

BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

No.16 C-1, Miller Tank Bed Area (Behind Jain Hospital)
Vasanthanagar, Bengaluru-560052.

Present: S.S Pattanashetti,
Electricity Ombudsman,

Case No. OMB/B/G-333/2019

Dated 28/06/2019

In the matter of

Vijayaa Steels Limited,
No.84/1, Kallanayakanahalli,
Anchepalya,
Kunigal,
Tumkur District.

Represented by:
Shri T.L Jeelan Basha,
Advocate,
Navayana Law Offices,
No. 205, 2nd Floor, Triguna Icon,
Wilson Garden,
Hosur Main Road,
Bengaluru-560027. -

Appellant

Vs

- 1) Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
BESCOM, O & M Circle,
Tumkur District, Tumkur.
- 2) The Assistant Executive Engineer (Electrical),
O & M Sub-Division, BESCOM,
Kunigal-572130. -

Respondents

1. This Application/Complaint is filed by M/s Vijayaa Steels Limited (Appellant/Complainant), under the provisions of Clause 21.2 of the KERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations 2004, in Form 'B' challenging the order No.

ಬೆ/ಗ್ರಾವೇ/ಪ್ರ.ಸ.01/2018-19/cys-54 dated 01/03/2019 of CGRF, O & M Circle, BESCOM, Tumkur District, before this Authority, by inter-alia seeking the following reliefs:

1. To set aside the order dated 1st March 2019 passed by CGRF of the 1st Respondent;
 2. To direct the Respondents to transfer the installation bearing R.R No. KEHT1 existing in the name of Vijayaa Steels Limited in favour of Vikat Alloys Private Limited, with immediate effect;
 3. To grant compensation as per the KERC's (Licensees Standards of Performance) Regulations, 2004;
 4. To grant cost of this complaint; and
 5. To pass such other and incidental orders as may be deemed appropriate under the facts and circumstances of the case.
2. Brief facts, which are relevant to the case as claimed by the Appellant, are as follows:
- a. The Appellant/Complainant is HT-2 (A) (II) category consumer of the licensee serviced by the 2nd Respondent's Sub-Division Office assigned with a Revenue Register R.R. No. KEHT 1. The Complainant, by way of Sale Deed dated 10th March 2017 has sold the entire property to M/s Vikat Alloys Private Limited for a consideration of Rs 5,20,00,000/-. It is stated that the Appellant/Complainant by his letter dated 18th January 2018 requested the 2nd Respondent for transfer of installation bearing R.R No. KEHT 1 existing in the name of Vijayaa Steels Limited in favour of M/s Vikat Alloys Private Limited.
 - b. It is further stated that the Appellant/Complainant has reminded the 2nd Respondent on 27-07-2018 & 31-08-2018, to transfer installation bearing R.R No. KEHT 1 existing in the name of Vijayaa Steels Limited in favour of M/s Vikrat Alloys Private Limited.
 - c. Aggrieved by the inaction of the Respondents, the Appellant / Complainant has approached the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) Tumkur District vide complaint dated 20-09-2018.

In pursuance to this, the Superintending Engineer, BESCOM, Tumkur vide his letter dated 26th October 2018 has directed the Executive Engineer to file parawise reply before the CGRF to resolve the issue of the consumer grievances. In spite of this, the Executive Engineer has failed to file any reply before the CGRF. Further, CGRF also did not take any action to redress the grievances within the statutory period. At this juncture, the Superintending Engineer has issued a notice on 31/01/2019 calling upon the Appellant/Complainant to attend the hearing which was scheduled to be held on 04/02/2019. However, the hearing was indefinitely postponed by letter of Superintending Engineer, BESCOM, Tumkur Circle dated 02-02-2019. Thereafter, the Appellant/Complainant has visited the office of the concerned officials on several occasions and there was no communication with regard to the date of CGRF proceedings.

- d. It is further stated that as per Clause 7 of CGRF and Ombudsman Regulations, the licensee has to furnish parawise comments within 15 days from intimation from the Forum. A copy of the complaint should be forwarded by the Forum to the licensee within three days, so as to facilitate the response of the licensee. Thus, within 18 days, all pleadings should have been completed. Further, the Forum is bound to pass the orders within a period of 60 days from the date of admission of the complaint. However, in the present case, despite the fact that the complaint is filed on 20/09/2018 no decision was taken by the Forum. More importantly, the Superintending Engineer of the 1st Respondent himself has written letter to the Chairman of the CGRF that a Review Petition should be filed in the Hon'ble High Court. The Respondent/CGRF issued a notice on 25-02-2019 intimating that the CGRF proceeding is scheduled on 01-03-2019. The Appellant/Complainant attended the hearing and presented detailed arguments. It is further stated that, no order was passed by the Forum on that day and no parawise reply was filed by the Respondents, and no copy was served on the Appellant/Complainant. However, on 18-03-2019 the 2nd Respondent sent an order dated 01-03-2019 rejecting the Complaint of the

Appellant/Complainant. On perusal of the impugned order, it is noticed that one of the Members viz., Sri Vishwanath Kedar has allowed the complaint and has directed that installation should be changed in the name of Vikat Alloys Private Limited. However, Chairman of the CGRF/Superintending Engineer-BESCOM has directed as under:

- i. Complaint is dismissed;
 - ii. After paying Additional Security amount the Appellant/Complainant is directed to file transfer application in the name of the new owner viz. Vikat Alloys Private Limited;
 - iii. W.P No. 6090 of 2017 has been challenged by way of Review Petition No.53 of 2019 before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru and are subjected to the outcome of Review Petition No.53 of 2019.
- e. Being aggrieved by the order passed by 2nd Respondent, the Complainant has approached this authority on the following grounds:
- 1) The impugned order is passed only by the Chairman/CGRF and there is a dissent order by Member/CGRF and the 3rd Member/CGRF has not expressed any opinion. Even though the signatures of all Members are affixed at the end, there is no clarity on which Member has passed what order and if all the Members have unanimously expressed this opinion in the order, on that ground alone the impugned order is bad in law;
 - 2) The officials of BESCOM themselves have suggested internally to file Review Petition in order to ensure frustration of the Complaint and the same officials who directed for filing of the Review Petition against the Writ Petition are sitting as Chairman of the CGRF, this is farcical to state the least;
 - 3) The request for transfer of installation has been submitted on 18-01-2018, the same was acknowledged on 01-02-2018 and several reminders have been sent thereafter by enclosing all necessary papers including the absolute Sale Deed enclosing the transfer. However, the installation has not been transferred in

the name of the new owner viz., M/s Vikat Alloys Private Limited and the same is serious violation of law;

- 4) The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka has not granted any interim Stay order in R.P No.53/2019 against the judgement. Hence mere filing of Review Petition cannot be a ground to reject the Complaint and this action on the part of the Licensee is a violation of the provisions of the Electricity Act and Standards of Performance Regulations issued by the Hon'ble KERC, as per which, for every day of delay beyond the prescribed time period the licensee is bound to pay a specified amount to the affected consumers;
 - 5) The consumer from day one has indicated that it is ready to execute the indemnity bond as required under the applicable laws. Therefore, irrespective of any pending amounts the new entity will always be bound to pay the dues of BESCOM. Hence, there is no loss of any kind to BESCOM. As per the Standards of Performance Regulations for Transfer of ownership and title, transfer should be affected within 7 days from the date of application. Therefore, the complainant is entitled to receive compensation@ Rs 50/- for each day of default i.e., 7 days from the date of receipt of the application for transfer of installation submitted by the Appellant/Complainant.
3. Both the parties were informed vide this office letter No. OMB/B/G-333/2019/D-1256 dated 10-04-2019, regarding availability of provisions in Sub-Regulation 1 of Regulation 20 of KERC (CGRF & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2004 for settlement through conciliation and mediation and to appear before this Authority on 30-04-2019. However, they have not availed the benefit of the said provision.
 4. The 2nd Respondent in the impugned order dated 01-03-2019 has made the following order:

“ಗ್ರಾಹಕರಿಗೆ ಬಾಕಿ ಇರುವ ಅಧಿಕ ಭದ್ರತಾ ಠೇವಣಿ ರೂ. 362.88 ಲಕ್ಷಗಳನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಕೋರಲಾಯಿತು. ಆದರೆ, ಗ್ರಾಹಕರು ಹಾಗೂ ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ದೊರೆರಾಜ್‌ರವರು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತಾವು ಆ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸಲು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ವಾದಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಶ್ವನಾಥ ಕೇದಾರ್ ನಾಮ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಿತ ಸದಸ್ಯ ರವರು ಕೆ.ಇ.ಆರ್.ಸಿ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಗ್ರಾಹಕರು ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಥಾವರವನ್ನು ಮೆ: ವಿಕಟ್ ಅಲಾಯ್‌ರವರಿಗೆ ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಉಚ್ಚನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದ ಆದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬದ್ಧರಾಗಿರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು Indemnity Bond (ನಷ್ಟಭರ್ತಿ ಬಾಂಡನ್ನು) ದೃಢೀಕರಿಸಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಂತರ ಮೆ|| ವಿಜಯಸ್ಪೀಲ್‌ರವರಿಂದ ವಿಕಟ್ ಅಲಾಯ್‌ರವರಿಗೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕುಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ, ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಸ್.ನಾಗೇಂದ್ರ ಅಧೀಕ್ಷಕ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್ (ವಿದ್ಯುತ್) ಬೆವಿಕಂ, ವಾ.ಕಾ & ಪಾ, ತುಮಕೂರು ವೃತ್ತ, ಹಾಗೂ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು, ಗ್ರಾಹಕರ ಕುಂದು ಕೊರತೆಗಳ ನಿವಾರಣಾ ವೇದಿಕೆ, ತುಮಕೂರು ವೃತ್ತ, ಆದ ನಾನು:

“In exercise of the powers conferred on the commission under section 181 read with sub section (5) (6) and (7) of section 42 of the Electricity Act, 2003 commission has framed the Regulation, namely KERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) (Second Amendment) Regulations 2013. The Commission amended the clause 3.1, 3.2(a), (b) and (c), 4.1 and 6.1 vide Notification referred 92) above and created additional CGRFs with a view to making it convenient for consumer to get their grievances redressed expeditiously in ESCOMs” ರನ್ವಯ ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ದತ್ತವಾಗಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಬೆ/ಗ್ರಾವೇ/ಪ್ರ.ಸ.01/2018-

19/cys-54 ದಿನಾಂಕ 01-03-2019ನ್ನು ದೂರುದಾರರ ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ:

ಅ) ಗ್ರಾಹಕರ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ವಜಾಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆ) ಅಧಿಕ ಭದ್ರತಾ ಠೇವಣಿ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸಿ ಹೆಸರು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಗ್ರಾಹಕರಿಗೆ ಸೂಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇ) ಮುಂದುವರೆದಂತೆ ಬೆವಿಕಂ ನಿಗಮ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಕಾನೂನು ವಿಭಾಗದಿಂದ ರಿಟ್ ಅಪೀಲ್ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 6090/2017ರ ತೀರ್ಪಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 16-02-2019ರಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಉಚ್ಚನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ರಿವ್ಯೂ ಪಿಟಿಷನ್ (ಆರ್.ಪಿ) ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 53/2019ರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಉಚ್ಚನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯವು ನೀಡುವ ತೀರ್ಪಿಗೆ ಬದ್ಧರಾಗಿರಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ”.

5. A notice was issued to both the parties vide this office letter No. OMB/B/G-333/2019/D-1256 dated 10-04-2019 to appear before this authority on 30-04-2019 and put forth their arguments.
6. Respondent-1 has filed parawise replies dated 26-04-2019, by inter-alia stating that:
 - a) The CGRF, BESCOM, Tumkuru District vide its order dated 01-03-2019 has dismissed the application of the Appellant/ Complainant and directed to pay security deposit as demanded by BESCOM, subject to result of the review petition No.53/2019 filed by BESCOM against the order of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.A. No. 6090/2017 dated 16-02-2019 is admitted.
 - b) It is true that Appellant/Complainant is a HT-2 (A) (ii) category consumer serviced by 2nd Respondent sub-division assigned with a revenue register No. KEHT1.
 - c) The Appellant/Complainant vide letter dated 18-01-2018 requested the 2nd Respondent to transfer installation bearing No. KEHT1 existing in the name of Vijayaa Steels Ltd., in favour of M/s Vikat Alloys Ltd., is also admitted. It is further submitted that the Appellant/Complainant at the time of obtaining power supply

executed Agreement in favour of BESCO, Kunigal on 22-12-2006. As per Clause -20 of this agreement which reads as under:

“Clause-20: Assignment of the benefit of this agreement by the consumer:

The consumer shall not without previous consent in writing of the supplier, assign, transfer or part with the benefit of this agreement and shall not in any manner part with the or create any partial or separate interest in it.”

The Appellant/Complainant has not obtained any written permission from BESCO before selling the industry bearing No. KEHT1 to M/s Vikat Alloys Pvt. Ltd., thereby the Appellant/Complainant committed breach of contract entered in to between BESCO and the Appellant/Complainant Vijayaa Steels Ltd., So as per the provisions of 18 (c) of agreement the electricity supply to the Appellant/Complainant is liable to be disconnected for breach of contract. Further this installation KEHT1 was serviced in the name of Vijayaa Steels Ltd., as per the agreement clause-5 dated 22-12-2006, the meters provided by the BESCO. Hence the Appellant/Complainant is bound by all the agreement clauses dated 22-12-2006.

- d) It is further submitted that since the Appellant/Complainant has not paid additional security deposit of Rs 362.88 lakhs to the BESCO, the installation has not been transferred in the name of M/s Vikat Alloys Pvt. Ltd.,
- e) It is further submitted that the Appellant/Complainant has not obtained prior written permission of BESCO before selling the Industry wherein KEHT1 to M/s Vikat Alloys Pvt. Ltd. this is clear

violation of Agreement Clause-20 dated 22-12-2006 executed by Appellant/Complainant in favour of BESCOM. It is further submitted that the Appellant/Complainant himself is responsible for the delay in the matter since the Appellant/Complainant has not paid the security deposit of Rs 362.88 lakhs to BESCOM. It is further submitted that the allegations made by the Appellant/Complainant are false and baseless and prayed before this Authority to dismiss the complaint of the Appellant/Complainant in the interest of justice.

7. After careful examination of the documents filed, submissions made and arguments putforth by the contesting parties, the issue arising for consideration is:

Whether the CGRF-Tumkuru District was right in dismissing the complaint of the Appellant?

My answer to the above is

In the Negative.

8. **Reasons:**

The provision regarding transfer of installation (change in the name of consumer) is contained Clause 36 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka. The Appellant/Complainant approached the Respondent-2/AEE, Kunigal Sub-Division on 18-01-2018 for transferring installation R.R.No. KEHT1, existing in the name of Vijayaa Steels Ltd., in favour of M/s Vikat Alloys Private Limited by enclosing all necessary documents as required under Clause 36 of Conditions of Supply of Electricity of Distribution Licensees in the State of Karnataka. As seen from the proceedings of the order of CGRF, Tumkuru District dated 01-03-2019 the contention of the

Respondent-2/AEE before the CGRF-Tumkuru District is that they could not affect the transfer of name, because of the following reasons:

- (a) The Application for transfer of name was not filed in the prescribed format (Form No.13);
- (b) Industrial License (HT2a(ii) in the name of new consumer was not submitted;
- (c) The transferor had arrears outstanding against the installation in the form of additional Security Deposit of Rs 362.88 lakhs.

9. However, in the para-wise reply submitted before this authority by the Respondent-2/AEE dated 26-04-2019, he has not mentioned anything regarding non submission of required documents by the Appellant/ Complainant. Hence, not much credence can be attributed to the CGRF-Tumkuru District order mentioning that the Appellant/ Complainant had not filed the required documents before the Respondent-2/AEE. It is surprising to note that the Respondent-2 /AEE has taken a stand in his parawise reply dated 26-04-2019 that the Appellant-2/Complainant has violated Clause-20 of Agreement dated 22-12-2006 between BESCO, AEE and the Appellant/Complainant, where in it is stated that “the Consumer shall not without previous consent in writing of the supplier, assign, transfer or part with the benefit of this agreement and shall not in any manner part with the or create any partial or separate interest in it”. The Respondent-2/AEE could have suo-moto taken action on the Appellant/Complainant, when he came to know of the sale transaction between the Appellant/Complainant M/s Vijayaa Steels Ltd., and M/s Vikat Alloys Private Ltd. violating the conditions of

Agreement. The Respondent-2/AEE has not taken this stand even before the CGRF at the time of hearing. Suddenly in the present Appeal he has taken this stand. As the Respondent-2/AEE has not taken the stand anywhere earlier no importance can be given to this stand in the present case. The strong argument of Respondent-2/AEE is that the Appellant/Complainant has not paid additional Security Deposit of Rs 362.88 lakhs to BESCO, because of which the installation has not been transferred in the name of M/s Vikat Alloys Private Ltd. All along the Respondent-2/AEE has been harping on the issue of non-payment of additional Security Deposit by the Appellant/Complainant. The Appellant/ Complainant has questioned the imposition of additional Security Deposit and requested for installation of prepaid meter before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in Writ Petition No. 13836/2015. The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka has held that:

“if the person requiring the supply is prepared to take the supply through a pre-payment meter, he shall not be liable to furnish security as contemplated under clause (a) of sub-section (1) referred to above. In this case, as the petitioner is prepared to take the supply through a pre-payment meter, and as pre-payment meter is presently not available, it is appropriate that respondent nos. 1 & 2 shall supply electricity to the petitioner by collecting approximate monthly energy charges in advance without insisting for any security as contemplated under clause (a) of sub-section (1) referred to above. The amount of the petitioner lying in deposit with respondent nos.1 & 2 shall be adjusted towards energy charges. This order shall cease to be in force once respondent nos.1 & 2

provide a prepayment meter to the petitioner. The writ petition is disposed of in the above terms”.

10. This order was challenged by BESCOM in Writ Appeal No. 6090-91/2017. In the said Writ Appeal, the order of Hon’ble High Court of Karnataka is as follows:

“We find that the learned Single Judge has taken note of these submissions and has, therefore, rightly directed the BESCOM to supply electricity to the petitioner by collecting approximate monthly charges in advance without insisting for security deposit, till a pre-payment meter is installed for the respondent consumer. No fault can be found in the impugned order.

In view of the above, we are clearly of the view that these appeals are devoid of merit. This is apart from the fact that no sufficient cause for condonation of inordinate delay of 821 days is made out. Accordingly, the appeals stand dismissed”.

11. The order of the Hon’ble High Court of Karnataka in W.A No.6090-91/2017 has been challenged by BESCOM in Review Petition bearing R.P No. 53/2019. When the subject matter of payment of additional Security Deposit is pending before the Hon’ble High Court of Karnataka., it is not correct on the part of the licensee to insist for payment of additional Security Deposit for transferring power supply installation. This amounts to arm twisting tactics by the Respondent-2/AEE. In the proceedings before the CGRF-Tumkuru District, the nominated Member has rightly pointed out that the power supply installation can be transferred in the name of M/s Vikat Alloys Private Ltd, after obtaining necessary documents of sale of property and after obtaining an indemnity bond from both

the buyer and the seller that they will abide by the orders of Hon'ble High Court in the matter.

12. In pursuance to the Section 57 of the Electricity Act, 2003, KERC has framed Regulations for protecting the interest of the consumers. Accordingly, Karnataka Electricity Regulatory Commission (Licensees Standards of Performance) Regulations, 2004 has been framed. The amount to be paid to consumer for default in each case is contained in Schedule-I of the said Regulations. Sl.No.9 of Schedule-I deals with transfer of ownership and conversion of service title, Transfer of ownership change of category. The maximum time limit for rendering this service by the licensee is within 7 days of receipt of application. Any default in the prescribed time limit, the consumer has to be paid Rs 50/- for each day of delay. In the present case, the Appellant/Complainant has submitted his application dated 18-01-2018 for transfer of installation standing in the name of M/s Vijayaa Steels Ltd. to M/s Vikat Alloys Private Ltd. The same has been acknowledged by the Respondent-2/AEE on 01-02-2018. Respondent-2/AEE has not cared even to send a reply to the Appellant/Complainant. Due to the inaction of the Respondent-2/AEE, the Appellant/Complainant had to file complaint before the CGRF, Tumkuru District. The Appellant/Complainant has to be compensated for the inaction of the Respondent-2/AEE till the Appellant/Complainant filed a complaint before the CGRF, Tumkuru District i.e., 20-09-2018.

13. In view of the foregoing discussions, the following order:

O R D E R

- a) The order of CGRF, Tumkuru District No. ಬೆ/ಗ್ರಾವೇ/ಪ್ರ.ಸ.01/2018-19/cys-54 dated 01/03/2019 is set aside;
- b) The Respondent-2/AEE is directed to effect transfer of power supply installation from the seller to the buyer of the property after obtaining all necessary documents including indemnity bond from both the buyer and the seller, in view of the pendency of the Review Petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka;
- c) The Respondent-2/AEE, BESCO, Kunigal Sub-Division to pay Rs 50/- for each day of default after 7 days of receipt of application of M/s Vijayaa Steels Ltd. in his office i.e., 7 days after 01-02-2018 till filing of complaint in Form 'A' before the CGRF-Tumkuru District i.e.,20-09-2018 (totaling to 225 days from 08-02-2018 to 20-09-2018). This amount shall be paid to the Appellant/complainant within 90 days from the date of this order as per Section 57 (3) of the Electricity Act,2003.

Sd/-

(S.S Pattanashetti)
Electricity Ombudsman.

- 1) M/s Vijayaa Steels Limited,
No.84/1, Kallanayakanahalli,
Anchepalya,
Kunigal,
Tumkur District.
- 2) Shri T.L Jeelan Basha,
Advocate,
Navayana Law Offices,
No. 205, 2nd Floor, Triguna Icon,
Wilson Garden,
Hosur Main Road,
Bengaluru-560027.

- 3) The Chairperson, CGRF/Superintending Engineer,
O & M Circle, BESCOM,
Kotithopu Road,
Tumkuru-572102.

- 4) The Assistant Executive Engineer (Electrical),
O & M Sub-Division, BESCOM,
Kunigal,
Tumkuru District-572130.

- 5) PS to Hon'ble Chairman, KERC
- 6) PS to Hon'ble Member (M), KERC
- 7) PS to Hon'ble Member (R), KERC
- 8) PS to Secretary, KERC
- 9) Chairperson of all CGRFs in the State.

