

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 9539913269
Email:ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com

APPEAL PETITION Nos. P/050/2018 to P/65/2018
(Present: A.S. Dasappan)
Dated: 30th November 2018

- Appellants : 1. P-050-2018
Sri. Harish K.P.
Villa No.116, Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
2. P-051-2018
Sri Reghunathan C.S.,
Villa No. M8, Santimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
3. P-052-2018
Smt. Sreelatha H.,
Villa No. 24, Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
4. P-053-2018
Sri Sreekumar V. Kurup
Villa No. 28, Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
5. P-054-2018
Sri Prasad C. Nair,
Villa No. 54, Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
6. P-055-2018
Sri K. Govindan Kutty
Villa No. 6, Santimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur

7. P-056-2018
Sri Ashraf P.K., Villa No. 42,
Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
8. P-057-2018
Smt. Padmavathi Amma K.,
Villa No. 15, Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
9. P-058-2018
Smt. Remanikutty Amma,
Villa No. M3 , Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
10. P-059-2018
Sri K.T. Sailesh,
Villa No. 39, Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
11. P-060-2018
Sri Ninan V.S., Villa No. A531,
Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
12. P-061-2018
Sri Jemini Suthan, Villa No. 52,
Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
13. P-062-2018
Sri Chandrabhanu, Villa No. 64,
Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur

14. P-063-2018
Sri Ramadasan, Villa No. 32,
Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
15. P-064-2018
Sri Thankachan Joseph,
Villa No. 48,
Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur
16. P-065-2018
Smt. Anisha K.S.,
Villa No. 27,
Santhimadom Villa,
Iringapuram P.O.,
Guruvayur, Thrissur

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division,
KSE Board Ltd, Guruvayur,
Thrissur

ORDER

Background of the case:

The appellants are the individual Villa owners at Santhimadom Villa Project. The appellants' grievance is that the collection of Rs.203.26 per square metre of the residential area from the Appellant to give service connections by installing 3 No.100 kVA transformers is against the regulations in the Supply Code and the respondent is bound to repay the excess amount collected from the appellants as against the regulations in the Supply Code. The appellants filed petitions before the CGRF, Ernakulam in OP Nos. 111 to 126 which were disposed of vide order dated 31-05-2018, by holding that it is better to abstain from going into the merits of the case as the subject matter on the same issue is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP (C) No.28266/2016. Aggrieved with the above decisions of CGRF, the appellants have approached this Authority with this appeal petition on 14-08-2018.

Earlier an appeal petition No. 136/2015 on the same subject matter filed by one Sri. Jayaprakash was disposed by this Authority in order dated 18-01-2016. The brief fact of the case is as follows:

M/s Santhimadom Builders and Developers applied for power demand for 1184.40 kVA for their two residential cum commercial complexes namely Kottapady North Project & South Project. But they abandoned the projects and the individual owners completed the villas later and they applied for electric connection separately. The individual owners completed residential villas of North Project and they were given electric connection after remitting the expenditure as demanded by the KSEB Limited. Few individual owners of South Project approached the Hon'ble High Court seeking direction to dispose of their applications for electric connections without insisting the payment of the expenses to be incurred for providing new transformer. The contention of the villa owners is that the total power requirement, as specified by the builder, will not come more than 1 MW and the demand for bearing cost of transformer and other equipments cannot be sustained.

Aggrieved by the decision of the KSEBL some of the applicants approached the Honourable High Court. The Hon'ble High Court disposed of the case by directing the respondents to provide electric connection on remittance of cost required for up-gradation of distribution system. Based on the judgment, 55 individual owners remitted the requisite amount proportionate to their plinth area and obtained connection. After availing the connection, one of the building owners, Sri Paramu Kumaran approached Hon'ble High Court stating that the total requirement of the present building owners comes only 350 kW which is less than 1 MW and requested to refund the excess amount remitted for availing service connection.

In the judgment, the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala have directed the writ petitioner, Sri Paramu Kumaran, S/o Paraman Kalluchirayil, to approach CGRF under Section 130(8) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code (KESC) 2014. Sri M Jayaprakash, Navitha Rooms, S2, AP3 201 D2, Iringapuram P.O., Guruvayur filed a petition before the CGRF requesting to refund the excess amount remitted for availing service connection and which was dismissed vide order dated 21-05-2015 holding that the petitioner does not come under the definition of "*complainant*" as per law. The appeal submitted by Sri Jayaprakash in Appeal No. 136/2015 was disposed by holding that the proportionate expenditure of Rs. 203.26 per square metre arrived by the respondent is found as excess and hence directed to recalculate the rate and to issue orders accordingly and also directed that the excess amount remitted by the all the applicants shall be adjusted in the future bills or to refund the amount. It was also insisted that as the service connections of 55 villas of the scheme were effected and in the circumstances the builder is not proceeding with the project and also considering the direction of Hon'ble High Court in this

matter, connections to the rest of applicants may be given as per the provisions of Electricity Act and the Regulations. The said order of this Authority in the Appeal petition has been challenged by the KSEBL before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP (C) 28826 of 2016 and is pending for disposal.

Arguments of the appellant:

1. The appellants are the individual Villa owners at Santhimadom Villa Project. When the appellant has filed application for electric connection the KSEB insisted the appellant to remit the entire cost for the extension of the distribution system to supply the electric connection. Aggrieved by the decision of the KSEB some of the applicants approached the Honourable High Court. The contention of the applicants is that the total power requirement in the proposed site is less than 1 MW and the demand for remitting cost of the transformer and other equipments cannot be sustained.

2. The Honourable High Court disposed the Writ petitions by directing the KSEB to provide electric connections on the basis of applications submitted if they comply requisite conditions enumerated under regulation 36 and makes payment of expenditure required for the supply of electricity connections. Accordingly 55 Villa owners applied for electricity connection. The KSEB has collected Rs.203.26 per square metre of the residential area, from each applicant as the cost for supplying electricity connection to the Villa stating that the load demanded by the applicants is more than 1 MW.

3. But actually the power requirement demanded by the 55 applicants is less than 1MW. The KSEB has issued service connections to the 55 Villas so far by installing 3 No.100 KVA transformers. The estimate prepared by the KSEB with regard to the power requirement of the Villa project is highly excessive and the amount collected from the applicants for issuing service connections is against the provisions of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014. Therefore one of the villa owners Sri. Paramu Kumaran has approached the Honourable High Court and filed Writ Petition No.6267 of 2015 seeking for a direction to the KSEB to refund the excess amount collected by the respondent as against the provisions of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014. The Honourable High Court directed Sri. Paramu Kumaran to approach CGRF under Section 130(8) of Electricity Supply Code 2014.

4. The KSEB has issued service connections to the appellants by installing only 3 No.100 KVA transformers and the present power requirement is less than 1MW. So the KSEB has no right to collect the cost for the extension of the distribution system. The collection of Rs. 203.26 per Square metre of the

residential area as the cost for the extension of the distribution system from the appellants is the violation clause 36 of the Supply Code.

5. As per Clause 36 of the Supply Code the expenditure for extension or up gradation or both of the distribution system under taken exclusively for giving new service connection to any person or a collective body of persons if the power requirements of the applicant with a contract demand above 1MW is to be met by the applicant. In the present case the demand for the power requirement is less than 1MW. The KSEB has issued service connections to the 55 Villas by installing 3 No.100 kVA transformers.

6. With regard to the above subject matter Sri. Jayaprakash, Navitha Rooms, Iringapuram has filed an Appeal Petition No. P/136/2015 before the State Electricity Ombudsmen to recalculate the rate fixed-by the respondent and to repay the excess amount collected from the consumers. Accordingly the State Electricity Ombudsmen found that the proportionate expenditure of Rs. 203.26 per square meter as fixed by the respondent to give the service connections is excess and direction has been issued to recalculate the rate vide order passed in Appeal Petition No. P/136/2015.

7. The collection of Rs.203.26 per square metre of the residential area from the Appellant to give service connections by installing 3 No.100 KVA transformers is against the regulations in the Supply Code. The KSEB is bound to repay the excess amount collected from the appellants as against the regulations in the Supply Code.

Therefore it is most respectfully prayed that the Ombudsman may be pleased to set aside the order passed in O.P.No.111/2017-18 passed by the CGRF and to issue direction to the KSEB to recalculate the rate charged for giving service connections to the appellant in accordance with the regulations in Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 and to repay the excess amount collected from the appellant.

Arguments of the respondent:

1. The subject matter in the complaint has been raised before this Forum in Complaint No. 155/14-15 which was dismissed as found not maintainable and subsequently before the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman in Appeal Petition No. P/136/2015. The Appeal was disposed vide order dated 18/01/2016 directing the respondents to recalculate the proportionate expenditure based on the observations in the order and to adjust in the future bills or to refund the excess amount remitted by all the applicants.

2. In view of the judgment of the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in W.A. No. 1068/2013, it was decided by the Board to prefer Writ Petition challenging the above order and to seek suitable amendment in the Supply Code, 2014 incorporating the enabling provision to safeguard the interest of the Board. The Writ petition WP(C) 28226 of 2016 filed in this regard is pending before the Hon'ble High Court.

3. It is submitted that based on the above stated facts, as per Regulation 22(d) of the KSEERC (CGRF and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2005 this Appeal is not maintainable before this Ombudsman.

4. Without prejudice to the above, the brief facts regarding the complaint are submitted. M/s Santhimadom Developers had submitted a power demand application to the office of the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section Guruvayur on 19.03.11 for South project with 1279.313 KVA based in the area of the building for their two residential cum commercial complexes namely Kottapady North Project & South Project. An estimate was prepared as per the application and clarification pertains to certain technical details was sought from the builder but he did not turn up.

5. The south project involves 109 Nos. individual residential villas and commercial complex like Ayurvedic Hospital, Shopping complex, Office building, Marriage Hall etc. Construction of almost all the villas (102 Nos.) were completed and other buildings were partially completed.

6. North Project involves 12 Nos. of residential villas and a residential flat complex. Work of all independent villas completed and flat is partially completed and availed power supply after installing 1 No 100 KVA transformer. Since the developer /builder deserted the project, the occupants applied for electric connection individually. The occupants from the completed residential villas of North project approached the KSEB Ltd with their willingness to bear cost for giving electric connection, and the KSEB Ltd had given connection to them.

7. As nobody from South project was willing to remit the cost as per Regulation 36 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014, the KSEB Ltd was not in a position to release the electric connections. So the occupants, approached the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala vide WP(C) Nos. 20614, 15379, 15380, 15387, 15388, 19382, 19369, 19370, 19375, 19407,19780, 19782, 19794, 19938, 19992of 2014.

8. The KSEB Ltd submitted statement of facts to the Hon'ble High Court stating the load details of the project calculated based on the Regulation 50 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 comes to load greater than 1 MW. The load was calculated based on the scheme submitted by the builder and almost all the work of the builder was completed. So the expenditure for extension or upgradation of electric system is to be borne by the consumer or group of consumers.

9. The Hon'ble High Court in disposing the Writ Petitions vide Common judgment dated 18.08.2014, categorically held that these connections come under the purview of the Regulation 36 of the Supply Code, 2014 and the electric connections to the applicants can be granted on the basis of the applications submitted by them if they comply with the requisite condition enumerated under the Regulation 36 to make payment of the proportionate expenditure required for upgradation of the system.

10. Based on the judgment, fifty five occupants including the Appellant approached the Electrical Section Guruvayur with applications for electric connection and the demand notice towards the estimate cost for extending / upgrading the existing electric network was issued. The estimate so prepared involves the work of 7 Nos. of 100 KVA transformers, 1 No 250 KVA Transformer, 450 metres HT/LT line and 400 metres LT 3 phase 4 wire line. The cost for giving connection to residential complex was Rs. 2893550/-and this is for entire residential area of 14235.98 Sq. m. The proportionate expenditure of Rs.203.26 per sq.mtr so arrived was collected from the applicants. Three Nos. of 100 KVA transformers were presently sufficient to provide electric connection to the present 55 applications and hence that were only installed. The occupants remitted the cost proportionate to their plinth area and the electric connections were effected to the applicants. The rest of the transformers and LT line will be installed as and when new applicants request for connection and remit the proportionate amount.

11. The Respondents collected the proportionate expenditure which is liable to be remitted by the applicants for connection including the appellant as per the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court towards the cost incurred for providing the electric connection in accordance with the provisions of Section 46 of the Electricity Act, 2003 r/w regulation 36 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014.

12. After getting the connection, one of the occupants Sri. Paramu Kumaran approached the Hon'ble High Court stating that the total load of the present applicants comes only 350 kW which is less than 1 MW. The appellant kept silent about the near future occupants. However the Hon'ble Court dismissed his petition vide judgment dated 27.02.2015 of WP (c) No.6267 of 2015

directing him to approach the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum. But he did not approach the Forum.

13. But one Mr. Jayaprakash being the representative of the villa owners approached the C.G.R.F. with Complaint No. 155/14-15 which was dismissed as found not maintainable and subsequently the Electricity Ombudsman with Appeal Petition No. P/136/2015. The said order of the Ombudsman in the Appeal petition has been challenged by the Board before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP (C) 28826 of 2016 is pending before the Hon'ble Court for disposal.

14. Things being so, the villa owners including the appellant through an Advocate approached the CGRF, Central Region during May 2018 with their grievance in the same subject matter with regard to the refund of the excess amount collected from them as the cost for the extension of the distribution system for providing electric supply to their premises. During the hearing these respondents and the advocate appearing on behalf of the appellants pointed out that the subject matter covered under all these cases is under the consideration of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 28226/2016.

15. The CGRF has dismissed the complaint on 31.05.2018 stating that "this Forum is of the considered opinion that it is better to abstain from going into the merits of the case as the subject matter is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala".

It is submitted that the above being the real facts of the case, the CGRF has rightly dismissed the Petition as found non maintainable. There is no merit in any of the grounds raised in the appeal and it is liable to be dismissed as such. For the foregoing reasons, it is prayed that to dismiss the appeal with cost.

Analysis and findings

All the appeal petitions are containing identical issues regarding same subject matter and nature of reliefs sought for are the same. Hence it is decided to deliver a common judgment applicable to all the appellants.

A hearing of the case was conducted on 12-10-2018 in my chamber at Edappally. Appellants Sri. Regunathan C.S., Sri. P.Ramadasan and Smt. Remanikutty Amma represented for the appellant's side. Sri K.S. Suresh, Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Guruvayur and Sri James T. Paul, Nodal Officer (Litigation), Electrical Circle, Thrissur represented for the respondent's side. During the hearing the appellants requested for a

site inspection for ascertaining the real facts of the issue. It was also decided to conduct site inspection and further hearing after receipt of details from the respondent.

A site inspection was conducted on 02-11-2018. The appellant and the respondent were present. 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 order dated 31-05-2018 of CGRF it can be seen that the petition was dismissed on the ground that a writ petition No. WP (C) 28226/2016 on the same nature and subject matter relates to this issue is pending before the Honorable High Court of Kerala.

This Authority went through all related records in the file, documents and depositions. The relief sought for by the appellant is to refund the excess amount collected by the respondent. In appeal petition No.136/2015, the anomalies pointed out by the appellant were:

- 1) The load was inflated by including load for non-existent buildings
- 2) Clubbing load for residential and commercial buildings
- 3) Total load was calculated by relying on plinth area unsupported by any document and
- 4) Municipal documents deliberately ignored for calculation of the load.

Accordingly the issues were analyzed by this Authority as follows:

“In order to decide the issue, the relevant judgment in WP (C) No. 15379 of 2014 of the Hon’ble High Court of Kerala in this matter has to be undergone and is held as under.

“The respondents to provide electric connections on the basis of applications submitted by the petitioners, if they complies with the requisite conditions enumerated under Regulation 36 and makes payment of the expenditure required for up gradation of the distribution system. Necessary steps for providing the connections shall be taken at the earliest, at any rate within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of the petitioners making the requisite deposits.”

In light of the judgment 55 occupants obtained electric connections by remitting the cost proportionate to their plinth areas. 7 Nos. 100 kVA transformers, 1 No 250 kVA transformer, 450 m HT /LT line and 400 m LT line was part of the estimate. The total cost for giving connection to residential complex was Rs. 28,93,550/-and this is for entire residential area of 14235.98 Sqm. The proportionate expenditure of Rs. 203.26 per square metre so arrived was collected from the 55 occupants. Three Nos. 100 kVA transformers were installed to provide electric connection to the present 55 applicants. After getting connection Sri Paramu Kumaran, a villa owner, approached Hon'ble High Court claiming that the total load of the present applicants comes only 350 kW which is less than 1 MW and requested to refund the excess amount collected by the respondent.

Let us examine the relevant provisions in the Regulations 35, 36 and 37 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014.

Regulation 35 deals with Expenditure for extension or up-gradation or both of the distribution system to be borne by the licensee -

The expenditure for extension or up-gradation or both of the distribution system up to and including the distributing main, for meeting the demand of new consumers and the additional demand of existing consumers shall normally be borne by the distribution licensee and this expenditure shall be recovered from the consumers through tariff as approved by the Commission.

Here Regulation 36 and 37 are relevant and reads as under 36. *Expenditure for extension or up-gradation or both of the distribution system to be borne by the consumer -*

The expenditure for extension or up-gradation or both of the distribution system undertaken exclusively for giving new service connection to any person or a collective body of persons or a developer or a builder, or for enhancing the load demand of a consumer or a collective body of consumers or a developer or a builder, shall be borne by the respective applicant or consumer or -collective body of consumers or developer or builder, as the case may be, in the following cases:-

- (i) for meeting the demand of an applicant with a contract demand above one megawatt (MW);
- (ii) for meeting the additional demand of existing consumers, if the aggregate demand including the additional demand applied for, is above one megawatt (MW);
- (iii) for meeting the demand of the domestic or commercial or industrial complex or colony constructed by a developer or a builder with a demand above one megawatt (MW);

- (iv) for meeting the demand of a high rise building irrespective of its demand;
- (v) for meeting the demand of power intensive unit irrespective of its demand; and
- (vi) for meeting the demand of a consumer requesting for dedicated feeder or protected load status irrespective of its demand:

Provided that, if due to technical reasons, the extension or up-gradation or both to be undertaken by the licensee as per this regulation is more than the requirement of such consumer, the expenditure for such extension or up-gradation or both to be realized from the consumer shall be limited to the proportionate expenditure.

37. Expenditure for service line, plant etc., for providing supply.

(1) The consumer shall bear the expenditure for the service line or of the plant or of both, provided exclusively for him by the licensee.

(2) The expenditure for line and plant mentioned in sub regulation (1) above shall be determined as per the cost data approved by the Commission.

Regulation 50 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014, reads as follows:

(i)	For domestic loads	500 Watts per 10 Square Metre of constructed area
(ii)	For Commercial loads	1500 Watts per 10 Square Metre of constructed area
(iii)	For lift, water lifting pump, street light if any, corridor/campus lighting and other common facilities	Actual load shall be calculated separately
(iv)	For Industrial loads	Actual load required shall be calculated separately

The respondent fixed the loads in accordance with the above Regulation. But it is a fact that as the project was incomplete and individual owners completed the villas and applied electric connections separately. So far the respondent had issued service connections to 55 villas. The non residential buildings owned by the builder himself were found incomplete and seen as abandoned and no applications submitted for connection. Actually the occupants of villas have no role with the above non residential buildings. So, application, if any, comes from the occupants / owners of non residential buildings, it may be considered at that point of time.

The appellant further contented that 19 permits were cancelled by the Municipality which was not considered while preparing the estimate for total requirement of load. This point was argued by the appellant stating that the load calculations are inflated. The respondent has never challenged the above arguments. But the respondent argued that the total load requirement is

greater than 1 Mega Watt as per the load details of the project based on the Regulation 50 of Supply Code, 2014.

This load calculation was purely based on the scheme submitted by the builder and the expenditure for extension or up-gradation of the system is to be borne by the consumer or group of consumers. The Hon'ble High Court upheld the contention of the licensee and in its judgment dated 18-08-2014 directed to provide electric connections on the basis of application submitted by the petitioners if they comply with the requisite conditions enumerated under Regulation 36 and make payments of the expenditure required for up-gradation of the system. The Hon'ble High Court had already disposed of that issue, this Authority has no scope for further intervention.

In an overall evaluation of the events, documents and facts reveals that out of 109 villas, the respondent had issued service connections to 55 villas so far by installing 3 Nos. 100 kVA transformers. On a close perusal of the estimate to provide service connections to the individual occupants it can be seen that the load calculation was purely based on the scheme submitted by the builder. The respondent's argument is that in the estimate the total load was calculated on the basis of application and approved plan submitted by the builder and is in accordance with the Regulation 50 of Supply Code, 2014. The Municipal Authorities cancelled the permit of 19 villas and the respondent omitted to consider these facts while preparing the load calculation.

In the estimate the respondent has proposed 7 Nos. of 100 kVA transformers for providing service connections to the 109 villas. The reason for non-proposal of higher capacity transformers like 160 kVA, 250 kVA has not been furnished. Since 19 permits were already cancelled by the Municipal Authorities, it is not proper to include the area for the load calculation which is not in existence. The respondent has to provide service connections to the remaining 35 villas on receipt of applications subject to compliance with the requisite conditions and this can be given by installing one or two nos. 100 kVA transformers or a suitable transformer having adequate capacity.

Hence the respondent is hereby directed to recalculate the load requirements in a realistic manner considering those aspects. On my personal verification a proper planning is lacking while calculating the total power requirement of the applicants. The reason for proposing 7 Nos. 100 kVA transformers for giving 109 villas is not forthcoming from the respondent. If the officers of the licensee would have taken due diligence in preparing the estimate and effecting service connection this sort of unnecessary litigation could have been avoided".

A decision was taken by this Authority on the basis of the above analysis, findings and conclusions arrived at in appeal petition P/136/2015. This Authority has nothing more to add other than the above analysis and findings

on this present appeal petitions. As the respondent has challenged the order issued in appeal petition No. 136/2015, it is proper and justifiable to dispose this appeal petitions filed by the appellants as per the outcome of the writ petition No. 28266/2016 pending before the Hon. High Court of Kerala and respondent shall act accordingly regarding the reliefs sought for by this appellants also.

Decision

Since a writ petition filed by the respondent lies before the Hon. High Court of Kerala and in the light of the provision under 22(d) of the Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission (CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2005, which restricts the maintainability of the petition filed for the same cause of action, the appeal petition filed by the appellants, need no further action at this Forum and hence needs to be rejected.

For the reasons detailed above, the appeal Petitions, filed by the appellants stand dismissed as it is found not maintainable before this Authority. Having concluded and decided as above, it is ordered accordingly. No order on costs.

ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

P/050/2018 to P/65/2018/ _____ /Dated: _____

Delivered to:

- | | | |
|-----|------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | P/050/2018 | Sri. Harish K.P. |
| 2. | P/051/2018 | Sri. Reghunathan C.S. |
| 3. | P/052/2018 | Smt. Sreelatha H. |
| 4. | P/053/2018 | Sri Sreekumar V. Kurup |
| 5. | P/054/2018 | Sri Prasad C. Nair |
| 6. | P/055/2018 | Sri K. Govindan Kutty |
| 7. | P/056/2018 | Sri Ashraf P.K. |
| 8. | P/057/2018 | Smt. Padmavathi Amma K. |
| 9. | P/058/2018 | Smt. Remanikutty Amma |
| 10. | P/059/2018 | Sri K.T. Sailesh |
| 11. | P/060/2018 | Sri Ninan V.S. |
| 12. | P/061/2018 | Sri Jemini Suthan |
| 13. | P/062/2018 | Sri Chandrabhanu |
| 14. | P/063/2018 | Sri Ramadasan |
| 15. | P/064/2018 | Sri Thankachan Joseph |
| 16. | P/065/2018 | Smt. Anisha K.S. |

2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd, Guruvayur, Thrissur

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.