

THE STATE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

D.H. Road & Foreshore Road Junction, Near Gandhi Square,
Ernakulam, Kerala-682 016

Ph: 0484 2346488, Mob: 8714356488

www.keralaeo.org Email: ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com

**Appeal Petition No. P/037/2024
(Present A. Chandrakumaran Nair)
Dated: August: 09-08-2024**

Appellant : Sri.Louis George
Neriyam Parambil (Chirathara)
Thuruthy.P.O, Changanacherry
Kottayam Dist., Pin-686535

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer
Electrical Sub Division,
Kerala State Electricity Board Ltd.,
Changanacherry, Kottayam Dist.,

ORDER

Background of the case

The appellant is the owner of the house which is under the Electrical Section, Kurichi under the subdivision Changanacherry of the licensee (KSEBL). The power connection is in the name of Joseph.J.J with consumer number 1146375012289. Late Joseph J.J is the grandfather of the appellant. The house and property in the name of Joseph J.J has been given to Fr. Louis Neriamparambil through a registered document and the appellant purchased the land and house from Fr.Louis through a deed. The present occupier and owner of the connection is the appellant. The power supply to the appellant is fed from Thoopram Transformer which is passing through a paddy field/marshy land. There was frequent problems for the power supply and this has been taken up with Licensee. The Licensee has shifted the connection to Mulakkamthuruthy transformer and the cost of labour is born by the appellant. Now the appellant is demanding for the refund of amount paid by him for the work as this is to be done by the Licensee.

The mechanical meter of the appellant was replaced with electronic meter on 29/05/2022. The reading on 22/06/2022 was recorded as 95 units and no readings was taken for a period for 22/06/2022 to 10/11/2022. The reading recorded for a period from 10/11/2022 to 07/12/2022 was 1384

units and accordingly a bill for Rs. 13,441/- was issued. The meter under dispute has been tested and found that the meter is working satisfactorily. The appellant is disputing on the bill of high amount. The appellant filed the petition to CGRF and CGRF issued the order on completing the procedure on 09/05/2024. The order state that the appellant in liable to pay the bill raised by the licensee and also ordered for shifting the line at the cost of the appellant. Aggrieved with the decision of CGRF, this appeal petition is filed to this Authority.

Arguments of the Appellant

1 Reimbursement of Amount paid for shifting the existing OHLline.

Since 20/03/1968, our connection is in my grandfather's name late J.J Joseph under Consumer No. 1146375012289. Until late seventies, our connection were from Kidangara network along with 20+ other consumers in the immediate neighbourhood. During the course of time, KSEB installed a new Transformer mainly for Thoopram paddy field and all connections including ours were fed from it. At a later stage, all other connections except ours, were shifted by KSEB to Vazhappally feeder network of Kurichy section, with own funds that means not levying any amount from consumers. The posts were teak poles. The teak poles and old lines including that hung between E-F (referred in KSBs version to OGRF) were remained kept as it is. During 2010, it came to my notice that ours is the only connection left out to feed from the fag end of Thoopram transformer. Recognising that this may be the prime reason for the very frequent power interruption to our household while all the neighbours as well as the streetlights in the nearby Panchayat Road have supply. Accordingly a formal request was made to KSEB to de-link our connection from fag-end Thoopram transformer and connect to Vazhapally feeder network KSEB promptly connected to Vazhappally feeder while keeping the old lines and the teak poles as it is. As a result, power failures reduced or only occurring at par with the other households of my locality.

After some time, KSEB replaced Teak poles with PSC poles. While replacing teak poles with PSC poles, KSEB arbitrarily dismantled the pre-existed OHLines E-F (between the posts in the small island in my property and K Josin Abrahams property) and the supply to my house has been reverted back to Thoopram Transformer as before. For the removal of OH lines, KSEB did not give any notice and took my consent. The cross arm at the top of the newly replaced PSC pole in my property is still there which implies that the dd line was existed between the post in small island and KJosin Abrahams house. Thus, all my previous efforts got aborted by the illegal act of KSEB When I enquired at KSEB, they could not provide any definitive and convincing action. One of the worker hinted that some neighbours insisted to remove the lines. Reasonably suspect that some neighbours badly influenced the field staff. As Thoopram transformer is mainly intended for

Agricultural connections, after paddy harvest, no body other than few householders are vigilant to restore power failure especially in monsoon months. Being an NRI since 1995, used to reside few days only in my house during vacation. When I returned to India for good in Sept 2021 and I took my old aged mother to reside with us for the rest of her life in our ancestral property.

Power failure were so frequent that even last for several days and our house practically become redundant and uninhabitable for want of essential utilities like Electricity. Practically every other day I have to contact and/or visit KSEB office Kurichy for restoring supply. While I was away, my mother heard a blasting sound near to meter side followed by power failure. KSEB crew came and replaced the analogue with digital display meter. Did something on the service wire connection as a temporary fix. Then, I formally requested KSEB to tighten the sagged line and cut touching if any and restore the dismantled lines and connect to Vazhappally feeder, like our neighbours KSEB cleared touching, almost corrected sagging but not acceded to my request to reinstate my connection to Vazhappally Feeder network. During hearing, I explained the whole story in detail to Hon'ble CGRF members. KSEBS contention as evident from their written version to CGRF is that " at the time of effecting service connection (in 1968), it was the most feasible path to effect the connection" and the proposal to reinstate. KSEBS finding that running line through waterlogged paddy fields is not feasible is questionable as we can see lines running over waterlogged areas and uncultivated paddy fields all over Kerala. If KSEB considered running lines over my uncultivated paddy fields is not feasible then my connection was also not brought into Vazhapally feeder as per my written request. If it is not feasible, why my supply was taken through existing OHlines from the post near the Pump house of Thoopram Transformer which are crossing paddy field and Thupram north Thodu KSEB now consider the mud way leading to my house and Thoopram padam as the most viable route (shown as C-Din sketch) instead of reinstating the arbitrarily dismantled line along E- F, between posts in my property and Josin K Abraham property. Reinstatement of dismantled line is the most economical solution as it involves only stretching the lines only. As the onus of bearing all the cost of improvisation of its network like adding Transformer, shifting lines etc. charging any amount from consumer for such works not mandated in Electricity Supply Code and any relevant rules as far as I know. While appreciating KSEBS efforts to ensure uninterrupted power supply to my house, charging the cost of required infrastructural arrangements to my account is not justifiable. For line shifting, KSEB demanded Rs.30,270/- which I had remitted and works is almost finished. Based on the above narrative, I humbly request your orders to return back this amount or to consider it as an Advance Payment to be adjusted for future energy bills.

2 Granting Excerption for Paying Suspicious Energy Bill

CCRF's determination that the bill Rs13441/- issued is legal and sustainable initiates room for further analysis. The forum also agree that the meter is in good condition as per the meter downloaded data said to be obtained from KSEB owned TMR Division. As confirmed by KSEB in its version to CGRF, from 22-06-22 to 10-11-22 there was no consumption (because the house became uninhabitable due to frequent non-supply. Suddenly, from 10/11/22 to 7/12/2022 the meter recorded consumption of 1384 units (in just 27 days). As mentioned in CGRF findings, it is clear that it obtained downloaded meter data for the period 1/8/2022 to 1/11/23. CGRF conclude the finding that the petitioner consumed electricity from 1/06/2022 to 3/01/2022 While KSEB itself confirms there is no consumption between 22-06-22 to 10-11-2022 how it is possible. CGRF to assure that petitioner consumed electricity during this same period. The period of disputed bill is from 10/11/22 to 7/12/2022 But, OGRF said to have obtained meter downloaded data as early from 1/08/22 and up to 1/11/2023. Why the meter down loaded data stretched over to other periods for which no dispute exists. Being an electrical device, it is common that the energy meter can also malfunction at times including slowing and fasting overtime, which is one of the reason KSEB asking for replacing and testing it. Except the period from 10/11/22 to 7/12/2022 not raised any dispute. Thus, CGRF findings seems not unambiguous. Decision based on ambiguous data is not legally sustainable and benefit of doubt to be given in favour of the consumer.

While both KSEB and forum confirm meter is in good condition, did not ascertain other possibilities include earth leakage in house hold wiring, wrong recording of initial reading of replaced meter, poor workmanship of meter installation/service connection. In my plea, asked CGRF to intervene to analyse the root cause of any earth leakage but not addressed. I had narrated an incident of blasting heard and smoke in the meter side to CGRF in my petition, which would have caused insulation loss, and touching of wires in the outgoing wires to switch board. Though, KSEB ascertain that the initial reading of the replaced meter is Zero but not substantiated with traceable documentary evidence. Thus the possibility of recording error in the IRstill exists. (As per my understanding of Electrical Code Chapter VII Para 138) KSB has to assure wiring, apparatus etc to be free from leakage etc to eliminate any possible safety hazard). As discussed above, I humbly request your orders to grant exemption from paying the disputed bill of Rs.13441/- believing that it had not been demanded based on non-ambiguous data and accurate findings.

Arguments of the Respondent

The supply to the consumer is fed from Thoopram Transformer which is fag end. Transformer of Vazhapally feeder as the premises is situated very near to paddy field. So at the time of effecting service connection, it was the most feasible path to effect the connection, by drawing a 1ph 2 wire line using 4 PSC poles installed in a waterlogged area. Also the HT Feeding to this

transformer is through paddy field. (Shown as A-B in Sketch) (Ex 1). The consumer has submitted a request for shifting the line through the paddy field for reducing the supply restoration time and effect the service connection from the post near the house of Sri.Josin K Abraham, Kavithazhe, consumer no 12284 (Shown as E-F in Sketch) (From Mulakkamthuruthy Transforemer). But this proposal is not feasible as after shifting the line, some portion of the OH line remains in the water logged area. If the OH line drawn again through the paddy field and marshy place, the restoration of supply needed more effort and time.

The Consumer has raised concern over the supply interruption and voltage fluctuation in the above premise in his grievances submitted to Hon'ble Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (southern region, Kottarakkara). For redressing the complaint, a new route was obtained through the public path to access the premises of the consumer. The existing line can be shifted to the new route by tapping the line from the post no: TM/42/22 just near the house of Sri Varkey James, Thaiparambil house(Shown as C-D in Sketch). By this shifting, connection to the consumer (1146375012289) can be shifted from Thoopram Transformer to Mulakkamthuruthy Transformer. The estimate amount for the work is 30,624/- .

Regulation 95(4) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014,

95. Procedure for shifting electric line or electrical plant of the licensee.- (4) The application for shifting an electric line or electrical plant shall be granted only if:-

- (a) the proposed shifting is technically feasible; and
- (b) the owner of the land or his successor in interest gives consent in writing to shift the electric line or electrical plant to any other portion of his land or to any other land owned by him; or any alternate right of way along any public path way available for shifting the electric line and the electrical plant; and
- (c) the applicant shall remit the labour charges and material charges required for shifting the electric line or electric plant as estimated by the licensee as per the cost data approved by the Commission from time to time in accordance with the Regulation 33 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014]. The Hon'ble Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (southern region, Kottarakkara in respect of OP No.04/2024 ordered vide CGRF/KTR/OP No.045/2024/132 dated 9.5.2024 that shift the line upon making the payment of the estimate amount. (Ex2).The new route was convinced to the consumer and the consumer remitted the estimate amount of Rs.30,624/-on 20.05.2024.vide Rt No.46370240520101071 and the work was executed on 07.06.2024.

The service connection has been effected to premises with LT consumer number: 1146375012289 in the name of Sri.Joseph J.J on 23/03/1968. As part of replacing all mechanical meter with electronic meter, the mechanical

meter in this premise has been replaced on 29/05/22 with an electronic meter with LCD display. The Initial Reading of the replaced meter at the time of replacement had recorded as zero. (Ex3). The energy bill issued to the consumer is based on the meter reading taken manually by the meter reader. The energy bill generated based on the manual entry of the meter reading. From 29/05/22 to 22/06/22 recorded consumption is 95 unit. From 22/06/22 to 10/11/22 no consumption has been recorded in the billing software. From 10/11/22 to 07/12/22 the recorded consumption is 1384 unit. So the bill amounts to Rs.13,441/- was issued to the consumer on December 2022. The consumer has raised dispute over this bill and application was given for testing the meter. So the bill has been put under dispute in ORUMANET software and the disputed meter had replaced with a new meter. The meter under dispute has been sent for testing at the meter testing laboratory, TMR Division, Pallom on 03/01/2023. The test result from the Meter testing lab was received on 06/02/23 and reported that the error of the tested meter is within the specified limit. But the consumer has hesitated to remit the energy charge and filed a complaint before Hon'ble CGRF for getting an order for entrusting the KSEBL to find any earth leakage in the house hold wiring and also allow him to remit the total amount in installment not more than Rs.2500/-

Accordingly the Hon'ble CGRF has verified the downloaded data of energy meter tested at TMR Division, Meter testing unit, Pallom. From the downloaded data, the month-wise It is clear from the consumption from 01.06.2022 to 01.01.2023 was obtained. downloaded data that the meter reading for Kwh in the meter on 1.12.2022 is 1456 and the reading taken by the meter reader on 7.12.2022 is 1479 and the same recorded in the ORUMANET software for generating the bill. The meter testing laboratory, TMR Division, Pallom is ISO/IEC17025-2017 NABL accredited testing laboratory. The Hon'ble Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (southern region, Kottarakkara in respect of OP No.04/2024 ordered vide CGRF/KTR/OP No.045/2024/132 dated 9.5.2024 that the bill issued by the licensee is legal and allow the consumer to remit the bill in installment basis. Accordingly letter was issued to the consumer and informed to remit the amount in installment. The regular current charge made in the case on hand is as per rules and regulations which has to be followed by the licensee. Since the demand is perfectly legal and valid, it is requested to kindly dismiss the appeal and issue appropriate order directing the appellant to remit the regular current charge as per the regulation 130(7) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014.

Regulation .130. Disputed bills.-

(7) If the complaint was found to be incorrect, the consumer shall immediately be notified and directed to make payment as per the original bill and the consumer shall be liable to pay [interest on late payment] if the payment is made after the due date of payment as per the original bill. Considering the aforementioned facts, appeal filed by Sri.Louis George,

Neriyamparambil (Chirathara), Thuruthy P.O, Changanacherry may be dismissed with cost.

Counter arguments of the Appellant

Original consumer was taken by my grandfather (Late) JJ Joseph in 1969. It was part of Kidangara section and all connection including ours and neighborhood houses were fed from same feeder, (Probably Vazhappally Feeder). In my petition to CGRF, highlighted that my grandfather gave his consent to pull lines from the post located in the small island in the middle of his paddy field to feed the house of the father of Mr. Josin K Abraham, Kavithazhe) (Consumer No.12284) and others in the forward route. Late, all connections except ours were shifted to Mulamkkamthuruthy feeder, fully isolating us from the 'most technically feasible' route as considered now by KSEB. While coming from Kuwait to stay in my home during vacation, power outage confined to my house was very frequent. Seeking a permanent solution, contacted KSEB (in 2010) to include my connection also to the neighborhood network by just switching to the old lines remaining there. Accordingly, KSEB shifted the connection to Mulakamthuruthy feeder and recurring power failure issue was solved largely. KSEB conceded to my request and switched the connection accordingly.

While replacing old Teak posts later with PSC poles, without seeking our consent, KSEB unilaterally disconnected our line from Mr. Josin K Abraham's post and re-connected to the old lines coming from post near Thoopram Padam North Pump house, crossing canal and our paddy field. Unfortunately, this episode of re-connection is not seen narrated furnished by KSEB in its Statement of Facts. The cross arm is seen fitted at the top of the PSC post in the small island as the convincing physical evidence that there was lines installed between the posts in our small island and edge of Mr. Josin's property. Needless to say, the consent given by my grandfather to run OH lines across his land is irrevocable and at the same time to be remain as reciprocal for the other party. In other words, if consent is given to take out power from ones property that consent is valid take in power through lines for first party along the same route/alignment. Neighbor do not possess the right to withdraw the given consent or put objection to put back the pre-existed connecting lines. As far as my knowledge, no objection was raised by Mr.Josin K.Abraham to pull again the dismantled lines pre-existed since the original connection period.

KSEB's argument for the unauthorized shifting is that it is not feasible to draw lines over waterlogged area is quite surprising. From the generating station up to the far end of the distribution network electric lines are passing through different terrains like forests, wetlands, rivers, backwaters paddy fields. Legal requirement for domestic connection is to have an irrevocable 'mutual consent' from the land owner like we and our neighbor exchanged about 55 years back to get KSEB supply. In these premises,

believe that KSEB's position is not acceptable as per the norms established in the consumer and/or legal frameworks. When, returned to India due to COVID-19 in 2021 only, I realized that my connection to Mulakamthuruthy feeder was disconnected and again connected to Vazhappaly Feeder. So, I requested KSEB to restore my connection to Mulakamthuruthy Feeder. KSEB proposed to shift the old lines along the approach road/pathway developed in later years. KSEB is obliged to keep the lines in its original position and route unless specified request from customer is formally obtained. KSEB disconnected our connection from Mulakamthuruthy feeder at its sole discretion without any consent or information. It is obvious that consumer need not bear the consequent costs (fully or partially) arisen from such unlawful arbitrary act. Amount Rs.32,000 remitted for 'shifting OH lines' to be reimbursed or to be treated as Advance Payment for adjusting in future bill payments.

CGRF relies the meter down loaded reading obtained from TMR division a facility operated from officers pooled from KSEB. Analysis of the tabulated downloaded backup data relied on by CGRF and KSEB is confusing as elaborated below:

Sl. No	Date	Reading	Consumption
1.	01/06/2022	14	14 units
2.	01/07/2022	393	393-14 = 379 units
3.	01/08/2022	661	661-393 = 268 units
4.	01/09/2022	938	938-661 = 277 units
5.	01/10/2022	1136	1136-938 = 198 units
6.	01/11/2022	1355	1355-1136 = 219 units
7.	01/12/2022	1456	1456-1355 = 101 units
8.	01/01/2023	1516	1516-1456 = 60 units

Vividly, the consumption between 1-11-2022 to 1-12-2022 is 101 units only. And, between 1-12-2022 to 1-1-2023 it is 60 units only.

From this, it is evident that the bill issued by KSEB for 1479 units seems erroneous. It is more or less the total units consumed so far from the date new digital meter installed. KSEB cannot insist consumer to pay bill raised on erroneous grounds. As per the downloaded data accepted by both KSEB and CGRF, consumption of circa 1479 units not occurred in the subject billing cycle. And, possibility of high consumption due to earth leakage or fault(s) originated from KSEB (as pointed out in my petition to CGRF) is also seems ruled out. Since Jan 2023, I am not residing at my house fearing

power failure any time. Now OH lines shifted and connection made along the path way which KSEB consider as the technically feasible route. Kindly allow the costs including meter testing charges, travel expenses, documentation etc. Reading of the total energy consumed until now will be furnished later during hearing.

Analysis and findings

The hearing of the case was conducted on 06/08/2024 at 11 am in the office of the KSE Board IB, Bormma Kavala, Pallom, Kottaym Dist., (Dam Safety Research Centre). The hearing was attended by the appellant Sri. Louis George, Neriamparambil (Chirathara), Thuruthy P.o, Changanacherry, Kottayam and the respondent The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Limited, Changanachery, Kottaym.

There are two grievances for the appellant one is for the reimbursement of the amount paid by him for the shifting of service line and second is exempting him from paying of the bill raised by the Licensee for Rs.13,441/-

The power connection to his house was from a transformer known as Thoopram transformer and the line was passing through fields/marshy lands. The appellant was faced frequent power failure problems, and it was difficult for the licensee to attend the power failure as this line was passing through the marshy lands. The appellant has sent complaints to the Licensee. The licensee had shifted the service connections of neighbours who was connected to the Thoopram transformer to Mulakkamthuruthy transformer except that of the appellant. A shortest route which was suggested by the appellant has not been accepted by the licensee as the line has to again pass through the marshy land. The licensee has find out a route through the approach road to his house and the line is from the Mulakkamthuruthy transformer. The CGRF has taken decision that the shifting of the line has to be executed on receiving the payment from the appellant. Accordingly the Licensee had prepared the estimate and send as a demand note. The amount has been remitted by the appellant and then the shifting of the line was executed. The appellant is now totally happy with the shifting of the line.

The regulation 94 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 states about the procedure of shifting service line

- 94 (1) *“Procedure for shifting of meter or service line within the premises of the consumer:-The consumer shall apply for shifting the meter within the existing premises or for deviation of existing service lines within his property, in the format specified in Annexure-10 to the Code.”*
- (2) *“The licensee shall process the application in accordance with the provisions of the Code.”*

(3) *“For site inspection as well as issuance and payment of demand note for the estimated expenditure for works, both the licensee and applicant shall follow mutatis mutandis, the procedure and timelines as laid down in regulations 77 to 83 of the Code.”*

Then as per regulation 82(1) the licensee has to prepare the demand as per the cost data approved by the commission.

82 (1) *Demand note to be prepared as per cost data approved by the Commission. The demand note shall be prepared as per the provisions of this Code and on the basis of cost data approved by the Commission, from time to time.*

83 (1) *“Payment of expenditure as per demand note:-The applicant shall make the payment within fifteen days of receipt of demand note, failing which the application shall stand lapsed and the applicant shall be informed accordingly in writing under acknowledgement:*

Provided that the licensee may grant enlargement of time to the applicant for payment of charges in case the applicant submits within 15 days of the receipt of demand note, a written request for such enlargement of time.”

The regulation 83(1) states that the applicant shall make the payment of charge within 15 days of receipt of demand note.

Now the appellant's demand is to refund the amount paid stating that the shifting of the line is the responsibility of the licensee. According to the regulation if any line is to be shifted as per the request/for more convenience of a consumer, the consumer has to bear the cost, However the appellant's prayer to CGRF has not included the refund of payment already made. The appeal filed to the Ombudsman must be on the prayers filed to the CGRF.

The second part of the prayer of the appellant is to exempt him from paying the bill raised by the licensee for Rs. 13,441/-The mechanical meter of the appellant was replaced with the electronic meter on 29/05/2022. The initial readings of the meter was zero. The reading recorded by the meter on 22/06/2022 was 95 units. The reading was not taken for two billing cycle due to door locked condition, but the officials recorded in the 'Oruma net' as that there was no consumption up to 12/2022. The reading was taken on 07/12/2022 and raised the bill stating that the consumption for one month that is from 10/11/2022 to 07/12/2022 as 1384 units. Accordingly the bill has been raised for Rs. 13,441/. There is a major lapse from the licensee by not showing the D/L status in the bill. The appellant has disputed the payment. Then the meter was tested and the data has been down loaded. The meter was functioning normal. Then from the down loaded data the monthly reading was available. Then the monthly bills could be prepared

based on the down loaded data and arrears could be calculated accordingly. The licensee have not mentioned whether the billing is done on the average consumption during the D/L status. If any amount has been paid by the consumer that is to be deducted from the amount due as arrears.

The regulation 134 states about the right of licensee to raise the demand, as arrears if the consumer was under charged .

134 (1) "Under charged bills and over charged bills :- If the licensee establishes either by review or otherwise, that it has undercharged the consumer, the licensee may recover the amount so undercharged from the consumer by issuing a bill and in such cases at least thirty days shall be given to the consumer for making payment of the bill."

Here the consumer is liable to pay the arrears, but the bills are to be prepared based on the monthly consumption which is available from the downloaded data.

Decision

On verifying the documents submitted and hearing both the petitioner and respondent and also from the analysis as mentioned above, the following decision are hereby taken.

1. The refund of amount deposited for the shifting of the line is not considered as this prayer is not included in the original petition filed to the CGRF. The appeal should be for the prayers already filed to CGRF which has not been retressed. Hence this prayer is dismissed.
2. The bill raised for Rs. 13,441/- is to be revised by preparing the monthly bills based on the monthly consumption obtained from the downloaded data.
3. The appellant is liable to pay the amount as per the revised bill to be prepared as per the decision 2 above
4. No other costs ordered.

ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

No. P/037/2024/ _____ dated: _____

Delivered to:

1. Sri. Louis George, Neriya Parambil (Chirathara), Thuruthy P.O, Changanacherry, Kottayam Dist., Pin- 686 535
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Limited, Changanacherry, Kottayam Dist.,

Copy to:

1. The Secretary, Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission, KPFC Bhavanam, Vellayambalam, Thiruvananthapuram-10.
2. The Secretary, KSE Board Limited, Vydhyuthibhavanam, Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram-4.
3. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Vydhyuthibhavanam, KSE Board Ltd, Kottarakkara - 691 506.