

**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](mailto:ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com)

---

**Appeal Petition No. P/079/2025  
(Present A. Chandrakumaran Nair)  
Dated: 10-03-2026**

Appellant : Smt.Shiny Mathew,  
W/o P.A Mathew,  
Minnaram Complex,  
Near Dr.Devadas Hospital,  
R.O Jn, Anchal P.O,  
Kollam (dt) - 691306

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer,  
Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd,  
Anchal, Thiruvananthapuram (DT)

**ORDER**

**Background of the case**

The appellant Smt. Shiny Mathew is a consumer of Licensee KSEBL under their Anchal Section with consumer no. 1145975031378. The appellant had availed the three phase LT connection for the operation of a Scanning Centre & Medical Laboratory existing in the Minnaram Complex at Anchal Junction, Kollam. An 100kVA transformer was installed in the compound of this Minnaram Complex for extending the service connection to the appellant. Initially the requirement of power was 75kVA and the present demand is around 34kVA only. The transformer and other connected systems were installed as a deposit works. The main allegations raised by the appellant is that the delay in installation of transformer resulted to cancellation of the order of some other costly machine like CT, Scan etc. There were regular voltage fluctuations or high voltage which damaged the components of their Scanning Centre/Laboratory. The appellant requested for the compensation of Rs. 45 lakhs. The 100kVA transformer in their premises was enhanced to 160 kVA without their consent for giving power connection to another consumer. The prayer is that the transformer and the structure are to be relocated at the cost of the Licensee otherwise the land where the transformer is installed is to be purchased by the Licensee. The petition filed to CGRF which numbered as OP/23/25-26 has been heard and issued order on 23/09/2025. The appellant aggrieved with the order of CGRF and filed this petition to this Authority.

## **Arguments of the Appellant**

We question the technical feasibility and infrastructure available during the period from 2010 to 2011, as revealed by the commission. We believe that KSEB officials should have recognized the increasing power demands of consumers. A proactive approach, including a 3 to 5 years forecast, would have prevented this situation. We are writing to express our concern regarding the installation of a 100 kVA transformer on our property in 2010-2011. At that time, we had requested only a 75 kVA power supply for a planned project. While KSEB fulfilled our request following full payment, the project was subsequently canceled due to the delayed installation. Despite the presence of two existing, independent pole structures within a 15-20 meter radius, KSEB installed the transformer within our property boundaries, claiming it was an outright purchase for our benefit, KSEB could have utilized one of these existing poles by converting it into a double pole, which would have avoided unnecessary complications and expenses.

We believe that the installation was carried out without adequate consideration for our property and cost-effectiveness. KSEB has asserted that the installation was performed at our request. However, as consumers, we are not knowledgeable about the technical specifications of LTA/HT connections or other connection types. Therefore, we suspect there may be a misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the situation. During the discussions, the Commission stated that compensation in the amount of Rs. 45.0L is beyond their purview, and the Forum is not competent to award the compensation as requested by the petitioner. If the Commission solely relies on the KSEB's false statements, without acknowledging the actual circumstances, this Forum could have been avoided, saving both parties' time and resources. As the petitioner, we have clearly communicated to the Forum that the EE, AE, and other KSEB officials in their respective offices prioritize their own interests and comforts, without making any effort to resolve the consumers' issues. Furthermore, these officials typically hold their positions for a period ranging from six months to one year. Consequently, upon our visits, there are often new personnel, necessitating a complete explanation of the case from the outset. Any documents or proofs submitted as evidence for our claim tend to disappear after a few days, and no one can account for them. Had our pleas been heeded earlier, the incurred loss could have been averted, and there would have been no need for the Dy. Chief Engineer from Kottarakkara to visit our premises. We have detailed our concerns regarding KSEB, specifically outlining issues from 2020 to the present, spanning a period of five years. Furthermore, the losses we have sustained have demonstrably benefited KSEB financially as a result of one consumer's situation.

Following recent discussions, it has become clear that the Forum lacks the authority to provide compensation, and the tariffs implemented by KSEB are regulated by KSERC, as confirmed by KSEB officials. Therefore, we respectfully submitted that this matter falls outside the purview of the CGRF. We anticipate that the CGRF will decline to address this issue, as the factual aspects are outside of their jurisdiction. We further contend that the application of KSEB/CGRF/KSERC regulations may vary considerably depending on the

petitioner's status, such as politician, VIP, or top officials, with existing loopholes potentially exploited to their advantage. In such instances, the common investor is left without recourse other than to the government. Our understanding is that KSEB is composed of Trade union leaders, the Chief engineers of their umbrella, and a secretary from the relevant ministry, maximum. The work progress is solely based on the trade union leaders' advice, and they are still exploiting loopholes to increase tariffs and further burden consumers. As common citizens, we find it challenging to advocate for our rights against such representatives effectively.

Following the request for a 62 kVA connection by another consumer, the existing 100 kVA transformer was replaced with a 160 kVA transformer. As a result, we experienced a two-day power outage due to the installation of the new connection. We also object to the Commission's position that KSEB only needs to notify consumers via SMS for any future expansions from the current location. We believe such notification is acceptable only in the event of a natural disaster, not for expansions originating from the existing site. KSEB should compensate for the time spent on this transformer to offset incurred losses and prevent further harm to existing consumers. Instead of causing further inconvenience and loss, KSEB should relocate the existing transformer to a suitable location. The responsibility for finding such a location does not rest with us. Currently, KSEB occupies our prime real estate, which has created significant difficulties for us in clearing sewage and performing routine generator maintenance. This situation is unacceptable. Despite significant local and global advancements, KSEB remains inflexible in its stance. If a suitable alternative site is identified within a far radius of the current location, it is unreasonable to expect the petitioner to bear the associated costs again. This decision appears to imply that any resulting benefits are exclusively for KSEB, irrespective of the methods employed, with no regard for consumer losses. As consumers, we respectfully request that KSEB either compensate us for the land occupied for the transformer installation or relocate the transformer to an alternative location, such as nearby poles or any other feasible site convenient to them. Consumers should not be burdened with such costs, and there are no applicable estimates in this case. KSEB's current practices already place an undue financial burden on consumers, and demanding additional payment is a damaging and unsustainable policy. We strongly object to this position. We had requested that KSEB purchase the encroached land, instead of installing the transformer on it. However, the commission determined that KSEB's actions were appropriate, placing the blame on the petitioner.

Since 2020, the transformer has been experiencing continuous faults, which have been communicated to KSEB - Anchal, Punalur, both verbally and in writing. However, no preventative measures were taken to address the high voltage fluctuations until the matter was escalated to the Dy. Chief Engineer, Kottarakkara, who then conducted a site visit following our repeated requests. As a result of this transformer issue, our equipment valued at 245.0 Lakhs has been irreparably damaged, resulting in significant financial losses, business disruption, and reputational harm. Furthermore, the Pediatrician's clinic and the tax consultant's office, which occupied our premises, have experienced considerable

difficulties due to these high-voltage technical problems. Consequently, the Pediatrician's clinic was compelled to relocate to its own premises, necessitating urgent civil works. The tax consultant's office lost 10 years of data, faced operational risks, and was forced to close for several months to retrieve data from the Income Tax department and clients. They, too, suffered substantial financial losses, incurred considerable effort, and experienced reputational damage. They have lost over 100 clients as a result of this unfortunate situation. Following the replacement of the initial faulty transformer with a second unit, issues arose shortly after its installation. Subsequent requests for assistance were made to the Anchal, Punalur, and Kottarakkara offices. The provision of two additional earthing points was ultimately implemented, which provided some relief. According to KSEB's official statement, the Commission emphasized that the additional earthing was a generous measure, and KSEB has carried out all possible measures to curb the problems. However, the petitioner did not address whether adequate earthing was initially provided, which could have mitigated losses and saved time. Despite the Commission's thorough review of the grievances, it was determined that the petitioner's claims were unsubstantiated and attributable to their own actions

Despite our previous requests, the matter remains unresolved. Therefore, we respectfully request The Honorable State Electricity Ombudsman to consider the following:

Our medical equipment, valued at Rs. 45.0 Lakhs, sustained irreparable damage, likely due to a high-voltage surge or a malfunctioning transformer. This damage has rendered the equipment completely unusable due to burnout of circuit boards, sensors, and other non-repairable components. We are now obligated to make payments for replacement equipment. Therefore, we request substantial compensation for the total loss incurred.

We request either the relocation of the transformer to a nearby, independent pole or another feasible location, or the provision of substantial compensation for the land currently occupied.

Given our significant financial commitments to KSEB, we request consideration to mitigate the losses incurred due to the underutilization of the initially requested 75 kVA load. The transformer was installed following full payment, but project delays, resulting from the installation process, lead to its cancellation. Consequently, we have not utilized the requested power beyond a 39 kVA connected load, with actual consumption now at 32 kVA or lower. KSEB has benefited fully from this situation. Had our requirements been within the 30-40 kVA range, these transformer issues would have been avoided.

## **Arguments of the Respondent**

The complainant Smt. Shyni Mathews had availed an electric connection bearing Consumer number 1145975031378 under demand based tariff with connected load of 39kW on 29.10.2011 by installing a 100kVA transformer in the Minnaram complex compound. A Scanning center and Medical Laboratory is functioning in the said premises. The installation of 100kVA transformer was carried out in

accordance with the request for 75kVA power allocation submitted by M/s Minnaram Complex and based on the technical feasibility prevailing at that time. Smt.Shiny Mathew remitted the work deposit amount. The subsequent reduction in the actual load consumption is approximately 34kVA is regrettable, however, the same was not known to KSEB at the time of initial approval of as the consumer already submitted request for 75 kVA power allocation. Once installed and commissioned, reversal or cancellation of such installation is constrained by regulatory and optional guidelines. Further a roof top solar connection with a connected load of 9.5kW was effected on 22.9.2021 at M/s Minnaram Complex.

On 24.12.2021, Con. No. 1145975031378 submitted a complaint via email to the Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Punalur regarding over voltages fluctuations. Upon inspection of the site remedial actions were initiated including load balancing and provision of additional earthing. Subsequently as per the direction of the Deputy Chief Engineer, the old 100kVA transformer is replaced with new one. There after a telephonic complaint was received from the consumer No. 1145975031378 by the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Anchal regarding the over voltage fluctuations, Assistant Engineer Inspected the premises on 08.07.2024 and checked the voltage levels on the consumer premises which were found to be within the permissible limit as per Electricity Supply Code 2014, Regulations 6&7 and the same was acknowledged by the complainant at that time. On 09.07.2024 the department team also replaced the LAs in the transformer station and provided additional neutral earthing. The consumer was also advised to install surge arrestors to protect sensitive electronic equipment's at the premises.

Later another consumer bearing Con. No. 1145978032214 submitted a request to enhance the power to 62kW in his premises. Two options were considered,

- (i) Enhancing the existing 160kVA Aswathi transformer situated opposite side of the road to 250kVA or
- (ii) Enhancing 100kVA Minnaram Transformer to 160kVA.

Installation of 250kVA Transformer would require construction of a new plinth, which was found impractical in the thickly packed Anchal town area. Higher officials inspected the site and recommended the second option of enhancing the 100KVA Minnaram Transformer to 160kVA which is found to be technically feasible and operationally convenient. Accordingly the estimate was sanctioned and remitted the AS amount of Rs. 4,74,807/- on 03.04.2025 by the consumer 145978032214 and the Minnaram transformer was enhanced to 160kVA on 06.05.2025

Again Smt Shyni Mathews, Minnaram Complex, Near Dr. Devan's Hospital, RO Junction, Anchal P.O, Kollam lodged a complaint on 10.06.2025 to the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Anchal alleging the voltage fluctuations at their premises. Pursuant to the complaint Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Anchal and Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Anchal inspected the premises on 11.06.2025 and measured the LT voltage levels at the

premises, it was varied from 236V to 238V, well within the permissible limit. The same was acknowledged by the complainant at the time of inspection.

It is most respectfully submitting that all reported voltage fluctuation issues were duly acknowledged and necessary remedial actions including replacement of the transformer, provision of additional earthing points, replacement of Lightning Arrestors, load balancing were undertaken.

All type of LT & HT supply outages including unscheduled interruptions are promptly intimated through the OMS and no irregularities have occurred in this regard. The suggestion regarding relocation of the transformer or purchase of land involves complex issues such as land valuation, regulatory approval and infrastructure planning and hence can not be implemented easily. I am submitting the suggestions for consideration. KSEBL, being licensee, has ensured the maintenance of standard voltage levels in accordance with the Regulation 6 & 7 of the Electricity Supply Code, 2014.

The allegation that voltage fluctuations caused damages to the Complainant's equipment is false. During inspection the LT voltage level at the premises was found to be within the permissible limits. Consumer has not produced any certificate from any competent technical authority sub-stating the alleged loss. No complaints regarding voltage fluctuations or equipment damage have been received from nearby consumers till date. All other statements not specifically admitted herein are false and hence denied.

The complainant had also filed a petition before the Hon'ble Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Kottarakkara vide OP No.23/2025-26, wherein the forum passed the following order follows

1. Application for compensation filed by the petitioner is hereby disallowed.
2. The respondent is directed to take precautionary measures to minimize the voltage fluctuations in future. Before conducting planned maintenance / realignment works the licensee should ensure prior intimation had already done to the consumer via SMS.

## **Counter Argument of the Appellant**

We are surprised to receive such an untrue statement from KSEB - Anchal. At the CGRF hearing, the same statement was presented by an AEE. We emphatically stated to the CGRF that this is entirely fabricated and without any basis. The KSEB officials' demeanor is unprofessional and unacceptable, and their actions cannot be questioned. They disregard our appeals, offering only insincere promises and trivial excuses. Before the Honorable State Electricity Ombudsman, we inquire whether any faults admitted by KSEB since its inception can be requested. The CGRF hearing was, in essence, a formality, and we anticipated the outcome beforehand, as we had communicated to the AEE. To our knowledge, the CGRF in Kottarakkara has not reached a favorable decision,

and we have previously expressed our view that this hearing was unproductive. Given that the CGRF is overseen by KSEB, such rulings are, predictably, what we anticipated.

For example, a simple SMS notification is considered adequate for consumers regarding connection extensions, enhancements, or transformer replacements. However, any resulting losses to the consumer are apparently disregarded. Furthermore, if the CGRF assumes that the transformer was solely purchased by Minnaram, how can they authorize another power connection from it? Consequently, the laws appear to be consistently biased in their favor. Before the Honorable State Electricity Ombudsman, we respectfully submit that justifications for our concerns have been previously detailed in our correspondence, dating back to 2021. To reiterate, our initial request was for a 75 kVA power supply for a project. However, the delayed transformer installation resulted in the project's cancellation, for which we did not pursue compensation from KSEB. Approximately 25 to 30 kVA of power would suffice for standard laboratory equipment operation. Currently, Our connected load is 39 kVA, and the actual demand is significantly lower. The transformer has been installed on our property primarily for the convenience of KSEB, and not for our benefit.

We have been experiencing high voltage issues at our location for over a decade. Maintaining the transformer at a lower voltage would have mitigated this problem, offering significant physical and financial benefits to both parties. If the consumer was at fault, why was the transformer replaced? Even after the installation of the second transformer, fluctuations persisted, necessitating the application of additional earthing. If earthing or other technical issues were the primary concerns, these measures could have been implemented earlier, rather than waiting for our requests. Furthermore, the installation of the third transformer on our property was not in our best interest but rather served KSEB's advantage, resulting in further financial losses for us. KSEB has not installed transformers on any other private property to meet the power needs of other installed transformers on any other private property to meet the power needs of other consumers. In summary, we are seeking a resolution to a complaint that has been outstanding for over ten years, and this issue has not emerged suddenly.

Beyond the densely populated area of Anchal, numerous towns within Kerala present even greater complexities. In light of this, we question the practical approach employed by KSEB in this matter. There appears to be no justification for the actions taken, which seem solely intended for the convenience of KSEB officials. The ease of excavating the wetland appears to have been the primary factor in KSEB's decision-making, rather than addressing the concerns of the consumers. KSEB has encroached upon our property boundary, where our essential utilities are located. As a result of KSEB's actions, we have incurred significant financial losses. Therefore, we request that you purchase this land if you intend to retain your equipment on our property. Otherwise, we have no intention of selling the land. If another party requests a power upgrade, would KSEB install the transformer on its property? If not, we request an explanation as to why you have done so to us. Before the Honorable State Electricity Board Ombudsman, we respectfully request that KSEB provide the basis for their assertion that the complainant's claim of equipment damage resulting from voltage fluctuations is unfounded. Furthermore, we request details regarding the

type of certificate from a competent technical authority required to substantiate the alleged loss. If KSEB is aware that the consumer's claim is without merit, we seek an explanation for the transformer replacement and the implementation of additional earthing measures.

There was no fire outbreak during our business operation. If KSEB is referencing this as proof, we find it regrettable. Even in the event of a fire, KSEB would likely attribute it to consumer negligence, absolving itself of any responsibility. As previously stated, one pediatrician who rented premises has departed due to the resulting power failures, and Dr. Devdas Hospital's business is significantly lower than before, as is ours. The tax consultant in the adjacent premises remains operational, though their computer motherboard has been irreparably damaged, leading to significant disruption. They have suffered the loss of eight years' worth of data and several key clients. The aforementioned clinic and hospital primarily conduct outpatient services (OPD), which do not necessitate large equipment for doctor consultations. However, all their tests are conducted at our facility. Despite these adverse consequences, the affected parties remain viable. The Honorable State Electricity Ombudsman should conduct an inquiry to evaluate the matter's merits. KSEB's justifications appear to be afterthoughts, and we will no longer submit to their influence. We request that KSEB cease its harassment and permit us to conduct our business without further interference. As laypersons, we are unfamiliar with KSEB's sections 43 and 45, including their subsections. KSEB should not impose these regulations on us, especially after encroaching on or intruding on our property.

Before the Honorable State Electricity Ombudsman, we respectfully submit that we will not contribute any funds to KSEB for the relocation of the transformer to a location of their choosing. KSEB has encroached upon our property, and they must vacate the premises. Due to KSEB's inability to provide the required power at the time of our request, we were coerced into paying for the transformer and associated expenses, including poles, despite the availability of necessary poles within a radius of 15 to 20 meters. A consumer is obligated to pay for energy charges and the services rendered by KSEB. Demanding payment for the transformer purchase, installation, and commissioning, and then again for its displacement, constitutes an unreasonable significantly lower 13 to 15 years ago, and the area was not as densely populated as it is now. Such justifications are mere afterthoughts and lack merit. Under no circumstances will we make any payment to KSEB for the transformer's relocation. We do not desire a transformer, and we only requested specific power requirements over a decade ago. If KSEB persists in this matter, we will have no alternative but to take drastic action.

Considering KSEB's self-proclaimed authority, we find it necessary to scrutinize the validity of any documentation they may submit. To further clarify, we wish to reiterate that all digital equipment operates on computer-based systems, utilizing circuit boards and sensors. Consequently, exposure to excessive power results in equipment malfunction, constituting the aforementioned losses. We are prepared to present supporting documentation from the equipment supplier, demonstrating the replacement of defective equipment on a buy-back basis. Before the Honorable State Electricity Ombudsman, we respectfully submit that we have not lodged any complaints with KSEB following the installation of the

160 KVA transformer. Furthermore, we are cognizant that KSERC serves as the appellate authority for tariff-related matters. Therefore, this issue has not been the subject of discussion.

## **Analysis and findings**

The hearing of the appeal petition was conducted on 27/02/2026 at 11.00 a.m in the KSEB IB, Paruthippara. The hearing was attended by the appellant representative Sri. P.A Mathews and the respondent Sri.Aneesh Kumar.V.S., Asst. Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd.,Anchal, Thiruvananthapuram Dist.

The appellant had availed a Commercial connection for running their business of Scanning Centre and Medical Laboratory from the Licensee KSEBL. The initial request for the contract demand was for 75kVA in LT, three phase. The present electricity demand is only around 34 kVA. KSEB was not aware of the reduced demand. A roof top solar plant of capacity 9.5 KW was installed and connected to the grid on 22/09/2021. During 12/2021, the appellant had complained that they are facing over voltage fluctuations. The officials of the Licensee had inspected the installation and done all remedial actions such as additional earthing, replacement of transformer, etc. Again the consumer complained about the over voltage, the Licensee could not identify any over voltage issue and the voltage was within the limits mentioned in Electricity Supply Code 2014. The voltage level to be maintained by the Licensee is mentioned in the regulation 6 of the Supply Code 2014.

### **6. Voltage levels for LT, HT and EHT supply. -**

**(1)** Voltage levels specified for low tension (LT), high tension (HT) and extra high tension (EHT) supply are the following: -

**(a)** Low Tension (LT) supply, -

**(i)** Single phase 240 Volts between phase and neutral;

**(ii)** Three phase 415 Volts between phases;

The variation in voltage level allowable is described in regulation 7 of the Supply Code 2014.

**7. Duty of licensee to maintain the specified voltage levels. -** The licensee shall not vary the voltage at the point of supply from the voltage levels as specified in regulation 6, except with the written consent of the consumer or with the previous sanction of the Commission:

*Provided that variations in voltage at the point of supply within the limits*

*specified hereunder is permissible without written consent of the consumer or the sanction of the Commission:*

- i. six per cent on higher side and lower side in the case of low-tension supply;*
- ii. six per cent on the higher side or nine per cent on the lower side in the case of high tension supply; and*
- iii. ten percent on the higher side or twelve and a half percent on the lower side in the case of extra-high tension supply:*

*Provided further that the above limits of variations in voltage levels shall be applicable till the Central Electricity Authority specifies a different set of limits.*

Here in this case the appellant stated that the voltage has gone up to 246 V & 248 V etc in single phase. According to the regulation, the voltage level could be  $240 \pm 6\%$ . This means that the voltage could be 225.6 V to 254.4 V in single phase and 390 V to 440 V in three phase supply. Then it could be seen that the voltage level maintained by the Licensee is very well within the regulation. Further the respondent has produced the copies of the substation Log book of Anchal 110 kV substation. This also shows the voltage maintained in the 11 kV feeder also was within the permissible limit. The consumer purchasing the equipment from the various suppliers should ensure that rated voltage of the equipment should be as per the voltage level of the supply voltage. If any difference is there some protecting regulator system is to be connected to before the equipment to maintain the voltage suitable to the equipment. Normally the equipment also have a lower and higher cut off for voltage. If the voltage regulator/voltage stabilizer would have used in the system, this would have protected the equipment from damages. As such the contentions of the appellant that the equipment were damaged due to higher voltage is not justifiable and hence rejected.

Another allegation raised by the appellant is that due to delay in installing the transformer the orders placed for the CT machines, etc. have been cancelled. This resulted to reduction of their business and as well as the electricity demand. The appellant has totally failed to submit document to justify their argument. Hence the argument of delay in installation of transformer resulted to the loss in business have been rejected.

The 100kVA transformer have been erected as a deposit work for the appellant and an amount around 9 lakhs have been deposited for this. This transformer have been installed inside the premises of the Minnaram Complex at the location which would have been decided by the appellant and the respondent. The transformer was regularly maintained by the Licensee and the same was replaced once to convince the consumer about the high voltage issues. There was a request from another consumer very close to the premises of appellant to enhance their connected load. The Licensee had enhance the capacity of the

existing 100 kVA transformer to 160 kVA transformer to extend the connection to the new requirement. The respondent stated that this transformer is a pole mounted transformer erected on the two pole structure. The new 100 kVA transformer erected in the same structure without modification and not occupied any extra space. The contentions of the appellant is that their consent is not obtained to install the transformer in their property. The Section 46 of the Electricity Act 2003, empower the licensee to recover the expenditure incurred for giving the connection.

**Section 46. (Power to recover expenditure):** *The State Commission may, by regulations, authorise a distribution licensee to charge from a person requiring a supply of electricity in pursuance of section 43 any expenses reasonably incurred in providing any electric line or electrical plant used for the purpose of giving that supply.*

The regulation 24 of the Supply Code 2014 states that the service line, meter and other equipment are to be the property of the Licensee.

**24. The service line, meter and associated equipment deemed to be the property of the licensee. -**

*(1) The whole of service line, meter and other associated equipment shall be deemed to be the property of the licensee and shall remain under his control so long as they are connected to the distribution system of the licensee.*

*(2) The licensee may use the service line and other apparatus to give supply to other consumers, if the supply to the consumer who has paid for such line and apparatus is not affected adversely:*

*Provided that the service line and other equipment of a consumer with a dedicated feeder shall not be used to supply power to another consumer.*

*(3) Even if the supply to the consumer who has paid for the line or equipment is disconnected, for whatsoever reason, the consumer shall permit the licensee, continued access to the service line and other equipment if they are required to give supply to other consumers, until alternate arrangements are made by the licensee:*

*Provided that no payment shall be due to the consumer for such access or facility.*

This regulation is very clear that the Licensee have the authority to give connection to other consumers, even if the installation are provided for another consumer. Here the line is not a dedicated line and hence alternate arrangement is not warranted. And also states that the consumer is not eligible to get any

payment for the access or facility. In light of the above regulations, the contention of the appellant that the Licensee has to pay for the space occupied is not having any legal stand and hence to be rejected.

The another contention is that the appellant had incurred losses due to switching off the power supply to replace the transformer. The respondent stated that the message has been send to them as SMS about the non availability of power as per prevailing regulations.

## **Decision**

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

1. I hereby agree with the decision of CGRF as per the order dated 23/09/2025.
2. No other costs ordered.

**ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

No. P/079/2025/\_\_\_\_\_ dated: 10/03/2026.

### **Delivered to:**

1. Smt.Shiny Mathew, W/o P.A Mathew, Minnaram Complex, Near Dr.Devadas Hospital, RO Jn, Anchal P.O, Kollam (dt) - 691306

2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd, Anchal, Thiruvananthapuram (DT)

**Copy to:**

1. The Secretary, Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission, KPFC Bhavanam, Vellayambalam, Thiruvananthapuram-10.
2. The Secretary, KSE Board Limited, Vydhyuthi Bhavanam, Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram-4.
3. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Vydhyuthi Bhavanam, KSEBL, Kottarakkara-691506.