



aggrieved by this order the applicant presented the instant application under the provisions contained in Regulation 6.4 of the MERC (CGRF and E.O.) Regulations 2006.

3. A notice was given to the respondent. The respondent submitted reply under no.EE/O&M/H'ghat/Tech/5080 dated 30-09-2013. The case was fixed for personnel hearing on 07-10-2013. Shri B.V.Betal, authorized representative, represented the applicant. Shri P.B.Ingale, Junior Engineer, Hinganghat represented the respondent. Both the parties were heard.

4. It was argued for the applicant that he submitted an application for electricity supply to an agricultural pump on 07-07-2009. He deposited the amount as per demand on 21-01-2011. He submitted the test report on 28-01-2011. Shri Betal contended that the application was complete in all respect and the applicant completed all required formalities. As such he was entitle for connection within the time limit prescribed under Regulation 4 of the MERC (standards of performance of distribution licensees, period for giving supply and determination of compensation) Regulations 2005. The respondents have not released the connection till today. So compensation as provided under Regulation 12 may be awarded to him. It was further submitted that the compensation may be ordered to be paid till the date of the order of the forum. The respondent may be directed to pay the remaining amount as soon as the connection is released to the applicant. The respondent may be directed to release the connection immediately. In addition the applicant may be awarded Rs.2.00 Lakhs towards the loss to his agricultural produce. Rs.50,000/- and Rs.40,000/- respectively may be awarded

for physical and mental harassment. Rs.5,000/- each may be awarded for the travel expenses and the cost of the instant proceeding.

5. In reply the respondent submitted that the applicant submitted the application on 01-07-2009. A demand note was issued on 20-06-2010. The applicant deposited the amount on 21-01-2011 and he submitted the test report on 28-01-2011.

It was further stated that to provide the connection to the applicant it is necessary to lay L.T. line admeasuring 0.36 k.m. His name is entered in the paid pending list of 2010-11 at Sr.No.334. The connections are released as per the orders from the higher authorities, the availability of funds under SPA scheme. The work to release connections to the applicants, who have deposited the amount during June 2010 to March 2011, has been taken in hand. There is no delay in release of connection to the applicant. So he is not entitle for any compensation. The application may be dismissed.

6. The technical member of the forum submitted a note as under,

I have gone through the documents on record & submissions made by both the parties, it is not disputed that the complainant has completed all the formalities for getting electric connection to his Ag pump. However supply of electricity to agricultural pumps is carried out under various schemes such as SPA –PE ,DPDC, Non DDF CCRF etc . At present, there seems to be huge pendency of agricultural pump applications in Hinganghat Division under SPA scheme ,hence the work of laying HT/LT lines & T/F for supplying connection is entrusted to the agency & to be carried out as per the seniority of the applications/applicants who have deposited the demand amount upto March 2011& completed the formalities in all respect. While at the time of execution of work

(as per seniority list ) there are the instances of standing crops in the field ,the objections are being raised by the adjacent Agriculturist, hence the respondent has to wait till the crop season is over to carry out the work.

In view of circumstances mentioned above ,there is no intentional delay for providing electric connection to the complainant's agricultural pump on the part of respondent . The respondent shall provide the connection to the complainant's Ag pump as per the seniority list, otherwise it will cause great injustice on the part of other applicants who have paid the demand prior to the complainant.

MSEDCL's circular 22197 of 20.05.2008 regarding NON DDF CCRF Scheme , gives option to applicants to carry out the works, get supply early and get refund of the costs incurred, through future electricity bills.

Moreover the complainant's cause of grievance about payment of compensation for delay in giving supply will arise only when supply is given to him. In this case the supply is not yet given. The complainant's prayer for compensation for delay in giving supply is premature, in view of the order passed by Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman, Mumbai in representation No. 32/2010 & other representations were similar issues are being involved.

In view of above I am of the opinion that the respondent is not responsible for delay in giving supply & any losses caused to the complainant. Hence in my opinion the complainant is not entitled for compensation.

7. We have perused the record. We have heard the arguments advanced by both the parties.

It is admitted position that the applicant submitted the application in the prescribed form. He deposited the amount as per rule. He submitted the test report. His name is also entered in the paid pending list prepared by the respondent. So it is clear that the application submitted by the applicant is complete in all respect.

Regulation 4.5 prescribe the time limit for release of connection, it reads as under,

*4.5 Where the supply of electricity to a premises require extension or augmentation of distributing mains, the distribution licensee shall give supply to such premises within three months from the date of receipt of complete application in accordance with the MERC (Electricity supply code and other conditions of supply,) Regulations, 2005.*

After hearing the parties and upon perusal of the record it reveal the applicant had submitted the complete application. So he was entitle for connection within a period of three months from 28-01-2011. The respondents have not released the connection till today. So he is entitle for compensation as provided under Regulation 12 and appendix A item1 (iii) attached the said Regulations.

8. In absence of any evidence much less reliable and cogent evidence we are not inclined to accept other claims of the applicant.

9. The respondent can not deny binding effect of SOP Regulations. So the note submitted by technical member can not be considered in toto.

10. In view of the position discussed above we pass the following order, by majority,



**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM  
NAGPUR ZONE (RURAL) M. S. E. D. C. L.**

Plot No.12, Shrikrupa, Vijaynagar, Chhaoni,  
**NAGPUR – 440013**

Email.id- [cgrfnz@mahadiscom.in](mailto:cgrfnz@mahadiscom.in)  
cgrfnz@gmail.com

**(O) 0712- 2022198**

---

NO. CGRF/NZ/

Date :

Certified copy of order dated 08<sup>th</sup> October, 2013 in Case No.79 / 2013 is enclosed herewith.

Member-Secy/ Exe.Engineer,  
C.G.R.F.(NZ)MSEDCL  
**N A G P U R**

To,  
Shri Kawadu Vithobaji Badkhal, At.Murpad, Po.Kajalsara, Hinganghat, Dist.Wardha

Copy s.w.r.to :-

1. The Chief Engineer(NZ), MSEDCL, Vidyut Bhavan,Katol Road, Nagpur.

Copy f.w.cs.to:

1. The Executive Engineer/Nodal Officer., O&M Circle Office, MSEDCL.Wardha
2. The Executive Engineer,C.C.O&M Dn., MSEDCL, Hinganghat  
for information and necessary action.

Address of the Electricity Ombudsman is given as below.

Office of - The Electricity Ombudsman,  
12, Srikrupa, Vijay Nagar,  
Chhaoni, Nagpur-440 013  
0712-2596670