

**THE STATE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

Charangattu Bhavan, Building No.34/895, Mamangalam-Anchumana Road,  
Edappally, Kochi-682 024

[www.keralaeo.org](http://www.keralaeo.org) Ph: 0484 2346488, Mob: 91 9447576208

Email:ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com

---

APPEAL PETITION No. P/058/2016

(Present: V.V. Sathyarajan)

Dated: 31<sup>st</sup> January 2017

Appellant : Sri. C.P. Paul  
Proprietor,  
Paulson Park Hotel,  
Carrier Station Road,  
Ernakulam

Respondent : The Executive Engineer,  
KSE Board Limited,  
Electrical Division,  
Ernakulam.

**ORDER****Background of the case:**

The appellant is running a hotel in the name and style, 'Paulson Park Hotel', with consumer number 5481 under the jurisdiction of Electrical Section, College, Ernakulam. On 05-09-2001, the appellant had submitted an application before the Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, College, Ernakulam for conversion of existing LT service connection to HT, after remitting the required application fee and after complying with all necessary formalities. Moreover, the appellant had executed an OYEC agreement on 03-05-2002 with the Assistant Executive Engineer for availing the HT supply and remitted an amount of Rs. 2,84,400.00 towards cash deposit for allocation of power to the extent of 180 kVA with a contract demand of 150 kVA.

The power allocation was sanctioned as per proceedings dated 09-08-2002 of the Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Ernakulam and the appellant had remitted the estimated amount of Rs. 1,11,100.00 on 14-08-2002 as demand draft for carrying out the works, as directed by the Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Ernakulam. Meanwhile, one Sri Ameer V. Aslam objected for erecting electric post in front of his land and subsequently the locations of poles were changed. A revised estimate for Rs. 1,37,790.00 was prepared by the respondent, as per the directions of Hon'ble High Court in OP No. 31261/2002 filed by Sri. Ameer V. Aslam.

However, the appellant remitted the additional demand for Rs. 26,690.00 under protest on 10-06-2003. Though the contractor had started the work for giving HT service connection, the work could not be carried out due to the presence of so many telephone cables drawn along the road. Consequently, erection of the proposed DP structure was shifted to the opposite side of the road. Against this proposal, one Smt. Mary Sebastine had filed a petition before the Assistant Executive Engineer objecting to the drawing of the line and also filed a suit vide OS No. 888 of 2003. An injunction was passed against the Board preventing from proceeding further steps in this regard. Since the respondent did not carry out further steps, the appellant filed WP(C) 25386/2003 before the Hon'ble High Court.

The Hon'ble High Court disposed of the Writ Petition by directing the Board to apprise the Civil Court regarding the statutory provisions and the objections of land owner have to be considered by the District Magistrate and the Court will consider the alternate remedy available under the statute and the suit can be disposed of by the Munsiff Court if found not maintainable. After vacating the injunction by the District Court, the respondent filed a complaint before the Additional District Magistrate under Section 16(1) of the Telegraph Act. As per the proceedings dated 05-02-2007, the Additional District Magistrate directed the Board to draw the line as per Horizontal Direct Drilling (HDD) method after removing the posts already erected in front of Mary Sebastian's property.

The grievance of the appellant is that the inordinate delay to provide HT service connection had resulted in bringing to a halt of functioning of the hotel, which consequently resulted in default in payment of electricity charges and subsequently dismantlement of connection. The appellant approached the CGRF requesting to treat him as a deemed HT consumer with effect from 05-09-2001 till dismantling of the service and further claiming a sum of Rs.1,63,71,357.00 towards loss and damages suffered by the appellant on account of non conversion of the LT connection to HT. The CGRF dismissed the petition vide order No. 30/2006-07 dated 10-12-2007 as it found no merit in the contentions of the appellant.

Aggrieved by the order passed by the CGRF the appellant had filed appeal petition before this Authority. The appeal was disposed of by ordering that the billing done from August 2003 has to be revised at HT treating the appellant as a deemed HT consumer and no other reliefs, vide order No. 02/2008 of 14-3-2008. The KSEB filed WP(C) 20445/2008 before the Hon'ble High Court challenging the order rendered by the Ombudsman directing to treat the consumer as deemed HT from August 2003 onwards. On the other hand, the appellant also filed WP (C) 26745/2008 challenging orders passed by the CGRF as well as Ombudsman declining to grant the amount of compensation claimed. The Hon'ble High Court, in its common judgment dated

27-11-2013, remanded the matter afresh, after affording fresh opportunity of personal hearing to the parties concerned.

**Arguments of the appellant:**

1. The appellant stated that a complaint dated 01-10-2007 was submitted seeking for a direction to the respondents to treat the appellant as a deemed HT consumer from the period from 05-09-2001 till disconnection and dismantling of the service and for a direction to pay the appellant a sum of Rs. 1,63,71,367.00 as cost towards the losses and damages suffered by the appellant on account of the non-conversion of LT to HT connection, as on 01-09-2007 together with future interest at 12% per annum.

2. The appellant submitted a detailed reply to the arguments raised by the respondent which is detailed as below:

- i. There is no misinterpretation of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in OP No. 31261/2002 in revising the estimate to Rs. 1,37,790.00.
- ii. There was no delay on the part of the Board in taking steps to execute the conversion work.
- iii. The appellant was made a party to the case filed by the KSEB authorities before the Additional District Magistrate because the appellant is the beneficiary.
- iv. If the appellant was prepared to avail power supply by erecting poles in his premises, the supply could have been given in 2003 itself.
- v. The appellant has accumulated arrears of Rs. 1,60,15,422.00 as on 30-04-2007 and rules do not permit power supply to a premises having arrears.
- vi. The appellant has not so far made any request to refund the amount.

3. The Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum without any application of mind to the case put forth by the appellant, entered into the following findings:

- a) The appellant is not really interested in getting power supply.
- b) The appellant has failed to fulfil his obligation towards himself.
- c) If KSEB cannot be held responsible for any loss claimed to have been sustained by the appellant.
- d) As per Regulation 3(8) of the Terms and Conditions of Supply, 2005, the Board shall not be responsible for the delay in extending supply, if such delay is on account of delay in getting statutory clearances etc.
- e) The appellant is directed to consider the suggestion to give consent for HDD method and to remit the arrears or to request for refund of the amount.

4. The findings entered by the Forum would establish that the Forum did not even care to have at least a cursory glance through the various documents produced by the appellant along with the complaint.

5. The order of the Forum is perfunctory, perverse and illegal and is liable to be set aside.

6. As can be seen from the submissions made by the KSEB, even now they are maintaining the stand that there was no delay on their part in executing the conversion work, the delay occurred solely due to the pendency of the Civil Suit, that as soon as the injunction was vacated by the District Court, they approached the Additional District Magistrate making the appellant also a party even without his knowledge, now the Additional District Magistrate has ordered to execute the work employing HDD method and to remove the poles already erected.

7. It is submitted that the very case of the appellant is that the KSEB knowing fully well that in cases of the present nature, the Additional District Magistrate has no jurisdiction, misrepresented the matter even before the Hon'ble High Court and deceitfully stuck to the stand that it was for the consumer to get the injunction vacated. The appellant left with no other remedy, approached the District Court and got the injunction vacated. Thereafter, the KSEB authorities filed a petition before the ADM making the appellant also a party without even intimating him about such act. Finally, in collusion with Mary Sebastian, the KSEB, authorities suggested to the ADM that conversion work could be executed by employing a new method viz. HDD so that the poles already erected could be removed.

8. The Board would further state that had the appellant agreed to erect the poles in his premises, the work would have been completed in 2003 itself. This statement reveals the grossly dishonest and unethical stand adopted by the Board officer. At no point of time did any such proposal for erecting the poles in the appellant's premise arise. Such a proposal was never mooted. Moreover, conversion work can be executed in accordance with the proposal sanctioned by the Electrical Inspectorate only and not according to the whims and fancies either of the officials of the Board or the consumer.

9. Lastly, the Board says that the appellant is still in arrears of Rs. 1,60,15,422.00 as on 30-04-2007. Either this statement reflects the deplorable ignorance of the KSEB authorities about the orders efficacy or the utmost contempt with which they treat the orders of the Hon'ble Ombudsman. The Hon'ble Ombudsman had by order dated 07-11-2007 declared that the bill dated 03-04-2007 issued by the Kerala State Electricity Board authorities for alleged arrears are unenforceable. A true copy of the said order was forwarded to the Assistant Engineer, who is the first respondent herein also. Even after

receipt of the order, the 1st respondent is still claiming that there are arrears to be realized from the appellant.

10. After depositing the cash deposit for power allocation, it was sanctioned as per 'proceedings dated 09-08-2002 of the Executive Engineer specifically states that if power supply is not availed within six months from the date of the order, the industry has to pay the prescribed minimum charges. This clause positively indicates that once power allocation is sanctioned, power supply has to be given to the consumer within a maximum period of 6 months. Therefore, normally, power supply should have been given on or before 09-02-2003. It was during this interval that the Kerala State Electricity Board authorities, misinterpreting the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in O.P. No. 31261 of 2003, revised the estimate illegally and the appellant was made to remit an additional amount of Rs. 26,690.00. The appellant remitted this amount under protest.

11. Therefore, it can be seen that the appellant by 10-03-2003 had done everything which he was required under the statute. By July 2003, the KSEB authorities had obtained sanction from the local authority envisaged under Section 10(C) of the Indian Telegraph Act. Even after obtaining the said sanction, the Kerala State Electricity Board authorities did not move a little finger to execute the conversion work. It was only when the appellant moved the Hon'ble High Court in WP (C) No. 25386 of 2003 that the Board stated that they were prevented from executing the work by an injunction of the Civil Court. The Hon'ble High Court directed the Board to take steps to get the suit dismissed. This direction was ignored by the Board with deliberate intention to defeat the appellant. Four years thereafter, they approached the Additional District Magistrate making the appellant also a party without his knowledge and in collusion with the plaintiff in the Civil Suit.

12. The Hon'ble High Court had in the judgment in WP(C) 25386 of 2003 directed the Board to refund the money collected from the appellant if it was not possible to execute the conversion work. Thereafter, the appellant had on several occasions requested for refund together with compensation for the damages suffered by him. Thereafter also, the appellant made request for refund as per his letter dated 04-01-2005 addressed to respondents 2 and 3 herein.

13. In view of the facts stated above it is clear that the appellant is entitled to the reliefs sought for in the complaint before the CGRF ought to have been granted for the reasons which were brought before the CGRF. Therefore it is submitted that the reliefs may be granted.

**Arguments of the respondent:**

The respondent has furnished the following arguments in the statement of facts submitted by him.

1. The appellant is running a Star Hotel under Consumer No. 5481. Service connection was dismantled on 16-05-2006 due to non-payment of current charges. This was on account of non-payment of amount due on account of misclassification of appellant's premises under LT VII A Tariff during the period when no eligibility certificate was produced.

2. In view of the scheme adopted by the Government, Tourism was declared as an industry and pursuant to that the respondent Board was directed to assign Industrial Tariff under LT IV to the appellant also on production of necessary eligibility certificate from the Tourism Department. The appellant thereafter produced eligibility certificates from the Tourism Department from 01-08-1989 to 01-08-1991 and the Board granted concessional tariff under LT IV tariff to the appellant. Even though the appellant claimed eligibility for the subsequent period, no certificate of eligibility was tendered by the appellant. But on account of an inadvertent omission on the part of the respondent Board, the appellant was wrongly enjoying the benefit of LT IV Tariff. When this anomaly was detected by the respondent Board in 1998, tariff was immediately changed to LT VII A Tariff retrospectively for the period during which eligibility certificate was not tendered.

3. The appellant aggrieved by the action on the part of the respondent Board in classifying them under LT IV Tariff, approached Hon'ble High Court vide OP No. 5980 of 1998 which was finally disposed of by this Hon'ble Court vide judgment dated 18-03-2006, directing the appellant to produce eligibility certificate from the Tourism Department to the satisfaction of Board and on failure to produce necessarily eligibility certificate in this regard the Board was free to disconnect to supply and proceed for recovery. Thereafter the eligibility certificate for the period from 22-08-1996 to 02-08-1999 was only produced. In pursuance of the judgment in OP No. 5980/1998 a bill for Rs.1,15,86,310.00 dated 18-06-2006 was issued to the appellant.

4. On account of this an invoice was prepared for the period from 8/1991 to 8/1996 and from 15-05-1999 to 4/2005 under LT VII A Tariff. This was done on account of failure on the part of the appellant to produce the required eligibility certificate for availing tariff under LT IV for the relevant period from 8/91 to 8/96 and from 05/99 to 4/05.

5. The appellant submitted an application for conversion of Low Tension connection to High Tension connection on 05-09-2001. The appellant remitted the amount estimated for carrying out the conversion work on 14-08-2002 and for this purpose 45 meters of underground cable laying and erection of Double Pole structure was required. As the work progressed, one Sri Ameer V Aslam

objected for erecting pole in front of his land and he approached the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala by OP No. 31261/2002 and the locations of the poles were changed and the revised estimate was prepared and sent to the appellant.

6. It is submitted that as soon as the work restarted another owner Smt. Mary Sebastian objected and filed Suit No. 888/2003 which was later dismissed. After the dismissal of the said Suit, the work was started again with police protection. Before the completion of the said work Mrs. Mary Sebastian filed a representation before the Additional District Magistrate on 10-03-2006. The Additional District Magistrate after site inspection suggested Horizontal Direct Drilling method for laying UG cables and directed to remove the poles already erected. Again a revised estimate was prepared. Alleging delay on the part of the respondent KSE Board to effect connection the appellant approached the CGRF (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum).

7. The Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum dismissed the complaint filed by the appellant vide proceedings dated 10-12-2007 holding that there is no negligence on the part of the respondent KSEB and the delay in providing connection was mainly on account of the statutory clearances and willingness of the consumer.

8. Aggrieved by the order of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, the appellant filed appeal before the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman vide proceedings dated 14-03-2008, disposed of the appeal holding that the Board cannot postpone conversion from LT to HT beyond July 2003 and further directed the Board to treat the appellant as deemed HT Consumer from August 2003 and directed to revise the bills accordingly from August 2003.

9. Aggrieved by the order of this Hon'ble Authority, the appellant as well as the respondent herein preferred Writ Petition No. 26745/2008 and 20445/2008 respectively. The Hon'ble High Court vide judgment dated 27-11-2013 remanded the matter before this Hon'ble Authority for fresh consideration.

It is submitted that the respondent has not been negligent or there has not been any callousness in executing the work. The appellant has been very adamant in not permitting the respondent in erecting poles in his premises.

The delay is on account of the various litigations as referred above. It is submitted that as per Regulation 3(8) of The Kerala State Electricity Board Terms and Conditions of Supply, 2005 provides for the non liability of the Board in cases of delay on account of the necessary statutory clearances and non fulfilment of consumer's obligations to provide necessary clearances. Regulation 3(8) of The Kerala State Electricity Board Terms and Conditions of Supply, 2005 is extracted herewith for easy reference- "3(8) the Board shall not be responsible for the delay, if any, in extending supply if the same is on account of delay in getting statutory clearances, right of way, land acquisition,

or the delay in consumer's obligation to provide necessary clearances, or payment of required cost of work as per Clause 4 and security deposit as per Clause 15 and 16 or for any other reasons beyond the reasonable control of the Board. In all such cases, the Board will take all reasonable steps to avoid delay"

It is submitted that the delay in taking steps to execute the conversion work from LT to HT occurred owing pendency of OP No. 31261/2002 and OS 888/2003 and WP(C) 25386/2003. It is further submitted that had the appellant agreed to install poles in his premises, the above delay could have been avoided. Hence the respondent cannot be held the responsible for the delay.

The appellant ought to have remitted his arrears due to the Board as per Regulation 15 (E) of the Terms and Conditions of Supply of Electrical Energy which provides for the clearance of arrears before the conversion from LT connection to HT connection.

### **Analysis and findings:**

The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in the common judgment dated 27-11-2013 in WP (C) Nos. 20445 and 26745 of 2008 have directed this Authority to dispose of Appeal Petition No P/2/2008 afresh within 3 months of receipt of a copy of the judgment, after affording fresh opportunity of personal hearing to the parties concerned. Accordingly, the hearings of the case were conducted on 22-12-2016 and 10-01-2017, in my chamber at Edappally. Advocate Sri Sudhir, and Sri. C.P. Paul represented the appellant's side and Advocate Smt. Lakshmy S., Sri S. Sheriff, Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Ernakulam, Sri Emerson P.A., Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, College, Sri Tito. V. William, Nodal Officer (L), Ernakulam and Sri. Anil Kumar V, Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, College represented the respondent's side. On examining the petition, the argument note filed by the appellant, the statement of facts of the respondent, perusing all the documents and considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, this Authority comes to the following conclusions and findings leading to the decisions thereof.

The version of the appellant is that he had filed a petition before the CGRF requesting to treat him as a deemed HT consumer for the period from 05-09-2001 to the date of dismantling of his service connection and also for a compensation for an amount of Rs. 1,63,71,367.00 towards the damages sustained by him on account of the non-conversion of the LT service connection. Instead, the CGRF had arrived at a conclusion that the Board officials had taken all responsible steps in the right time for execution of works, but it was held up due to unpredictable objections raised by the nearby property owners and hence the officials cannot be blamed for the delay. The



request for treating connection as deemed HT from 05-09-2001 was not allowed and it was also held that the respondent is not liable to pay compensation. Hence the appellant approached this Authority against the orders passed by the CGRF.

Accordingly the appeal was disposed of by this Authority vide proceedings dated 14-03-2008 holding that the licensee cannot postpone conversion from LT to HT beyond July 2003. It is also directed the licensee to treat that appellant as deemed HT consumer from August 2003 and to revise the bill accordingly. The Hon'ble High Court quashed the order passed by this Authority and directed to dispose the appeal afresh, after affording fresh opportunity of personal hearing to the parties concerned. During the hearings the appellant argued that he had complied with the prerequisites for the conversion of service connection including execution of OYEC agreement, and timely made the payments demanded by the respondent. But the Board officials didn't move a little finger to execute the conversion work till the disposal of WP(C) 25386/2003 filed by the appellant before the Hon'ble High Court.

Refuting the above contentions the respondent has filed counter affidavit in which it is stated that one Sri Ameer V. Aslam approached the Hon'ble High Court in OP No. 31261/2002 objecting erection of pole in front of his property and as per the judgment of Hon'ble High Court, the location of poles was changed and revised estimate was given to the appellant. But the adjoining property owner, Smt. Mary Sebastine filed a Suit in OS No. 888/2003 and obtained an injunction order against the Board. Meanwhile the appellant filed a Writ Petition No. 25386/2003 before the Hon'ble High Court requesting to execute the conversion work. The Hon'ble High Court disposed of the Writ Petition with the following directions. "If connection cannot be given to the petitioner, then the Board will refund the same with applicable rate of interest in terms of the conditions of supply either on the petitioner not pressing the claim or if the court refuses to give permission for giving connection to the petitioner."

It is also submitted that after the dismissal of OS No. 888/2003 the work was restarted, Smt. Mary Sebastine filed a representation before the Additional District Magistrate on 10-03-2006. The Additional District Magistrate after site inspection suggested Horizontal Direct Drilling method for laying UG cables and directed to remove the poles already erected. But the contention of the appellant is that the respondent had filed a petition before the Additional District Magistrate under Section 16 (1) of the Telegraph Act by citing the appellant also a co-petitioner without his consent. A copy of the proceedings of the Additional District Magistrate dated 05-02-2007 in this regard reveals that the Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, College and the appellant were the petitioners in the petition filed before the Additional District Magistrate. The Assistant Executive Engineer proposed a modern technical

method Horizontal Direct Drilling (HDD) and the Additional District Magistrate allowed to draw the line as per the HDD method after keeping all clearances and removing the already erected poles in front of the Mary Sebastine's property. Again a revised estimate was prepared, but conversion could not be effected and alleging the delay the appellant approached the CGRF.

***The question raised in this case is that is there any unreasonable delay on the part of either side in timely completion of the conversion work?***

While evaluating the contentions of the respondent it is essential to look into the provisions contained in the Regulation 6 of the Supply Code, 2005, which is extracted below:

***"the licensee shall provide electricity connection to the owner or occupier of any premises requiring supply as per the time line under Clause 8 subject to the payment of required fees, charges and security and satisfying the conditions stipulated in the approved 'terms and conditions of supply' of the licensee by such owner or occupier of the premises:***

***Provided that the licensee shall not be responsible for the delay, if any, in extending supply if the same is on account of delay in getting statutory clearances, right of way, land acquisition, or the delay in consumer's obligation to provide necessary clearances, or payment of required cost of work as per Clause 7 and security deposit as per Clause 13 or for any other similar reasons beyond the reasonable control of the licensee. In all such cases, the licensee shall take all reasonable steps to avoid delay."***

As per the condition VII of power allocation sanction, if the power supply is not availed within six months from the date of this order (09-08-2002) the industry has to pay prescribed minimum charges. In the event of appellant fails to avail the connection, after six months he is liable for the payment of minimum charges. If the appellant is in fault the respondent could have raised the demand after six months. That means correspondingly there is a duty or responsibility on the part of respondent to inform the appellant / consumer about the reason for the unreasonable delay in effecting the conversion. This was not followed in this case.

On going through the records, it is found that the appellant had remitted the required fees, charges and security deposits for satisfying the conditions stipulated in the Terms and Conditions of Supply, 2005. Though the work had been started, it was held up due to various litigations. Then the question to be answered is that whether the respondent had taken all reasonable steps to avoid delay. It is found that the adjoining property owners objected erection of

the poles in front of their property. The contention of the respondent is that had the appellant agreed to install the poles in his premises, the delay could have been avoided. But the appellant denied this argument by stating that at no point of time did any such proposal for erecting the poles in the appellant's premises arise and as a matter of fact such a proposal would have not been sanctioned by the Electrical Inspectorate.

This Authority is not agreed with the CGRF's observation that if the consumer is prepared to remit the arrears and give his consent for HDD method, the Board is ready to provide HT connection and he can not be treated as deemed HT because of on this ground. The proposal for HDD was put forward by the Assistant Executive Engineer during the hearing of the Additional District Magistrate in 2007 only. Why he has not proposed such a method earlier so as to avoid the revision of estimate and increase in the expenses. The appellant's prayer is to treat him as a deemed HT consumer from the period from 05-09-2001 to 16-05-2006, the date of disconnection and dismantling of the service. In this case the delay occurred due to other reasons beyond the reasonable control of the Board. But the appellant is not solely responsible for the delay occurred which is also beyond the reasonable control of him. The respondent had not taken any fruitful efforts to effect the conversion by removing the hindrances by proposing any alternative methods like Horizontal Direct Drilling method till the year 2007.

It is also pertinent in this case that the respondent has not given any communication to the appellant expressing the unavoidable circumstances whereby the respondent is prevented from effecting the conversion even after collecting the entire expenses from the appellant. In view of the above facts, I am of the opinion that the appellant's claim for treating him as deemed HT consumer is legitimate. However, the appellant is claiming as deemed HT consumer from 05-09-2001. That cannot be accepted. But it is reasonable to treat the appellant as deemed HT consumer with effect from 08-02-2003 (after the expiry of 6 months from 09-08-2002), (09-08-2002, the date on which the power allocation sanction was accorded) till the date of dismantling of service i.e. 16-05-2006. It is made clear that the appellant is entitled for refund of the amount deposited for effecting the conversion from LT to HT. Needless to say that the amount will carry interest at bank rate as on the date of remittance of amount as per Regulation 134(3) of Supply Code, 2014.

### **Decision**

In view of the discussions it is decided that the appellant is eligible for deemed HT consumer with effect from 08-02-2003 to the date of dismantling of service i.e. 16-05-2006. It is also made clear that the appellant is entitled for refund of the amount deposited for effecting the conversion from LT to HT with interest at bank rate as on the date of remittance of amount.

The question of compensation of Rs. 1,63,71,367.00 claimed by the appellant, this Authority is not empowered to take a decision as to the right of the appellant to claim compensation and to decide the amount of damage sustained by the appellant in this regard. That question is left open. The appellant is at liberty to approach the appropriate Forum for the damages if he so desires.

**ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

P/058/2016/\_\_\_\_\_ /Dated:\_\_\_\_\_

Delivered to:

1. Sri. C.P. Paul, Proprietor, Paulson Park Hotel, Carrier Station Road, Ernakulam
2. The Executive Engineer, KSE Board Limited, Electrical Division, Ernakulam.

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, CGRF-CR, 220 kV, KSE Board Limited, Substation Compound, HMT Colony P.O., Kalamassery, PIN: 683 503.