that the said transformer will not hold the extent of load of 166 HP. So the contention of the complainant that RMD recorded in the meter is not correct is not tenable.

According to respondents lessee of vendor of complainant paid Rs.1,53,000/- towards additional load charges. It is pertinent to note that even after payment of additional load charges the load was not enhanced in the master. According to respondents due to software issues they were not able to enhance the load beyond 100 HP as the service was released under LT Cat –III. So they are calculating the bill manually for this service connection. If there is any software issues, respondents ought to have addressed a letter to Corporate Office/Tirupati to see that problem is resolved. But on that pretext, they cannot continue the service under LT Cat – III in master and raise the bill manually.

Consumer is complaining that though lessee of his vendor paid the additional load amount, infrastructure was not provided by the Licensee. But according to respondents they have informed to the complainant that consumer has to submit an application at mee- seva for up gradation of the load and consumer has to purchase the DTR on his own cost and provide necessary infra-structure for converting the service connection into HT category.

Without applying for conversion of his service from LT to HT category consumer is not entitled to say that necessary infra-structure for HT category was not provided. Respondents also ought not have allowed the consumer to continue under LT category resulting in financial loss to DISCOM. They ought to have proceeded as per Clause No. 12.3.3 of GTCS for termination of agreement, if the consumer is not willing to convert his service to HT Category.

The tariff order for F.Y. 2018-19 for LT category provides how billing has to be made when the recorded demand of the service connection under LT category exceeds 75 KVA.

Respondents have to issue bill only as per Clause No.3.3 (3) iv of the tariff order issued by Hon'ble Commission. The same is at Page No.304 of Tariff Order for the F.Y. 2018-19.

“If the recorded demand of any service connection under this category exceeds the 75 KVA(1KVA=1KW), such excess demand shall be billed at the demand charges prescribed under HT Category-I (11 KV Supply) ”

Almost the same provisions as mentioned above are adopted in the tariff order issued by the Hon'ble Commission for the F.Y. 2019-20 also. So, respondents ought to have raised bill against the service connection as per the tariff orders issued for F.Y 2018-19 and 2019-20 respectively and they are not permitted to raise bill for the entire consumption under HT category without converting the service from LT to HT. The point No. 2 is answered accordingly.

Point No.3 :

According to respondents the complainant is having connected load of more than 100 HP and as the lessee paid Rs.1,53,000/- towards additional load charges the service became HT service from the date of payment of additional load amount . The service connection could not be converted into LT before expiry of one year period. The relevant provision for deration of CMD or Termination of agreement in respect of HT supply is provided in Clause No. 5.9.4.2 of GTCS which is reproduced here under :

“ Deration of CMD or Termination of Agreement in respect of HT supply:

The consumer may seek reduction of contracted maximum demand or termination of the HT Agreement after the expiry of the minimum period of the Agreement by giving not less than one month notice in writing expressing his intention to do so. However, if for any reason the consumer chooses to derate the CMD or terminate the Agreement, before the expiry of the minimum one year period of the Agreement, the CMD will be derated or the Agreement

will be terminated with effect from the date of expiry of initial one year period of the Agreement or after expiry of one month notice period whichever is later. The company can also terminate the HT Agreement , at any time giving one month notice if the consumer violates the terms of the HT Agreement or the GTCS or the provision of any law touching the Agreement including the Act and rules made there under and AP Electricity Reforms Act, 1998. On termination of the HT Agreement the consumer shall pay all sums due under the Agreement as on the date of its termination”.

The above provision clearly shows that consumer is permitted for reduction of maximum contracted load by giving a notice not less than one month in writing after expiry of minimum one year period of the agreement. In this case even though the consumer has said to have exceeded the RMD for about 13 months in a period of 16 months, respondents did not choose to inspect the premises to ascertain the exact connected load and take steps for converting the service connection into HT category. Admittedly the service is shown under LT Cat –III in the master though bills are raised manually under HT category. Agreement was not entered with the consumer under HT category. So the question of termination of HT agreement after expiry of minimum one year period does not arise at all in this case.

The contention of the respondents is that as they issued bills under HT category to the consumer, the service connection could not be converted into LT Cat –III prior to expiry of minimum one year period from the date of billing of the service under HT is not tenable as they failed to show any provision in the GTCS that minimum one year period is required to convert the service from HT to LT category when monthly CC bills are raised under HT category while keeping the service under LT category in master. So minimum period of 1 year for converting the service from HT to LT category in this case does not arise at all. The point No.3 is answered accordingly.

Point No's .4 :

Complainant is claiming compensation of Rs.10,00,000/- towards financial losses between October'2018 and May'2019. Complainant became registered consumer with Licensee in February'2019 only. No evidence is placed before this forum that lessee of the vendor of the complainant made any complaint in respect of deficiency of power supply to the respondents. On the other hand though the lessee of vendor of the complainant paid additional load amount but did not choose to file an application to convert the service connection into HT category or complained about inclusion of additional load charges in his CC bills on the ground that he never exceeded RMD. So also he had not presented any complaint against the performance of the transformer to the respondents. This Forum is also not competent to award compensation for alleged financial losses occurred either to the lessee of vendor of the complainant or to the

complainant. If the complainant is of the opinion that there is a deficiency of service and is entitled to compensation his remedy is elsewhere and not before the forum.

According to the Complainant, they submitted request for 2 new service connections to meet their expected demand on 14.02.2019. According to respondents those two services were released on 18.05.2019. The relevant provisions for release of new service connections are given in serial No. IX of Schedule –II of Regulation No.07/2004 as amended by Reg. No. 09/2013 and it is :-

IX Release of new connection/additional load upon payment of all charges				
i	All cases - If connection feasible from existing network for release of supply	Within 30 days of receipt of application(along with prescribed charges)	Rs.100 for each day of default	Not applicable
ii	Network expansion/enhancement required to release supply			
a	Release of supply Low Tension	Within 30 days of receipt of prescribed charges	Rs.100 for each day of default	Not applicable
b	Release of supply High Tension 11 KV	Within 60 days of receipt of prescribed charges	Rs.500 for each day of default	
c	Release of supply High Tension 33 KV	Within 90 days of receipt of prescribed charges		
d	Release of supply Extra High Tension	Within 180 days of receipt of prescribed charges		
e	Erection of sub station required for release of supply	Within the time period approved by the Commission	Rs.1,000/- for each day of default	

So if the period of processing of application is also taken into consideration the service has to be released within 30 days from the date of payment of all charges . Respondent No.4 in his written submission on 03.08.2019 at Page No. 3 under point IV (4) specifically stated that consumer obstructed them for charging the DTR without AB switch. Complainant also did not specifically deny on this aspect, even though he filed written arguments repeatedly with same points. It is not possible for the respondents to release the service connection within stipulated period if the consumer obstructs in charging the Distribution transformer. Complainant has not placed any specific provision that it is mandatory on the part of the respondents to provide AB

switch for each and every service connection. According to the respondents AB switch is a protective equipment only and they will provide according to the need and necessity.

In view of specific plea by the respondents that complainant obstructed them in charging the Distribution transformer without providing of AB switches even though if there is a delay in charging the distribution transformer the same need not be taken into consideration for awarding compensation. Hence complainant is not entitled for any compensation. The point is answered accordingly.

Point No.5 :

According to the respondents, consumer informed that he is not willing to register HT application at mee - seva on the ground that he had applied for 2 No' s new service connections with 49 HP capacity. The estimate was approved by AE/O/Vakadu as there were no service connections in the name of applicant. After sanctioning of estimate, name transfer was effected for service connection No. 3121249002177. Only one service can be released in one premises and multiple services cannot be allowed as per General Terms and Conditions of Supply.

As per the version of respondents, consumer applied for name transfer on 16.02.2019 whereas he had applied for 2 service connections on 14.02.2019 and it was not brought to their notice subsequently that he had also applied for transfer of service connection No. 3121249002177 in his name. Both parties did not specifically state before the forum during the personal hearings whether both the services i.e. the service transferred in his name and the new service connection applied by him are located in one premises or not ?

Premises is defined in Sub - Section 51 of Section 2 of the Electricity Act, 2003 as :

“Premises includes any land, building or structure:

Clause No. 3.5 of GTCS provides definition of separate establishment which is as follows:

3.5.1 : For the purpose of the GTCS, separate establishments shall include the following types of establishments:

- i. Having distinct set-up and staff;*
- ii. Owned or leased by different persons;*
- iii. Covered by different licenses or registrations under any law where such procedures are applicable; and*
- iv. For domestic category, the households having a separate kitchen.*

3.5.2 : Each separate establishment will be given a separate point of supply

3.5.3 : Notwithstanding the above provisions, the Company reserves the right, where it is reasonably established, that the consumers of the same group or family or firm

or company who are availing supply under different service connections situated within a single premises by splitting the units, the Company may treat such multiple connections existing in the single premises as a single service connection and charge the total consumption of all the consumers at the appropriate tariffs applicable for a single service connection. Any officer authorised by the Company shall issue notices to the concerned consumers asking them to furnish a single application for all such services and to pay required charges for merging the services into a single service.

3.5.4 : Wherever the total connected load of all such multiple connections exceeds 75 HP, the consumers must necessarily switch over to HT supply or LT III(B) as the case may be and regularise their services duly following the procedure for availing such supply, within 60 days from the Date of Service of such notice,. If the consumer still fails to pay the necessary charges to convert to the specified category, the services will be disconnected after 60 days from the date of service of the notice. Pending such switch over, the licensee shall be entitled to bill the service at HT tariff as per the procedure mentioned under Clause 12.3.3.2(i)

According to the averments in the complaint, complainant and his son purchased land having Service connection No. 3121249002177 and 3121249002950 with capacity of 57 and 45 HP respectively. Complainant applied for two service connections with 49 HP each. If both the service connections in the name of both the complainant and his son are located in one premises, the contracted load will be 106 HP (57 HP + 49 HP) and 94 HP (45 HP + 49 HP). So both the services put together in the name of the complainant will be more than 100 HP. According to respondents complainant is not willing to apply for HT service on the ground that he had applied for two more LT services. So if it is correct, complainant though he is having capacity under HT category do not want to apply for HT category and wants to be in LT category, so that he will get benefit of lower tariff. Simply mentioning that multiple services were given as they are not aware that the consumer had applied for transfer of service connection in his name after applied for new connection is not tenable. Respondents, if subsequently found that multiple services are given in one and the same premises in the name of one consumer in-advertantly, they ought to have followed the Clause No. 3.5.3 and 3.5.4 of GTCS. In the absence of any evidence, no finding can be given by this Forum whether there are multiple services in the name of complainant and his son in one premises or not ? It is open for the respondents to determine whether there are multiple services in the premises of complainant and his son as per Clause 3.5.3 and 3.5.4 of GTCS. The point is answered accordingly.

4. In the result respondents are directed :

1. To withdraw the auto generated case booked against the service connection No.3121249002177 and adjust the amount collected in future bills.
2. To issue revised bills as per the tariff orders issued by the Hon'ble Commission for the F.Y. 2018-19 and 2019-20 respectively for the service connection No's. 3121249002177 and 3121249002950 if exceeded RMD under LT-III category. The excess amount collected if any shall be adjusted in future bills.
3. Respondents shall issue revised bill within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order and submit compliance report within 15 days thereon.


If aggrieved by this order, the Complainant may represent to the **Vidyut Ombudsman, Andhra Pradesh**, 3rd Floor, Sri Manjunatha Technical Services, Plot No:38, Adjacent to Kesineni Admin Office, Sri Ramachandra Nagar, Mahanadu Road, Vijayawada-520008 within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.

This order is passed on this, the day of 29th February 2020.

Sd/-
Independent Member

Sd/-
Chairperson

Forwarded By Order


Secretary to the Forum

To

The Complainant

The Respondents

Copy to the General Manager/CSC/Corporate Office/ Tirupati for pursuance in this matter.

Copy to the Nodal Officer (Executive Director/Operation)/CGRF/APSPDCL/TPT.

Copy Submitted to the Vidyut Ombudsman, Andhra Pradesh 3rd Floor, Sri Manjunatha Technical Services, Plot No:38, Adjacent to Kesineni Admin Office, Sri Ramachandra Nagar, Mahanadu Road, Vijayawada-520008 within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order

Copy Submitted to the Secretary, APERC, 11-4-660, 4th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapool, Hyderabad- 500 004.