

THE STATE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

D.H. Road & Foreshore Road Junction, Near Gandhi Square,

Ernakulam, Kerala-682 016

Ph: 0484 2346488, Mob: 8714356488

Email: ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com

**Appeal Petition No. P/054/2023
(Present A. Chandrakumaran Nair)
Dated: December-27-2023**

Appellant : Smt. Visma A, M/s Velplex Industries,
Kizhakkepuram, Varkala P.O.,
Thiruvananthapuram (Dist.)- 695310

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division,
Kerala State Electricity Board Ltd.,
Varkala, Thiruvananthapuram (Dist.).

ORDER

Background of the case

The appellant smt. Visma is a consumer to the licensee under Kedakulam electrical section, Varkala, TVM with a tariff LT IV A (3phase). The registered connected load of the appellant is 90kW and the contract demand is 99kVA for running a plywood manufacturing company. The connection was effected on 04/04/2016. The recorded demand of the appellant is regularly exceeded 100kVA which is a violation of the contract agreement. The APTS squad of the licensee inspected the consumer premises on 24/09/2022 and found that the connected load is 155.415kw which means an additional load of 65.415 was connected to the installation. The officials of the licensee called and informed that an amount of Rs. 47,450.15/- was outstanding which was not known to the consumer. The bill dated 4/02/2023 was not served to the appellant. The AE issued a letter dated 04/08/2023 stating that details of low voltage surcharge and also how this is applicable to the appellant. Aggrieved by the decision of AE, the appellant approached CGRF and CGRF issued order dated 27/09/2023 stating that the appellant is liable to pay the disputed bill. Aggrieved with the decision of the CGRF, this review petition is filed to this authority.

Arguments of the Appellant

Complainant is a consumer of electricity with consumer No 13938 under Electrical Section office, Kedakulam of the Kerala State Electricity Board. It is a plywood manufacturing unit having sanctioned connected load 99kVA. Periodical monthly electricity bills issued by the Section office after taking readings were paid by the complainant. But on 3/3/2023, the Lineman called the complainant over the telephone and informed that an additional bill dated 4/2/2023 for Rs. 47450.75 was not paid by the complainant and that the supply will be disconnected for non payment of the said bill. The complainant was never served with such a bill and therefore there was no demand to the complainant claiming such amount on 4/2/2023.

Therefore the complainant submitted a letter dated 3/3/2023 to the Assistant Engineer of the Section office. On receipt of that letter the Assistant Engineer send the copy of the said bill to the complainant through Email. In that Email and bill nothing was stated as to how the said bill was issued and what is its basis. On further enquiry, the Assistant Engineer issued a letter dated 4/3/2023. The said letter says that during the month of 2/2023, the system generated bill for Recorded Maximum Demand 108.9 KVA whereas the actual Maximum Demand recorded was 112.8 KVA. The difference of the said 3.9KVA is billed as per the subject bill. It is also stated that as per tarriff order 2022-23, the consumers who are required to avail supply at HT as per Regulation 8 of the Electricity Supply Code 2014, but availing supply at LT shall pay low voltage surcharge at the rate of Rs. 205.00 per kVA per month for LTIVA tarriff. The calculation is also narrated therein.

Being aggrieved by the above letter issued by the Assistant Engineer, the complainant approached the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Kottarakkara. Low voltage surcharge is mentioned in Regulation 9 of the Electricity Supply Code. The above provision limits the surcharge only for the respective limits of connected load. In other words the surcharge can be imposed only for the load in excess of the permitted connected load or contract demand at the rates specified by the Regulatory Commission in the tarriff order. It can never be for the entire load consumed by the consumer in particular month. This is surcharge for load exceeding the permitted load. Regulation 8 of the Supply Code stipulates that the maximum connected load for three phase 415 V is 100kVA and maximum contract demand is 100 kVA provided that the limit of connected load or contract demand specified for different supply voltage levels may be exceeded upto a maximum of twenty percent if supply at the appropriate higher voltage level is not feasible due to non availability of distribution line at such higher voltage level in that area of supply. Regulation 9 of the Supply Code says that Consumers availing supply at voltage lower than the one specified in regulation 8 for the respective limits of connected load or contract demand

shall pay the low voltage supply surcharge to the licensee at the rates as approved by the Commission from time to time in the tariff order.

The Tarriff order No 297/D(T)/2022/KSERC dated 25/6/2022 with effect from 26/6/2022 and which was in force at the time of impugned demand says in clause 12 that "The consumers who are required to avail supply at HT and above as per the Regulation 8 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014, but availing supply at LT, shall pay the low voltage surcharge at the following rates. Low voltage supply surcharge for consumers having connected load /contract demand above 100 kVA and availing supply at LT level Consumers listed under LTIV(A) category..Rs. 205/kVA/month". The Consumer Grievance Forum without considering the contents of the above statutory provisions simply quoted the statement filed by the Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Varkala and stated that "the Forum accepts the explanation submitted by the respondent" and ordered that the petitioner is liable to remit the disputed bill amount of Rs. 47453/-, to allow installment facility for remitting the amount and also directed to initiate proceedings if needed in the present situation to change the voltage level supply of the service connection to High tension in accordance with regulations. In other words there is absolutely no application of mind by the Forum to the facts, circumstances and legal aspects of the matter. The Forum failed to understand the real meaning of the Tariff order. The Tariff order directed payment of Rs. 205 /KVA/month for the excess contract demand/connected load over 100 kVA for LT three phase consumers. The Forum made it applicable for the entire connected load blindly following the words of the KSEBL Engineer without any independent application of mind.

The twenty percent excess load permitted under Rule 8 proviso was not considered by the Forum. The Forum also failed to notice that the Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission has not stated in the tariff order that the surcharge shall be computed for the entire maximum demand recorded. The Forum ought to have found that the surcharge is applicable only for the exceeded portion of the load and not for the entire load. Pursuant to the order dated 27/9/2023 issued by the CGRF, the KSE Board issued a demand RB/KDLM/CGRF OP No 19/2023/2022-23/13 dated 12/10/2023 demanding additional surcharge of Rs. 215758/- for the months 5/2023, 6/2023, 7/2023,9/2023 and 10/2023 along with the earlier demand of Rs. 47453 and threatened that supply will be disconnected if the amount is not paid within fifteen days. It is humbly submitted that supply at high voltage level is not feasible in the premises due to non availability of distribution line at such higher voltage level in that area and therefore the complainant is entitled to have an excess of twenty percent above the limit of connected load or contract demand.

The Kerala State Electricity supply Code Regulation 101 clearly says as to what is to be done when the RMD exceeds contract demand in the case of LT consumers like the Complainant under demand based tarriff. It says

that if the maximum demand recorded exceeds the contract demand in three billing periods during the previous financial year, the licensee shall issue a notice of thirty days to the consumer directing him to submit within the notice period an application for enhancement of contract demand. If the consumer is not responding within the notice period, the licensee shall enhance the contract demand of the consumer to the average of the top three readings of maximum demand shown by the maximum demand indicator (MDI) meter of the consumer during previous financial year. If the additional load can be sanctioned without augmentation or upgradation of the existing distribution system. If the distribution system is not adequate to meet the excess demand of the consumer, he shall be directed by the licensee to restrict his demand to the permissible limit till necessary upgradation works are done. The absence of a notice as prescribed under Regulation 101 clearly reveals the fact that the KSEBL is interested only in imposing surcharges on the consumer even if the consumer has exceeded the contract demand minutely.

It is humbly requested that the Ombudsman may be pleased to set aside Order dated 27/9/2023 in OP No 19/2023 of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Southern Region, Vidyuthi Bhavan, Kottarakkara and to allow this complaint.

Arguments of the Respondent

Con. No. 1145276013938 is an industrial consumer (LT IV A) under Kedakulam Electrical Section with a registered connected load of 90 kW and a contract demand of 99 KVA for the purpose of plywood manufacturing. The connection is registered in the name of Smt. Visma A, D/o Aliyaru Kunju, Valiyaveedu, Palayamkunnu. The average consumption of the consumer is as follows: main meter kWh (normal)-15100 kWh, off-peak-2270 kWh, peak-3730 kWh, kVArh(lead)-2220, kVArh (lag)-13040, RMD (normal)-113 kVA, RMD (off-peak)-71 kVA, RMD (peak)-71 kVA, and KVAh (All)-25540. Over the course of several months, the Petitioner has been observed to consistently draw power in excess of 100 kVA, thereby violating the terms of the contract demand agreement. This violation has been communicated to the Petitioner through a notice issued by the Assistant Engineer, Kedakulam, advising them to either reduce their connected load to conform to the contract demand or to opt for a High Tension (HT) connection, which would be more suitable for the excess load.

On 24-09-2022, the APT Squad, Thiruvananthapuram, inspected the consumer's premises and found 155.415 kW connected load there. That is, 65.415 kW additional load connected as unauthorized. Moreover, the consumer violated the contract demand agreement. The RMD has exceeded the contract demand (99 kVA) continuously for several billing periods, and the connected load exceeded the sanctioned load (90 kW). Despite the Licensee's notice and multiple communications, the Petitioner has chosen not to comply with the terms of the notice and has refused to either limit the

connected load or opt for an HT connection. In response to the continuous violation of the contract demand agreement, the Licensee issued a low voltage surcharge bill to the Petitioner, as authorized by the relevant regulations, to account for the excess load. However, the Petitioner has not remitted the surcharge bill within the specified time frame.

In pursuit of a resolution, the Petitioner, unsatisfied with the surcharge bill and the Licensee's actions, filed a petition before the Chairperson of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) in Kottarakkara, seeking a resolution to the dispute. The CGRF, after thorough consideration, rendered a decision in favor of the Licensee, affirming the Licensee's position in the matter. Regulation 9 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014 pertains to the Low Voltage (LV) surcharge that may be levied on certain categories of consumers who have a connected load exceeding a specified limit. The LV surcharge is levied to compensate the Distribution Licensee for the additional costs incurred in supplying electricity at a low voltage. The amount of LV surcharge and the conditions for its levy are determined by the Distribution Licensee and approved by the Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission.

According to the contract demand agreement, the load allotted to the consumer is 99 KVA. **Regulation 11 (2) of the Supply Code 2014**, The maximum contract demand permissible for low tension consumer who avails power under demand based metering shall be 100 kVA, irrespective of his connected load. As per **Regulation 8 of the Supply Code 2014**, the maximum allowable contract demand for a 3-phase supply voltage of 415 volts is limited to 100 kVA. However, the consumer has been using more than the allotted load for over a year without renewing the contract demand agreement. Hence, under **Regulation 9 of the Supply Code 2014**, the licensee is allowed to levy a low voltage surcharge on the consumer at the rate approved by the Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission. The RMD for the month of January 2023 is 112.8 KVA. When the bill for the said month was prepared in the OrumaNet software on 4/2/23, the demand charge was only for 108.9 KVA. The issued bill is for the excess demand charge of 3.9 KVA to be billed for the month of 01/23, as well as the low voltage surcharge for the months of December 2022 and January 2023. It is important to note that the previous month's electricity bill is prepared for the next month. However, the consumer has misunderstood that the bill date mentioned in the bill is for the energy consumption month. As it was realized that the consumer did not receive the said bill, up to 28/03/2023 was given to the consumer to pay the low voltage surcharge. On the basis of this, the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Kedakulam served low voltage surcharge bill dated 4/2/23 of Rs 47450.75 to the consumer.

During the month of 01/2023 (from 1/1/2023 to 31/1/2023), the Orumanet software generated bill for RMD 108.9 kVA whereas the actual RMD for the period was 112.8 kVA. The difference of the said 3.9 kVA is the billed as per the bill issued on 04/2/2023. It is also stated that as per the

tariff order 2022-23, the consumer who are required to avail supply at HT as per the **Regulation 8 of the Supply Code 2014**, but availing supply at LT shall pay low voltage surcharge at the rate of Rs. 205/- per KVA per month for LT IV A tariff. The low voltage surcharge is not levied for excess kVA. It is imposed only when the voltage level in the distribution network is below the prescribed limits. The surcharge is usually based on the extent of deviation from the prescribed voltage level and is determined by the Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission (KSERC) in accordance with the guidelines provided in the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014. Hence denied the contention of the petitioner. As per **Regulation 8 of the Supply Code 2014**, the maximum connected load for three phase 415 V is 100 kVA. Provided that the limit of connected load or contract demand specified for different supply voltage levels may be exceeded up to a maximum of twenty percent if supply at the appropriate higher voltage level is not feasible due to non-availability of distribution line at such higher voltage level in that area of supply. In this case the 11kV supply and transformer are in the compound of the petitioner. Hence the contention of the petitioner is denied.

The **Regulation 9 of the Supply Code 2014** is that consumers availing supply at voltage lower than the one specified in regulation 8 for the respective limits of connected load or contract demand shall pay the low voltage supply surcharge to the licensee at the rates as approved by the Commission from time to time in the tariff order. Hence denied. The proviso of **Regulation 8 of the Supply Code 2014**, is that the limit of connected load or contract demand specified for different supply voltage levels may be exceeded up to a maximum of twenty percent if supply at the appropriate higher voltage level is not feasible due to non-availability of distribution line at such higher voltage level in that area of supply. In this case the 11kV supply and transformer are in the compound of the petitioner. The low voltage surcharge is not levied for excess kVA. It is imposed only when the voltage level in the distribution network is below the prescribed limits. The surcharge is usually based on the extent of deviation from the prescribed voltage level and is determined by the Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission (KSERC) in accordance with the guidelines provided in the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014. Hence denied the contention of the petitioner.

As per the order of the Chair person of CGRF, the consumer is liable to remit the dispute bill and hence served a notice to the consumer. The petitioner has raised concerns about the non-availability of high voltage supply in their area and has requested an excess of 20% above the limit of the connected load. It is crucial to clarify that the 11kV/415V transformer responsible for supplying LT power to the consumer is installed on the consumer's premises. Consequently, the assertion that 11 kV supply is unavailable at the consumer's premises is inaccurate. The petitioner submitted an application to switch to an HT connection in the Kedakulam section. Subsequently, on 11/07/23, the licensee served a demand notice to

the consumer for the HT connection and for makes the payment. However, as of the time of this statement, the payment for the HT connection has not been remitted by the consumer. The licensee maintain that the petitioner's argument regarding the unavailability of 11 kV supply and the excess load request may not be entirely valid given the presence of the HT power supply and the outstanding payment for the requested HT connection. In light of the above facts that the petitioner's appeal may not accurately represent the situation and hence denied.

The **Regulation 99 (5) of the Supply Code 2014** If the enhancement of load is feasible, the consumer shall:-

(a) pay additional security deposit, expenditure for alteration of service line and apparatus, if any, required to be made, and the cost to be borne by the consumer for modification for distribution system if any, within fifteen days of receipt of the demand note; and

(b) execute a supplementary agreement;

Regulation 99 (6) If the consumer pays the required charges and executes a supplementary agreement, the licensee shall execute the work of modification of the distribution system, service line or meter and other apparatus within the time line specified under regulation 85, mutatis mutandis, and sanction the additional contract demand or connected load.

It is evident that the petitioner has repeatedly violated the contract demand agreement by consistently drawing power exceeding the agreed limit of 99 KVA, reaching up to 113 kVA. This action directly contravenes Regulation 8 of the Supply Code 2014, which specifies a maximum load of 100 kVA for LT consumers. Despite being duly notified to either reduce their load below 100 KVA or switch to an HT connection, the consumer has failed to comply with this request. Therefore, the licensee is fully within their rights to collect a low voltage surcharge from the consumer as per the terms of the agreement and in accordance with relevant regulations.

All the above mentioned facts are true to the best of my knowledge and belief. The consumer has not yet regularised the connected load also the RMD seen more than 99 KVA, the contract demand as per the agreement. As the contract demand exceeds 100 kVA, the consumer should be converted to HT category. Hence it is humbly prayed that the appeal may be set aside in favour of the KSEBL, to pay the outstanding amount in respect of the low voltage surcharges.

Counter arguments of the Appellant

Low voltage surcharge is mentioned in Regulation 9 of the Electricity Supply Code. The above provision limits the surcharge only for the respective limits of connected load. In other words the surcharge can be imposed only for the load in excess of the permitted connected load or

contract demand at the rates specified by the Regulatory Commission in the tariff order. It can never be for the entire load consumed by the consumer in particular month. Regulation 9 of the Supply Code says that Consumers availing supply at voltage lower than the one specified in regulation 8 for the respective limits of connected load or contract demand shall pay the low voltage supply surcharge to the licensee at the rates as approved by the Commission from time to time in the tariff order.

The Tariff order No 297/D(T)/2022/KSERC dated 25/6/2022 with effect from 26/6/2022 and which was in force at the time of impugned demand says in clause 12 that "The consumers who are required to avail supply at HT and above as per the Regulation 8 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014, but availing supply at LT, shall pay the low voltage surcharge at the following rates. Low voltage supply surcharge for consumers having connected load /contract demand above 100 kVA and availing supply at LT level Consumers listed under LT IV(A) category Rs. 205/kVA/month". A reading of the above order of the KSERC reveals the fact that the surcharge is applicable only for voltages over and above the sanctioned load (in the case of complainant---99kVA).

But unfortunately the surcharge is now imposed in the impugned demands for the entire load of the consumer. Why the consumer has to pay the surcharge for permitted load is a valuable question for the licensee to answer. But in their counter statement, the licensee is silent with regard to this specific point. . It is crystal clear from the order of the KSERC that the low voltage surcharge is applicable only for voltage above 100kVA in the case of the consumer. The licensee justifies the imposition of the surcharge on the basis of the provisions of the Supply Code 2014. The very same Supply Code contains Regulation 101 which is also liable to be followed by the licensee. Regulation 101 clearly says as to what is to be done when the RMD exceeds contract demand in the case of LT consumers like the Complainant under demand based tariff. It says that if the maximum demand recorded exceeds the contract demand in three billing periods during the previous financial year, the licensee shall issue a notice of thirty days to the consumer directing him to submit within the notice period an application for enhancement of contract demand. If the consumer is not responding within the notice period, the licensee shall enhance the contract demand of the consumer to the average of the top three readings of maximum demand shown by the maximum demand indicator (MDI) meter of the consumer during previous financial year If the additional load can be sanctioned without augmentation or upgradation of the existing distribution system. It is also clearly mandated in Regulation 153 of the Electricity Supply Code that the licensee can only take steps to regularise the additional load or collect the demand charges for recorded maximum demand if the same exceeds the permitted levels.

The licensee is not performing its statutory duty whereas they are imposing low voltage surcharge on the entire voltage of the consumer

contrary to existing laws. 9. For these and other reasons to be submitted at the time of hearing it is most humbly prayed that the this appeal may be allowed.

Analysis and findings

The hearing of the case was conducted on 12/12/2023 at 03:30 p.m. in the office of the Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd., Kazhakuttam, Thiruvananthapuram(Dist.). The hearing was attended by the appellant's representative Sri. Muhamed Rafees A., and the respondent Sri. Sharaf B., AEE, Electrical Sub Division, Varkala.

The appellant availed an Industrial connection from the licensee for the purpose of running a plywood manufacturing company. The connected load registered is 90kW and the contract demand was 99kVA. It is stated by the respondent that the monthly recorded demand exceeds the contract demand regularly and accordingly they issued letter to the appellant to change the power supply from LT to HT. But the first correspondence seen in this regard is the letter dated 04/03/2023. The APTS inspection was conducted on 24/09/2022 and the site mahazzer prepared which shows that the connected load is 155.415 kW which is almost 65kW above the registered connected load. It is noted that no action have been initiated from the section officials either to enhance the contract demand or to restricted connected load to keep the demand within the contract demand. The first notice has been served to the consumer only on 04/03/2023 which after the lapse of 5½ months in spite of the APTS inspection and knowing the connected load.

Here the contention of the appellant was they are not served with the low voltage surcharge bill dated 04/02/2023, and came to know only when the officials of the licensee enquired about the pending payment. It is the responsibility of the officials of the section to issue the demand notice in time and also specify the detail in it as per section 122 and 123 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014.

The demand notice for Rs. 47,453/- has been sent to the appellant on 04/03/2023 which includes the demand changes for the excess demand over the contract demand and the low voltage surcharge for the months of 01/2023 & 02/2023. Subsequent to the CGRF order and the demand notice demanding Rs. 1,68,305/- the low voltage surcharge for a period from 03/2023 to 10/2023 has also been issued. Then the total amount outstanding is Rs. 2,15,758/-.

The Section 8 of the Supply Code clearly spelt about the maximum connected load/contract demand for different supply voltage levels.

Section 8 *“The supply voltage levels for different connected loads or contract demands for new connections or for gross connected load or contract*

demand consequent to revision of connected load or contract demand, shall be as follows:-

Provided that the limit of connected load or contract demand specified for different supply voltage levels may be exceeded up to a maximum of twenty percent if supply at the appropriate higher voltage level is not feasible due to non availability of distribution line at such higher voltage level in that area of supply.

Provided further that the limits of connected load or contract demand specified for different supply voltage levels as specified above may be exceeded in exceptional cases with the approval of the Commission, subject to the conditions stipulated in such approval”.

The Section 9 of the Supply Code states about the low voltage surcharge.

Section 9 “Consumers availing supply at voltage lower than the one specified in regulation 8 for the respective limits of connected load or contract demand shall pay the low voltage supply surcharge to the licensee at the rates as approved by the Commission from time to time in the tariff order”.

The Section 11(2) of the Supply Code-2014 also describes that the maximum contract demand permissible for low tension consumer who avails power under demand based metering shall be 100 kVA irrespective of his connected load.

The question raised by the appellant is that contract demand of 20% excess is permitted if the higher voltage line is not feasible due to non availability of distribution system. Here the respondent is very clear that the HT line extension is feasible in this area. Even then the consumer is not exempted from paying the low voltage surcharge. The second question is whether low voltage surcharge is applicable for the entire recorded demand or only the portion exceeding the contract demand. When the contract demand exceeded 100kVA, the low voltage surcharge is applicable for whole recorded demand and note the exceeded the contract demand.

The Section 101 Supply Code states about the annual review of the contract demand and Suo moto enhancement.

101(1) “In the case of HT and EHT connections, if the maximum demand recorded exceeds the contract demand in three billing periods during the previous financial year, the licensee shall issue a notice of thirty days to the consumer directing him to submit within the notice period, an application for enhancement of contract demand”.

101(2) “If there is no response from the consumer by the end of the notice period, the licensee shall enhance the contract demand of the consumer to the average of the top three readings of maximum demand shown by the

maximum demand indicator (MDI) meter of the consumer during the previous financial year, if the additional load can be sanctioned without augmentation or upgradation or uprating of the distribution system”.

101(3) “In the case of LT consumers under demand based tariff, similar review and consequential process shall be carried out”.

101(4) “Consequent to enhancing the contract demand, applicable charges shall be collected from the consumer and the consumer shall be directed to execute supplementary agreement if required”.

The above Section is vividly explain when such enhancements happened in the consumer premises, the officials have to intimate in writing and the suo moto enhancement of the contract demand. Here, in this case, this is not been complied with. Further even after the inspection of APTS, the officials are very clear about the increase in connected load. It seems no action has been taken to regularize the connected load and to enhance the contract demand. This is to be viewed very seriously.

In the hearing, the respondent was mentioned the appellant has applied for HT connection and was sanctioned. The line extensions would be completed by the licensee on completing the works which are to be executed by the licensee.

Decision

On verifying the documents submitted and hearing both the petitioner and respondent and also from the analysis as mentioned above, the following decision are hereby taken.

1. The appellant is liable to pay the low voltage surcharge when the recorded demand exceeds the contract demand as per the tariff order of the KSEERC for the entire recorded demand.
2. The appellant has to shift the service connection from LT to HT for getting more reliable power supply.
3. The licensee may enquire why the delay occurred for the officials in intimating the consumer and also raising the bill in time.
4. No order on cost.

ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

No. P/054/2023/ dated: 27/12/2023

Delivered to:

1. Smt. Visma A, M/s Velplex Industries, Kizhakkepuram, Varkala P.O., Thiruvananthapuram (Dist.)- 695310.
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Kerala State Electricity Board Ltd., Varkala, Thiruvananthapuram (Dist.).

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, Vydhyuthi Bhavanam, KSE Board Ltd, Kottarakkara - 691 506.