

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 No. P/045/2019
(Present: A.S. Dasappan)
Dated: 26th August 2019

Appellant : Sri. A.K. Xaviour,
Aruparayil House,
Pulikuttuserry P.O.,
Kottayam

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division,
KSE Board Ltd, Gandhi Nagar,
Kottayam

ORDER

Background of the case:

The appellant is a consumer under the Electrical Section, Aymanam under VI F tariff bearing consumer No. 13859. He has taken a Single phase connection in 2015 at the time of the construction of his house. After the completion of the construction work, the appellant applied for load enhancement under LT 1 A domestic tariff and conversion of service connection to LT three phase, on 18-07-2017. In the application, the connected load applied was 51326 Watts, but on inspection it was found that the connected load at the premises as 44 kW (leaving all unconnected equipments and plug points). On 03-01-2018, the Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Pallom accorded sanction for an estimate amounting to Rs.12.23 lakhs for constructing 950m of 11 kV SC OH line and installing one 100 kVA transformer at the property of the appellant for meeting the appellant's load requirement and accordingly demand notice was issued to the appellant by the respondent. The appellant was not willing to bear the expenditure required to meet his power requirement stating that the appellant is bound to remit the expenditure only if the power requirement is above one Megawatt. Challenging the demand notice issued, the appellant filed a petition before the CGRF, Southern Region which was disposed vide Order No. OP 20/2019 dated 21-05-2019, ordering that the distribution licensee is empowered to recover the expenditure incurred for providing supply as per Regulation 32 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 and the Forum

dismissed the case. Still aggrieved, the appellant has submitted this appeal petition before this Authority.

Arguments of the appellant:

1. The appellant made an application dated 18.07.2017 for load enhancement and conversion of his single phase connection to a LT three phase connection. The load applied in the application was 51.33kW. However in an inspection conducted by the Department, the load was found to be 44 kW only.

No action was taken on the application for almost a year. The appellant had to install a generator incurring huge amounts to meet the power demands. Thereafter the appellant received a demand notice of Rs.12.23 lakhs stating that a 11 kV line has to be constructed from the nearest possible tapping point and to install a 100 kVA transformer at the appellant's premises. Aggrieved by the same the appellant submitted a petition before the respondent and the same was rejected.

Aggrieved by the rejection of his application by the respondent the appellant approached the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Kottarakkara filing O.P. No. 20/2019. The appellant inter alia contended that he is eligible for the benefit of Regulation 35, 36, 49 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014 and contended that the Licensee is responsible for ensuring the distribution system as per demand and those expenses should not be recovered from the consumers while giving connections up to One Megawatt (MW).

The respondent filed an objection to the petition inter alia contending that required load was 60kW and his house being located at the fag end of the KSEBL plants, the only option is to construct a 11KV line from the nearest possible tapping point and to install a 100 kVA transformer at the appellant's premises and the appellant has to meet the expense for the same. He further contended that appellant was trying for illegal gains by hiding the actual loads that once an applicant declares load requirement, the Board is required to meet the consumers demand and that the KSEB cannot held liable for the outcome of an illicit outcome of the appellant.

The Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum after advancing the arguments has held that appellant has requested for enhancement of connected load to 60 kW and that the only possible option is to draw a 11 kV line from the nearest possible tapping point and to install a 100 kVA transformer at the appellant's premises. The Forum also held that in order to get rated voltage in the premises of the appellant, it is necessary to draw 11kV line and a 100 kVA transformer should be installed and further held that the Board is entitled to recover, the expense for the same from the appellant as per Regulation 32 of the Supply Code-2014.

The order of CGRF is arbitrary, illegal and perverse and it was issued in total non-application of mind. The specific legal contention of the Appellant with respect

to Regulation 32, 35, 36 and 49 of the erecting the transformer were not addressed or answered by the Forum. The Forum did not consider the true facts and circumstances involved in the matter and failed to appreciate that the appellant is entitled for the benefit of various provisions of Electricity Act and Supply Code-2014. The Forum did not address the contentions raised by the appellant but was carried away by the submissions made on behalf of the respondents.

The Board is responsible for ensuring that its distribution system is upgraded, extended and strengthened so as to meet the demand for electricity in its area of supply. The consumer should not be made liable for expense incurred for a duty exclusively vested on the licensee (Board).

Order No. 001/Com.Ex/KSERC/2012 dated 03.05.2016 issued by the Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission specifically states that the cost of the transformer for giving a low tension supply up to 100 kVA should not be realized from the applicant even if it is erected exclusively for giving that supply. The said order also specifies that the expenditure reasonably incurred by the licensee for conversion of a single phase low tension service to a three phase low tension service line can be recovered from the consumer if the same is on the specific request from the consumer. The appellant has requested only for a conversion of his existing single phase line to three phase line. The Appellant did not even request for an exclusive connection to his house. The cost of erection of transformer has to be met by the Licensee and the appellant should not be held liable for the same. If at all needed, only the amount for conversion from single phase to three phase can be recovered from the appellant, as per law.

The Forum failed to appreciate the fact that there is three phase connection within 500m from the residence of the appellant and that a transformer is located at about 700m. The appellant has only requested the conversion of his connection to three phases by upgrading the existing transformer. The benefit of the same would extend to others residing in the locality. It is pertinent to note that a mass petition was already been filed by the persons in the locality regarding low voltage and this complaint could also be redressed by the upgradation of the exiting transformer.

The Forum failed to see that Board has taken the longest route to give the estimate in the demand notice. There are 2 other alternate routes and the possibility of the same was never assessed by the respondent. In that ground alone, the impugned order has to be set aside.

Non consideration of the application of the appellant and inviting the appellant into unwanted litigation is due to the illegal, arrogant and untenable stand taken by the Respondents. Only because of this process, Appellant is at a loss of Rs.20000. Hence Appellant is entitled to get the cost of the litigation.

RELIEFS:

- i. To set aside the demand notice for Rs. 12.23 lakhs and also to set aside the order dated 21-5-2019 issued by the CGRF
- ii. To direct the respondents to allow the original application of the appellant.
- iii. To declare that the appellant has to pay only the expense for conversion of his existing Single phase connection to Three phase connection.
- iv. To allow Cost of the Application and Appeal.
- v. Any other relief which this authority feels deem fit

Arguments of the respondent:

A power allocation application for enhancing the connected load of the appellant's house was submitted by Mr. A K Xaviour before the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section Aymanam on 18/7/2017. Since the required load is 60kW and being his house located at the far end of KSEBL plants, the only possible option to meet his 60kW load was to construct 11 kV service line from the nearest possible tapping point and to install 100 kVA transformer at appellant's premises. Due to narrow roads and the area through which the lines are to be drawn is thickly populated with persons owing very small pieces of lands, it was a challenging task for Aymanam Section officials to locate a suitable route. Hence it took some time than normal for Section officials to accord oral approvals from public for fixing required stays at the line routes.

Finally after fixing the feasible and possible route, on 3/01/2018 the Executive Engineer accorded sanction for an estimate amounting to Rs.12,23,000/- for meeting the appellant's load requirement. Since the appellant was out of country during the period, the matter was conveyed by the Assistant Engineer through the occupants of his residence. Upon returning back from his trip the appellant instead of remitting the amount, demanded KSEBL to bear the cost for meeting his 60kW requirement. Later the appellant met several higher authorities of KSEBL with a demand to bear the expenditure but was turned down by the authorities as it is against the rules prevailing under KSEBL. Further on 8/11 /2018, the appellant submitted a completion report with a connected load of 19.182KW load for the very same premises. While carrying out inspection, the section officials found the connected load at the premises as 44 kW (leaving all unconnected equipment's and plug points). The appellant then unofficially informed the Assistant Engineer that he intends to use generator for the rest of the load. Since possessing two sources of supply at a premise requires approvals from Electrical Inspectorate, the appellant was advised by the Assistant Engineer to provide changeover switch with proper isolations and to furnish required approvals from Electrical Inspectorate. The appellant then vide his letter dated 29/12/2018 asked Assistant Engineer to hold his 19.182 kW application and requested to process his application dated 18/7/2017, i.e. 60 kW Power allocation application.

Since the appellant was not ready to bear the expenditure required to meet his power requirement, KSEBL was unable to process his requests. The appellant is now messing up matters by stating the 44kW load detected by KSEBL staff within his premises. Here the point to be noted is about the authority/ decision of citizens to determine his connected load. According to statutes, the decision vests with the applicant only, if a consumer declares that his load requirement is 60 kW, KSEBL cannot deny the same, it is the responsibility of the licensee to meet consumers requirement at a rate fixed by the KSERC. Here in the first application, the consumer requested for 60kW load, KSEBL accordingly issued demand note to the consumer which he later turned down. He then filed another application for 20kW load on 11/11/2018, but in this case the appellant tried to hide his actual loads for gaining unlawful benefits, thus the so called 44kW load detection was the outcome of an illicit act from the part of appellant for which he is solely responsible, KSEBL cannot be held responsible for the same. This was well communicated several times to the appellant, but instead the applicant decided to approach the CGRF and filed OP No. 20/2019. In the petition filed before the CGRF the appellant himself claims that his intention was to operate a home stay at the premises, and being an entrepreneur he lost two seasons due to KSEBL issues, according to the applications furnished by the appellant before KSEBL, the purpose was noted as domestic, so his intentions were pretty clear.

A hearing was then called for by the Forum and the main contention raised by the appellant was about the 44kW load which was detected by the KSEBL authorities at his premises on account of his completion report submitted before the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Aymanam on 8/11/2018 for 20KW load. Based on the appellant's contention, the Forum during hearing directed KSEBL to conduct feasibility study for 44kW load by drawing separate 3Ph. Line after enhancing Noottimuppathu Padam transformer from 63 kVA to 160 kVA. Accordingly feasibility study was conducted for the same and the report was forwarded to the Forum. After analyzing the claims the Forum found that in order to get rated voltage in the premises of the appellant, it is necessary to draw 11 kV line and installation of a 100 kVA transformer. The distribution licensee is empowered to recover the expenditure incurred for providing supply as per Reg.32 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014. Since the respondents have acted in accordance with the statues there is no reason for the appellant to file this case. Hence the petition may be rejected.

The required expenditure was well conveyed to the consumer several times, even the appellant came to all officials up to Executive Engineer level during the so called period and demanded to undertake works under KSEBL's expense, and hence he was well aware of the approvals. The letter dated 4/6/18 was a letter issued to the appellant against his demand; this does not mean that this is not the first time he is getting hold of the details regarding the expenditure required for meeting his 60kW load requirement. Since the required load was 60 kW and his house being at the fag end of KSEBL plants, the only option left was to draw 11 kV line up to the

appellants premises and to install 100 kVA transformer for which an estimate was already been prepared and forwarded to the appellant.

It is admitted that the appellant had filed an application before the Executive Engineer on 29/1/2019 demanding KSEBL to bear expenses required for meeting his load requirements. Since the amount raised was strictly in accordance with regulation 32, 37 of Supply Code, 2014 the application submitted by the appellant was rejected by the Executive Engineer and directed the appellant to remit the expenditure required for meeting his load requirement.

Against the order of Hon'ble Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission, KSEBL approached Hon'ble High Court of Kerala with a writ petition and the court by its order dated 29/7/2016 stayed the proceedings of the Hon'ble Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission. Hence in accordance with regulation 32, 37 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014, the consumer is liable to bear the expenditure required for meeting his power requirements.

It is admitted that the residents of the area approached KSEBL with a complaint detailing the shabby LT lines through paddy field; subsequently KSEBL rerouted the lines through the available road and cleared the anomalies. The voltage complaints raised by the residents were also attended by the KSEBL officials by carrying out 3 phase conversion work, but the appellant keeps on raising voltage complaints within the area for gaining unlawful benefits.

Even though there exist several routes, KSEBL could choose only the routes which are feasible for drawing 11kV lines. Since the appellant's house is located in an area to which the road access is through thickly populated area where people staying in the verge of road, owing very small pieces of land. Drawing an 11 kV line through such area requires installation of stays/posts and cutting down of trees owned by these poor fellows. Even the appellant himself in several areas informed KSEBL officials about the difficulties in getting consents from the people. In order to avoid public protests, KSEBL officials looked all possible options and finally the possible route with minimum obstruction to those poor nearby residents were chosen for drawing 11 kV line. Moreover joint inspections were carried out by the appellant and the Assistant Engineer of the Section later to look for a feasible location for installing 100 kVA transformer so as to minimize the length of 11 kV line on basis of appellant's proposal to either purchase or procure consents for the desired locations. Accordingly three locations were finally chosen for which later the appellant unofficially informed that he is unable to procure or obtain approvals from the landlords, hence that options were also dropped.

Regulation 32 of Supply Code 2014 empowers KSEBL to collect expenses required for meeting the load requirements of the appellant which in fact was turned down by the appellant. KSEBL had rendered all possible assistance to the appellant for fulfilling his power requirements, but the appellant instead of obeying the law of the land keep on accusing KSEBL officials for gaining unlawful benefits.

Analysis and Findings: -

The hearing of the case was conducted on 11-07-2019 in the chamber of Electricity Ombudsman at Edappally, Kochi. Sri Mahesh Vijayan has represented for the appellant and Sri. Viji Prabhakaran, Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Gandhi Nagar, Kottayam has appeared for the respondent's side. On examining the petition, the counter statement of the respondent, the documents attached and 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 thereof.

The instant appeal has been filed against the demand issued for a sum of Rs. 12.23 lakh to the appellant towards estimate cost of construction of 11 kV line and to install a 100 kVA transformer for the power requirement in the premises of the appellant. The appellant is aggrieved to the extent that the respondent has no right to collect the development charge or any other similar charge in any other name, as the development of distribution system is the sole responsibility of the licensee as he is eligible for the benefit of Regulations 35, 36 and 49 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014.

The points for decisions are: -

- (1). Whether there is any other distributing main available having spare capacity and feasible and any other options to provide three phase power supply in the premises of the appellant?
- (2). Whether the demand of Rs. 12.23 lakhs as distribution cost is payable by the appellant for providing 44 kW load to the premises of the appellant and if so, whether it is reasonable and justifiable?

The respondent has submitted three proposals for drawing 11 kV Overhead (OH)/ Aerial Bunched Cable (ABC) line and installing 100 kVA transformer for effecting the three phase service connection to the appellant by converting the existing single phase connection. The first proposal is drawing 950m 11 kV OH line from Puthukary Transformer station and installing 100 kVA transformer at the appellant's premises and the estimate amounting to Rs. 12.23 lakhs was got sanctioned and directed the appellant to remit the amount. The second proposal is drawing 820m 11 kV OH line from 130 Padam Transformer station and installing 100 kVA transformer at the appellant's premises. According to the appellant, though the length of the line is less than the first proposal and the estimate calculated is Rs. 10.7 lakhs, this proposal was turned down due to difficulty to get consent from the property owners and due to narrow roads which make it difficult to construct an HT line through this route. The third proposal is drawing 750m 11 kV ABC line from Kanichery Transformer station and installing 100 kVA transformer at the appellant's premises. This is the shortest route but the appellant was not ready to bear the cost of ABC which comes to Rs. 16,78,586/-.

The respondent has contended that the distribution licensee is empowered to recover the expenditure incurred for providing supply as per Reg.32 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 which reads as follows.

“The licensee may recover from the owner or lawful occupier of any premises requiring supply, the expenditure reasonably incurred by the licensee for providing from the distributing main, any electric line or electrical plant required exclusively for the purpose of giving that supply:

- Provided that, the licensee shall not be entitled to recover such expenditure if such expenditure is incurred under any scheme approved by the Commission:
- Provided further that, the licensee may exempt any person requiring connection from the payment of expenditure if the State Government directs the licensee to provide new electric connection to any category of consumers and pays in advance to the licensee, the expenditure at the rates in the cost data approved by the Commission ”. Further it is stated that the proposed 11 kV line and transformer is required exclusively for meeting appellant’s load requirements.

The appellant has averred that the Board is responsible for ensuring that its distribution system is upgraded, extended and strengthened so as to meet the demand for electricity in its area of supply. The Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission Order No. 001/Com.Ex/KSERC/2012 dated 03.05.2016 specifically states that the cost of the transformer for giving a low tension supply up to 100 kVA should not be realized from the applicant even if it is erected exclusively for giving that supply. The said order also specifies that the expenditure reasonably incurred by the licensee for conversion of a single phase low tension service to a three phase low tension service line can be recovered from the consumer if the same is on the specific request from the consumer. According to the appellant, he has requested only for a conversion of his existing single phase line to three phase line and did not even request for an exclusive connection to his house.

In reply to this, the respondent has stated that against the order of Hon'ble Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission, KSEBL approached Hon'ble High Court of Kerala with a writ petition no. WP (C) 25347/2016 and the Court by its order dated 29/7/2016 stayed the proceedings of the Hon'ble Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission.

Another allegation raised by the appellant is that the respondent had demanded development charges which were against the orders issued by this Authority in Appeal No.129/2015 dated 30/10/2015 and judgment issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, in WPC 9967/2016 and WPC 37708/2015 and its writ appeals Nos. 1482/2017 and 1448/2017.

Let me 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 also 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.

In the instant case, the question is the requirement of the load for conversion to the three phase line is exclusively for the use of the appellant.

Regulation 32 speaks of expenditure reasonably incurred by the licensee for providing from the distributing main, any electric line or electric plant required exclusively for the purpose of giving that supply and the licensee is entitled to recover the expenditure from the owner or lawful occupier of the requiring supply. Regulation 37 says the consumer shall bear the expenditure for the service line or of the plant or of both, provided exclusively for him by the licensee. The respondent's version is that the proposed 11 kV line and transformer is required exclusively for meeting the appellant's load requirements. The respondent has acted on the basis of these regulations and issued demand notice to the appellant for providing supply.

The appellant's arguments depend on Regulations 35 and 36 of the Supply Code 2014. As per regulation 35, the expenditure for extension or upgradation or both of the distribution system up to and including the distribution main for meeting the demand of new consumers and the additional demand of the existing consumers shall normally be borne by the distribution licensee.

As per Clause 36 of the Supply Code the expenditure for extension or upgradation 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 and the appellant has requested the benefit of regulations 35, 36 and 49 of the Supply Code 2014.

A site inspection was conducted on 12-07-2019. The appellant and the respondent were present. During the inspection, it is found that there exist four different transformers within the proximity of the appellant's residence. The appellant's house is found located in an area to which the road access is very narrow where people staying in small houses on the verge of road. For implementation of the second proposal consents from the private property owners is required. Regarding the third proposal implementation cost is very high compared to the other two proposals. Considering the above points, it is found that the possible route for drawing 11 kV line is the first proposal, which was approved by the Licensee. The mass petition regarding voltage problems in the area as stated in the appeal petition was from the residents of 130 Padam Transformer. During the site visit, the voltage of the fag end consumer belonging to the said transformer and Aryatoozham Transformer was taken as per this Authority's direction and was noted as 238.5 V and 229 V. The respondent has admitted that the residents of the area

approached KSEBL with a complaint detailing the shabby LT lines through paddy field, subsequently KSEBL rerouted the lines through the available road and cleared the anomalies. The voltage complaints raised by the residents were also attended by the KSEBL officials by carrying out 3 phase conversion work.

The appellant has a single phase line in the premises under VI F tariff which was obtained for construction purposes in 2015. On completion of the work, a three phase power allocation application for enhancing the connected load of the appellant's house was submitted before the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section Aymanam on 18/7/2017, under LT 1 A tariff. It is found that there occurred delay in processing the application and the Executive Engineer accorded sanction for an estimate amounting to Rs.12.23 lakhs and directed to issue demand notice. On visiting the area, this Authority is of the opinion that any further up gradation work is not required in this area for meeting public demands. The residents of this area having small houses are not required any three phase connection at present and there are no voltage problems. Hence the development of distribution system is exclusively for meeting the appellant's load requirements. In a common judgment in writ appeals Nos. 1482/2017 and 1448/2017, the Division Bench of the Honourable High Court of Kerala had ordered that the Board shall carry out installation of the transformer and then approach the Commission for fixation of Tariff. This judgment was in confirmation of the judgment pronounced by the Single Judge in the writ petitions that "the Board has to install the transformer at their costs and then approach the Commission for determination of individual tariffs with respect to the two units". The appellant has no request for a dedicated feeder and the appellant is ready to hand over required land to the KSEBL for installing the transformer as there is no space in the road. The requirement of power to the appellant is more or less 50% of 100 kVA transformer. Since the appellant's request is for enhancement of the load by converting the single phase to three phase, the licensee shall also bind to adhere the procedures specified in regulation 93 of the Supply Code 2014. Hence this Authority is of the opinion that the appellant has to bear the line development expenditure up to the distributing main and the licensee has to install the transformer at their cost. The respondent shall connect the Low Tension (LT) side of the transformer to the Licensee's LT distribution network and feed nearby LT premises to the extent possible.

Decision

From the analysis done and the findings and conclusions arrived at, which are detailed above, I take the following decisions.

The demand notice for Rs. 12.23 lakhs issued by the respondent is quashed.

The respondent is entitled to recover the expenditure from the appellant for the extension of 11 kV line up to the transformer station and for the conversion of the single phase low tension service connection to three phase connection.

The respondent shall bear the cost of the transformer for giving the three phase LT supply to the appellant.

The respondent shall opt the technically feasible route for drawing the 11 kV LT line using Overhead Conductor/Aerial Bunched Cable.

Having decided as above, it is ordered accordingly. The Appeal Petition filed by the appellant is disposed of with the said decisions taken and issued. The Order No. OP 20/2019 dated 21-05-2019, of CGRF (South), Kottarakkara, is set aside. No order as to costs.

ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

P/045/2019/_____ /Dated:_____

Delivered to:

1. Sri. A.K. Xaviour, Aruparayil House, Pulikuttuserry P.O., Kottayam
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd, Gandhi Nagar, Kottayam

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, Kottarakkara - 691 506.