

Before the Ombudsman, K.E.R.C. Bangalore

Present: Shaik Ahmed,
Ombudsman

Case No.OMB/H/G-14/2006/2416

Dated 04.04.2007

APPELLANT:

Shri R.N.Bhosle,
Shivashakti Oil Mills,
Bijapur Road,
Muddebihal,
Bijapur District

RESPONDENTS:

1. The Asst.Executive Engineer(E)
O & M Sub-Division,
HESCOM

MUDEBIHAL,
Bijapur District

2. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
HESCOM, Eureka Junction II Floor,
T.B.Road,
HUBLI.

The Appellant above named has filed this appeal against the order dated 09.08.2006 passed by CGRF, HESCOM in file No.3380-81. The facts of this case are that the Appellant had filed a petition before the CGRF alleging that the 1st Respondent had not accorded sanction to reduce the load in respect of his installation bearing R.R.No.MBL MP 177/4 within the period specified under Section 34.02 of the KERC (ES & D) Code 2000-01. The CGRF, HESCOM has passed the following order on 09.8.2006.

..2...

CGRF.3380-81

9 AUG 2006

ಗೆ,

ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್.ಎನ್.ಬೋಸ್ಲೆ,
ಮೆ.ಶಿವಶಕ್ತಿ ಆಯಿಲ್ ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರೀಸ್,
ಬಿಜಾಪೂರ ರೋಡ್,
ಮುದ್ದೇಬಿಹಾಳ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೆ,

ವಿಷಯ: ಗ್ರಾಹಕರ ಕುಂದುಕೊರತೆ ನಿವಾರಣಾ ವೇದಿಕೆಗೆ
ನೀವು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ದೂರು ದಿನಾಂಕ,

“ಮೇಲಿನ ವಿಷಯ ಕುರಿತು ನಿಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನೀವು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ದೂರು ಗ್ರಾಹಕರ ಕುಂದುಕೊರತೆಗಳ ನಿವಾರಣಾ ವೇದಿಕೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಪತ್ರದೊಂದಿಗೆ ನೀವು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ದೂರನ್ನು ಮರಳಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಾಪಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು, ಹೆಸಾಂ ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ ರವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂ.ಹು.ವಿಕಂ/ಎಲ್ ಸಿ-೧೨೮೦೧೯-೨೦/೩.೯.೨೦೦೪ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಪ್ರವೃತ್ತಿಗಳು ವಿನಂತಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಮುಖ್ಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್(ವಿ)
ಹಾಗೂ ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ಗ್ರಾಹಕರ ಕುಂದುಕೊರತೆಗಳ
ನಿವಾರಣಾ ವೇದಿಕೆ, ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ

Aggrieved by the above order of the CGRF, the Apopellant has filed this appeal.

I have gone through the records submitted by both the parties. The Appellant had requested for a personal hearing but when the opportunity of hearing was extended to him, he did not come forward to adduce further evidence in support of his claim. The 1st Respondent has submitted that the Appellant did not submit relevant records required for the reduction of load on his installation and has intentionally delayed to submit the records in order to avoid payment of additional deposit/fees etc. He has further informed that after receipt of the application from the Appellant, the reduction of load has been accorded on 15.10.2004 itself.

I find that there is no grievance involved in this case. The request of the Appellant to reduce load on his installation has been considered by the 1st

..3...

--3--

Respondent and there was absolutely nothing for the Petitioner to approach the CGRF or the Ombudsman either. Nevertheless, the CGRF should have passed a speaking order signed by its Chairperson and Members as stipulated in Regulation No.8.3 of KERC (CGRF & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2004. Although the impugned order is not in conformity with Regulation 8.3 of the KERC (CGRF & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2004, it is pointless to remit the case back to CGRF to pass a fresh speaking order as the request of the Appellant for the reduction of the load has already been considered and there is no grievance at all.

ORDER

In the circumstances stated above, the appeal preferred by the Appellant is rejected.

(Shaik Ahmed)
Ombudsman

1. Shri R.N.Bhosle, Shivashakti Oil Mills, Bijapur Road, Muddebihal, Bijapur District.
2. The Asst.Executive Engineer(E) O & M Sub-Division, HESCOM, Muddebihal, Bijapur District.
3. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, HESCOM, Eureka Junction II Floor, T,B,Road, Hubli-29
4. The Managing Director, HESCOM, Navanagar, P.B.road, Hubli-25
5. The General Manager, (Tech/Admn & HRD), HESCOM, Navanagar, Hubli-25
6. The Executive Engineer(Elec) O & M Division, HESCOM, Muddebihal, Bijapur District.

7. PS to Hon.Chairman / 8. PS to Hon.Member-1 / 9. PS to Hon.Member(Tech)

10. Consultant(OCA) / 11. Chairpersons of all Grievances Fora for information.