

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
AMRAVATI ZONE, AMRAVATI**

'Vidyut Bhavan', Shivaji Nagar, Amravati: 444603, Tel. No. 0721 2551158

Order

Dt. 17.02.2018

Case No. 20/2017

In the matter of grievance pertaining to non release of IP connection.

Quorum

**Dr. Vishram Nilkanth Bapat, Chairman
Sau. Sushama Joshi, Member (CPO)**

In the matter of

**Shri Shaikh Usman Shaikh Khalil
Survey No 114, Navsari Chowk , Amravati**

Complainant

.....Vs.....

**The Executive Engineer
MSEDCL, Urban Division, Amravati.**

Respondent

Appearances:-

Complainant Representative:-

Shri Ashish Subhash Chandarana

Respondent Representative:-

**Shri. S.A.Mali Executive Engineer , Amravati Urban Dn.
Shri.R.S. Malasane Add.Ex.Engineer,Amravati U I S/Dn.**

Being aggrieved by non-release of the already approved connection after consistent follow up and representation to various authorities of NA MSEDCL including Superintending Engineer, Amravati and Regional Director, Nagpur, the complainant approached CGRF under clause 6.2 of MERC CGRF OMBUDSMAN Regulation 2006 for redressal of his grievance on dt.20/12/2017 and filed his complaint which is registered as Case no.20/2017.

As per Complainant's complaint before Forum, Complainant submitted that:-

1) The applicant applied for industrial connection on 7.7.2017 to N.A. MSEDCL. After the due procedural compliance as per the norms in effect, the N.A. MSEDCL sanctioned estimate and load for the said connection vide letter dt 15.7.2017 (Annexure A-3).

- 2) The applicant initiated the erection work under the supervision of NA MSEDCL officials. This work went on during 22.8.2017 to 3.9.2017. Electrical inspector was called upon for inspection of the installation. The Electrical Inspector, Government of Maharashtra accorded approval to the electrical installation for connection and to subsequent charging of the installation vide their letter dated 4.9.2017.
- 3) Complainant claims that despite of his continuous purusal from 4.9.2017, NA MSEDCL kept delaying the release of connection without any formal communication whatsoever.
- 4) NA MSEDCL issued letter dt. 16.9.2017 to the applicant asking for NOC from Mahanagarpalika, Amravati sighting the objection letter dt. 31.7.2017 received from Orchid City International School, Amravati in respect of releasing this connection. In that context, NA MSEDCL claimed that the complainant misled MSEDCL about the jurisdiction and zone (green / yellow) under which the site in question falls. Therefore MSEDCL asked the complainant to submit NOC from Mahanagarpalika, Amravati in respect of setting up the industry on this site. The applicant denies the charge of misleading MSEDCL in any way and claimed that MSEDCL officers are lying on the facts. Complainant also challenged NA MSEDCL to produce evidence of his misleading them.
- 5) The complainant pleaded that the said site is in agriculture zone (Annexure A-7) and Maharashtra State Government has permitted setting up Agro-based industries in agriculture zone vide amended provisions of MRTPC act (Annexure A-8).
- 6) Complainant submitted that he received letter from NA MSEDCL dtd.16/09/2017 stating that he had made submission that land for sanctioned connection is not within Amravati Mahanagar Palika jurisdiction which was denied by complainant in total. In this context he added that he had submitted letter of Asst.Town Planner of Amravati Mahanagar Palika for Green Zone of his land. Also the Competent Authority of NA MSEDCL accorded approval to his proposed 148 HP IP Connection as per SOP Regulation in force on 15/07/2017 which clearly establishes the jurisdiction of land as Mahanagar Palika. Letter of NA MSEDCL dt.16/09/2017 was responded to by Complainant with facts and gave show cause notice cum opportunity for rectifying the discrepancies in service which is still unanswered from NA.
- 7) It is submitted that act of non release of sanctioned electric IP connection by NA MSEDCL on the basis of third party complaint without giving the opportunity to complainant of being heard is arbitrary, unlawful and is against the principle of natural justice and also not as per provision of law. Moreover it is not in the interest of service providing company like MSEDCL to stop its sell of electricity with cross subsidy loaded tariff category by the wrongful and biased action of officers of NA MSEDCL. The delay in release of sanctioned connection may result in heavy financial loss to Applicant and may even lead to bankruptcy as he has invested huge amount in setting up ginning

industry after due sanction of power supply to his industry for which MSEDCL will be solely responsible.

8) Complainant pointed out that NA MSEDCL released power supply to school in green zone belonging to objection raising party in release of power supply to Industry which is permitted activity in green zone and same is denied to Complainant Applicant in present case which shows their intention to suit their desired purpose. Also it is alleged that NA MSEDCL managed to inward Complaint of neighbouring school owner in back date as 31/07/2017 to suit their purpose of denial of power supply. Record in this indicates that work of erection of infrastructure for connection was under construction from 22/08/2017 i.e. from date of sanction of electrical drawing by State Government, Date of procurement of transformer was 30/08/2017 and date of permission of Electrical Inspector was 04/09/2017 with work of erection was done under supervision of NA MSEDCL . So why NA MSEDCL allowed to carry out the work if they had received the complaint on 31/07/2017 and kept mum upto 16/09/2017. Thus it is very clear that concerned officials of NA MSEDCL are inclined to favour Complainant's neighbour and are trying to compel the complainant to sell the land to school management by the act of non providing sanctioned IP Connection to Applicant .

Complainant submitted that season of cotton is going on and any further delay in release of connection would cause again great financial loss to him. So he requested to issue interim relief in present case with prayer before Forum as below;

- i) Direct NA MSEDCL to release power supply immediately to Applicant as an interim relief
- ii) Direct NA MSEDCL to pay interest @ 10.80 p.a. on the entire capital investment incurred on his project as certified by his C.A. with liberty to MSEDCL to recover the same from guilty officer if so guilty found read with principles laid down by Hon.ble Apex Court in the matter of Lucknow Development Authority Vs. M.K.Gupta
- iii) Any other relief to applicant consumer which Hon.ble CGRF may deem fit considering facts and circumstances of the case to meet the justice including cost Rs 20000/-

In response to present complaint and notice of CGRF, Amravati Zone dt. 26/12/2017 to Non Applicant MSEDCL to file their reply, Non Applicant MSEDCL in its written statement dtd.10/01/2018 before Forum submitted that :-

1) Applicant submitted application for 148 HP Industrial Connection at S.No 114, Navsari on dt 07/07/2017 without NOC of Local Governing Body and Maharashtra Pollution Control Board to MSEDCL. But as per affidavit submitted by applicant and Departmental letter No 309 dt.08/06/2017, application is processed to make power

supply available easily. Accordingly estimate is sanctioned on dt 14/07/2017 and load sanctioned on 15/07/2017.

2) As per affidavit submitted by applicant it was admitted fact that NOC of Amravati Mahanagar Palika is not available with him and if any consequences occurred regarding ownership of land where supply required, MSEDCL will disconnect the supply of his Industrial connection and in that case he will be the sole responsible for any mental / financial loss. And on the base of affidavit submitted by applicant, power supply to his Industrial connection is sanctioned.

3) Meanwhile MSEDCL received complaint from Director, Orchid City International School, Amravati regarding illegal construction of Ginning Industry under complaint in Amravati Mahanagar Palika jurisdiction and raised objection on electrical supply to said Industry. Accordingly applicant has been informed about said complaint and asked him to submit NOC of Mahanagar Palika with instructions to stop the work of erection of electrical network. Work was stopped by Agency for a month and then completed without information and supervision of MSEDCL and obtained permission from Electrical Inspector, Amravati.

4) Legal advice has been asked from Assistant Law Officer in respect of complaint under reference and release of power supply on 06/09/2017. Assistant Law Officer issued guidelines vide letter dt 12/09/2017 that power supply shall be released after submission of NOC of Local Governing Body.

5) Accordingly applicant was asked to submit NOC of Amravati Mahanagar Palika vide letter dt 20/09/2017. But up to date, applicant had not submitted NOC of Amravati Mahanagar Palika and hence as per terms and conditions in affidavit, supply to Industrial Unit of applicant is not released.

6) It is not deliberate delay from MSEDCL side in release of power supply but as applicant could not comply submission of mandatory document as NOC of Local Governing Body, the N.A. has not released the supply. It humbly submits before Forum that application is processed for sanction without sufficient documents so as to release the power supply immediately after submission of necessary documents but as per legal provision supply will be released after submission of NOC of Amravati Mahanagar Palika.

During hearing before Forum, learned representative for complainant Shri Ashish Chandarana elaborated complaint as under:-

Complainant submitted that Executive Engineer, Amravati Urban Division vide his letter dt. 07/07/2017 clearly mentioned complete case papers for processing of application and as per (Electricity Supply Code And Other Conditions Of Supply) Regulations, 2005, Regulation 5.1, After a Distribution Licensee receives a duly

completed application containing all necessary information/documents in accordance with Regulation 4.1, the Distribution Licensee shall send its Authorised Representative to survey the site for giving power supply that means documentation submission procedure from Applicant side was completed and hence accordingly NA MSEDCL had sanctioned 148 HP IP connection to Applicant in accordance with provision of sanction of load in force and issued demand note for payment dt 15/07/2017 without stating any condition and asking for any required documents. Hence accordingly Applicant paid the necessary charges, started the sanctioned work and completed under information and supervision of NA MSEDCL. After receiving permission on 04/09/2017 from Electrical Inspector, Amravati for charging the electrical network after due verification for safety, Applicant requested to charge the same and release his sanctioned power supply but NA MSEDCL refused it on the basis of third party complaint as referred in written submission. Also he argued all points mentioned in written submission elaborately and stated that this undue delay in releasing connection is only due to political pressure on concerned officials of NA MSEDCL. He submitted that NA MSEDCL adopted all the necessary steps for releasing connection such as sanctioning, issuing demand note, issuing letter for transformer testing, transformer testing and supervision of work etc. but with interference of local politician, NA MSEDCL created hurdles in releasing connection and to avoid any departmental action they preferred to take the advantage of advice of law officer after lapse of time. Also NA issued letter to Applicant on 06/09/2017 whereas advice of law officer was received to NA vide letter dt.12/09/2017. Applicant presented letter of Regional Director, Nagpur dt.08/06/2017 for release of connection without NOC. He submitted internal correspondence between Addl. Executive Engineer and Executive Engineer in present case pointing out interference of local MLA and discussion thereof. He also submitted permission of Maharashtra Pollution Control Board, Amravati as one of the mandatory documents for release of connection. All documents as referred are on record. Also as estimate for said connection is sanctioned by NA MSEDCL in NON DDF/CC & RF head, its estimated amount / incurred amount is termed as advance payment of electricity bill of prospective electric connection as per norms of NA . Also season of ginning industry under operation is as good as finished. So with all facts and documents made available by Applicant, it is very clear that undue delay is happened in releasing connection to Applicant. Hence it is requested by Complainant to issue interim order before passing final order.

Executive Engineer Shri S.M.Mali and Addl. Executive Engineer Shri R.S.Malasane on behalf of NA MSEDCL replied on complaint with fact as;-

Shri S.M.Mali submitted his oral submission in line with written statement . Additionally he submitted that as referred by Complainant's Representative GTP and Material inspection is regular process in releasing any connection and carried out

subject to terms and conditions of affidavit submitted by applicant and it was done in good sense. As complaint received from neighbour regarding release of connection to Industrial Unit of applicant without permission of Amravati Municipal Corporation, then legal advice in that matter was asked to legal cell in department and as per legal advice, NOC of Local Governing Body that is Amravati Mahanagar Palika is asked to applicant. He submitted that the present CGRF had issued order to submit NOC of Amravati Mahanagar Palika to take the advantage of IP tariff category in Case No 16 of 2017. Also he added that facts and circumstances in the matter of Lucknow Development Authority Vs. M.K.Gupta were different to that of present case, hence decision in said case is not applicable to present case as no deliberate pendency is occurred at any stage of release of connection to applicant and now also is ready to release it with immediate effect provided applicant submits NOC of Amravati Mahanagar Palika which is mandatory document in present case.

Shri R.S.Malasane in addition to above added that meaning of "complete case papers" as referred by Complainant's Representative is not to be taken as he explained as it is a part of language of official correspondence. Applicant had obtained permission of Electrical Inspector, Amravati at his own risk with the instructions of stoppage of work from MSEDCL to him. MSEDCL did not call Electrical Inspector for inspection and hence question of completion of work under supervision of MSEDCL does not arrive at all. Applicant and concerned agency completed the work of erection of electrical network without information of MSEDCL. In reference to letter from MSEDCL to applicant dt 06/09/2017 and intention thereof, it is submitted that matter was getting delayed and hence with due discussion and conformation with Asst. Law Officer, NOC of Amravati Mahanagar Palika was asked vide letter dt 06/09/2017 and letter to that effect from Asst. Law Officer was issued on 12/09/2017 and nothing is wrong in this. Also it is denied that complaint from Orchid School was managed to record it on back date on 31/07/2017 and it can be verified from record. He further submitted that work was stopped by applicant after getting instructions from MSEDCL but later on it had been completed by his own. He requested Forum for not taking internal correspondence on record as referred by Complainant's Representative. He further added that there is no malafide intention in total process as issue of NOC of Local Governing Body is mandatory requirement as per regulation for release of connection to Industrial Unit and hence asked to applicant for its submission.

NA MSEDCL filed additional supplemental written statement before Forum vide letter No.448 dt 30/01/2018 in line with written statement as before and oral submission as above. Additionally it is submitted that applicant approached to CGRF without going to IGRC as per regulation 6.2 of MERC CGRF & OMBUDSMAN Regulation 2006 with sufficient time in his hand and hence he adopted wrong practice for filing his complaint. Also decision in Case

No 16 of 2017 of present Forum had referred for want of NOC of Mahanagar Palika for categorisation of Ip tariff to then consumer. Further decision of Hon'ble High Court Of Bombay, Nagpur in PIL No 70/2017 is cited with remark as Electric connection should not be released in Municipal Corporation Area without its Occupancy certificate. And hence NA MSEDCL shall not be held responsible for any loss occurred to applicant as he completed his work at his own risk by knowing all facts. Written statement and annexures are on record so requested to please arrange to issue suitable orders in present case.

After submission of supplementary written statement and oral submission by NA MSEDCL ,Complainant,s Representative objected on late submission of written supplemental statement by NA MSEDCL and submitted that it has to be submitted with prior information of him so that he could have submit his reply to Hon.ble Forum. Though also he is submitting his oral reply on most of the issue raised by NA MSEDCL. Complainant's Representative in his oral submission after filing written supplemental statement by NA MSEDCL submitted that :-

Issue of Occupancy Certificate as referred in decision of Hon'ble High Court Of Bombay,Nagpur in PIL No 70/2017 for release of electrical connection is not related with Industrial connection and facts were different in that case. It was case of electrical fatal accident and death of children due to electrical line and hence Safety issue was main concern. In that effect applicant had already obtained permission for charging of line from Electrical Inspector who is the competent authority in safety issue. He stressed on the issue that as per Executive Engineer's submission that complaint for illegal construction of applicant received on 31.07.2017 then why he informed to applicant so late by 06.09.2017 and meanwhile why he inspected the material for said work. He could have informed to Electrical Inspector also but not. Again he pointed out (Electricity Supply Code And Other Conditions Of Supply) Regulations, 2005, Regulation 5.1, for processing of application. He added that NA MSEDCL consistently changing its stand on this issue such as yellow zone information, submission of NOC of Amravati Mahanagar Palika which are irrelevant for releasing the electrical connection to Industrial Ginning unit of applicant. He submitted on the issue of not following correct practice for filing grievance before CGRF without going to IGRC as per regulation 6.2 of MERC CGRF OMBUDSMAN Regulation 2006 that he already informed to all concerned officials of NA MSEDCL but could not obtain remedial action on it and hence approached to Hon'ble CGRF. Complainant's Representative aggressively submitted that NA MSEDCL could not take selective stand on the decision of Hon'ble High Court Of Bombay, Nagpur in PIL No 70/2017 and requested

Hon'ble Forum to ask the NA MSEDCL for submission of list of connections released after said decision. He concluded with the request that he will file his written reply on supplemental written submission of NA MSEDCL within 48 hours before Forum.

In the written reply submitted by the complainant on 02.01.2018, he submits that, NA MSEDCL did not come with clean hand as it had submitted additional submission in mid of hearing after aggressive submission by complainant, to mislead the Hon'ble Forum. Complainant submits that any submission except citations or written note of argument should have come on record after serving due advance copies to applicant or the NA as the case may be. He stressed on the dishonest intention of additional submission from NA MSEDCL and prayed for adverse finding against concerned. NA MSEDCL could have submitted it before Forum on 30.01.2018 by email with information to Applicant as it had prepared on 30.01.2018 or at the beginning of hearing. This clearly indicates the dishonest intention of NA MSEDCL and it seems that NA MSEDCL comes with the strategy that additional statement should be submitted if only their functioning under political pressure is exposed. He reproduced Regulation 6.13 of MERC CGRF & EO Regulation 2006 for procedure of reply submission from both sides which is on record. Hence any submission in violation to regulation is unlawful. Still applicant is submitting his reply on additional submission of NA MSEDCL as :-

Regarding to working of the higher authority of NA as a Member Secretary is objected before MERC and hence it is not appropriate to reiterate it before Forum. He pointed out provisions of regulation 5.1 and 5.4 of (Electricity Supply Code And Other Conditions Of Supply) Regulations, 2005, for processing of application and time of demanding any outstanding documents from applicant for release of connection if necessary. Thus as NA MSEDCL neither asked any documents with demand note of charges nor during execution of work of erection of line, now NA MSEDCL can not ask any further documents and applicant had made investment of 10-11 lakh on account of MSEDCL obligation as it is as per directives of NA MSEDCL. NA MSEDCL issued letter on 06.09.2017 after permission of Electrical Inspector on 04.09.2017. This clearly shows that work had completed and investment made in that is as per approval of NA MSEDCL and hence the responsibility lies with NA MSEDCL. The justification in delayed information to Applicant have no correlation as referred by NA. Also it is submitted that affidavit submitted by applicant is regarding any legality of ownership of his land which is not the case here. Regarding accepting complaint of neighbourer on back date was his view as NA MSEDCL did not inform applicant till 06.09.2017 and also NA MSEDCL had produced extract of inward register which is not certified hence not acceptable. Applicability of decision in Lucknow Development Authority Vs. M.K.Gupta is elaborated in present case by citing regulation 5 of (Electricity Supply Code And

Other Conditions Of Supply) Regulations, 2005, with fixing responsibility of concern officials of NA MSEDCL for demanding additional documents at the time of demand note for charges, producing sample letter of load sanction of Amravati Circle asking some documents (Annx.R2) and observations of Hon'ble High Court, Nagpur bench in WP No 4297 of 2014 (Annx.R3) which are on record. He justify filing of his complaint before CGRF without going to IGRC with the provision of regulation 6.2 of MERC CGRF OMBUDSMAN Regulation 2006 and MERC practice directions in this context (Annx.R4) as applicant had approached to authorities which is deemed to be a approach to IGRC as per above. He submitted that decision on referred decision by present CGRF for IP tariff categorisation was different case as it was case of tariff applicable and additional facts are brought on record which can give new angle. He submits that senior officer of the rank of Executive Engineer of NA MSEDCL is trying to mislead the Forum by producing selective portion of Interim Orders of Hon'ble High Court to suit their desired purpose whereas there are bunch of interim directions are given in the said case prior to that particular order in the PIL No 70/2017 and which cannot be read in isolation. Also the matter is related to Nagpur city with its 141 constructions exposed to threat of electrical accident and suo moto cognizance of Hon'ble High Court with death of 2 childrens due to electrical accident and is on record . Also he submitted the Daily news paper The Hitwada dt 03.02.2018 showing that the issue is related to Nagpur city only and is on record. This shows the ill intention of NA . And He submits that Member Secretary must recuse himself from the decision making process of this case as per the correspondence with MERC on record and prays to record suitable adverse observation against concerned authorities for making misleading submission by means of supplementary submission at the time of hearing with expectation that matter shall be decided on the basis of false information.

After going through the documents placed on record, arguments advanced by both the parties in present matter, verifying and analyzing the facts, the Forum had to answer on following points before going to decide the present case .

1) Registration and hearing of complaint :- As objected by NA MSEDCL and justified by Applicant the Registration and hearing of complaint the Forum had the clear cut reason for Registration and hearing of present complaint read with regulation 6.2 , 6.4 and 6.7 of Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations,2006 .

2) Submission of written statement, documents during hearing :- As NA MSEDCL submitted additional statement during hearing without prior information to applicant and same is objected by applicant, it has to be made clear that suitable order has to be passed after hearing all the issues on merit for natural justice to concern parties and hence allowed in view of inherent powers of the Forum with further time for

submission to applicant on the points raised by Non Applicant. However, the Forum is of the view that the nodal officer of the N.A. MSEDCL being a responsible authority, should not have violated the fundamental procedure laid down by MERC regarding submission of reply to CGRF.

With this and details of written/oral submission from both the parties, provisions and decisions cited, the Forum is of the opinion that

- 1) Application for power supply to Industrial Ginning Unit at survey no 114, Navsari for 148 HP on dt 07/07/2017 without NOC of Local Governing Body and Maharashtra Pollution Control Board was submitted by applicant to MSEDCL with affidavit for legal issue of ownership of land and responsibility of applicant for same is mutually agreed facts.
- 2) Load sanction for 148 HP for releasing Ip (3PH) power supply to applicant at survey No 114, Navsari Chowk, Amravati is granted by NA MSEDCL on 15.07.2017 and informed to applicant to pay necessary charges without asking for any outstanding documents including NOC of Amravati Mahanagar Palika though other conditions regarding work execution have been specified. Also Load Sanction of 148 HP IP connection clearly indicates that the jurisdiction of the said land as Municipal Corporation as per Commercial Circular No 280 dt.04.02.2017 of MSEDCL in force was admitted by the N.A. MSEDCL.
- 3) Work of transformer testing was carried out by MSEDCL and erection of electric network necessary for releasing power supply to Industrial ginning unit was completed and Electrical Inspector, Amravati issued the permission for charging of erected electrical installation on dt 04.09.2017.
- 4) On the basis of a complaint received from Orchid International School, Amravati, NA MSEDCL issued letter to applicant on 06.09.2017 and consequently on 20.09.2017 that is after lapse of significantly longer period from raising the demand note for charges payable, and asked the applicant to submit NOC of Amravati Mahanagar Palika as per legal advice from legal cell of MSEDCL for release of the connection. The said connection is yet to be released by N.A. MSEDCL.
- 5) As per provisions of regulation 5.1 and 5.4 of (Electricity Supply Code And Other Conditions Of Supply) Regulations, 2005, for processing of application and time of demanding any outstanding documents from applicant for release of connection if necessary, the N.A. MSEDCL should have asked for the outstanding documents to the applicant at the time of issue of demand note for payable charges that is on date 15.07.2017.

Hence with above facts, observations and findings, this Forum proceeds to pass the following unanimous order.

ORDER

- 1) The Complaint No. 20/2017 is partly allowed.
- 2) The N.A. MSEDCL is directed to release the connection to the applicant within 7 days from the date of receipt of this order.
- 3) The N.A. MSEDCL is directed to pay interest amount to the applicant as per nationalized bank lending rate in force on the amount of investment claimed under Non DDF, CC&RF as per Work Completion Report by the applicant on the electric network erected by him for the period from 12.09.2017 to the actual date of release of the said connection. The compensation amount should be adjusted in forthcoming energy bills.
- 4) The N.A. MSEDCL is directed to recover the loss of revenue to MSEDCL on payment of interest from its guilty officers after due enquiry as per principle laid down in M/S Lucknow Development Authority versus M.K. Gupta in 1994 SCC(i) 243 decided by Ho. Supreme Court of India.
- 5) No order as to cost.
- 6) N.A. MSEDCL is directed to submit compliance report of this order to this Forum within 60 days of receipt of this order.

Sd/-
(Mrs.S.P.Joshi)
Member(CPO)

Sd/-
(Dr.V.N.Bapat)
Chairman

Contact details of Electricity Ombudsman appointed by MERC(CGRF & EO)
REGULATIONS 2006 under regulation 10:
THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN,
Office of Electricity Ombudsman (Nagpur)
Plot No.12, Shrikripa, Vijay Nagar, Chhaoni,
Nagpur-440013.
Phone:-0712-2596670

NO. EE / CGRF/AMZ/ Amravati/ No./ 25

Dt. 20.02.2018

To,
The Nodal Officer,
Executive Engineer
MSEDCL, Urban Division,
Amravati.

The order passed on in the Complaint No.20/2017 is enclosed herewith for further compliance and necessary action.



Secretary

Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
MSEDCL, Amravati Zone, Amravati

Copy to:-

1) Shri Shaikh Usman Shaikh Khalil
Survey No 114, Navsari Chowk , Amravati
Distt.:- Amravati.

Copy f.w.c.to:-

1)The Chief Engineer, MSEDCL, Amravati Zone, Amravati.
2)The Superintending Engineer, O&M Circle, Amravati.