

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/007/2016

(Present: V.V. Sathyarajan)

Dated: 31st May 2016

Appellant : Sri Kunhabdulla
Managing Partner,
Fareeda Clinic, Vatakara,
Kozhikode

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division,
Vatakara North, KSE Board Ltd,
Kozhikode

ORDER

Background of the case:

The appellant had availed single phase connection with consumer number 2389 under Electrical Section, Vatakara North on 01-03-1996 which was converted to 3 phase in April 1998. The appellant was served with an arrear bill for Rs. 37,160.00 being the charges for the excess energy consumed during the period from 1/1997 to 9/1999. Against this bill the appellant had filed an Original Suit No. 66/2000 before the Hon'ble Munsiff Court, Vatakara which was decreed in favour of the appellant. Hence the respondent filed an appeal petition (AS No. 18/2001) before the Sub Court, Vatakara.

The respondent's contention is that the Hon'ble Sub Court in its judgment dated 20-10-2004 was pleased to allow the appeal partly with the observation that the respondent's right to realize the additional electricity charges for the excess consumption of 1774 units from May 1998 to September 1999 would not be prejudiced by the decree of Hon'ble Munsiff Court, Vatakara in OS No. 66/2000. The appellant's contention is that the respondent issued demand notice for Rs. 5,82,106.00 without denoting the period of arrears and with threat of disconnection on 03-07-2014. The appellant stated that he deposited the amount towards the current charges for and on behalf of respondent in the Court as per the order of Hon'ble Sub Court, Vatakara in AS No. 18/2001.

Aggrieved against the above demand, the appellant submitted a petition before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Kozhikode which

was dismissed vide order in OP No. 94/2015-16 dated 29-12-2015 holding that the demand notice issued to the appellant for Rs. 6,00,200.00 dated 19-11-2014 is in compliance of Section 45 of Electricity Act, 2003 and to the Regulation 131 of Supply Code, 2014 and the decision of Hon'ble High Court in WP (C) No. 90 of 2009 and hence in order. Not satisfied with the above order, the appellant has filed this appeal petition.

Arguments of the appellant:

The appellant stated that he had availed a single phase service connection under Electrical Section, Vatakara North on 01-03-1996 and converted to three phase in April 1998. But in the year 2000 the respondent issued arrear bill for Rs. 37,160.00. Against this the petitioner approached Hon'ble Munsiff Court, Vatakara vide OS No. 66/2000. The suit was decreed in favour of the appellant. But on 03-07-2014 the respondent issued another demand notice for Rs. 5,82,106.00 without denoting the period of arrears and with the threat of disconnection. The appellant remitted the amount for and on behalf of respondent in the Court as per the order of the Hon'ble Sub Court, Vatakara in AS No. 18/01. Against the above notice the appellant approached the CGRF, Kozhikode.

But the Hon'ble CGRF dismissed the petition stating that appellant had admitted the arrears before the respondent and in One Time Settlement Scheme. So the Forum finds that arrears are due from the appellant to the licensee. In the result the Forum passed an order that, petitioner is liable to pay Rs. 6,00,200.00 and the respondent is at liberty to continue with the action of realizing arrears. The appellant raised the following contentions based on the grounds detailed as below.

1. CGRF is absolutely wrong in finding that the appellant admitted the liability towards the licensee and can't dispute the same. The CGRF ought to have found that the admission under compulsion or coercion is not valid one. The appellant specifically denied the admission of liability before the Forum. At this juncture, CGRF ought to have made sure the admission at free will before the conclusion of "admission."
2. Further if the licensee is offered something or threatened to disconnection the poor consumer will give anything in writing. At this juncture also the admission is not valid one.
3. The CGRF ought to have found that even if there is an admission, it does not mean that appellant is not liable to pay the unlawful demand of the respondent.
4. The CGRF ought to have seen that the appellant had remitted that amount in regularly in Court and the licensee was not withdrawn the amount in proper time. That is the only reason for delay and claiming the surcharge.

5. The respondent's action is arbitrary and thereby the appellant has suffered so much.

6. The Hon'ble CGRF has not considered the fact that the meter reading was not recorded by the respondent and so far the appellant was informed how much unit of electricity he has consumed.

7. Further the respondent himself admitted that no excess or unauthorized consumption by the appellant.

8. The respondent was not contented in their first version before the Forum that the appellant has admitted the liability and prayed for the instalments.

Arguments of the respondent:

The respondent stated the following arguments.

1) The appellant has been served with a bill for Rs. 37,160.00 being the charges for the excess energy consumed during the period from 1/1997 to 9/1999. Against this bill the appellant had filed an Original Suit No. 66/2000 before the Hon'ble Munsiff Court, Vatakara. The suit was decreed in favour of the appellant. KSE Board filed an appeal petition (AS No. 18/2011) before the Hon'ble Sub Court, Vatakara against the above stated order of the Hon'ble Munsiff Court, Vatakara in OS No. 66/2000. The Hon'ble Sub court was pleased to allow the appeal partly with the observation that the respondent's right to realise additional electricity charges for the excess consumption of 1774 units from May 1998 to September 1999 would not be prejudiced by the decree of the Hon'ble Munsiff Court, Vatakara in OS 66/2000. The Hon'ble Sub Court permitted KSE Board to realise the above said amount with a statement that failure to make payment will have legal consequences including disconnection of electricity service to the premises.

2) The appellant had not remitted regular current charges from 01/2001 to 10/2011 in the office of the respondent, KSEB.

3) The appellant had not preferred the office of the respondent concerned to remit the regular current charges for the period from 01/2001 to 11/2011 while the appeal was under the trial before the Hon'ble Sub Court, Vatakara. However the appellant has deposited an amount of Rs. 1,16,406.00 before the Hon'ble Sub Court, Vatakara. The Hon'ble Court has pleased to release Rs. 1,16,406.00. KSE Board has credited the same in the account of the consumer. It is further submitted that during the trial of the appeal petition before the Hon'ble Sub Court the appellant had deposited the amount before the Hon'ble Court at his whims and fancies and not on the real demand for current charge. The appellant had deposited only Rs. 1,16,406.00 as regular current charge at the Hon'ble Sub Court during the pendency of the appeal Suit. Hence the appellant has to remit a balance of for the period from 01/2001 to 11/2011.

4) On 17-12-2012 the appellant submitted a request to the Deputy Chief Engineer, Electrical Circle, Vatakara to allow him to clear the above mentioned arrear current charges through One Time Settlement Scheme. Considering the request of the petitioner and on the BO FB (General) No. 2193/2012 (DPCI/OTS - Special Scheme/2012 dated 19-11-2012 vide Order No. GB 21 OTS/2012-13/81 dated 21-12-2012, the Deputy Chief Engineer issued an order admitting the request of the petitioner to settle the pending arrears by availing One Time Settlement Scheme.

At this stage, as on 21-12-2012 the arrear amount of the appellant was Rs. 6,10,426.00 (Rs. 1,90,531.00 as electricity charge and Rs. 4,19,895.00 as surcharge). The appellant had not responded positively to the order of the Deputy Chief Engineer, which was made on the basis of the request of the appellant himself. Instead vide a letter on 22-04-2013 he requested for cancellation of surcharge during the period of dispute in the Court and also requested for instalments to remit the arrear current charge. The consumer had been accorded sanction for remitting the up to date arrears in twenty equal instalments and also revised and reduced the surcharge to Rs. 3,40,374.00, which were calculated up to 04/2013. Thus up to April 2013 the consumer had an arrear of Rs. 5,32,636.00 (Rs. 1,92,262.00 as current charges and surcharge Rs. 3,40,374.00). Even after sanctioning instalments as requested by the appellant, he himself abstained from remitting the arrears on the reasons best known to him alone.

The appellant had been issued a notice on 02-07-2013 and again on 03-07-2014 to clear the arrears. Followed by the above notices on 19-11-2014 the appellant was again served a notice to clear up to date arrear amounting to Rs. 6,00,200.00 (Current charge 1,92,262.00 plus Surcharge 4,07,938.00). The appellant filed a complaint on the above bill before the Hon'ble CGRF only during December 2014 after the completion of the notice period of the arrear demand notice dated 19-11-2014 and after the disconnection of the service due to non-remittance of the arrears. The appellant had admitted the above stated arrear by his letters dated 17-12-2012 and 22-04-2013. Failure on the part of the appellant to remit the lawful arrear in time has led to the disputed bill of Rs. 6,00,200.00 which was issued on 19-11-2014. Updated arrear bills were computed based on updated surcharge on the basis of the provisions in the Electricity Act, 2003 and Regulation 131 of KESC, 2014.

5) KSEB Limited, being a Public Sector Utility, has no need to compel any consumer or coerce him to take power supply or to remit an amount which due to KSEB. Functions of Kerala State Electricity Board are regulated by well tailored rules and regulations applicable to both the licensee and the consumers. It is the primary duty of the consumer to remit the applicable current charges for the energy consumed by him. If the consumer fails to satisfy any of the provisions which he has to fulfil, then the licensee is bound to take legitimate ways like disconnection, legal

proceedings etc. to realise the amount. Such actions are not threatening but the legitimate ways stipulated in the Acts and Regulations concerned.

6) It is reiterated that KSEB has not raised any unlawful demand against the appellant but raised demand for current charges used by the appellant along with surcharge due to non-payment of the amount in time.

7) KSEB has withdrawn the amount deposited by the appellant before the Court in time. Surcharge imposed is for the balance amount of the arrear charges that has to be remitted by the appellant.

8) The appellant has been informed of the meter reading in time and the statement of the appellant contrary to that is false and is malafide.

9) The disputed bill is not an arrear or penal bill but a bill for the regular energy consumed by the appellant.

Analysis and findings

A hearing of the case was conducted in the Court Hall of CGRF (Northern Region), Kozhikode, on 10-05-2016. Advocates N.P. Mehaboob, and Madhu, were present for the appellant's side and Sri. K.P. Suresh, Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Vatakara and Sri C. Sunil Kumar, Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Vatakara North represented the respondent's side. The brief facts and circumstances of the case that led to filing of the petition before this Authority are narrated above. On examining the petition of the appellant, the statement of facts filed by the respondent, the arguments in 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.

On going through the records, it is found that the appeal petition filed by the respondent against the judgment of Hon'ble Munsiff Court, Vatakara in OS No.66/2000 was disposed of by the Hon'ble Sub Court on 20-10-2004. It is pertinent to note that the KSE Board introduced the Spot Billing System in the year 2000. The respondent has claimed that though they have issued bimonthly spot bills regularly to the appellant since 2000, the appellant deposited the current charges in the Sub Court Vatakara instead of remitting in the respondent's office. From the records it can be seen that an amount of Rs 1,16,406.00 has been deposited by the appellant in the Court for the period from 1/2001 to 11/2011.

The question raised in the appeal starts from the challenge made by the appellant against the bill issued for the excess energy consumed during the period from 01/1997 to 09/1999. The Original Suit No. 66/2000 in the Hon'ble Munsiff Court, Vatakara and the appeal No. AS 18/2001 before the Hon'ble Sub Court, Vatakara was pending and the appellant was depositing the current charges before the Sub Court, Vatakara on the pendency of

appeal. The statement produced by the respondent shows that the last deposit made by the appellant is on 15-02-2012. Also noted that the total amount deposited for Rs. 1,16,406.00 was collected by the respondent from the Court. This must be probably after 15-02-2012. According to the respondent the total amount due from the appellant as on 15-02-2012 is Rs. 3,08,668.00. The amount collected by the respondent from the Court by way of deposit by the appellant was Rs. 1,16,406.00. So it is evident that as an amount of Rs. 1,92,262.00 was pending from the appellant as on 15-02-2012.

So the point to be decided in this case is whether the appellant is liable for making the payment of arrears of Rs. 6,00,200.00 (current charges for Rs. 1,92,262.00 and surcharge Rs. 4,07,938.00) issued on 19-11-2014. If at all this amount liable to be charged, is it proper for the licensee to impose an amount of Rs. 4,07,938.00 towards the surcharge on the defaulted amount?

Though the appeal petition was disposed by the Hon'ble Sub Court on 20-10-2004, the reason for non-realization of current charges after 20-10-2004 from the appellant was not furnished by the respondent. Moreover, the reason for remittance of bimonthly current charges in the Court even after the disposal of the case on 20-10-2004 was not specified. However, a statement of arrear details has been furnished by the respondent as shown below.

Sl No	Bill No	Bill Type	Bill Date	Due Date	Amount Due	Paid in court	Balance
1	344713	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-03-2000	03-07-2000	23908	0	23908
2	353070	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-10-2000	17-03-2000	4800	0	4800
3	344714	Pre CC(Dispute)	04-05-2000	04-11-2000	4820	0	4820
4	365370	Pre CC(Dispute)	07-01-2000	07-07-2000	12180	0	12180
5	344845	Pre CC(Dispute)	09-05-2000	09-12-2000	8983	0	8983
6	344846	Pre CC(Dispute)	11-05-2000	11-12-2000	8101	0	8101
7	353239	Pre CC(Dispute)	01-01-2000	01-07-2001	2500	0	2500
8	344847	Pre CC(Dispute)	01-05-2001	01-12-2001	6740	0	6740
9	365367	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-01-2001	03-07-2001	4186	0	4186
10	353236	Pre CC(Dispute)	05-05-2001	05-12-2001	9604	0	9604
11	365368	Pre CC(Dispute)	07-01-2001	07-07-2001	6734	0	6734
12	365369	Pre CC(Dispute)	09-01-2001	09-07-2001	5901	0	5901
13	353238	Pre CC(Dispute)	11-11-2001	18-11-2001	10012	0	10012
14	353240	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-03-2002	03-10-2002	7398	0	7398
15	365017	Pre CC(Dispute)	05-01-2002	05-07-2002	11436	10916	520
16	353241	Pre CC(Dispute)	07-07-2002	14-07-2002	7182	3681	3501
17	353242	Pre CC(Dispute)	09-09-2002	18-09-2002	5367	2773	2594
18	353243	Pre CC(Dispute)	11-11-2002	19-11-2002	1966	1358	608

19	353244	Pre CC(Dispute)	01-01-2003	01-08-2003	2475	1703	772
20	353245	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-03-2003	03-10-2003	3605	2278	1327
21	353246	Pre CC(Dispute)	05-01-2003	05-08-2003	4889	3097	1792
22	353247	Pre CC(Dispute)	07-01-2003	07-08-2003	3834	2425	1409
23	353248	Pre CC(Dispute)	09-01-2003	09-09-2003	5473	3234	2239
24	353249	Pre CC(Dispute)	11-01-2003	11-07-2003	6330	3701	2629
25	353250	Pre CC(Dispute)	01-01-2004	01-07-2004	5596	3267	2329
26	353251	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-01-2004	03-07-2004	4706	2980	1726
27	353252	Pre CC(Dispute)	05-01-2004	05-07-2004	8195	4843	3352
28	353253	Pre CC(Dispute)	07-01-2004	07-07-2004	5464	3229	2235
29	353254	Pre CC(Dispute)	09-01-2004	09-07-2004	4981	3156	1825
30	353255	Pre CC(Dispute)	11-01-2004	11-07-2004	6363	3760	2603
31	353256	Pre CC(Dispute)	01-01-2005	01-07-2005	6962	8372	-1410
32	353257	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-01-2005	03-07-2005	7016	1911	5105
33	353258	Pre CC(Dispute)	05-01-2005	05-07-2005	2627	2660	-33
34	353259	Pre CC(Dispute)	07-01-2005	07-07-2005	2660	2900	-240
35	353260	Pre CC(Dispute)	09-01-2005	09-07-2005	2812	0	2812
36	353261	Pre CC(Dispute)	11-01-2005	11-07-2005	2368	2358	10
37	353262	Pre CC(Dispute)	01-01-2006	01-07-2006	2633	2700	-67
38	353263	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-01-2006	03-07-2006	2884	2900	-16
39	353264	Pre CC(Dispute)	05-01-2006	05-07-2006	2637	4852	-2215
40	353265	Pre CC(Dispute)	07-01-2006	07-07-2006	2215	3661	-1446
41	353266	Pre CC(Dispute)	09-01-2006	22-04-1906	2304	0	2304
42	353267	Pre CC(Dispute)	11-01-2006	11-07-2006	1357	0	1357
43	353268	Pre CC(Dispute)	01-01-2007	01-07-2007	1507	1507	0
44	353269	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-01-2007	03-07-2007	1791	4541	-2750
45	353270	Pre CC(Dispute)	05-01-2007	05-07-2007	2750	0	2750
46	353271	Pre CC(Dispute)	07-01-2007	07-07-2007	2741	2741	0
47	353272	Pre CC(Dispute)	09-01-2007	09-07-2017	2750	0	2750
48	353273	Pre CC(Dispute)	11-01-2007	01-07-2008	1632	4582	-2950
49	353274	Pre CC(Dispute)	01-01-2008	01-07-2008	2089	9838	-7749
50	353276	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-01-2008	03-07-2008	2126	4482	-2356
51	353277	Pre CC(Dispute)	05-01-2008	05-07-2008	3502	0	3502
52	353277	Pre CC(Dispute)	07-01-2008	07-07-2008	2121	0	2121
53	3820	Pre CC(Dispute)	15-09-2008	22-09-2008	1485.8	0	1485.8
54	22578	Pre CC(Dispute)	11-12-2008	19-11-2008	2233.23	0	2233.23
55	40539	Pre CC(Dispute)	01-12-2009	19-01-2009	2291.97	0	2291.97
56	58811	Pre CC(Dispute)	13-03-2009	20-03-2009	3378.52	0	3378.52
57	76318	Pre CC(Dispute)	13-05-2009	20-05-2009	5071.8	0	5071.8
58	94002	Pre CC(Dispute)	07-10-2009	17-07-2009	2027	0	2027
59	112074	Pre CC(Dispute)	14-09-2009	22-09-2009	2160.94	0	2160.94
60	148788	Pre CC(Dispute)	11-11-2009	18-11-2009	2396.35	0	2396.35

61	148788	Pre CC(Dispute)	01-11-2010	18-01-2010	2450.9	0	2450.9
62	167347	Pre CC(Dispute)	03-11-2010	18-03-2010	2469	0	2469
63	185545	Pre CC(Dispute)	05-10-2010	17-05-2010	5237.93	0	5237.93
64	348162	Pre CC(Dispute)	10-11-2011	18-10-2011	1151.77	0	1151.77
65	365278	Pre CC(Dispute)	22-11-2011	29-11-2011	4210	0	4210
66	369261	Pre CC(Dispute)	12-06-2011	13-12-2011	4512	0	4512
67	388696	Pre CC(Dispute)	02-08-2012	15-02-2012	2377.98	0	2,377.98
TOTAL					308668	116406	192262

On going through the above statement it can be seen that an amount of Rs. 1,92,262.00 is pending as on 15-02-2012 after adjusting an amount of Rs.1,16,406.00 deposited in the Sub Court. It is evident from the statement that in the subsequent bills issued to the appellant, the respondent has not shown any arrears pending from the appellant. At the same time it is detected that for the same period more than one bill was seen issued to the appellant. For example bill No. 344847 dated 01-05-2001 for Rs. 6,740.00 and bill No. 353236 dated 05-05-2001 for Rs. 9,604.00, were seen issued with due date as 1-12-2001 and 5-12-2001 respectively for the same month. The reason for the issuance of above bills in the same month is not furnished by the respondent.

The Regulation 18(8) of Supply Code 2005 is in force at the relevant period says that **“The Licensee shall not recover any arrears after a period of 2 years from the date when such sum became first due, unless such sum has been shown continuously in bill as recoverable as arrears of the charges of electricity supplied.”** It is quite surprising to note that the respondent has taken more than 10 years to claim the arrears of regular current charges from a consumer. **Regulation 23 of The Electricity Supply Code, 2005, authorizes the licensee to levy interest on the consumer for late payments, based on actual number of days of delay from due date of the bill.** The licensee even at this stage has not taken proper action to recover the pending arrears from the appellant, which shows serious lapses and negligence on their part.

As per Regulation 37 (1) KSEB Terms & Conditions of Supply 2005 **‘any complaint with regard to the accuracy of the electricity bill shall be made in writing to the officer who has issued them. Arithmetical mistakes on the face of the bill shall be corrected and revised demand issued by the officers who issued the bill. In all the case any correction or revision of demand shall be done only by the officers not below the rank of Executive Engineers in respect of LT consumers and Deputy Chief Engineer in respect of HT/EHT consumers. The correction or revision of the demand shall be made only after ascertaining the bona fides of the complaint. However, the bill should be paid on or before the due date originally fixed, and adjustment, if any, will be made only in subsequent bills. The amount so paid will be**

regarded as advance to the credit of the consumer's account until such time as the invoices in dispute are fully settled'.

The licensee should have prepared the defaulters list and issued arrear notice as per rules or should have specifically instructed the spot billers to include the arrears as an item in the spot bills, wherever required. This has not happened in this case. The consumer is liable to pay the spot bill amount as such or deposit an amount equivalent to the previous six month's average, under protest, within the time specified in the bill, even if he has any genuine complaints on the correctness of the bill, pending disposal of dispute between him and the licensee, **as per Section 56(1) of Electricity Act, 2003.**

According to the respondent as on April 2013 the appellant has an arrear of Rs. 5,32,636.00 (Rs. 1,92,262.00 as current charge and Rs. 3,40,374.00 as surcharge). The argument of the respondent that they had issued arrear notice to the appellant on 02-07-2013 and 03-07-2014 to clear the dues is without any documentary evidence and cannot be admitted. Another contention raised by the respondent is that an arrear notice amounting to Rs. 6,00,200.00 (current charge Rs. 1,92,262.00 and surcharge Rs. 4,07,938.00) was served to the appellant on 19-11-2014. Against this notice the appellant approached the CGRF and as per interim order the appellant remitted an amount of Rs. 48,066.00 which is an amount equal to one fourth of the principal amount of Rs. 1,92,262.00. So the present arrear amount to be recovered from the appellant is Rs. 1,44,196.00 as principal and Rs. 4,63,665.00 as surcharge.

The respondent failed to raise proper demand of the pending arrears from the appellant. In this case it is evident that civil cases are pending before the Munsiff Court and Sub Court, Vatakara. The Hon'ble Sub Court disposed of the appeal AS No. 18/2001 in the year 2004 (copy of the judgment is not produced by either side). But the records show that appellant was remitting electricity charges before the Court up to 15-02-2012. In this background it is not possible for the officers of the licensee to verify and assess the arrears of the appellant regularly from the Court. But the amount deposited by the appellant for Rs. 1,16,406.00 was credited respondent's account from the Court after 15-02-2012 as per the statement.

So, it can be presumed that it came to the knowledge of respondent that an amount of Rs. 1,92,262.00 is due from the appellant as on 15-02-2012. But a notice demanding arrears and surcharge was seen issued only on 19-11-2014. There is no justification on the part of respondent for the delay of more than 2 years for raising the demand. Admittedly, as on the date of the bill, an amount of Rs. 1,44,196.00 (Rs.1,92,262 - Rs.48,066) is due from the appellant to the licensee. So, thereafter the appellant is liable for payment of surcharge for the delayed payment of the bill.

Here in this case, the respondent failed to follow the Regulation 18(8) of Supply Code, 2005 is in force at the relevant period. Consequent to

default in paying the current charges by the appellant and in absence of any positive action to demand the arrear bill as per rules, the surcharge cannot be imposed. Hence the question of sustainability of surcharge of Rs. 4,63,665.00 is found unsustainable and the demand raised in the bill to that effect is to be quashed.

Decision

Under the above mentioned circumstances, the appellant can be exonerated from the liability for payment of surcharge up to the date of issue of arrear notice i.e. 19-11-2014. The respondent is directed to issue revised demand for the pending arrears along with surcharge applicable from 19-11-2014. This shall be done within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.

Having concluded and decided as above it is ordered accordingly. The appeal petition is found having some merits and is admitted. The order of CGRF in OP No. 94/2015-16 dated 29-12-2015 is set aside. No order as to costs.

ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

P/007/2016/ _____ Dated _____

Delivered to:

1. Sri Kunhabdulla, Managing Partner, Fareeda Clinic, Vatakara, Kozhikode
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd, Vatakara North, Kozhikode

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