

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/09/2024
(Present A. Chandrakumaran Nair)
Dated: May-08-2024**

Appellant : Sri. Muhammed Kutty,
Thadathil House, Thennala P.O.,
Malappuram (Dist.)- 676508.

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division,
KSE Board Limited, Tirurangadi,
Malappuram(Dist.)

ORDER

Background of the case

The appellant shri. Muhammed Kutty is a consumer of the licensee (KSEB) under the electrical section, Venniyur, Malappuram. The service connection was LT 3 phase, availed on 29/02/2012 under the tariff LT IV with connected load 12.877 kw. The appellant defaulted the payment and the licensee asked to remit a total of Rs. 26,024/- including surcharge. The instalment payment has been accepted by the licensee based on the request from the consumer and even then the appellant has not made the payment. Then the power has been disconnected on 01/02/2022 and the dismantle notice has been served on 19/08/2022 on completion of 180 days of disconnection. The connection was dismantled on 26/09/2022. As the amount due was not paid, the Revenue Recovery proceedings have been initiated by serving a notice to the consumer through letter dated 10/10/2022. The appellant approached Honourable High Court of Kerala by a WP and the court directed the appellant to file the petition to CGRF. Accordingly appellant filed the petition before CGRF and CGRF issued order dated 30/12/2023 on completing the proceedings. This petition is filed to the Ombudsman as an appeal petition to the order of CGRF.

Arguments of the Appellant

Petitioner is running an SSI Unit, Manufacturing of Wooden Furnitures. The unit was started after availing huge loan from Banks and other agencies. The electric connection was taken under OYC Scheme spending huge amount .Petitioners consumer number is 1165796019022. The connected load of the unit is 12877 kw. Fixed charge is Rs 1050.The petitioner employed five Bengali workers for doing wooden work by using machinery. For some years the unit was functioning very normally. But from the year 2016 the unit could not function due to lack of voltage. From 2016 to 2022 altogether 113 months the total electricity consumption was 2187 Unit. Per month average consumption was only 27 unit .Almost all the days the electricity consumption was zero unit. The reading details issued by senior superintendent electricity section from 01/01/2016 to 26/09/2022 is produced. The petition is for getting refunded the excess amount Rs 59812 collected from him by the respondent towards the fixed charges for the period which electricity board could not provide sufficient voltage to run the unit and also to award compensation of Rs 10lakhs for the losses suffered by the petitioner due to the insufficiency of voltage from 2016 to 2020.

Even though petitioner could not run the unit petitioner was regularly paying the fixed charges to the electricity Board. Altogether petitioner paid Rs 71841/- from 04/03/2016 to 29/09/2022.For all these period petitioner's wood would be taken in a lorry to Kottakkal and the machinery works for the manufacturing of wooden furniture were done at that place and petitioner was compelled to pay huge amount there. Due to the lack of voltage in the electricity connection petitioner suffered huge loss. Several petitions were filed before the electricity board authorities but no action was taken by the board authorities for improving the voltage of the electricity supply in that area. During the year 2018 there was a flood the unit could not function for some months .After that in the month of March 2020 the unit was closed down due to the covid pandemic .Petitioner filed a complaint dt 25.03.2020 before the Assistant Engineer,Electrical Session Venniyoor Specifically praying to take steps to review the connected load of the petitioners unit and take steps to review the connected load of the petitioners unit and take steps to resolve the issue of low voltage and it is further prayed that electricity charges should be recovered as per the unit consumed by the petitioner It is further prayed to repay the excess amount collected from the petitioner in the head of electricity charges. Every month sub engineer is visiting the unit and they have physically convinced that there is no voltage for functioning the unit. So the contention of the board that there was no complaint from the part of the petitioner is undeniable and above all it is specifically averred in the petition dated 25.03.2020 that there is no sufficient voltage for functioning of the unit. Due to the Covid Pandemic Petitioner's unit was closed from the month of March 2020.But the petitioner continued to pay the fixed charges and other dues to the electricity board till June 2020. On 11/05/2022 a notice was issued by the

assistant Engineer stating that Rs 24934 is due and it should be paid within 15 days otherwise the connection will be disconnected.

When the petitioners electricity connection was disconnected on 01/02/2020 and on 26/09/2020 the meter installed in the unit was forcefully taken away by the board authorities after causing substantial damage to the unit. So at present the unit is in an ugly shape due to the illegal mischief committed by the board authorities. On 19/08/2022 a notice was issued by the assistant Engineer, Electrical Section Venniyoor stating that if the petitioner pays Rs 26,094/- electricity dues the re-connection will be affected, otherwise the meter will be removed. The disconnection was on 01/02/2020 and the electricity charges till 19/08/2022 are due. It is crystal clear that they are demanding the electricity charges for 6 months after the disconnection of the electricity. Apart from that a registered notice issued on 22/10/2022 stating that revenue recovery steps will be taken against the petitioner for recovering the electricity duties. Petitioner filed a representation before the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section Venniyoor, pointing out the difficulties of the petitioner and praying to reconnect the electricity to the petitioners unit and to stop the revenue recovery proceedings going to be taken against the petitioner.

Now on 23/11/2022 the respondents served a revenue recovery notice on the petitioner demanding Rs 20,266 as electricity charges and Rs 5758/- as interest. Now the entire machinery of the petitioners unit is damaged due to non functioning of the unit. If the revenue recovery proceedings are effected petitioners will be thrown to the street. Rs 59,812 is due to the petitioner from electricity board which was illegally collected. The electricity connection was taken under the OYEC scheme by paying a huge amount to electricity board. After 4 years of getting connection from 2016 to 2020 the unit could not work due to lack of voltage. The reading details issued by the board will clearly establish that the petitioner consumed only 2187 units from 2016 to 2022. During that period petitioner altogether paid 71,841. So electricity charges consumed for 6 months are only 12,028/- for that they have recovered Rs 71,841.

Now another recovery notice is issued. The act of the electricity board against the petitioner is in violation of the provisions of the consumer protection act. The electricity board is an organ of the state here in this case the citizen of the welfare country is coming forward to start a small scale industry by getting the electricity connection under OYEC Scheme. He was not provided sufficient voltage for functioning the unit and Rs 59,812 was recovered from him without providing any service. And RR Proceedings are initiated for non-paying of the electricity charge and the unit is closed. By making the provisions in the electricity supply rule they are looting the electricity small scale industrialists in our state. They are duty bound to protect the SSI Units by providing necessary electricity. Recovering a fixed charge for a period where electricity board to provide sufficient voltage to run the unit, they are not entitled to recover any charge from the consumers.

A citizen who has not any electricity is undergoing any revenue recovery proceeding is a clear misuse of power. The electricity board is not entitled to recover any money from an electricity consumer which he has not consumed. Here in this case the petitioner consumed only 2187 units of electricity for that he has already paid Rs 71841. The electricity board has recovered Rs 59812 from the petitioner even without providing a single unit of electricity.

So a direction may kindly be issued to the board to return Rs. 59812/- the excess amount collected from the petitioner and issue a declaration that recovering money in the head of the electricity charges beyond the consumption of electricity is illegal. The complainant is running a small scale industry of manufacturing of furniture Due to the deficiency of Voltage the unit could not function for several months The electricity consumption was zero unit for several months. Even grinder machines of the House could not be operated due to the deficiency of Voltage. During this period fixed charges were recovered from the consumer. It is a universally accepted legal proposition that nobody can recover money without providing service to a consumer. The electricity board recovered Rs. 59812 without providing any service. The prayer is to return that amount. It is submitted that subsequently electricity board has made necessary amendments in the electric line to increase the voltage that itself is a proof to show that there was no voltage at the relevant time of in which complaint is filed. The dismissal of the complaint is against the basic concept of consumer law that without providing a service recovering charge is illegal and consumer is entitled for damage.

Arguments of the Respondent

The petitioner Sri. Muhammed Kutty .T, S/o Mammi Haji, Thadathil House, Thennala(PO) was a registered consumer (now dismantled and under RR action). bearing service connection number 1165796019022/LT IVA, industrial tariff under the jurisdiction area of the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Venniyur. The service connection was effected on 29.02.2012 under industrial tariff, LT IV (Industrial manufacturing unit) with a connected load of 12877 Watts (the registered connected load).

The argument of the petitioner that the industrial unit could not function from the year 2016 due to voltage issue is wrong. No voltage issue was reported from that area during the said period by anyone including the petitioner. The petitioner had submitted a request on 17-03-2022 for instalments and another on 05-11-2022 for reconnecting the dismantled connection, to check the connected load and to stop the Revenue Recovery action. He did not mention the alleged voltage issues in any of these requests. Furthermore, he stated that in these two letters that the industrial unit could not work due to poor business because of covid-19 and the flood in 2018. This was the reason for the low consumption of electricity. As per verifying the consumption pattern of the above connection, it is understood that no considerable difference between the consumption before 2016

(normal functioning period as argued by the petitioner) and after 2016 (non functioning period due to lack of voltage as argued by the petitioner). Therefore, it is clear that the voltage issue is a recently fabricated story in order to substantiate his arguments.

Total consumption of the above connection from 01-01-2016 to 26-09-2022 is 2184 units. No amounts in excess or illegal had been levied from the consumer. The regular monthly bills were served on the consumer in accordance with the tariff/charges approved by the Kerala Electricity Regulatory Commission from time to time as done on other consumers of the respondents' jurisdiction. Energy Charges were collected only for the months in which the electricity was used by the consumer along with the fixed charges and meter rent as per the rule. For the months electricity was not used, only the fixed charges along with meter rent were incorporated in the bills as per the rule. The electricity board is not responsible for the alleged loss or damage in his business. The board was trying to collect the dues from him as per the prevailing rule as done from all other consumers of this respondent. The matter of low voltage was fabricated at a later stage just to counter revenue recovery proceedings. Thus, there is no question of any compensation payment to the consumer by the KSEBL. Since March 2021, the petitioner had not paid any amount to KSEBL. That is why the connection was disconnected on 01.02.2022. He was actually trying to mislead the forum by saying that he had paid the bills up to 29.09.2022. In the absence of dismantle request from the consumer, the rule directs to collect the fixed charge and the meter rent from the consumer even if there is no current charge consumption in the premises until dismantling the same upon default of payment within 180 days of disconnection (Regulation 139(6) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014). In this case, the consumer's arrear amount includes only fixed charges and meter rent for the period of not recording any electricity consumption along with arrear of consumption period. It is mandatory to bill with meter rent and fixed charge in accordance with the prevailed tariff schedule until the connection is dismantled. Fixed charge is calculated on the basis of the registered connected load of the premises. Here the registered connected load of the consumer was 12877 Watts. Thus, the KSEB has not collected any excess charge from the consumer.

Let me also bring into the notice of the Hon'ble court that the petitioner had not submitted any complaint about low voltage issue from that area for the said period, nor submitted any request for reducing the said connected load. He did not make request for disconnecting the premises for no use or function either. It is clear from the petitioner's argument that he was served a notice asking him to pay the electricity arrears because the payment was not done even after he had got the benefit of Covid-19 related relaxation period for the payment. It was due to the non-payment of the current charge dues (from 07/2020 to 04/2022 of Rs.24943/-), the service was disconnected on 01.02.2022 as per the regulation 138(1) (a) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014. The consumer was served a notice again on

11.05.2022 while he failed to pay the arrear amount. Upon completion of 180 days of disconnection, as per the Regulation 139(6)& 144(1) (b) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014, a dismantle notice was served on the consumer on 19.08.2022 by asking to remit the dues of Rs.26094/- .It was clearly mentioned in the said notice that the connection would be dismantled and necessary legal steps would be initiated to realise the arrear amount if he failed to remit the same in time. The above amount also includes the fixed charge and meter rent after the disconnection period (from 01-02-2022 to 19-08-2022). Since the consumer did not ready to pay the dues even after acknowledgement of the dismantle notice on 30.08.2022, the said connection was dismantled on 26.09.2022, upon the expiry of the period granted to clear the dues.

Before commencing the Revenue Recovery Proceedings, a Pre-RR notice was also issued to the consumer with the notice date 10.10.2022 through Registered Post. In the said notice, the consumer was instructed to remit the dues within 15 days of the notice to avoid revenue recovery proceedings through the appropriate channel (O/o the District Collector Malappuram in this case). This notice was also neglected. Subsequently, Revenue Recovery Requisition was submitted before the District Collector Malappuram through the O/o the Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Tirurangadi, the authority concerned, vide RR Requisition No.2022/7825/10 dated 21.11.2022. But, the petitioner submitted a request to the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Venniyur, instead of paying the dues, for re-connecting the dismantled service connection, to check the connected load and to stop the RR action procedure. The copy of the request is herein produced and marked as Exhibit 12. A detailed reply for the said query was issued to petitioner on 21-11-2022.

The Thurakkal Transformer under the Venniyur Electrical Section has currently four LT Feeders and LT feeder feeding petitioners premises (Con.No:19028) is a three phase feeder with a span length of 330 m from the Transformer to the eastern side. The said line was a three phase line at the time of giving Industrial connection to the complainant. The place where low voltage problem persisted under Thurakkal Transformer was in the line towards southern side from the Thurakkal Transformer. The work mentioned in the reply of complaint and RI Act was the conversion of the existing single phase line to three phase line using LT ABC for a diastance of 500 m from the three phase line going towards southern sside. After this work the voltage problem in the line is improved.

The consumer was a regular defaulter in paying the regular bills and KSEBL was compelled disconnect his service for non payment. No amounts in excess or illegal had been levied from the consumer. The regular monthly bills were served on the consumer in accordance with the tariff / charges approved by the Kerala Electricity Regulatory Commission from timeto time as done on other consumers of the respondents' jurisdiction. Energy Charges were realised only for the months he used electricity along with the

fixed charges and the meter rent as per the rule. For the months he hadn't used electricity, only the Fixed Charges with meter rent were incorporated in the bills, again as per the rule.

As per the existing rule of the Electricity Regulatory Commission, fixed charges along with the meter rent is to be collected from the consumer even if he doesn't use the energy until a request for dismantle is submitted to the relevant office. In this case, the consumer did not request for dismantling. So, he was instructed to pay only the fixed charge and the meter rent as arrear for the period he didn't use the electricity. It was done as it is mandatory to bill with meter rent and fixed charge in accordance with the prevailed tariff schedule until dismantle. Fixed charge is calculated on the basis of the registered connected load of the premises. Here the registered connected load of the consumer is 12877 Watts. He never submitted any valid application either for reducing the said connected load or disconnecting the premises for no use or function. So, there is no fault with the KSEB in levying the consumer with the given charges as per the rule. The board had given this consumer the approved Covid-19 relaxation from disconnection, upon permitting time period for remitting the dues without disconnecting his service connection on default permissible period. It is clear from his complaint that the disconnection was made after giving sufficient period plus the extended period as approved by the board. Thus, his allegation that the board did show any humanitarian consideration is also baseless.

The electricity board is not responsible for the alleged loss or damage in his business. The board was trying to collect the dues from him as per the prevailing rule as done from all other consumers of this respondent. The matter of low voltage was fabricated at a later stage just to counter revenue recovery proceedings. Thus, there is no question of any compensation payment to the consumer by the KSEBL. Therefore, we humbly submit before this Hon'ble Forum that all the arguments of the said petitioner are baseless. The consumer is intentionally delaying the remittance by raising different arguments. Hence it is hereby submitted that the Hon'ble Forum may issue necessary directions to the consumer to remit the dues along with the additional expense incurred on us because of this court proceedings.

Counter Arguments of the Appellant

I am the Complainant in the above case and conversant with the facts of the case. The Electricity Board failed to provide voltage for running my small scale industry which was running for my livelihood without providing voltage, the Board recovered huge amount as minimum charge It is basically against the concept of Consumer Law. The definition of the service in the Consumer Protection Act categorically declares that electricity supply also will come within the ambit of service and collecting charges without providing sufficient voltage is against basic concept of Consumer law. As per the Technical side of the Electricity Board there should be a minimum

supply of 410 Volts for the working of a Three phase motor and a Variation (either decrease or increase)of 5% is allowable, which means for the fair working of motor there should be a minimum voltage of 390 Volts.If a motor is working below that voltage it can get get overheat and burn according to the basic electricity principles.

According to the letter dated 14/09/2023, from Assistant Engineer ie Exhibit P15 in Appeal petition, they have already submitted that they were supplying 370 Volts only. The definition of service and its commentary in Consumer Protection Act, which is given in the page no 456 in the authoritative book of the Consumer protection act is produced along with this affidavit which categorically declares that the electricity supply also will include within the definition of the term 'service'. The deficiency of electricity service is also discussed in detail in the consumer protection Act. The relevant page discussing the deficiency in the service is also produced along with this affidavit.

The peculiarity of the consumer of Electricity service is also described in page no 266 of the Consumer Protection Act. A true photocopy of that page is also produced along with this affidavit. A plain reading of the above section of the consumer protection act will categorically establish that collecting fee without providing sufficient voltage is a clear violation of the Consumer Protection Act. It is a universally accepted legal proposition that without providing service, a fee cannot be charged from a consumer. The above law was enacted as per the decisions taken in the International Conventions. This law has a Universal application irrespective of any rule or law existing in our country. When the reply of the electricity board under the right to information act states that the line under the Thurackal Transformer is having deficiency of service, what more evidence is required for the petitioners to establish his case. The authority ought to have directed the Controlling Engineer of the Thurackal Transformer to file an affidavit that he has provided sufficient voltage to the consumer. The most important contention of the electricity Board is that the consumer did not file a complaint pointing out the deficiency of voltage. In a consumer complaint, the authority ought to have conducted an enquiry whether the electricity board provided sufficient voltage. Without doing that the authority is trying to save the electricity board which is against the basic principles of consumer law .All the prayers in my appeal may kindly be allowed considering my affidavit.

Analysis and findings

The hearing of the appeal petition was conducted on 12/04/2024 at 11:30 am in the office of the State Electricity Ombudsman, DH Road & Foreshore Road Junction, near Gandhi Square, Ernakulam south. The hearing was attended by the appellant Sri. Mohammed kutty and respondent Smt. Raihanath O., Asst. Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd., Tirurangadi.

The appellant sri. Muhammed Kutty has availed a 3 phase service connection from the licensee to run his industrial unit which manufacture wooden furniture. The power supply was connected on 29/02/2012 with connected load 12.877 kw. The main electrical load connected are 3 phase & single phase motors. The industry was around 300m from the Thurakkal transformer. The appellant's main contention is that the voltage was very low since it is connected. The appellant was defaulted the payment and then submitted a request on 17/03/2022 for the instalment facility for cleaning the arrear. The licensee has accepted and sanctioned 10 instalments to make the payment. Then also the consumer didn't made the payment. As pr section 56(1) Electricity Act & Regulation 138 (1) a of the Supply Code 2014, the power supply was disconnected.

56 (1) *“ Where any person neglects to pay any charge for electricity or any sum other than a charge for electricity due from him to a licensee or the generating company in respect of supply, transmission or distribution or wheeling of electricity to him, the licensee or the generating company may, after giving not less than fifteen clear days' notice in writing, to such person and without prejudice to his rights to recover such charge or other sum by suit, cut off the supply of electricity and for that purpose cut or disconnect any electric supply line or other works being the property of such licensee or the generating company through which electricity may have been supplied, transmitted, distributed or wheeled and may discontinue the supply until such charge or other sum, together with any expenses incurred by him in cutting off and reconnecting the supply, are paid but no longer :*

Provided that the supply of electricity shall not be cut off if such person deposits, under protest,

(a) An amount equal to the sum claimed from him, or

(b) The electricity charges due from him for each month calculated on the basis of average charge for electricity paid by him during the preceding six months, whichever is less, pending disposal of any dispute between him and the licensee.”

Regulation 138(1) **“Grounds for disconnection.-** *The licensee shall not disconnect the supply of electricity to any consumer except”*

(a) “if the consumer defaults in payment of the dues payable to the licensee as per the bill or demand notice or any order issued by a competent authority, within the period stipulated therein;”

Here in this case, the licensee has given sufficient notice in compliance with the act and regulation and then only power was disconnected on 01/02/2022.

Then the dismantle notice has been served on 19/08/2022 as per regulation 139(6), 141 and 144 (1) (b) of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code-2014.

139(6) **“Procedure for disconnection.-** The licensee shall, after disconnection on the grounds mentioned in subregulation (1) of regulation 138, give intimation to the consumer as per format given in Annexure- 18 to the Code, to remove the cause of disconnection within forty five days, failing which the supply may be dismantled”.

141 **“Charges payable during the period of disconnection. –** The consumer is liable to pay the charges if any as approved by the Commission, during the period of disconnection also:

Provided that no charge shall be due to the licensee for the period which is in excess of one hundred and eighty days from the date of disconnection if the connection remains continuously disconnected for one hundred and eighty days except on the request of the consumer.”

144 **“Grounds for dismantling of service- (1)** The service shall be dismantled on the following grounds:-

(b) If the grounds on which the supply was disconnected are not removed or rectified within the notice period”.

The said connection was dismantled on 26/09/2022. The arrear amount has been worked out as Rs. 26,024/- after adjusting the security deposit of Rs. 6,500/-. The appellant was not made any effort to clear the payments inspite of repeated notices and reminders from the licensee. The notice dated 10/10/2022, is the final notice before initiating the revenue recovery procedure. As the appellant was not made any payment, the licensee has approached Malappuram District Collector for the Revenue Recovery procedure.

The detailed consumption statement submitted by the respondent shows that there is no consumption from the date of connection i.e., 04/2012 to 04/2014 almost two years. Then there is consumption from 05/2014 to 05/2019 i.e., around 5 years. Now, the main contention of the appellant is that the industry could not function since 2016 due to low voltage. But, the appellant had not send any complaint to the licensee regarding the low voltage issue bill 2022. He also failed to submit any document to support his contention of low voltage. The appellant never checked the voltage of the line and not tabulated the readings or any tested records showing that the voltage is very low. The industry is only 330m away from the LT distribution transformer. Normally the low voltage issue never arises when the consumer is close to the transformer. The appellant has produced a letter which was issued by the licensee as the answer to RTI question. The question is not particular about the appellant. Further a copy of the internal note sent by AE to EE has been produced, which is not specific about which location of LT line and at what distance from the Thurakkal transformer. Hence these couldn't consider as the proof to show the voltage is low. The appellant has sent a complaint about the low voltage only after 2020, which almost 8 years from the power was connected. As such, the issue of low voltage is only a recent idea projected by the appellant. Further, the appellant has quoted

consumer protection act and contenting that the consumer need not pay for the services if deficiency there in the services. The low voltage is a deficiency in service, but the consumer/appellant is totally failed to prove that the voltage was very low in his service connection. The issues noted are;

1. The voltage was not measured or recorded.
2. There was no tabulated recorded of voltage received by the appellant.
3. No complaint raised by the appellant till the power disconnection.
4. The low voltage issue has been raised only when the licensee has initiated action to recover the dues.

In view of the above, the deficiency in service could not be established and hence his version could not be accepted.

The respondent stated that the appellant had defaulted payment since march 2021. Then, why this much delay in disconnecting the power. As per the act and regulation the licensee would have given 15 days notice to disconnect the power. Here the power have been disconnected only on 01/02/2022. The power would have been disconnected at least by 01/05/2021.

If we consider the 01/05/2021 as the deemed disconnection, the deemed dismantling date should be 180 days after the deemed disconnection date. Then the deemed disconnection date would have been 27/10/2021. Then the fixed charge is applicable only up to 27/10/2021.

Decision

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

1. The licensee has to revise the demand considering the deemed date of dismantling as 27/10/2021.
2. The appellant is liable to pay the charges as per revised demand raised by the licensee as per 1. above.
3. No other cost agreed.

No. P/09/2024/ _____ dated: 08/05/2024.

Delivered to:

1. Sri. Muhammed Kutty, Thadathil House, Thennala P.O., Malappuram (Dist.)- 676508.
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Limited, Tirurangadi, Malappuram(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, Gandhi Road, Kozhikode- 673011.