

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/042/2026 (Present A. Chandrakumaran Nair) Dated: 08-09-2026

Appellant : Sri.B.T Reghunatha Pillai
Kuttikkattu Veedu, Kureepuzhachery,
Kavanadu P.O, Kollam (Dt)- 691003

Respondent : The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd,
Sakthikulangara, Kollam (Dt)

ORDER

Background of the case

The appellant Shri. Regunatha Pillai is a consumer of the Licensee KSEBL under their Electrical Section, Sakthikulangara with consumer no: 1145611016943. The Service connection of the appellant is the residential connection and was effected on 04/03/2013. There was another service connection with consumer no: 1145618007829 is passing through the property of the appellant which was effected on 12/12/1991. The appellant had requested the licensee to reroute the service line. As per the request, the licensee had conducted an inspection to assess the feasibility of the rerouting and an estimate amounting Rs.82,849/-has been prepared. The licensee has been asked to deposit the estimate amount. The appellant was not paid the amount and requesting for enquiry about the manipulation by the officials of the licensee. The appellant had filed petition to the CGRF (South Zone) vide petition no:OP/64/25-26. The CGRF had issued the order dated 16/06/2026 on completing the procedural formalities. Aggrieved by the decision of CGRF, this appeal petition is filed to this authority.

Arguments of the Appellant

My residential house at the above given address was under lock and key for the period from June 2020 to January 2026 owing to my job related transfers to faraway places. Upon my return to home in January 2026, I had noticed that two service wires were drawn through my property for providing electricity connection to my neighbour Smt. Parvathy and I submitted a written complaint to the assistant Engineer Sakthikulangara on 27.01.2026 to remove the said wires as the same were drawn across my property without my knowledge and consent.

As there was no response from KSEB Sakthikulangara to my written complaint even after a period of two months, I filed a complaint before the Honourable CGRF, Southern Region, Kottarakkara on 31.03.2026 and I was called to the Office of CGRF on 25.05.2026 for hearing. Only after receiving intimation from CGRF about my complaint, KSEB Sakthikulangara Officials removed one service wire and intimated me that it was not possible to remove the other service wire as the same was drawn on 12.12.1991, which is totally false and baseless. In fact, I am dead sure that the said connection was extended in 1991 from another Electric Post and the service wire was drawn through another property which belongs to sister of Smt. Parvathy. I presented my case to the Honourable Chairperson and informed that the statement made by KSEB Sakthikulangara is false and the two wires were drawn only after June 2020 through my property and requested to order and enquiry about the false affidavit submitted by KSEB Sakthikulangara.

But the Chairperson was not inclined to heed my plea and informed me that I should approach Honourable ADM as my case was of a property dispute. I again submitted that it was not a property dispute and it was a clear case of foul play and illegal activity on the part of the KSEB Sakthikulangara and once again requested to order and enquiry about manipulation of records, but she was reluctant and informed me that only ADM could make a decision on it and ultimately I had to leave the Office of CDRF without a solution to my grievances.

But to my utter dismay, when I received the copy of written Order from CGRF Kottarakkara I was shocked to see that contrary to the verbal remarks made by the chairperson, the statement submitted by KSEB Sakthikulangara Office was replicated in the order. Also, it was informed to me through the Order to deposit Rs.82,849/- to remove the said wire which was drawn through my property only after June 2020 without my willingness.

In view of the above, I humbly request that an enquiry may be ordered to ascertain the facts of the case and KSEB Sakthikulangara may be ordered to remove the said wire immediately.

Arguments of the Respondent

The complainant, shri. Reghunatha pillai, is a consumer under the Sakthikulangara Electrical Section (Consumer No: 1145611016943). Inspection revealed that the service line of another consumer, Smt. Parvathy Amma (Consumer No: 1145618007829), passes through his residential property.

As per records, the connection to shri. Reghunantha pillai (Consumer No: 1145611016943) was provided on 04-03-2013. Office records clarify that smt.Parvathy Amma's connection (Consumer No; 1145618007829) has been in existence since 12.12.1991. However, this complaint has been raised after a long period.

Currently, three other connections (1145617012462, 1145614000457, 1145612009069) are provided from pole RS 32/3. Among these, the connection given from this pole under number 1145617012462 is another service connection located within the complainant's own property. The service wire of Consumer No.1145618007829 passes through the exact same alignment as this service wire.

Considering the complainant's request, possibilities for rerouting the line along another path were examined. To remove the service lines from his property, a new line needs to be constructed. For this, consent from the concerned consumer (1145618007829) and payment of the prescribed estimate amount by the complainant or the concerned party are required. It is hereby informed that the service line will be relocated and re-installed once the estimate amount of Rs.82,849/- is remitted and necessary legal procedures are completed.

Counter Argument of the Appellant

With respect to the statement submitted by assistant Executive Engineer KSEB Sakthikulangara, I beg to submit the following:-

I never pleaded that the Electricity Connection extended to Smt. Parvathi Nair (Consumer No. 1145618007829) was not given on 12.12.91. My contention was that the said connection was provided to her from another Electricity post through another property which was under the possession of Smt. Lekshmi Bhai (her mother) and now under the possession of her younger sister. This can be corroborated from the property of Smt. Lekshmi Bai and my property was nowhere mentioned in it. (I am attaching a copy of the said certificate). This itself indicates that the line was not drawn through my property in 1991 and it was relocated in a later stage.

It seems that the Assistant Executive Engineer is conveniently omitting the above said fact that the line was relocated and drawn through my property in a later stage during my absence. Rather he is only mentioning about the date of connection to argue and to mislead that this is an old case. I strongly believe that they had provided second connection to Smt. Parvathi and relocated the old

connection from another Electricity post and drawn both the service wires through my property between June 2020 and January 2026 as my house was under lock and key during this period.

Only when I had approached the honorable CGRF Kottarakara they removed the second connection after dilly-dallying my complaint for near about four months. In view of the above, I humbly request that KSEB Sakthikulangara authorities may be asked to clarify about my complaint on relocation of the old connection (which was provided on 12.12.91) from one electricity post to another one in a later stage and drawing the line through my property during my absence without my knowledge and consent and necessary action may taken on my representation.

Analysis and findings

The hearing of the appeal petition was conducted on 29/07/2026 at 03.30 p.m in the KSEB IB, Paruthippara. The hearing was attended by the appellant Sri. B.T Reghunatha Pillai and the respondent Sri. Akhin Kumar S., Asst. Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd., Sakthikulangara, Kollam Dist.

The appellant had availed a residential connection on 04/03/2013. This property was purchased during 1994 from his wife's sister. There are three service lines passing through the property of the appellant other than his service connection. The connection with consumer no:456 was existing since 1960 as per the records of the licensee . The service connection with number 7829 was taken on 1991 as per the records in the name of Venu kumaran Nair. The connection no:12462 was taken in the name of smt. Dhanalekshmi during 2002. The records shows that the service connection bearing no:16943 in the name of Shri. Regunantha Pillai was taken during 2013.

The connection no:12462 is for another house of the appellant. The service connection 16943, 12462 and 7829 are originated from the same post. The connection 12462 is connected with a support post for the service line. The service wire of connection 7829 is also passing through the property of the appellant, which he want to shift from this property. The appellant claimed that the post designated as RS 32/3 is in his property. The connection 7829 was provided by the Licensee with a consent form signed by Smt. Lakshmi bhai, as the post was situated in her property. The consent was signed during 1991 and at that time the property was not purchased by the appellant. It seems there is a dispute between smt.Lakshmi Bhai and the appellant about land in which the post no:RS 32/3 is situated which is to be decided by the Revenue Authorities. The appellant claimed the connection no:7829 was taken from another post which was existing during 1991 and then the Licensee has shifted to the present location on a later date without his consent. The copy of consent letter produced by the Licensee is seen to be signed and submitted during 1991. This shows that this service connection was taken from the same post itself. Then the argument of the appellant is not having any stand. The appellant also have failed to produce the copy of any document to prove his claim.

Then the shifting of the service line should be executed as per the provision of the Kerala State Electricity Supply Code - 2014. The regulation 95 of the Supply code - 2014 describes about the shifting of the line.

95. Procedure for shifting electric line or electrical plant of the licensee. -

(1) The owner of the land or his successor in interest who has given right of way for the construction of an existing electric line or electrical plant over, under, along, across, in or upon the said land, may apply for shifting the electric line or electrical plant to any other portion of his land for genuine purposes.

(2) The application for shifting the electric line or electrical plant shall be submitted [through the web portal of the licensee.] [Provided that, the time frame for shifting the electric line or electrical plant shall be as per the timeline specified in Regulation 85 of this Code.]

(3) On receipt of the application the licensee shall inspect the site and assess the technical feasibility of the proposed shifting.

(4) The application for shifting an electric line or electrical plant shall be granted only if: -

(a) the proposed shifting is technically feasible; and

(b) the owner of the land or his successor in interest gives consent in writing to shift the electric line or electrical plant to any other portion of his land or to any other land owned by him; or any alternate right of way along any public path way available for shifting the electric line and the electrical plant; and

(c) the applicant shall remit the labour charges and material charges required for shifting the electric line or electric plant as estimated by the licensee as per the cost data approved by the Commission from time to time in accordance with the Regulation 33 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014.]

(5) The licensee shall shift the electric line or electrical plant if the conditions specified in subregulation (4) are complied with by the applicant.

Here the Licensee has inspected the site and checked the feasibility. If the line is to be totally shifted to a new route the estimate cost is Rs.82,849.24/-. When a person want to shift the line from his property the cost of shifting is to be borne by the applicant, if any consent is required the same is also be obtained. Another option offered by the respondent during the hearing is that the service wire of 7829 also could be drawn along with the existing service wire connection of 12462 and then take a deviation from the existing support post. The respondent agreed that if this proposal is acceptable to the appellant, the same could be

executed without any cost. This is seen to be more a viable solution as already service wire is existing.

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. If the appellant is ready to accept the proposal drawing the service wire of 7829 also along with the service wire of 12462, the same shall be executed by the Licensee without any cost.
2. If the decision (1) is not acceptable to the appellant, the line have to be shifted as per the regulation 95 by remitting the estimate amount by the appellant.
3. No other costs ordered.

ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

No. P/042/2026/_____ dated: 08/09/2026.

Delivered to:

1. Shri.B.T Reghunatha Pillai, Kuttikkattu Veedu, Kureepuzhachery, Kavanadu P.O, Kollam (dt) - 691003
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSE Board Ltd, Sakthikulangara, Kollam (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.