

THE STATE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN
Charangattu Bhavan, Building No.34/895, Mamangalam-Anchumana Road,
Edappally, Kochi-682 024
www.keralaeo.org Ph: 0484 2346488, Mob: 91 9447576208
Email:ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com

APPEAL PETITION NO. P/119/2015

(Present: V.V. Sathyarajan)

Dated: 26th October 2015

Appellant : Sri. Aboobacker M
Vellalil House,
Kannapally Bhavanam,
Kayamkulam, Alappuzha.

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division,
KSE Board Limited,
Kayamkulam, Alappuzha.

ORDER

Background of the Case

The appellant is an industrial consumer bearing consumer no. 14511 with a connected load of 60 kW under Electrical Section, Cheppad. The APTS team inspected the premises of the appellant on 6-4-2011 and it is found that the B phase of the CT operated three phase meter recorded zero voltage resulting the consumption of that phase was not recorded by the meter. Based on the site mahazar prepared by the Sub Engineer a short assessment bill amounting to Rs. 3,15,830/- for the period from 9/2010 to 4/2011 was served on the appellant on 19/05/2011. Aggrieved by this, the appellant had challenged the said assessment in WP (C) No. 14284 of 2011 (1) before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.

The Hon'ble High Court directed the appellant vide an interim order, to remit Rs. 1,00,000.00 and the appellant remitted accordingly. Thereafter the writ petition was disposed of directing the respondent to issue a calculation statement to the appellant and to hear and to take appropriate decision within one month from the date of receipt of an objection from the appellant. A calculation statement was issued to the appellant and after considering the objection filed by the appellant, a final bill for Rs. 3,15,830.00 issued to him by the respondent.

Aggrieved by this, the appellant filed petition before the CGRF seeking to set aside the short assessment bill. The CGRF has dismissed the petition with the following directions.

1. The short assessment bill dated 19-05-2011 for Rs. 3,15,830.00 is in order.
2. The respondents are directed to raise fresh bill for the above amount with interest at bank rate till date, after deducting the amount already paid. The petitioner can avail installment facility as per rules.

Challenging the orders of CGRF, the appellant had submitted this Appeal Petition dated 20-05-2015 before this Authority.

Arguments of the Appellant: -

The arguments of the Appellant are based on the brief facts and circumstances which are narrated above. Further the Appellant has adduced the following arguments. The question of law involved in this dispute is whether, the Distribution Licensee could demand amounts for the preceding period on the suspicion that the premises meter faulty/under recording, violating Clause 19(2) of Supply Code 2005 or not, and if demanded, whether that amount is an amount/sum due under Section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003 and whether such a bill/demand fit under Clause of 25(5) of Supply Code, 2005.

- 1 The meter reading was regularly taken by a Sub Engineer and bills were also issued regularly, which the appellant had honoured without any fail. No amount due on electricity charges is left unpaid and no arrear is outstanding on the consumer.
- 2 While so, on 06-04-201, Mr. K.V. Shaji, Sub Engineer, Electrical Section Cheppadu in the presence of the Anti power Theft Squad of KSEB/KSEBL and witnesses inspected the electrical installations and examined the meter at the premises and prepared a mahazar. In the mahazar it is well stated that the meter and the CT were in sealed box. Thereby, chance for external interference with metering equipments eliminated. It is also reported in the mahazar that the power meter and the CT are functioning properly. After that it is stated in the mahazar that, a standard reference meter was connected and while this meter reads 2000 units the premises meter only records 1340 units. However, it is not at all reported how the test meter was standard under statutes. Thereby, in the mahazar it is inferred that the premises meter is only recording 2/3 of the actual energy consumed and it is due to lack of proper electrical contact due to corrosion at the terminal point of the meter. However without taking any corrective actions the inspection team sealed the metering equipments. While so, no reference of the

meter under recording is available in the meter reading register or any other billing records and the consumer was continuously billed as per the reading of the same meter until 12/2012.

- 3 After the inspection above, a bill dated 19-05-2011 for Rs. 3,15,830.00 was issued upon the appellant for short assessment for the period from 09/2010 to 04/2010. The due date of payment and the last date of payment for not disconnecting supply were fixed as 25-05-2011. No billing detail of the amount was included in this bill and the appellant was kept in darkness in the matter.
- 4 This appellant filed WP(C). No. 14284 of 2014 before Hon'ble High Court of Kerala and the High Court found out and stated in the judgment dated 16-07- 2011 that, "the basis of consumption for which the bill is drawn is not revealed", which is still as such on this date also. The Hon: Court ordered the appellant to remit Rs. 1,00,000.00 and the 4th respondent Assistant Engineer to furnish calculation details of the bill, and shall take appropriate steps on the objection which is submitted by the petitioner within one week on receipt of the above calculation statement after affording an opportunity of personal hearing and the Assistant Engineer shall take such decision within a period of one month on receipt of objection. Rs. 1,00,000.00 remitted by the petitioner shall be appropriated in accordance with the decision of the Assistant Engineer.
- 5 The Assistant Engineer issued a calculation statement dated 29-10-2014 against which another objection was filed dated 25-10-2015. The Assistant Engineer communicated a letter dated 22-11-2014 offering one time settlement of an amount of Rs. 8,15,521.00. This amount included the balance amount of Rs. 2,16,557.00, after deducting Rs. 1,00,000.00 which had been remitted by the appellant as per the Hon'ble High Court order and Rs. 2,97,364.00 towards short assessment for the period from 06/2011 to 03/2012 and Rs. 3,01,600.00 towards surcharge. No demand for short assessment for Rs. 2,97,364.00 for the period from 06/2011 to 03/2012 was never ever issued to this appellant and since dispute on the bill for Rs. Rs. 316557.00, was never resolved. Therefore, question of surcharge never arose, this appellant never accepted the offer.
- 6 The Assistant Engineer then communicated another letter/order and bill dated 02-12-2014 demanding to remit Rs. 3,53,255.00 which included the balance amount of Rs. 2,15,830.00 and surcharge on it amounting to Rs. 1,37,425.00 after hearing of the consumer. It is well stated in the order that, this appellant doubted the accuracy of the instruments used in the inspection and tests. However, the Assistant Engineer gave any satisfactory reply or reasons in the order to refute that, the doubt of this appellant about the soundness of the testing

equipments basing facts and rules or regulations. Thereby, the doubt and apprehension of the appellant regarding the authenticity and correctness of equipments is not cleared and the doubt on professional acumen and authority of the Mr. Shaji. KV, Sub Engineer, who conducted the inspection and tests, is also not cleared. In this order, among other things he stated that, as per Clause 24(5) of Supply Code, 2005 the consumer is bound to remit the short assessment amount for the unrecorded period and the bill is confirmatory with the rules and regulations under Electricity Act, 2003. Then another disconnection notice dated 29-12-2014 was also issued.

- 7 Aggrieved by the above, the complaint No. CGRF- CR/Comp. 144/2014-15 before the CGRF (Central) disposed in favour of the licensee relying statutes which are not at all applicable in this case and which never answer the question of law involved and raised by this appellant in the complaint.
- 8 In the matter above, it is respectfully submitted that, Under Section 55 of Electricity Act, 2003, the licensee shall supply electricity through a correct meter. It shall be in accordance with CEA (Installation and Operation of meters) Regulations, 2006, the provisions under Supply Code, 2005 and KERC (Licensee's Standard of Performance) Regulations 2006.
 - a. Under Clause 6(2) of the above regulation, consumer meter is generally owned by the licensee and
 - b. Under Clause 7(b) consumer meter shall be installed by the licensee either at the premises or outside the premises of the consumer and
 - c. Under Clause 10, the operation, testing and maintenance shall be carried out by the licensee and
 - d. Under Clause 15(2) discrepancies in the meter shall be rectified by the licensee and
 - e. Under Clause 18 (2) the meters shall be tested by the licensee with an NABL accredited mobile laboratory at site or at an NABL accredited laboratory after dismantling the meter from the premises and
 - f. Under Clause. 19(2) of Supply Code, 2005, if licensee is unable to base a bill on meter reading due to its non-recording or malfunctioning, the licensee shall issue a bill based on the previous six months average consumption. In such cases the meter shall be replaced within one month.
 - g. Under item No. 5 of Schedule -1 to the KERC (Licensee's Standard of Performance) Regulations 2006 also, the licensee shall replace slow, creeping or stuck meters within 30 days of detection. Here the licensee had flouted every bit of statutes above while issuing impugned bill.
9. KSEB/KSEBL is also a distribution licensee, which shall act and perform as per Regulation above in addition to other statutes under

Electricity Act, 2003.. It is unequivocally stated in the mahazar that Mr. Shaji K. V. Sub Engineer examined the meter, connected equipments, connected load, and other, in the presence of witness and APT Squad Thiruvalla, which means that the Sub Engineer alone conducted the examination. The pertinent question which arises here is, whether this Sub Engineer is an authorized and qualified employee of the NABL accredited mobile laboratory or an NABL accredited laboratory of the licensee to test the meter. The other question is that whether the equipments used for test were the equipments of such an NABL accredited laboratory of the licensee. The fact of the case is that, the licensee did not have such an NABL accredited laboratory while, the said examination/test was conducted on 06-04-2011. Thereby such test results by a crude test conducted with the equipments whose correctness is not at all proved and professional acumen of the person testing the meter is also not proved is not at all acceptable under the norms of law. Hence, the test results stated in the mahazar or other could not be based to issue the short assessment bill and thereby the bill is issued without any proven valid grounds, hence the bill is arbitrary and illegal and hence null and void.

10. It is the bounden duty of the licensee under Section 55 of electricity Act, 2003 to supply electricity through a good meter and if the meter is found faulty it should be replaced within a period of one month and that months bill should be issued based on the average consumption for the preceding period six months as provided under Clause 19(2) of Supply Code, 2005. Therefore, there are no enabling provisions for the licensee to issue Bill for a period from 09- 2010 to 04-2014. Thereby also Exhibit P2 Bill is arbitrary and illegal.
11. Despite having the mandated provision under Clause 19 (2) of Supply Code, 2005, to replace a faulty meter within one month, the licensee changed the meter only during 12/2012. The finding under Para 6 under the head "Analysis and Findings" of the order of the CGRF that the meter was changed during 03/2012 is not correct. As per the copy of the meter reading register issued under Right to Information Act the reading from 08/2008 to 12/2012 is continuous in four digit number and in the increasing order and the four digit reading ends at 12-01-2012 with a reading 71189 and a three digit reading starts from 01/2013 with 731. Also there is entry against the month of 12/2012 in the meter reading register "meter changed on". However reason for meter change is not at all entered in any of the records available. Therefore, the meter was changed only during 12/2012. The bills were issued according to the above readings and the licensee cannot dispute this glaring fact. Therefore, it is to be presumed that the test report of Mr. Shaji K. V. Sub Engineer was not accepted by the licensee and hence the meter is not changed until 12/2012.

12. The CGRF (Central) had made grievous mistake while stating that, the meter was changed during 03/2012. Copy of page No. 156 & 157 of the meter reading register is produced.
13. The Assistant Engineer had claimed that, as per Clause 24(5) of supply Code, 2005, the consumer is bound to pay the amount. The CGRF (Central) also have relied the regulation to order in favour of the licensee. This is totally wrong and illegal. Clause 24 of-supply Code, 2005 deal with modalities of "Dispute on Bill". Clause 24(5) starts with the words, "If the licensee establishes that it has undercharged the consumer"..... "It never means that, if the licensee establishes that it has under read a meter of the consumer" or the meter is found not recording. The meaning of "charge" in this context under law dictionary is the expense which had been incurred. Therefore, it is the cost of services or supply. Therefore, the cost is denoted by the word charge and "under charged" means only valued less than what is required, but not under measured than actual. Therefore, Clause 24(5) shall never be interpreted to issue the bill.
14. Section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003 also never comes to rescue the bill. The CGRF have read this section wrongly to uphold the bill and to order in favour of the licensee. It is not at all established under the available Regulations that meter was under recording by two third. No tests on the meter as required under statutes has ever been done. Here in this case, one Sub Engineer reads the meter continuously and another sub engineer on some day says that, the meter is faulty or under recording after an inspection and examination, process of which is not at all approved under statutes. Whereas the first Sub Engineer who is continuously inspects and reads the meter does not have any such opinion continuously. In the meter reading register, there is no entry stating that the meter is under recording or faulty. Therefore, there is conflicting opinion among two Sub Engineers. According to the Sub Engineer who reads the meter continuously regularly, finds the meter recording consumption correctly and the other Sub Engineer who made a surprise visit says the meter is under recording. There is no concrete evidence supported the opinion of the second Sub Engineer by statutes to establish that the meter is under recording.

Therefore also the short assessment bill is arbitrary and illegal and has been drawn out and issued without any valid reasons and grounds.

Nature of relief sought from the Ombudsman

1. To call for the documents and to hold and declare that Exhibit P2 bill amounting to Rs. 3,15,830.00 arbitrary and illegal and to set aside it.
2. To issue orders to refund Rs. 1,00,000.00 which has been collected against bill.

3. To issue orders to pay expenses of the appeal to the appellant, which the Hon: Ombudsman find adequate
4. Such other reliefs the appellant prays for, during the course of appeal continuously inspects and reads the meter does not have any such opinion

Arguments of the respondent:

The respondent stated that as per Regulation 24(5) of the Supply Code, 2005(5) "If the Licensee establishes that it has under charged the consumer either by review or otherwise, the licensee may recover the amount under charged from the consumer by issuing a bill and in such cases at least 30 days shall be given for the consumer to make payment against the bill. While issuing the bill the licensee shall specify the amount to be recovered as a separate item. In the subsequent bill or as a separate bill with an explanation on this amount."

Section 56(2) of Electricity Act 2003 states that "Notwithstanding anything contained in any other Law for the time being in force no sum due from any consumer under this section shall be recoverable after the period of two years from the date from such sum has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrears of charges for electricity supplied and the licensee shall not cut off the supply of the Electricity." Further Clause 19(2) of Supply code states that "If Licensee is unable to base a bill on meter reading due to its non-recording or malfunctioning, the licensee shall issue a bill based on the previous six months average consumption. In such cases the meter shall be replaced within one month." There is no such clause 25(5) of Supply Code 2005 as specified in the appeal petition. The respondent also stated the following.

1. Appellant is running an ice factory under Electrical section Cheppad. Its connection is assigned with consumer No. 14511 with a connected load of 60 kW, CT operated Energy meter is provided at the premises. The meter reading was regularly taken by a sub engineer and bills were issued accordingly. The arrear current charges against the consumer is Rs. 5,13,921/- without surcharges.
2. Sri. K.V: Shaji, Sub Engineer, Electrical section Cheppad conducted an inspection at the premises of Cons no. 14511, Sri Aboobacker. M on 06.04,2011, in the presence of the APTS unit Thiruvalla. A site mahazar was prepared at the time of inspection. The meter in the premises was a CT operated three phase meter having serial No. 05450834. In the site mahazar it is clearly specified that in B phase, voltage is recorded as zero. Since the voltage of B phase was showing zero, the consumption of that phase was not recorded by the meter. The B phase voltage given to power meter was failed from 23-08-2010 as per the tamper data. The failure was recorded in the tamper data. The accuracy of the meter was

also tested with a standard reference meter. During the test it is found that the power meter is recording only 1340 WH while standard reference meter was recording 2000 WH. The B Phase voltage failure was due to corrosion in the service cable at the point where it is connected with the meter terminal. The Inspection team sealed the metering equipments without taking any corrective action, for preserving the evidences.

3. A sort Assessment Bill was issued to the consumer on 19.5.2011 demanding a payment of Rs. 3,15,830/- for the period from 9/2010 to 4/2011. The copy of the site mahazar was also issued to the consumer before issuing the Bill. The Bill was assessed to an amount of Rs. 3,15,830 /- for the unmetered consumption from 9/2010 to 4/2011.
4. Without filing any dispute or appeal before the KSEB Ltd, the consumer directly filed WPC No. 14284 of 2011(1) before the Hon'ble High court of Kerala.
5. The Assistant Engineer communicated a letter dated 22/11/14 offering one time settlement of Rs. 815521/- (Including surcharge till date) on 29-10"
6. The short remittance amount for the period from 6/2011 to 3/2012 is Rs. 2,97,364.00 which was under dispute. Since the consumer had filed a case before Hon'ble High Court, the Assistant Engineer had not cleared the fault in the meter terminal. After 3/2012 fault in meter connection was cleared. Bill amount for the unrecorded portion of energy was shown in the bill separately (under dispute) from 6/2011 to 3 /2012.
7. The Assistant Engineer issued proceedings on 2/12/2014 as per the hearing conducted on 29.10.2014. As per the proceedings the consumer has total dues Rs. 2,15,830/- and surcharge Rs. 1,37,425/-.The proceedings was as per High Court order on the invoice dated 25.3.11 only. The total principal amount of arrear in respect of the consumer is Rs. 5,13,921/- without surcharges. As per the clause 24(5) of Supply code 2005, the consumer is bound to remit the short assessment amount for the unrecorded period. The consumer is not penalized and the amount only includes the energy charges due from him. The Bill issued was in conformity with the rules and regulations of Electricity Act 2003. Since the consumer has not remitted the amount as per the proceedings a disconnection notice was issued on 29.12.14.
8. As per the regulation 24(5) of die Supply Code 2005(5) the appellant is bound to pay the short assessment amount and surcharges.
9. The tamper report produced clearly shows that B Phase voltage given to the power meter was not functional from 23.8.2010 onwards.

10. The finding under Para 6 under the head "Analysis and findings" of the order of the CGRF states that "They corrected the meter only on 3/2012. It means that B phase connection to the meter terminal is corrected.
11. The demand had been raised with the time limit specified (two years) under section 56(2) of the Electricity Act 2003.

Analysis and Findings: -

The hearing of the Case was conducted in my chamber at Edappally, on 20-08-2015. Sri. Anandakuttan Nair, the representative of the appellant had appeared for the appellant and Sri Harikumar C, Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Kayamkulam represented for the respondent's side for the hearing. On examining the petition of the appellant, the statement of facts filed by the respondent, the arguments made during the hearing and considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, this Authority comes to the following findings and conclusions leading to the decisions.

The point to be decided is as to whether the appellant is liable to pay the short assessment bill for an amount of Rs. 3,15,830.00 for the period from 09/2010 to 04/2011 when the meter is not working due to defect in the terminal connections of the CT meter.

It is evident that the APTS inspected the electrical installations of the appellant and prepared site mahazar. In the same it was found that the voltage in the 'B' Phase is recorded as zero and consumption in that phase was not recorded in the meter. As per the tamper data it was noted that the 'B' Phase voltage to the meter failed from 23-08-2010. The accuracy of the meter was checked with a standard reference meter and it is found that the existing meter is recording only 1340 units when the standard reference meter is recording 2000 units. Further, it was also revealed that the reason for the voltage failure was due to the corrosion in the meter terminal point. The short assessment bill was issued for the unrecorded portion of energy for the period from 09/2010 to 04/2011 as per Regulation 24(5) of Supply Code, 2005.

The appellant's contention is that the respondent has not tested the meter in an accredited mobile laboratory or an NABL of the licensee. The crude test conducted on 06-04-2011 with the equipments whose correctness is not at all proved and professional acumen of the person testing the meter is also not proved. Further, the test results stated in the mahazar could not be based for issuing such a short assessment bill and hence the bill issued is without any valid grounds. The appellant also argued that without taking any corrective actions the inspection team sealed the metering equipments. While so, no reference of the meter under recording is available either in the meter reading register or any other billing records and the appellant was continuously billed as per the reading of the same meter until 12/2012.

The appellant contented that the meter and installations in his premises are totally correct and there is absolutely no legal justification on the part of licensee in making a revelation through an inspection. Moreover, the connection to the meter was correct and therefore there was no non recording of electricity in one phase of the meter. Hence the appellant questions the test result and the tamper report.

According to the respondent, the meter installed in the premises was a CT operated three phase meter. Upon inspection the voltage in 'B' Phase is found as zero. Since the voltage of 'B' Phase was showing zero the consumption of energy in that phase was not recorded in the meter. As per the tamper data 'B' Phase voltage to the meter was failed with effect from 23-08-2010. During the accuracy test of the meter with a standard reference meter it is found that when the meter is recording consumption 1340 units the standard reference meter records 2000 units. Further it is argued that the non recording of energy in one phase of the meter is due to the corrosion occurred at the terminals of the meter. In the case of CT operated three phase meter if the voltage in one phase is recorded as zero instead of 240 Volts range, there will be negligible consumption in that particular phase and the meter is only recording 2/3rd of the actual consumption. To compensate the unrecorded portion of energy during the period of missing of one phase, a short assessment bill for Rs. 3,15,830.00 was issued. The respondent's contention is that the licensee is entitled to realize the electricity charges as per Regulation 24(5) of Supply Code, 2005. The appellant is liable to remit the amount since he has consumed the energy.

This Authority has carefully examined the contentions of both parties on the issues involved and attained the following conclusions.

1. It is established that the meter was recording a lesser energy consumption than the actual consumption due to defective CT's outputs to the meter. In such cases the meter itself cannot be termed as faulty, as the 'electric current' inputs fed to the meter were missing, causing a reduction in recording. From the consumption pattern of the appellant it can be seen that every year during the months of November to March the energy consumed is less than the energy consumed for the rest of the year. Probably this can be because of the seasonal nature of the appellant's industry. Further, it is revealed from the site mahazar and the tamper data also shows that 'B' phase voltage is missing from 23-08-2010.

On a verification of energy usage of the appellant for the months 08/2010, 09/2010, 10/2010 respectively is 1404, 1551, and 1190 units. This shows that there is no defect in the connections. But the consumption for the months of 11/2010, 12/2010, 01/2011, 02/2011, 03/2011 and 04/2011 are respectively 850, 993, 578, 1222, 840 and 970. The decrease in consumption for these months

- immediately before the inspection by the APTS can be attributed for missing of voltage in one phase. So, a reasonable conclusion which can be arrived in the absence of any allegation of tampering in the metering equipment is because of the corrosion in the terminal point of the meter, one phase is not recording. So the appellant can be assessed for the non recorded portion of energy consumed by him for the months from 11/2010 to 04/2011 as short assessment.
2. The contention raised by the appellant regarding the competency of the person who conducted inspection, accuracy test, the mechanism used and also the allegation that the accuracy test is not conducted at NABL is not sustainable because the appellant has not raised any of these demands before the authorities of the licensee after inspection conducted by the APTS on 06-04-2011.
 3. On analyzing the monthly average consumption it can be seen that there is no much difference in consumption except for the year 2011 and 2012. The respondent's contention is that the energy consumption recorded in one phase of the meter was missing from 09/2010 to 04/2011 and the energy meter is recording 2/3rd of the actual energy consumed. There is no appreciable difference in the quantum of energy recorded in the meter on the energy consumed by the appellant, prior to the meter faulty period and during the alleged meter faulty period. That is to say, the appellant was seen having recorded an average energy consumption of 1152 units before the meter faulty period (8/2008 to 8/2010) and that during the meter faulty period (9/2010 to 4/2011) was 1083 units.
 4. Here in this case the meter is not faulty but requires urgent rectification in the CT connections and the respondent cleared the defect in meter only after 03/2012. There is no logic in the argument of the respondent that as the case is pending before the Hon'ble High Court, they had not rectified the defect in the CT connections. Here, no foul play is suspected on the part of the appellant.
 5. It is unfortunate to mention that the officers of the licensee failed to rectify the defects noted by the inspection team and permitted to continue the energy usage and later on 22/11/14 issued a letter for one time settlement pretending that the mistake is on the part of consumer. The action of the respondent in issuing the short assessment bill without rectifying the defect in the connection for a long period is arbitrary and illegal and hence the short assessment bill issued is set aside.
 6. On verification of the energy usage of the appellant by referring the meter reading furnished by the respondent for the period from 8/2008

to 12/2012, it is noted that the consumption pattern is not consistent but varies considerably

Decision

Considering the above facts I am of the view that the appellant shall be reassessed for the period from 11/2010 to 4/2011 as per the average energy consumption based on the meter reading in the succeeding three months after replacing the meter in 12/2012. Accordingly the respondent is directed to revise the bill giving credit for the payment already made. No interest or surcharge need be levied on the appellant during the appeal pending period and up to the due date of revised bill ordered now. The appellant may be allowed suitable installments if requested for.

Having concluded and decided as above it is ordered accordingly. The appeal petition filed by the appellant is found having merits and is allowed to extent ordered and is disposed of accordingly. The related CGRF order No. CGRF-CR/Comp. 144/2014-15 dated 22-04-2015 is set aside. No order as to costs.

ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

P/119/2015/_____ Dated:_____

Forwarded to:

1. Sri. Aboobacker M, Vellalil House, Kannapally Bhavanam, Kayamkulam, Alappuzha.
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Limited, Kayamkulam, Alappuzha

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, Power House, Power House Buildings, Cemeterymukku, Ernakulam-682 018