CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM SOUTHERN POWER DISTRIBUTION COMPANY OF A.P LIMITED,

TIRUPATI

This 25th day of March'2025

C.G.No.240/2024-25/Anantapur Circle

CHAIRPERSON

Sri. V. Srinivasa Anjaneya Murthy Former Principal District Judge

Members Present

Sri. S.L. Anjani Kumar Member (Technical)
Smt. W. Vijaya Lakshmi Member (Independent)

Between

Smt. A. Lakshmikanthamma, D.No.12-77, Near Church, KLD Road, Vidyaranya Nagar, Anantapur District.

Complainant

AND

- 1. Superintending Engineer/O/Anantapur
- 2. Assistant Accounts Officer/O/Kalyanadurg
- 3. Dy.Executive Engineer/O/Kalyanadurg (R)
- 4. Executive Engineer/O/Kalyanadurg

Respondents

This complaint came up for final hearing before this Forum through video conferencing on 18.03.2025 in the presence of the complainant's husband and respondents and having considered the material placed by both the parties, this Forum passed the following

ORDER

on 09.12.2024 at Anantapur stating that on 06.07.2015 she obtained service connection SC.No.7512423000590 for the purpose of Milk Chilling Centre but they got disconnected the service connection in May'2017, but the respondents issued demand notice for Rs.69,396/towards CC charges though power was not supplied, which is illegal and it is to be waived.

- The said complaint was registered as C.G.No.240/2024-25 and notices 02. were issued to the respondents calling for their response. The respondents submitted their response stating that the service connection was released on 06.07.2015 and in the internal audit conducted by the auditors they have noticed that the service was released towards Dairy Farm and to be categorized under LT -III (General) but wrongly assessed under wrong category LT-III/2 Animal Husbandry Unit and thereby the units already billed from September'2015 to July'2017 are revised by them and they assessed the shortfall amount @ Rs.89,407/- and basing on the said PRA/IA/Slip.No.3/9-2017 issued by the auditors, after deducting the Security Deposit amount of Rs.20,000/- from the said amount of Rs.89,407/-, the shortfall amount is arrived @ Rs.69,396/- and the same was included in the CC charges bill and notice was issued to the complainant to pay the said amount of Rs.69,396/-.
- 03. Heard the complainant's husband and respondents through video conferencing. Perused the entire record. It seems that the internal audit report is of the year 2017 whereas demand notice was issued to the complainant by AAO/ERO/Kalyanadurg/2nd Respondent herein on 06.12.2024 i.e. beyond two years.
- **04.** Sec.56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 reads as follows;

"Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no sum due from any consumer, under this section shall be recoverable after the period of two years from the date when such sum became first due unless such sum has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrear of charges for electricity supplied and the licensee shall not cut off the supply of the electricity".

Here, in the case on hand, the service in question was bill stopped in 2017 and it is not in live and from that date no notice was issued demanding for the alleged shortfall amount of Rs.89,407/- as per the auditor's slip. The respondnets also did not produce any material to show that the said shortfall amount has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrear of charges and for the first time after lapse of more than seven years, the notice demanding the alleged shortfall amount was issued to the complainant on 06.12.2024 which is contra to Sec.56 (2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 referred supra.

- demand of Rs.89,407/- by the respondnets is barred by limitation in view of Sec.56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 since the demand is beyond two years from the date of auditors slip and further it was not continuously shown as arrear in the subsequent CC bills and for the other reason that the service conenction was bill stopped and disconnected in 2017 itself. Hence, the action of respondnets in making demand of Rs.69,396/-is illegal and the notice vide Lr.No. AAO/ERO/KLD/JAO/SA/D.No.437/24 dated: 06.12.2024 issued by the AAO/ERO/Kalyanadurg/ 2nd respondent is not valid under Law.
- of. For the aforesaid discussion, we hereby declare that the demand notice vide Lr.No. AAO/ERO/KLD/JAO/SA/D.No.437/24 dated: 06.12.2024 issued by the AAO/ERO/Kalyanadurg/ 2nd respondent is illegal and is hereby quashed. The respondnets are directed to withdraw the said amount of Rs.69,396/-. Accordingly, the complaint is allowed. There is no order as to costs. The secretary of the Forum is instructed to forward a copy of this order to the complainant herein through whatsapp and Post.

O7. The complainant is informed that if she is aggrieved by the order of the Forum, she may approach the Vidyut Ombudsman, 3rd Floor, Plot. No.38, Adjacent to Kesineni Admin Office, Sriramachandra Nagar, Mahanadu Road, Vijayawada-08 in terms of Clause.18.1 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 25th day of March'2025.

CHAIRPERSON

Member (Technical)

Member (Independent)

Documents marked

For the complainant: Nil

For the respondents: Nil

Copy to the

Complainant through whatsapp and Post

All the Respondents

Copy Submitted to

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

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

The Secretary/Hon'ble APERC/Vidyut Niyantrana Bhavan, Adjacent to 220/132/33/11 KV AP Carbides Sub Station, Dinnedevarapadu Road, Kurnool-518002, State of Andhra Pradesh.

The Stock file.