

STATE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

Pallikkavil Building, Mamngalam-Anchumana Temple Road

Opp: Kochi Corporation Regional Office, Edappally, Kochi-682 024

www.keralaeo.org Ph.0484 2346488 Mob: +91 9567414885

Email:ombudsman.electricity@gmail

APPEAL PETITION NO. P/162/2010.

(Present: T.P. Vivekanandan)

APPELLANT : Sri. K.C.John,
Managing Partner, Palazhi Bio-Dairy Farms,
Kakkadu P O, Puthuppadi,
Kozhikode-673 586.

RESPONDENT : The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division, KSEBoard,
Thamarassery, Kozhikode Dt.

ORDER.

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE: -

The petitioner is the Managing Partner of Palazhi Bio-Dairy Farm, Puthuppadi, in Kozhikode Dt, which is a partnership Firm. The Firm is doing the business of conducting a Livestock Farm and a Dairy Farm situated side by side and having separate electric connection obtained at different periods of time under different tariff from Electrical Section, Thamarassery. The connection (consumer no: 8312) was provided under LT-IV tariff (industrial) in the year 2005, for the purpose of running a Dairy Farm. The second electric connection was given in the year 2007 for the purpose of a Livestock Farm under LT-V-Agricultural tariff with consumer No 9695. While so, the A.G's audit team during inspection and verification of the records, found that the connection given to the appellant's Dairy Farm (consumer no. 8312) was continuing in LT IV tariff, even after the Tariff revision Order issued by the Hon: KSERC on 27.11.2007, in which the tariff of the Milk processing Plants, having their Freezing, cold storage or Chilling load more than 20% of the Plant's total connected load, were to be shifted under commercial LT VIIA from industrial tariff. Prior to the tariff revision order, the Milk processing Plants were placed under LT IV-Industrial tariff, irrespective of their freezing/chilling load.

As per the audit report said above, the Respondent changed the tariff of the consumer and a letter with a demand a notice was issued to him, directing to remit an amount of Rs.2, 12,950/- being the amount calculated, of the difference in the tariff rates on converting to commercial, from 12/2007 onwards. The consumer being aggrieved by the change of tariff and the Bill, lodged complaint before the CGRF, Kozhikode, on 15.2.2010. The CGRF, after hearing the case dismissed the Petition on the

ground that the bill issued by KSEB was in order and the petition is devoid of any merits. Aggrieved by this order of CGRF, the appellant has filed the Appeal petition before this Authority on 24-8-2010.

ARGUMENTS OF THE APPELLANT: -

The arguments of the appellant are based on the brief facts and circumstances of the case that is narrated above. The appellant has adduced the following arguments;

The working of the livestock Farm include the rearing of cows for the purpose of milking the cows with milking machines, providing water for various purposes in connection with the running of Live-stock Farm, feeding the cows etc, for which purpose the electricity is being used. In the Dairy Farm, several operations like chilling of milk received from milking the cows in livestock Farm, packing of milk, preparation of milk products like curd, ghee etc. are carried out. The total connected load in the Dairy Farm i.e. in consumer no: 8312 is 20692 watts. Till the issue of the impugned invoice dated 15-12-2009, the electricity was billed under LT IV-industrial tariff.

He argues that LT V-Tariff is provided for agriculture. It is also mentioned under LT-V tariff category, in the schedule of tariff and terms and conditions for retail supply by KSEB with effect from 01.12.2007, that the tariff applicable to poultry Farm, silkworm breeding units, agricultural consumers including dewatering and lift irrigation, livestock Farm (minimum No. of milch cattle shall be five) and combination of livestock and dairy Farms, piggery Farms (minimum six breed able adult animals in the Farm) shall be LT V. Since his Firm is a combination of livestock and Dairy Farm, he is eligible for a single connection taking livestock and Dairy Farms together under the LTV Tariff. While availing a separate connection for his livestock Farm in the year 2007, the KSEB officials should have informed this fact to him and also should have helped and supported in getting an electric connection under LT-V tariff. The enthusiasm shown by the KSEB in extracting the electricity charges from him should have been reflected in providing the eligible benefits to the complainants also, he points out.

The appellant argues that Livestock and Dairy Farms are not at all profitable and can survive only with the subsidies and assistance from the Govt. It is for the purpose of helping the Farmers in undertakings of such non-profitable Firms, the activities like the combinations of Dairy Farms and livestock Farms are included under LT-V tariff. In this case while there is a benevolent provision under the tariff rules to give an electrical connection to the complainant's Farm under LT-V tariff and while there was no obstacle at all in providing the same to the Firm, the KSEB officials have kept the said provision as a secret only for the purpose of denying a connection under the LT-V tariff. The above circumstances are the true facts involved in providing two connections to us, as consumer no: 8312 and consumer no: 9695. The KSEBoard has done this when the complainant was eligible to get the connection for the whole Farm under LT-V Tariff.

On 15.12.2009, the complainant received an extraordinary demand from the KSEB section office, Puthupadi, directing the complainant to remit an amount of Rs.2, 12,915/- in respect of consumer no: 8312. In the letter attached to the said invoice, it was stated that in an inspection conducted by the AG's audit, it was revealed that the connection to the Dairy Farm (consumer no: 8312), was wrongly included in LT-IV Tariff and as per the gazette notification no: 2148 dated 27.11.2007, the milk chilling plants are liable to be included in LT-VII A tariff and hence the consumer was charged to LT-VIIA Tariff

from 27.11.2007, onwards. The action of KSEB in revising the tariff of the complainant's Firm from LT-IV to LT-VII A with retrospective effect from 27.11.2007 is absolutely wrong and without any basis.

Another point is that the invoice and the reason for changing the tariff from LT-IV to LT-VII A tariff is not correct and is against the schedule of tariff and terms and conditions of supply. It appears that the decision of KSEB was taken on the assumption that the entire power used in respect of consumer no 8312 is utilized for running the chilling plant alone. The only machinery used for chilling the milk is a bulk cooler. There are also other works going on in the Dairy plant such as pumping, packing and preparation of products such as ghee, curd etc. As per LT IV tariff, the Dairy Farm, milk chilling plant with or without chilling/freezing/cold storage activities shall be charges under industrial category, provided the chilling/freezing/cold storage load is limited to 20% of the connected load. If it exceeds 20%, LT VII A tariff shall be applicable. Thus there is no basis for bringing our Firm under LTVII A tariff. If the electric consumption for chilling/freezing/cold storage load is below 20% of the total connected load, the Firm is eligible for coverage under LT-IV tariff. The total connected load in consumer no: 8312 is 20962 watts. The consumption of energy for operating the chilling plant alone is below 20% and the consumer is liable to be continued under LT-IV tariff.

The CGRF in its impugned order has stated that the Assistant Executive Engineer (AEE) has filed a report dated 30.05.2010, that a test was conducted on the chilling Motors of the plant and convinced that the said motor has a capacity of 7.2 hp and the milk transfer pump has a load of 1 hp and hence the total load of chilling unit is approximately 8 HP which comes to 25% of the total connected load. This is totally against the statement filed by KSEB before the CGRF in which they have stated that the chilling is done by the bulk cooler having a capacity of 3 HP.

The appellant argues that the Test and findings of the AEE is not correct as the inspection was not done with the participation of the complainant or in the presence of the CGRF or its representative. The inspection was one-sided and the findings of the AEE were only to suit their case and the CGRF ought to have rejected the same. The testing and assessment of load of the Chilling Motor by the respondent himself is against the principles of natural justice and fair play. The CGRF ought to have conducted the test using an independent body like the Electrical Inspector in the presence of the complainant and the respondent. After getting the inspection report from the AEE, the CGRF has not given the complainant an opportunity to state his objections on the inspection report. If a proper inspection had been made, it will be revealed that the finding of the AEE, as to the capacity of the chilling plant motor is totally wrong.

The order of the CGRF is bad, contrary to the facts and against the tariff rules of the KSEBoard. The CGRF ought to have considered the fact that the Palazhi Bio-Dairy Farm is a combination of live-stock Farm and Dairy Farm with sufficient number of milch cattles and is eligible to be brought under LT-V tariff. The decision of the CGRF that the Firm is not eligible for LT-V tariff, since the two electric connections were taken at different times, one under industrial and the other in agricultural tariff by producing appropriate documents, is not sustainable. There is nothing that prevents the KSEB from bringing the Firm under LT-V tariff by providing a single connection. The fact that the complainant has taken two electric connections at different times is no reason to reject his claim to bring the Firm

under LT-V tariff by providing a single connection. It is to be noted that the two electric connections, i.e. consumer no: 8312 & 9695 were provided for the working of his Firm that consists of Dairy Farm and livestock Farm. To bring the complainant's Firm under LT-V tariff is the most appropriate and reasonable decision as per the existing rules of tariff.

Another argument is that, the CGRF ought to have noted that as per the terms and conditions of Supply, to determine whether a Dairy Farm is eligible for LT-IV tariff, is to be decided based on the percentage of power used for cold storage/freezing/chilling load alone and if the same is below 20% of the total connected load, the Dairy Farm is eligible for LT IV tariff. The milk transfer pump cannot be considered as a part of chilling activity. As per rules, the capacity of the chilling unit alone is to be considered for ascertaining its percentage in comparison to the total connected load. But in the order the CGRF has considered the load of milk transfer pump also for assessing the total load of the unit. The CGRF should have noted that the milk transfer pump does not form part of the chilling unit but is an appliance used for transferring the chilled milk to the packing unit only.

The CGRF should have noted that in the statement submitted by the AEE, it was mentioned that the Firm is using a bulk cooler (3HP) for chilling the milk. The contention of the AEE that, since only chilling and packing of milk was done there, the purpose is purely commercial and hence LT-VII A tariff is applicable is an argument without any reasoning. In LT-IV Tariff conditions (industry), it is specifically provided that if the chilling/freezing/cold storage load is limited to 20% of the total load, the Firm is eligible for LT-IV tariff. Simply because the activity is commercial, a Firm cannot be brought under LT VIIA tariff, if it is satisfying the conditions for inclusion in LT-IV tariff.

There are absolutely no grounds for bringing the consumer no: 8312 under LT-VII A tariff, while the complainant's Firm is eligible for LT-V tariff as per the existing norms and conditions. The KSEB is bound to provide the same to the Firm of the complainant. When an enactment, rules regulations or circular are brought by an Authority, the consumers are entitled to the benefit of the same. It is the duty of the officials to inform the consumers about the benefits eligible to them. If KSEB is not listing the complainant's Firm under LTV tariff as per the existing norms, they are doing a disservice not only to the complainant, but to the society also. The benevolent provisions provided by the Govt. for the uplift of agriculture are flagrantly violated by KSEB, by rejecting his genuine claim and not bringing him under the LT-V tariff. By changing the tariff of consumer no: 8312 from LT-IV to LT-VII A tariff, the KSEBoard has further harassed the complainant.

Finally, the appellant prays to consider the genuine request to bring the Firm under LT-V tariff and also order that the extraordinary invoice issued by the AE of the KSEB is not applicable to them.

ARGUMENTS OF THE RESPONDENT: -

The Respondent has submitted the statement of facts opposing the contentions raised by the appellant. The main contentions of the respondent are;

The Electric service connections were given to the appellant from Thamarassery Section office, prior to the formation of Puthupadi Section office. The service bearing consumer no: 8312 (old No: 20838) owned by the complainant was effected on 05.10.2005 for the Industrial purpose under LT IV tariff (SSI Tiny category). The petitioner requested for another service connection for a Dairy Farm

and the service connection bearing consumer no: 9695 (old no: 23315) was given from Thamarassery Section on 15.01.2007 under LT V (Agricultural) tariff. The consumer no: 8312 was registered for Industrial purpose with registered connected power load of 17.412 KW and light load of 3.28 KW.

The demand notice and the Bill were served as per the present tariff schedule and AG's audit note. The short assessment bill was done based on the purpose for which the energy was used. The said Milk chilling plant is billed in LT VII A Tariff because here the milk is chilled using a bulk cooler (3HP) and a milk transfer pump (1HP). Thus the total load of chilling purpose is 4 HP. The chilled milk is then packed using a packing system consisting of an air compressor of 12.5 HP, water pump (1/2 HP) and a packing machine (5HP). Thus the total load becomes 18 HP and used for chilling and packing purpose which is the major part of the connected load of Consumer No 8312. No other manufacturing process is carried out there and only chilling and packing of milk is carried out and hence the purpose of use is purely commercial. The electric connections were availed by the appellant in the same ownership and according to separate applications and documents submitted at the time of registering the service.

In the note to LT IV tariff category, it is made clear that the tariff applicable for Dairy Farm with milk chilling plants, where connected load of chilling is above 20% of the total connected load, shall be LT VIIA-commercial. The service bearing consumer no: 8312 is not a Dairy Farm but only a chilling and packing unit, and hence LT VII A tariff only is applicable. The short assessment bill was prepared and served as per Rule 37(5) of KSEB Terms and Conditions of Supply, 2005. The two connections with consumer no: 8312 and 9695, owned by the complainant, was given for different purpose in different periods and lies in different premises. The complainant is still availing all the benefits as per schedule of tariff under LT V (Agriculture) for service connections bearing consumer No: 9695. The Consumer No: 8312 is a separate one, in a separate premise and under different tariff. Therefore all the energy consumed in Consumer no: 8312 and 9695, can not be treated under one tariff as LT V (Agricultural).

Analysis and Findings: -

The Appeal Petition was heard on 30.3.2011 at KSEB, IB, Kozhikode and both sides were present. Mr. Sajeew Joseph, partner Palazhi Bio Diary, Mr. T. Firoz and Mr. K.C. Philip, Counsel, represented for the appellant and Mr. Muhammed Ashraf, AEE, Thamarassery Electrical Sub division, for the opposite side. The Hearing was partly done and the appellant requested posting for another date to submit a detailed argument note which was allowed. The case was posted for hearing on 23.2.2012, but again a request was made for adjournment by the appellant and finally the case was heard on 28.06.2012. Sri K C Philip and Z P Zachariah, Advocate, appeared for the appellant and Smt. Nisha Banu, AEE, KSEB appeared for the respondent's side. On perusal of the Petition, statement of facts of the Respondent, the arguments made during the hearing and the argument note filed and on a detailed analysis of all documents before me, I come to the following Findings and Conclusions leading to the decisions.

The dispute is, regarding the change of tariff of consumer No 8312, who is running a Milk chilling unit, from industrial to commercial tariff with retrospective effect from 01.12.2007 in 12/2009 and issue of a short assessment bill dated 15.12.2009 for Rs 212915/-, being the arrears of the difference in the tariff rates. As per the new tariff order, issued by the Hon: Commission and notified in the Govt Gazette on 27. 11.2007, some changes in the rules/norms for tariff fixation were brought in and one

among them was the change of tariff of Milk Processing units from industrial to commercial rates, in case the consumer utilizes more electrical load for Chilling/Freezing purpose, i.e. in excess of 20% of the total connected load of the Plant. The respondent on getting the AG's Audit report mentioning the anomaly in tariff fixed for the consumer and the revenue loss sustained by KSEB by fixing a wrong lower tariff, asked the respondent to recover the losses. The respondent on finding that the Chilling/Freezing load of the consumer is in excess of 20% of the total load, decided to change the tariff of the consumer No 8312 to commercial rate and issued a bill towards the arrears for the difference in the two tariff rates, for the period starting from 12/2007 to 09/2009.

The question to be decided is:

- 1) *Whether the consumer falls under industrial or commercial tariff during the disputed period from 01.12.2007 onwards and*
- 2) *Whether the short assessment bill issued thereof is correct and in order?*
- 3) *What about his request for change over to LT-V-Agricultural tariff from the present tariff, on combining both the electric connections of Dairy Farm and Livestock Farm into a single connection?*

It is a well-known fact that milk chilling is an integral part of the Process related to Milk processing, Pasteurization and storage of milk. The Hon: KSERC had categorized the Dairy Farms under LT IV- industrial and milk chilling plants as LT VIIA- commercial. However, the note (e) under LTIV-industrial category reads as "the Dairy Farms/milk chilling plant with or without chilling/ freezing/ cold storage activity shall be charged under industrial category provided the chilling, freezing or cold storage load is limited to 20% of the total connected load. If it exceeds 20%, LT VII A tariff shall be applicable".

Meanwhile, the KSSIA (Kerala State Small Industries Association), has filed petition (TP 76/2010) before KSERC seeking to declare the Tariff for milk chilling /milk processing units as coming under LT IV- industrial tariff itself. The Hon: Commission after hearing them and KSEB, delivered the order on 21.06.2010, deciding that the complete processing of milk by pasteurization, storage, packing etc has to be considered as industry and as such LT IV tariff shall be applicable to them. It was also ordered that the units engaged in cold storage, chilling, freezing and packing activities, shall be treated as commercial. *But it is specifically mentioned in the same order that the note (e) under LT IV-industrial (which introduced the new norm/rule of 20% limit for getting industrial tariff) shall be deleted and the order amended accordingly and the changes (now ordered) shall be effective only from the date of the order i.e. 21.06.2010. This stricture implies that the norm of 20% restriction on the Milk chilling load for getting industrial tariff shall remain in force, till to 21.06.10 (from 1.12.2007).* Accordingly, KSEB issued a circular dated 26.07.2010, directing its Officials to assign LT IV tariff for milk processing/ chilling units and the changes to be implemented from 21.06.2010 onwards. The KSSIA has again represented, against the issue of commercial tariff for milk processing units before the Hon: KSERC, but obtained the order confirming the tariff as LT VIIA (commercial) itself for the period 1.12.2007 to 21.6.2010 provided their chilling/freezing load is more than 20% of the total load.

In this case, it is found by the AEE that the total load of consumer is 20.69 KW and the chilling motor load has a capacity of 7.2 HP and the milk transfer pump load has a rating of 1 HP and hence the total 'Chilling' load comes to approximately 8 HP. Since the Electric load used for the purpose of

operating the chilling plant is above 25% of the total connected load, the applicable tariff shall be LT VIIA -commercial, argues the respondent.

The appellant does not agree with the above statement. He says that his chilling load is only a bulk cooler of 3 hp and the milk transfer pump does not form part of it. Further he argues that, since the Test conducted by the AEE to determine the capacity ratings of the Chilling Motors were not done in the presence of the consumer or did not convince or got it witnessed by the consumer, it is against natural justice as he was denied opportunity to defend his part. The KSEB does not dispute this fact. I also feel that the Tests done on the Machines to ascertain its capacity, should have been done after giving notice and ought to have prepared a Mahazar, noting the details of tests done with results, in the consumer's presence. Even if the consumer is not convinced of the tests done by the AEE, he can raise the issue and plead before the CGRF with his contentions. This procedure was not seen followed by the respondent and hence an opportunity was denied to the consumer to contest his case on it. The tests done on the machines by AEE, to evaluate its capacity rating, even though technically correct, lack the principle of natural justice as stated above and hence cannot be accepted.

The Audit was done on 02.11.2009 and based on its report, the tariff of consumer No 8312 was changed and a bill was issued. But the Audit party has only verified the records and issued the report. They were not aware of the actual chilling load of the consumer. Hence the respondent ought to have made an inspection of the premises of the consumer and ascertained the Chilling Load and made a mahazar (in the presence of the consumer or his representative) before taking further actions on the Audit note, since it is the responsibility of the respondent to convince or establish the irregularities committed by the opposite party before Law. In the absence of the Inspection, the respondent can rely only on the documents submitted by the consumer while taking the Electric connection in the year 2005, when the Electric service was first availed. That is to say, what were the electrical loads shown in the Completion report of the Installation Wiring Diagram, meant for Chilling purpose and other activities, at the time of executing the Electric connection Agreement for the new Connection. The records submitted by the consumer (while taking the service connection) show that the Chilling load (bulk cooler) has a capacity of 3 hp only. The milk transfer pump, the air compressor for packing system, water pump and packing machine does not fall under the category of chilling load and hence cannot be included in the list of chilling load. It is to be noted that, as per the Tariff rules, only the Chilling/ Freezing/ cold storage load, if it exceeded the 20% limit will attract the LT VIIA tariff and the Packing loads are exempted from that purpose. Thus the chilling load which is found to be 3 hp (2.24 KW), out of the total connected load of 21 KW, is definitely less than 20% limit set by the tariff rules. Hence I am inclined to accept the contentions of the appellant to that effect.

The appellant claims that their Firm combines both Livestock and Dairy Farm together and hence is eligible for a single connection for livestock and Dairy Farm together under the LT V –Agricultural tariff. The LT-V tariff is meant for those connections provided for agriculture including a combination of livestock and Dairy Farms. The appellant has availed a separate connection to his livestock Farm in 2007 under LTV tariff. The appellant has produced a certificate issued by the Deputy Director, Dairy development department dated 16.08.2010, certifying that M/s Palazhi Bio Dairy Farm is running a

combination of livestock and Dairy Farm under same management and same premises. But it is a recent certificate which can be used by the consumer for claiming the LT V tariff prospectively only, by placing the application before the Respondent for combining the said connections into one.

DECISION: -

From the analysis and discussion done above and the Findings and Conclusions arrived at, I take the following decisions.

Issue No.1 &2: - The AG's Audit Party has conducted an inspection during 11/2009 and they noted that the tariff assigned to Consumer No 8312 was wrong as per the new tariff rules. Subsequently the tariff was changed and a short assessment bill for Rs 2, 12,915/- was issued to the consumer with due date as 14.01.2010. It is noted that no inspection of consumer's premises was made by the KSEB, consequent to the AG's Audit Party's observation, to ascertain whether the consumer belong to LT VIIA commercial tariff or not. It is necessary to establish the fact that, error or anomaly has occurred in fixing the consumer's tariff, as per the new tariff rules, by the respondent. Secondly, the existing records of KSEB, regarding the consumer's Completion Report that were submitted to KSEB while availing the electric connection, shows the chilling load as the bulk cooler of 3 HP which comes to less than 20% of the total connected load.

Moreover, the respondent has done Tests on the Motors of the Chilling Plant so as to determine the correct chilling load as per the direction of CGRF. The respondent has also analysed the test results, to arrive at the true load of the consumer. The test was found to be done systematically and is found technically correct. But the tests undertaken by the respondent, was found to be done without issuing notice to the consumer or convincing or witnessing the Test report made thereof. The objection of the appellant that, the above action of the respondent violates the principle of natural justice and therefore lost his chance to defend the Case before the CGRF, is found reasonable.

For the above stated reasons, the action taken by the respondent, consequent to the AG Party's Audit note, on the appellant's Palazhy Dairy Farm, Consumer No 8312, in changing the tariff from LT IV-industrial to LT VIIA- commercial, with retrospective effect from 1.12.2007, is found to be not in order and hence decided as not maintainable. Therefore the short assessment bill dated 15.12.2009 for Rs 2, 12,915/-, is to be set aside. The consumer shall continue to be placed under LT-IV Industrial tariff, after 1.12.2007 as before, i.e. all along the disputed period. The excess electricity charges collected by KSEB from the consumer, under wrong tariff fixation (LT VII A) in the regular monthly bills since 12/07, may be refunded, with applicable interest as per rules, within 60 days of this order.

Issue No.3 : - It is reported that, there was separate connection for Dairy Farm with consumer No. No 8312 availed in 2005 under LT IV- industrial tariff and a livestock Farm with consumer No. 9695 under LT V-Agricultural tariff availed in 2007, by the same consumer. The appellant states that he is eligible for LT V tariff and the KSEB did not intimate the benefit earlier. This issue of changeover to lower Agricultural tariff was raised as a part of the present dispute only. There were no documents produced before me by the appellant to suggest that he has applied for it earlier. The appellant himself has applied and obtained the said two electric connections, at different periods of time, as

per his request and need. As per clause 32 of KSEB T & C of Supply, 2005, reads as; "The change of tariff under LT from higher to lower tariff at the request of the consumer shall be permitted in bonafide cases by the Officer not below the rank of AEE.....". Since it is the rule, the consumer should have enquired and placed application with documents and execute fresh Agreement for tariff change or for combining both services into a single connection. It is to be borne in mind that only after submitting the application for tariff change and convincing the bonafide of the request and filing necessary papers like schedule to Agreement etc. he becomes eligible for the conversion of the tariff. Here in this case, since the consumer has now requested the benefit of the combination of livestock Farm and Dairy Farm together under LT V –Agricultural Tariff and has placed application for the same on 17.8. 2010, it is ordered that the respondent shall take a decision on the application filed by the consumer for the said purpose, as per rules, with in 30 (thirty) days of the receipt of this order and shall intimate the same to the consumer.

Having concluded and decided as above it is ordered accordingly. The Appeal Petition filed by the Appellant is allowed to the extent ordered as above and stands disposed of as such.

No order on costs. Dated the 3rd of August, 2012.

Electricity Ombudsman.

Ref No. P/ 162/ 2010/1336/ Dated 03.08.2012.

Forwarded to : 1). Sri. K. C. John,

Managing Partner, Palazhi Bio-Dairy Farms, Kakkadu P O,
Puthuppadi, Kozhikode. Pin: 673 586.

2). The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division, KSEBoard, Thamarassery,
Kozhikode District.

Copy to: -

1). The Secretary, Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission,
KPFCBhavanam, Vellayambalam, Thiruvananthapuram-10

2). The Secretary, KSEBoard,
Vydyuthi Bhavanam, Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram-4

3). The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
KSEB, Vydyuti Bhavanam, Gandhi Road, Kozhikode-32.