



BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

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

**PRESENT : SRI MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN**

TUESDAY THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

C.M.P. No. 03 of 2025-26

in

Appeal No. 08 of 2025-26

Between

Sri Medi Lingaiah, s/o.Narsaiah, H.No.354, Chandragiri Villas, Cherlapally,
Nalgonda District - 508 001.

..... Petitioner/Appellant

AND

1. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda Rural/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
2. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/M&P/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
4. The Accounts Assistant Officer/ERO/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
5. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
6. The Superintending Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda

..... Respondents / Respondents

This petition is coming on before me for final hearing on 16.06.2025 in the presence of petitioner/appellant and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Vidhyut Ombudsman passed the following:-

ORDER

This petition is filed by the petitioner/appellant in Appeal No. 08 of 2025-26 to review the Award passed in the said Appeal.

2. In the petition, it is, inter-alia, submitted that without testing the meter in his house, test report was created. Earlier he did not submit any proof in support of his complaint and now he is bringing the proof of his complaint. Therefore it is prayed to review the Award passed in the main appeal.

3. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, no notice to the respondents is required in the present petition.

4. The petitioner has submitted that the respondents have created the test report without testing the meter and that the respondents have forged some of the documents. Accordingly he prayed to review the Award in the appeal.

5. The points that arise for consideration are:-

- i) Whether there are sufficient grounds to review the Award in question as prayed for? and
- ii) to what relief?

Point No.(i)

6. As seen from the records, the appellant has approached the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum-I (Rural), Hyderabad with a complaint dt.20.04.2024. In the said complaint it is mentioned that since ten years i.e., from 2014 onwards he paid amounts through Demand Drafts for testing the meter, but they were misplaced by the respondents etc., He requested the respondents to change the meter and revise the bill for his domestic Service Connection, but it was not done. Accordingly, it was prayed to direct the

respondents to revise the bill.

7. The learned Forum after getting written replies from the respondents and after hearing both sides passed the Award by withdrawing an amount of Rs.5902/- on 17.08.2024. The learned Forum has directed the petitioner herein to pay the balance amount. Thereafter, the petitioner approached this Authority by filing Appeal No. 08 of 2025-26. The points raised by the petitioner herein were answered in para No.15 in the Award of the said appeal. That being the case, now the petitioner cannot re-agitate the issue in the present petition. The petitioner produced certain copies of documents and almost all such documents were produced earlier.

8. The petitioner has also submitted that the documents dt.07.11.2022 and 23.03.2023 are the forged documents. This Authority has no jurisdiction to give a finding as to whether these documents are forged or not.

9. This Authority passed an Award in Appeal No. 08 of 2025-26 and the result portion in the said appeal is as under:-

“17. In the result, the appeal is rejected confirming the Award passed by the learned Forum. The appellant is granted (4) monthly instalments to pay the arrears pending as on today as under:-

1. Rs.50,000/- on or before 15.06.2025
2. Rs.50,000/- on or before 15.07.2025
3. Rs.50,000/- on or before 15.08.2025
4. Balance due if any on or before 15.09.2025

If the appellant fails to pay any of the instalments as directed above, the respondents are at liberty to proceed against the

appellant as per law. The appellant shall continue to pay the regular bills promptly.”

10. At the cost of repetition, the points raised by the petitioner were already answered by the learned Forum and by this Authority. Regarding forgery, this Authority has no jurisdiction to investigate. In view of these factors, I hold that there are no grounds to review the Award passed in the main appeal.

Point No. (ii)

11. In the result, the petition is dismissed.

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 this the 17th day of June 2025.

Sd/-

Vidyut Ombudsman

1. Sri Medi Lingaiah, s/o.Narsaiah, H.No.354, Chandragiri Villas, Cherlapally, Nalgonda District - 508 001.
2. The Assistant Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda Rural/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
3. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
4. The Assistant Divisional Engineer/M&P/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
5. The Accounts Assistant Officer/ERO/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda

6. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda
7. The Superintending Engineer/Operation/Nalgonda/TGSPDCL/Nalgonda

