Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.'s Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum Nagpur Zone, Nagpur

Case No. CGRF(NZ)/67/2018

Applicant : Shri Sunil Gulabrao Bhaimare,

Sant Tukudoji Ward, Near National Highway,

Hinganghat.

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,

The Executive Engineer

Hinganghat Division, MSEDCL,

Hinganghat.

Applicant represented by : 1) Shri. B. V. Betal,

Non-applicant represented by: 1) Shri H.P. Pawade, Exe.Engineer, MSEDCL.

2) Shri V.B. Kothare, Dy.E.E., MSEDCL.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Vishnu S. Bute,

Chairman.

2) Mrs. V.N.Parihar, Member Secretary

ORDER PASSED ON 29.06.2018

The applicant presented this application feeling aggrieved by the order passed by the IGRC Wardha in Case No. SE/Wardha/Tech/IGRC/2640 on 25.5.2017. The applicant is running a shop, "Bhaimare traders", by name, by the side of the National Highway. The applicant allege that the respondent erected a line, over his shop and the house, without his permission. The applicant prayed that the respondent may be directed to shift the line. The

Page 1 of 4 Case No. 67/2018

IGRC ordered that if there is a likelihood of damage to the applicant or his property, the respondent may prepare a proposal to shift the line under DPDC scheme. Feeling aggrieved by this order the applicant presented the instant application.

The respondent submitted parawise reply under no. EE/O&M/Hinganghat/Tech/1897 dt. 12.06.2018. The case was fixed for personal hearing on 28.06.2018. Both the parties were present. They were heard.

Shri B.V. Betal, a representative of the applicant argued for the applicant. He stated that the respondent laid line over his shop and the house without his permission. There is a likelihood of damage to the life of his family members and to his property. So the respondent may be directed to shift the line under the DPDC scheme. He is not satisfied with the order of the IGRC.

Shri Pawade, Executive Engineer, Hinganghat, represented the respondent. He stated that the electric line is existing there for last twenty years or so. The applicant is already having his house and the shop. However now he propose to extend his shop towards the National Highway. The extention is coming under the line.

The applicant himself is bound to keep safe distance from the line.

The applicant has not produced any document showing that his plot is duly approved by the competent authority. He has not produced any document showing that his existing construction and the proposed construction is duly approved by the competent authority. In support of his statement the respondent produced four photographs.

Page 2 of 4 Case No. 67/2018

Above all the respondent stated that the existing line is erected parallel to National Highway. The MSEDCL has to maintain certain safe horizontal distance from the National Highway. Hence it is not possible to shift the line closer to the National Highway.

Finally the respondent stated that the line was already existing there.

The applicant erected the structure now. The applicant is bound to keep safe distance from the line. The respondent will not bear the expenditure of line shifting. The application has no force. It may be dismissed.

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

At the outset the Forum noticed that there is absolutely no document on record showing that the applicant is a legal owner of the plot, he has taken any permission from the local authority for construction of the existing structure as well as proposed structure. The respondent say that the line is in existence for last about twenty years. The applicant constructed his existing shop subsequently. So we feel that the statement of the applicant that the respondent erected the line over his shop and the house is totally false.

This follows that the applicant cannot ask the respondent to shift the line at the cost of the respondent. If at all he wish to shift the line he will have to bear the expenditure.

Furthermore there is a National Highway just adjacent to the existing line. So there is no possibility to shift the line towards the National Highway.

Page 3 of 4 Case No. 67/2018

In view of the above position we are of the opinion that the demand of the applicant is unrealistic and illegal. It deserve no consideration. So we pass the following order.

ORDER

1. Application No. 67/2018 is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-Mrs. V.N.Parihar MEMBER SECRETARY Sd/-Vishnu S. Bute, Chairman

Page 4 of 4 Case No. 67/2018