



BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

First Floor 33/11 kV Substation, Beside Hyderabad Boat Club
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

**PRESENT : SRI MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

FRIDAY THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

Appeal No. 45 of 2025-26

Between

Smt. D. Prameela Devi, w/o. Venkateshwar Rao (Late) H.No.7-91, BC Colony,
Penubally Village, Khammam District. Cell: 8886222562.

..... Appellant

AND

1. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Penubally - 8712483750.
2. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Penubally - 8712483754.
3. The Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Sathupally - 8712483816
4. The Divisional Engineer /Operation/Sathupally - 8712483728.

..... Respondents

This appeal is coming on before me for final hearing on 10.02.2026 in the presence of Sri Dharavath Naveen Nayak- authorised representative of the appellant, virtually and Sri G. Raviteja - AE/OP/Penubally, Sri S.Ramaraao-ADE/OP/Penubally, Sri B. Rajarao- AAO/ERO/Sathupally and Sri L.Ramulu - DE/OP/Sathupally for the respondents, virtually and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following Award:

AWARD

This appeal is preferred aggrieved by the Award passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum - I (Warangal), (in short 'the Forum') of Telangana State Northern Power Distribution Company Limited in C.G.No. 373 & 382/2025-26/Khammam Circle, dated 24.12.2025, rejecting the complaint.

CASE OF THE APPELLANT BEFORE THE FORUM

2. The case of the appellant is that the respondents have released the Service Connection No.3464000664 (in short “the subject Service Connection”) to the house bearing no 7-91, situated at BC Colony, Penubally in the name of her husband Sri Dharavath Venkateshwar Rao. The appellant submitted an application on 25.10.2025 for disconnection of the subject Service Connection but no action was taken by the respondents. Therefore the appellant requested for the disconnection of the subject Service Connection.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS BEFORE THE FORUM

3. In the written reply filed by respondent No.1, it is, inter-alia, submitted that basing on the application of the appellant for disconnection of the subject Service Connection he visited the house where the subject Service Connection was installed and found one Sri Dharavath Nageshwar Rao along-with his family residing in the said house.

AWARD OF THE FORUM

4. After considering the material on record and after hearing both sides the learned Forum has closed the complaint by giving specific advises to the appellant.

5. Aggrieved by the said Award of the learned Forum, the present appeal is preferred reiterating the contents of her complaint filed before the learned Forum and stating that the house bearing No.7-91 is standing in her name and she has been paying house tax for several years. The said Nageshwar Rao has no connection with the house in question and he is an intruder of the house only. Therefore it is prayed to

direct the respondents to disconnect the subject Service Connection.

WRITTEN REPLY OF THE RESPONDENTS

6. In the written reply filed by respondent No.1, before this Authority, he has reiterated the contents of his written reply filed before the learned Forum.

ARGUMENTS

7. It is submitted by the authorised representative of the appellant that the appellant is the owner of the house bearing No. 7-91 and one Nageshwar Rao is an intruder in the said house who has no connection with the said house and therefore it is prayed to direct the respondents to disconnect the subject Service connection.

8. On the other hand, the respondents have supported the impugned Award and prayed to reject the appeal.

POINTS

9. The points that arise for consideration are:-

i) Whether the appellant is entitled for the disconnection of the subject Service Connection as prayed for?

ii) Whether the impugned Award of the learned Forum is liable to be set aside?
and

iii) To what relief?

POINT Nos. (i) and (ii)

ADMITTED FACTS

10. The admitted facts are as under:-

i. The respondents have released the subject Service Connection in the name of the husband of the appellant for the house No.7-91.

- ii. One Dharavath Nageshwar Rao is in possession of the house where the subject Service Connection is installed.

SETTLEMENT BY MUTUAL AGREEMENT

11. Both the parties have appeared before this Authority virtually and physically. Efforts were made to reach a settlement between the parties through the process of conciliation and mediation. However, no settlement could be reached. The hearing, therefore, continued to provide reasonable opportunity to both the parties to put-forth their case and they were heard.

REASONS FOR DELAY IN DISPOSING OF THE APPEAL

12. The present appeal was filed on 19.01.2026 This appeal is being disposed of within the period of (60) days as required.

CRUX OF THE MATTER

13. The appellant claims that the house bearing No. 7-91, belongs to her where the subject Service Connection is installed and for the purpose of repairs etc., of the said house, she requested the respondents for the disconnection of the subject Service Connection so as to undertake such repairs etc., The respondents contend that the third-party viz., Dharavath Venkateshwar Rao is in possession of the house in question, therefore, they were unable to disconnect the subject Service Connection.

14. Now it is relevant to mention as to the grievances handled by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and the purpose of its establishment.

PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHMENT OF CGRF AND THE GRIEVANCES HANDLED BY IT

As per clause 2.32 of Regulation No.3 of 2015 of Telangana Electricity Regulatory Commission, the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum shall redress the following grievances in respect of electricity:-

- a. Non-supply
- b. Re-connection of supply after receipt of dues by Licensee
- c. Disconnection of supply
- d. Meter-related issues
- e. Billing-related issues
- f. Standards of performances related issues
- g. Change of category or change of name or address of a consumer
- h. Release of a new connection and
- i. Other issues

15. The primary role of the CGRF is to resolve the disputes arising from the distribution of electricity and other related services. It serves as a quick and cost-effective way for consumers to seek redressal without the prolonged formalities. It adjudicates the disputes in a summary way without letting any oral and documentary evidence, except perusing some important documents. CGRF has designed to address consumer grievances effectively. It has power to award compensation also. Now it is desirable to know the purpose of Civil Court.

PURPOSE OF CIVIL COURT

16. The primary purpose of Civil Court is to resolve the disputes between the parties under Civil Law. The Civil Court adjudicates disputes involving property ownership and possession and several other disputes. Civil Court deals with complex legal issues and follows stringent procedural Rules.

REAL DISPUTE

17. In the instant case, as already stated, the appellant claims that she is the owner of the house bearing No.7-91. She has admitted that one Dharavath Nageshwar Rao is in possession of the said house as an intruder. These factors indicate that there is an element of civil dispute in the present matter. Thus based on legal principles and precedents, when a third-party is in possession, whether legal or illegal and their rights to that property are disputed, the respondents or the consumer Forum cannot adjudicate such cases. It requires a detailed investigation of title and possession etc., which falls under the jurisdiction of the Civil Court. CGRF cannot adjudicate complex question of facts which require extensive evidence which are better handled by the Civil Courts. More-over when the appellant claims that one Dharavath Nageshwar Rao is an intruder, in his absence no dispute will be resolved by any Forum. As long as the monthly bills are paid as in the present case, electricity cannot be disconnected. Thus the real dispute in the present case is not disconnection of the power supply but it is in respect of property dispute. It is significant to note that the Civil Court has machinery to decide all issues including ownership and possession of the property and also in evicting the persons as illegal who are in possession of such property without any authority..

18. The tax receipts etc., filed by the appellant are not at all helpful to the appellant in the present proceedings. In view of these factors I hold that the appellant is not entitled for the disconnection of the subject Service Connection and the impugned Award is not liable to be set aside. These points are accordingly decided against the appellant and in favour of the respondents.

Point No.(iii)

19. In view of the findings on point Nos.(i) and (ii), the appeal is liable to be rejected.


RESULT

20. In the result, the appeal is rejected confirming the Award passed by the learned Forum.

A copy of this Award is made available at <https://vidyutombudsman-tserc.gov.in>.

Typed to my dictation by Office Executive cum Computer Operator, corrected and pronounced by me on the 13th day of February 2026.

**Sd/-
Vidyut Ombudsman**

- 
1. Smt. D. Prameela Devi, w/o. Venkateshwar Rao (Late) H.No.7-91, BC Colony, Penubally Village, Khammam District. Cell: 8886222562.
 2. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Penubally - 8712483750.
 3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Penubally - 8712483754.
 4. The Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Sathupally - 8712483816
 5. The Divisional Engineer /Operation/Sathupally - 8712483728.

Copy to

6. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum of TGNPDCL- Warangal, H No.2-5-58, Head post office, Nakkalaguta, Hanamkonda, Warangal.