

Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum  
Kerala State Electricity Board - Southern Region,  
Vydyuthi Bhavanam, Kottarakkara

---

No: CGRF/KTR/OP.No.700/2012/1255

Date: 4 .5.2012.

---

From

Chairperson

To

The Assistant Executive Engineer,  
Electrical Sub Division,  
K.S.E Board,  
Puthenchatha.

Sub: - Releasing of order of disposal of OP.No.700/2012.

Ref: - B.O (FB) No.585/2006 (LA.II/1173/2006) dated 25.2.2006.  
Sir,

Enclosed the order of disposal of petition filed by Smt. Jasmine Rajesh in O.P.No.700/12 for further action.

Yours faithfully,

CHAIRPERSON  
DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER  
CGRF (SOUTH)

Copy to:-

1. Smt. Jasmine Rajesh, M/s. Mansions, T.C.No.16/136,  
Kumaramangalam, Easwaravilasam Road, Vazhuthakkadu,  
Thiruvananthapuram
2. The Deputy Chief Engineer, Electrical Circle,  
Thiruvananthapuram (U)
3. The Executive Engineer, Electrical Division,  
Thiruvananthapuram (U)

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM (SOUTH),  
KOTTARAKKARA**

---

Present: 1. Sri.R.Suku, Chairperson, Deputy Chief Engineer  
2. Smt. Beena Pious, Executive Engineer  
3. Sri.N.Sasidharan Unnithan, Member

Friday the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of March 2012

**OP No.700/2012**

Between

Petitioner: Smt. Jasmine Rajesh,  
M/s. Mansions,  
T.C.No.16/136,  
Kumaramangalam,  
Easwaravilasam Road,  
Vazhuthakkadu,  
Thiruvananthapuram.

And

Respondent: The Assistant Executive Engineer,  
Electrical Sub Division,  
Puthenchantha.

**Grievance of the Petitioner**

1. The complainant is the promoter of the building complex " Serene Square" under the geographical jurisdiction of Electrical Section Cantonment. This petition is submitted against collection of excess amounts than reasonable expenses for supply and causing unnecessary expenses as authorized under Section 46 of Electricity Act,2003, violating all rules, laws, regulations and orders related to distribution as detailed below and for not reimbursing the excess amounts collected within the reasonable time and for insisting unreasonable conditions not authorized by law. A request was submitted to reimburse the amount vide letter dated 07/12/2011. But no action has ever been taken by

the Deputy Chief Engineer, Electrical Circle(U), Thiruvananthapuram to reimburse the amounts or make a reply. The licensee is legally bound to reimburse the excess amounts collected in advance for supply, on commencement of supply even without a request to that effect from the applicant for supply. Hence the opposite party has caused grievance to the petition in the following ways.

- (i) The Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Thiruvananthapuram insisted to lay 440m of 3x300mm<sup>2</sup> XLPE 11KV UG cable whereas the petitioner needed only 3 x 150mm<sup>2</sup> XLPE 11KV UG cable specifically for his supply and caused excess expenditure of Rs.2,50,418/-
  - (ii) Collected Rs.6,60,000/- for an "Extensible type RMU" which was not at all necessary specifically for the petitioners' supply.
  - (iii) Collected unnecessary amounts @ 10% as supervision charges on works and purchases which were never supervised or authorized by rules to be supervised by the licensee.
  - (iv) Even after commencement of supply, the licensee did not refund the excess amounts collected as advance for reasonable expenses incurred specifically for the petitioners' supply.
2. The petitioner applied for 160KVA power supply to the premises "Serene Square". Since requested supply was above 50kVA it could be supplied only at HT and providing a transformer by the applicant. Hence an estimate amounting to Rs.8,89,000/- was sanctioned by the Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Thiruvananthapuram and administrative sanction Dated 06.02.2009 was also issued from that office and was ordered to execute the work on work deposit basis. The work order detailing

for purchasing and laying cable etc. was also issued on 06/02/2009. Then we were asked by the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Cantonment to remit the amount of Rs.8,89,000/- and no formal demand notice was issued for the purpose. Work deposit amount Rs.8,89,000/- was remitted by us vide receipt dated 3/04/2009. Further Technical Sanction Dated 04.06.2009 was also issued and it was ordered to meet the expenses for the work from the budget provision for the year 2009-2010. Then another amount of Rs.47,550/- was collected under an estimate, sanctioned by the Executive Engineer. The amount was remitted vide receipt. Even after commencement of supply the licensee did not refund the excess amounts collected ad advance as reasonable expenses incurred specifically for the petitioners' supply.

3. As per the direction contained in the order document 440m, 3x300mm<sup>2</sup> 11kV, XLPE UG cable was procured and laid down by the petitioner from the tapping point at "West Cliff" RMU to the location marked by the licensee in front of "Serene Square" and further procured and laid 7- m of 150mm<sup>2</sup> 11kV XLPE UG cable from there to the HTSFU at the premises under the supervision of the licensee's personals. Even though it was known to the petitioner that 510 m of 150mm<sup>2</sup> 11kV XLPE UG cable was only necessary for his supply, there was no way out due to the insistence of the licensee's officials but to lay 440m 3x300mms 11kV, XLPE UG cable and then 70m of 150mm<sup>2</sup> 11kV XLPE UG cable. It was informed that thee is Board order insisting the applicant to lay 3 x 300mm<sup>2</sup> 11kV, XLPE UG cable even though it is not necessary for the applicants' exclusive supply and the submission of the petitioner on this matter was reuted.
4. 160kVA transformer was procured and all subsystems from HTSFU at the building were procured and erected to the

satisfaction of the Electrical Inspector in accordance with the scheme approved vide Scheme Approval No.B-2137/2008/EIT 1015/tvm dated 05.01.2008 at petitioner's expenses. Then even the licensee did not take any step to supply.

5. On enquiry with the Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Cantonment, it was informed to remit another Rs.47,550/- on the basis of another estimate vide document captioned with "Additional work for providing HT supply due to non availability of RMU". The petitioner remitted that amount of Rs.47,550/- also vide Receipt dated 25/-6/2009 document. Collection of this amount was not necessary since it was specifically ordered vide document that the cable shall be laid from the "West Cliff RMU" and thereby it should have been connected with the "West Cliff RMU" which was there. Supply was commenced during 08/2009 to the HTSFU at the premises after doing some works included in the estimate document.
6. Energy meters were purchased and provided in the metering panel. Then terminal connections to the meters were given by the licensee's personals for the purpose of metering and billing the consumers for the consumed energy. Unnecessary and amounts not authorized by the State Regulatory Commission were collected by the licensee as service connection OYEC for connecting the meters. Separate remedy is being sought by the petition on that matter.
7. The 11KV supply provided by the licensee is transformed and distributed and maintained by the petitioner with in the defined premises. Now the "Serene Square" is enjoying 11kV supply provided by the licensee satisfactorily. No further improvement or installation of gadgets/devices are imperative or is required for further satisfactory supply of 11kV exclusively to the petitioner, since standard isolation equipment AB switch and other

peripherals are provided at the tapping point for isolation. Since AB switch is the standard isolation equipment used by the licensee universally in the state of Kerala no other isolation device is necessary for the petitioner's supply also. On the other hand, as per orders of the Executive Engineer the licensee is mandated and should connected the cable with "West Cliff RMU" which is very well there and there by erection of AB switch was redundant.

8. Since supply was commenced and the petitioner is enjoying supply satisfactorily, the other items of works detailed under the estimate documents including the Extensible type RMU" have become redundant and the claim on them also became unnecessary. Cable laying order document, Estimate amounting to Rs.8,89,000/- document and Estimate amounting to Rs.47,550/- documents are arbitrary, lack propriety and reasonableness also. If the licensee had measured the work on commencement of supply and returned the balance amounts after deducting expenses reasonably incurred exclusively for his supply, further discussion of the estimates and this petition could have been avoided.
9. The order document that 440m, 3x300mm<sup>2</sup> 11kV, XLPE UG cable shall be laid from West Cliff RMU and since no other switching device is proposed at the point of tapping supply it is clear that the cable should be connected to the Cliff RMU. This is proper and in consonance with Section 44 (2) of the KSEB Board Terms and Conditions of Supply. Hence the petitioner accepts it, except the size of the cable ordered. But the licensee chose to connect the cable through an AB switch after collecting additional amount of Rs.47,550/- from the petitioner over and above the collected amount of Rs.8,89,000/- for supply and caused additional financial burden on the petitioner unnecessarily.

Therefore the licensee should return Rs.33018/- after deducting Rs.14,532/- (the actual incurred expenses) from the collected amount of Rs. 47,550/-

As per law/rules/regulations/orders, any expenses collected for supply from applicant for supply shall be reasonable, it shall be incurred, shall be authorized by the State Regulatory Commission for collecting and the balance amount shall be returned within a reasonable time on supply. All these are flouted by the licensee.

The amounts to be paid/returned by the licensee

1. The excess amount collected Rs.8,87,842.60/- (Rs.8,89,000.00-Rs.1157.40)
2. The excess amount collected Rs.33,018/- (Rs.47,55.00 - 14,532.00)
3. The amount to be returned for causing to buy 300mm<sup>2</sup> cable, end termination kits and straight joint kit instead of 150mm<sup>2</sup> cable Rs.2,50,417/-

Total amount due from the licensee is Rs.11,71,277/-

The above amount was caused by the licensee in excess than the reasonably incurred expenses for exclusive supply to the petitioner. The licensee should have returned the money after measuring the work on commencement of supply. But is has not done so even though it is obligated for that. Therefore the licensee shall pay an interest @ of double the bank rate with effect from the next month of effecting supply, which is from 09/2009 onwards.

The petitioner sought for the following relief.

- (i) To declare that the estimate based on which the demand was created as work deposit amount of Rs.8,89,000/- and the amount collected is arbitrary and illegal and the estimate may be set aside.
- (ii) To declare that the order of the Executive Engineer to lay 440m of 300mm<sup>2</sup> XLPE 11kV UG cable and to erect an

extensible type RMU at its end in front of "Serene Square" is illegal and not required for exclusive supply to the petitioner.

- (iii) To issue orders to return/pay the amount of Rs.11,62,277/- which is detailed in the petition above with interest at the rate of double the bank rate with effect from 09/2009 as one time payment by way of demand draft with detailed statement of accounts to the petitioner within 15 days on receipt of the decree of the Hon'ble Forum.
- (iv) To pay the cost and expenses of the petition which the Hon'ble Forum may kind it adequate.
- (v) Such other relief the complainant prays for, during the cost of appeal.

#### **Version of the Opposite Party**

The Opposite party filed a version as follows:-

The statements of facts is submitted by Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Puthenchantha. These statement of facts are not approved by Board. Hence requested for time extension, for getting Board approval if the Hon'ble Forum found admissible, due to technical matters are involved in this grievance of the respected complainant.

The complainant is the promoter and registered owner for all the LT service connection with Consumer No.10194 to 10208 (15 numbers) under Electrical Section Cantonment, Thiruvananthapuram, of the building complex "SERENE SQUARE". The Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section Cantonment, Thiruvananthapuram, on behalf of Licensee (KSEB), prepared an estimate under Work Deposit category, for extending HT supply to "SERENE SQUARE" as per the request of the complainant for effecting above mentioned 15 Nos of LT service connection on his/her premise.

The service connection to "SERENE SQUARE" comes under the classification of high-rise building having connected load of above

50KVA, in the case, the owner/promoter will have to install transformer of required capacity by himself/herself (Clause 5(5) of Terms and Conditions of KSEB 2005). Only indoor installations shall be permitted in urban areas under Thiruvananthapuram, Kollam, Ernakulam, Trissur and Kozhikode and such other places where outdoor installations may not be possible due to space limitations and safety aspects (as per Clause 11(5) of T&C of Supply 2005).

And as per Clause 13 (2h) of T&C of Supply 2005, HT Panel including group control isolator, LT panels including metering panels shall be installed by the promoter/consumer at his own cost. It is the responsibility of KSEB to give supply up to the incoming of HT panel.

For extending the HT supply upto the incoming HT panel in the premise of "SERENE SQUARE", an estimate is prepared with the following requirement.

1. As the present (During taking estimate) CTC RMU available at the nearest HT supply point, ie at "West Cliff" is not an extensible type, and no other spare outlet available at this supply point, and hence an extensible RMU at this point was proposed and included in the estimate. As the estimate report of the Assistant Engineer, he also proposed to shift the existing RMU to the location in front of the premise on the public road, from where the cable was laid through the land of promoter.
2. For extending HT supply from the newly proposed Extensible type RMU to the shifted CTC RMU in front of Complainant premise, about 440m of 3 x 300 sqmm XLPE Aluminum cable is proposed through the public road.
3. For further extending the HT supply from the CTC RMU in front of the premise of the complainant on the public

road to the incoming of the promoter, about 70 m of 3 x 150 sqmm XLPE Aluminum cable is proposed through the land of promoter.

The above proposal of preparing estimate in no way violated the rule, laws, regulation or orders related to distribution and comes under the amount of reasonable expenses for extending supply under section 46 of Electricity Supply Act 2003. Due to city automation schemes in Trivandrum, Ernakulam, and Kozhikodu cities are nearing completion, vide B.O.(FM) No.1325/2007 (DPCII/APDRP -6/2006-7/07-08/11.6.2007, it is directed that all the prospective HT consumers or consumers requiring installation of transformers for availing supply within APDRP Scheme area shall be allowed to tap HT supply only through Ring Main Units (RMU).

And vide B.O.(FM) (Genl)No.2560/2010 (DPCII/APRRP-6/2006-07)dtd.30.9.2010, sanction was accorded to effect power supply to prospective HT consumers from the existing structure where RMU is proposed to be installed under APDRP Scheme after collecting Rs.6,60,000/- for the extensible type RMU, or Rs.2,50,000/- for Add-on Module as the case may be with an undertaking to remit the additional amount if required on execution with reference to the previous B.O(FM) No.2693/2007 (DPCII/APDRP-6/2006-07/07-08)29.11.2007.

And the cable size is along the public road is proposed vide B.O (FM)No.1113/2008 (DPCII/UG Cable 13/2007-08)/5.5.2008. (This statement has to be clarified, as this submission is not approved). *Hence the estimate prepared by the Assistant Engineer for extending HT supply to "SERENE SQUARE" under Work Deposit was as per Board orders and reasonable. Hence there is no excess amount collected to be reimbursed to the Promoter under this work deposit.*

The grievance of the complainant regarding the cable laid for extending the supply is not correct. The cable selection will depend on the design accepts like voltage drop, short circuit withstanding capacity

of Cable laid and power loss depended on size of cable. The size of cable proposed on the public road was as per board orders. As this is a technical aspect, this has to be reviewed by technical experts.

The supply has been extended to "SERENE SQUARE" with temporary arrangement for avoid delay due to non availability of material like Extensible type RMU etc. These equipments will be made available and installed as per the estimate at the earliest.

As per Board order BO FM (Genl)No.2560/2010(DPCII/APDRP-6/2006-07 dtd.30.9.2010, that the cost of the temporary DP Structure installation and its dismantling cost need not be realized from the consumers who remit the cost of RMU/Add-on Module. As per BO(FM)(Genl)No.965/2011 (DPCII/APDRP-6/06-07) dated 6.4.2011,orders that retrospective effect shall be given to the Board Order dated 30.9.2010. And the Executive Engineer of Electrical Divisions are authorized to refund the amount collected towards the cost of the temporary DP Structure installation and its dismantling cost over and above the cost of RMU/Add-on Module by adjusting in future bills, on request from such consumers.

The grievance raised by the complainant is a general complaint and not an individual complaint and related to the technical and policy matter of the government and Board, hence the complaint raised by the complainant is beyond the preview of the Hon' ble Forum. Hence this case may be dismissed.

#### Discussion and Findings

In the version submitted by the opposite party, for the hearing of this case, it was directed to the Assistant Executive Engineer, Puthenchantha on 23/1/2012 to file the version of the opposite party and as such, the version was submitted on 13/2/2012. On the 1<sup>st</sup> hearing date, on which, it was mentioned that the approval of the Board was not obtained for the version and extension of time was

requested for obtaining sanction. Thus the 2<sup>nd</sup> hearing was posted to 24/2/2012 and the standing counsel of the Board, Sri. B. Sakthidharan Nair appeared for the hearing, along with the Assistant Executive Engineer. The final hearing was on 23/3/2012 and till the date, no approved version was submitted. Therefore, the forum accepts the version filed by the Assistant Executive Engineer. In the arguments raised at the time of hearing and as per the estimate and proposal prepared by the Assistant Engineer, it was stated that, the existing non-extensible type RMU, shall be shifted and installed in front of the petitioner's premises. At the west cliff point, an extensible type RMU shall be installed by realizing the cost from the petitioner. The cost of this new extensible type RMU Rs.6,60,000/-.

As per Ext.P3 & P4, the Sanctioning authority Executive Engineer, has revised the proposal of the Assistant Engineer, in the sanctioning order No.A1/2008-09 dtd.6/2/2009 ie is reproduced here under:-

*"Technical sanction for the work may be issued by the Assistant Executive Engineer after remitting the work deposit amount by the applicant. The estimate forward by the Assistant Executive Engineer has been revised in this office. The expenditure on account of this work may be met from the Work Deposit amount to be remitted by the applicant."*

In the estimate forwarded by the Assistant Executive Engineer, the Executive Engineer, who is the estimate sanctioning authority has revised the estimate and sanction is seen given, which is clearly stated in Ext.P4, and that a new extensible type RMU shall be installed in front of the premises of the petitioner, and to realize its cost Rs.6,60,000/- from the petitioner. "Sanction has been accorded vide Amendment referred by the Chief Engineer (DS) to Smt Jasimine Rajesh for procuring and laying 440 mtrs of 3x300 mm<sup>2</sup> 11 kV XLPE UG cable from West Cliff RMU to the extensible type RMU installed in front of the building and laying, 70 mtrs of 150mm<sup>2</sup> 11KV XLPE UG cable from the RMU to 160 KVA indoor Transformer".

As per the version & argument of the Assistant Executive Engineer, the existing non-extensible type RMU at the West Cliff point is to be shifted to the premises of M/s. Serene Square. But the Executive Engineer has revised the estimate and sanctioned to the effect that the new extensible type RMU purchased/ cash remitted by the petitioner has to be installed in front of M/s. Serene Square. This order is produced by the petitioner as Ext.P4. That is, as per this sanction letter, an amount of Rs.8,89,000/-has been recovered from the petitioner as work deposit. But in the version, the opposite party had filed, and at the time of hearing, stated that, the estimate proposed by the Assistant Engineer is as per the prevailing Board order.

The above arguments of the opposite party is quite contradictory and hence it has become difficult for the Forum to take a just and correct decision. Hence, the Chairperson of the Forum personally inspected the premises of the West Cliff RMU and the proposed RMU in front of serene square and has found the following facts:-

1. In the West Cliff point there is a non-extensible type RMU. One transformer is connected to its outlet. An out going cable from the RMU is intercepted to a DP structure and a 300 sqmm cable is seen given to the cliff house. Another 300 [sq.mm](#) cable is given to Serene Square. A single pole is seen erected at the right side of entrance of serene square upon a foot path. When a RMU is installed upon the footpath, the purpose of the footpath is permanently defeated. From that RMU, when new connections are to be given for the prospective consumers, by using Add on modules, the footpath cannot be used in any manner. Such a situation is not fore seen or examined by the authority at the time of preparing the estimate.
2. A stand by feeder from that point is seen extended to cliff house which is a 300 sq.mm cable.

3. As per Ext.P3 & P4, an extensible type RMU is needed at West Cliff Point, to effect supply to cliff house feeder, to the petitioner and to other existing transformer. Thus the extensible type RMU proposed at the west cliff should have 3 free outlets. Then only supply can be tapped without Add on modules. As per the Ext.P3 & P4, the installation of extensible type RMU at West cliff point is not mentioned, and is not available there. Here it is not stated that an RMU should be installed at the Board's own plan.
4. On enquiry it was revealed that the west cliff feeder is a stand by one. The stand by feeder at the cliff house should be in such a way as it could be linked with another feeder. Then an extensible type RMU is needed at that point. From there through an Add on module, service can be effected to M/s. Serene Square. On enquiry it is revealed that the length of cable required from the cliff house to the petitioner's premises is below 250 mts.only.
5. As per Ext.P3 & P4, the Board shall install an extensible type RMU at the west cliff point. Nothing is seen mentioned towards this in the order nor the opposite party has stated the same. In the version of the opposite party and in the estimate sanction of the Executive Engineer, it is seen that the supply could be given by extending 440 mtrs. of 300 sq.mm cable.

Thus it can be seen that, from the existing cliff house stand by feeder, the supply can be extended to the petitioner's premises, which is less than 250 mtrs away. But as per the proposal of the Assistant Engineer and the sanction given by the Executive Engineer, 200 mtrs cable has to be laid in excess, which is clearly a wastage of money. As per Section 46, only the reasonably incurred expenditure need only be realized from the applicant, for effecting supply. Accordingly, to effect supply to M/s. Serene Square, it is clear that the Board has not

examined the shortest, economic and feasible way for giving supply. Section 46 is reproduced hereunder:-

*Power to recover expenditure:- The State Commission may, by regulations, authorize 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 estimate proposed by the Assistant Engineer is revised by the Executive Engineer. The Board now says that the estimate of the Assistant Engineer was correct. Here it is clear that the Board now relies on the estimate of the Assistant Engineer. Then, the competent authority has to sanction the estimate once again. In such an event, the Board will have to quash the Ext.P3 & P4. As per the Ext.P3 & P4 Rs. 8,89,000/- was recovered from the petitioner as work deposit. In sanctioning the revised estimate, it is obligatory to consider the prayers of the petitioner.

From this it is evident that the Board is going to revise the estimate. The service connection to the petitioner can be effected from the cliff house point by extending around 250 mtrs.of UG cable. On enquiry it was said that the Board staff had no easy access to the cliff house point and as such another route with an excess of 200 mtrs was proposed for effecting supply to the petitioner. The forum does not take into account, such a statement. It is invariably confirmed that the Board's distribution system shall be installed only in an easily accessible place. In such a situation, the Board cannot realize the expenses of an alternate route which causes the consumer extra expenses for the fault not of his own, and which is against Section 46 of the Act. This procedure of the Board cannot be accepted. Apparently, the Board orders

- (1) BO (FM)(GI)No.2560/2010 (DPCII/APDRP-6/2006-07) dtd.Tvpm 30/9/2010.
- (2) BO (FB) (Genl) No.2024/2011(DPCIIE/T&C of Supply 02/2009/2011) dtd.Tvpm 18/8/2011 are also to be considered.

The possibility of the shortest and economical access with reasonable amount shall be examined with its merits and demerits and it shall be informed to this forum within one month.

The expenses shall be recovered only as per Section 46 of the Act. As per Section 42 of the Act, it is the sole duty of the licensee to develop its distribution system effectively. Hence, the revision of the estimate shall be done on its merit. Section 42 is reproduced hereunder.

*Duties of distribution licensee and open access – It shall be the duty of a distribution licensee to develop and maintain an efficient, co-ordinated and economical distribution system in his area of supply and to supply electricity in accordance with the provisions contained in this Act.*

Section 46 states that only reasonably incurred expenses shall be recovered from the petitioner for giving that supply.

### **ORDER**

1. Ext.P3 & P4 are set aside. The revised estimate as per Section 42 & 46 of the Act shall be sanctioned within 30 days and while revising the estimate, it should be made sure that it is the shortest, economic and feasible way.
2. The excess amount remitted by the petitioner shall be refunded with interest of cash deposit amount, within the next 30 days.
3. No order as to cost.

If the petitioner is not satisfied with the above order of this

Forum, he/she is at liberty to prefer appeal before the Electricity Ombudsman within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order. The address of the Electricity Ombudsman is furnished below.

*State Electricity Ombudsman, Pallikkavil Buildings, Mamangalam-Anchumana Temple Road, Opp:Kochi Corporation Regional Office, Edappally, Kochi – 682 024, Ph: 0484 -2346488.*

Sd/-

BEENA PIOUS  
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,  
MEMBER

Sd/-

N.SASIDHARAN UNNITHAN  
MEMBER

Sd/-

R.SUKU  
CHAIRPERSON  
DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER

Forwarded

CHAIRPERSON  
(DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER)  
CGRF (SOUTH), KOTTARAKKARA.

