## CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSALFORUM

## SOUTHERN POWER DISTRIBUTION COMPANY OF A.P LIMITED, TIRUPATI

This the 16<sup>th</sup> day of November' 2023 C.G.No.30/2023-24/Kadapa Circle

**CHAIRPERSON** 

Sri. V. Srinivasa Anjaneya Murthy Former Principal District Judge

**Members Present** 

Sri. K. Ramamohan Rao Member (Finance)
Sri. S.L. Anjani Kumar Member (Technical)
Smt. G. Eswaramma Member (Independent)

# Between

Smt.Y. Jayamma, W/o. Y. Prabhakar, 67/1, Sai Rajeswari Colony, Proddatur, Kadapa Dt.

Complainant

#### AND

1.Dy. Executive Engineer/O/Proddatur 2.Executive Engineer/O/Proddatur

Respondents

This complaint came up for final hearing before this Forum through video conferencing on 06.11.2023 in the presence of the representative of the complainant and respondents and having considered the complaint and submissions of both the parties, this Forum passed the following:

# ORDER

1. The case of the complainant is that she purchased a house site bearing
Plot No.99 in Sai Srinagar Venture within the limits of the Kothapalli
Panchayat, that the Panchayat concerned granted approval of the

( liny

building plan and also gave no objection certificate to release electrical service connection and power supply to her building, that she approached the respondent No.2 for their service connection but they asked for land conversion document for the entire venture, that the venture was developed with 250 Plots in 2005 and during the period of 18 years from that date to this date multiple sale transactions of the plots were taken place, that at present there is no possibility for the Gram Panchayat to issue land conversion for the entire venture/land but when the Gram Panchayat gave no objection to release service connection, the respondents cannot refuse to release the service connection. The complainant further contend that she is ready to bear the estimated cost either for transformer or for 11 KV conductor or for electrical poles and hence necessary instructions may be issued to the respondents to issue electrical service connection and to supply power to her building.

2. The said complaint was registered as C.G.No.30/2023-24 and notices were issued to the respondents calling for their response. The respondents submitted their response stating that the complainant did not register any application at mee-seva for providing service connection to her premises and without registering application, the

( eing

complainant approached the Forum. They further stated that, if the complainant applies for service connection, it will be considered if she complies the conditions as per the standing guidelines issued by Corporate Office, Tirupati in reference Memo.No.CGM/O&M/GM/EE-C/F.e293682/D.No.1392/2023, Dt: 03.06.2023.

- 3. Heard the representative for the complainant and the respondents through video conferencing.
- 4. Now the point for determination is:

Whether the complaint is maintainable without registering an application before the respondents seeking for issuance of service connection to the building of the complainant?

5. **POINT:** Perused the entire record. Even according to the complainant, she has not filed any application before the respondents for issuance of service connection to her building. As per the Rules, on making an application by the complainant, the respondents have to scrutinize the said application and if the application is in order and necessary documents are produced, the service connection will be released and if the application is not in order, it will be returned with objections. If the complainant's application is returned/rejected, then only the complainant file the complaint before this Forum if she is

LIMY

not satisfied with the action of the respondents. Here, in the case on hand as the complainant did not make any application before the respondents with a request to release the electrical service connection, this Forum is of the considered view that the question of issuing any directions does not arise and this complaint is prematured and not maintainable. Since, there is no cause of action for the complaint, this complaint is liable to be rejected as per Clause. 10.2(d) (i) of Regulation. No.03 of 2016. Accordingly, the point is answered.

- 6. In the result, the complaint is rejected. However, the complainant is at liberty to register an application before the respondents seeking for release of service connection to her building and in such a case, the respondents are directed to consider the said application and to take action according to the Rules under the Electricity Act, 2003 and in case if the application of the complainant is returned/rejected and if the complainant is aggrieved with the said action of the respondents, she is at liberty to file a fresh complaint for redressal of her grievance before this Forum. There is no order as to costs.
- 7. The complainant is informed that if she is aggrieved by the order of the Forum, she may approach the Hon'ble Vidyut Ombudsman, 3<sup>rd</sup>

Ciny

Floor, Plot. No.38, Adjacent Kesineni Admin Office. to Sriramachandra Nagar, Mahanadu Road, Vijayawada-08 in terms of Clause.13 of Regulation.No.3 of 2016 of Hon'ble APERC within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order and the prescribed format is available in the website vidyutombudsman.ap.gov.in.

Typed to dictation by the computer operator-2 corrected and pronounced in the open Forum on this 16th day of November' 2023.

Member (Technical) Member (Independent) 16/11/2023

16/1/2025 Documents marked

For the complainant: Nil

For the respondents: Nil

Copy to the

Complainant and All the Respondents

# Copy Submitted to

The Chairman & Managing Director/Corporate Office/APSPDCL/ Tirupati.

The Hon'ble Vidyut Ombudsman, 3rd Floor, Plot No.38, Sriramachandra Nagar, Vijayawada-08.

The Secretary/Hon'ble APERC/Hyderabad-04.

The Stock file.

C.G.NO.30/2023-24/KADAPA CIRCLE