

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM  
KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD LTD- SOUTHERN REGION  
VYDYUTHI BHAVANAM, KOTTARAKKARA**

---

Present: 1. Smt.Laila.N.G,Deputy Chief Engineer, Chairperson  
2. Sri. Sanjeev Koshy,Executive Engineer, Member II  
3. Sri.C.K.Harikumar,Advocate,Member III

Thursday30<sup>th</sup> January2025

**OP No.65/2024**

Between

Petitioner: Sri. Joy Abraham,  
Carmel, Vadakkedthakavu,  
Adoor, PIN-691526.

And

Respondents : (1) The Assistant Executive Engineer  
Electrical Sub Division, Adoor.  
  
(2) The Assistant Engineer,  
Electrical Section, Adoor.

**ORDER**

**1. Grievance of the petitioner**

The petitioner is a consumer under Electrical Section Adoor. His grievance is to remove the stay wire situated at the entrance of his property which makes hindrance to the passage of vehicle. The stay has been put in his property for providing service connection to his neighbour Smt Minimol without his consent.He made several complaints to section office. But no action has been taken by the licensee. So the petitioner filed the complaint before the forum to remove the stay wire from his property.

**2. Version of the respondent**

The petitioner is a consumer under Electrical Section Adoor. The petitioner had lodged a complaint on 03/09/2024 to remove the stay wire which is making obstruction to the entrance of his property. On inspection it is understood that the stay wire has been put to give service connection to Smt. Minimol, Ajayvilasom, Munnalam, by drawing 90 m over head line

and 10 m weatherproof wire on 11/06/2024. No complaint was reported while preparing in estimates or doing the work. While doing the work the said location was covered with thorny plants in an unidentified pathway and stay was put across the boundary. Though the stay wire is essential, it can be avoided by shifting the post slightly to one side and support post shall installed instead of stay wire. For this an estimate of 26,264/- has been prepared and communicated to Smt Minimol. But she is not ready to remit the amount. Therefore the respondent is on the view that the complaint can be rectified only by remitting the estimated amount.

### **3 Analysis and Findings**

The hearing of the case was conducted on 28/11/2024. Both the petitioner and respondent were present for hearing. Having examined the petition in detail and the statement of facts of the respondent, Considering all the facts and circumstances in detail, perusing all the documents of both sides, the forum comes to the following observations, conclusions and decisions thereof.

The petitioner contended that while he was on abroad the stay has put in his property without his consent by making obstruction to the smooth passage of the vehicle. The respondent argued that, the stay can be removed by providing a support post after shifting the post and the the cost of estimate for the work has to be borne either by the beneficiary Smt. Minimol or the petitioner Sri. Joy Abraham. On going through records and site inspection conducted on 17/01/2025 , it is clear that the stay has been provided without the consent of the petitioner and making hindrance to the passage of vehicle to the entrance. Therefore the petitioner's requisition to shift the stay wire conveniently to another suitable location cannot be denied by the licensee. The petitioner is at liberty to use the property under his possession in whatever legitimate ways he desires. Therefore licensee has to make technical arrangements to remove the stay from his property by providing a strutpole to the opposite side of stay wire after locating post in the boundary.

Regarding the payment of estimated cost of shifting the stay wire, the forum observes that the petitioner has no obligation to bear

the expense as the stay wire was installed without the consent of the petitioner. The licensee also admits the facts that the stay wire is installed without obtaining the consent of the petitioner. Then the licensee should prepare estimate either based on using the strut pole or bringing the consent of the petitioner for providing the stay. Therefore here in this case beneficiary, Smt. Minimol is accountable for bearing the estimated cost .

**DECISION**

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case mentioned above the Forum ordered as follows.

1. The stay which creates the inconvenience shall be removed and a strut pole can be provided on the opposite side of stay, after realising the estimated cost from the consumer (Smt. Minimol), who is the beneficiary of the service connection.
2. The Order shall be executed within 15 days of the receipt of the order and a compliance report shall be sent before the Forum.
3. No order as to cost.

If the petitioner is not satisfied with the above order of this Forum, he 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.  
'The State Electricity Ombudsman, D.H & Foreshore Road Junction, Near Gandhi Square, Ernakulam, Kerala - 682 016. Phone: 0484 2346488'.

Sd/-  
C .K.HARIKUMAR  
ADVOCATE  
MEMBER III

Sd/-  
SANJEEV KOSHY  
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER  
MEMBER II

Sd/-  
LAILA.N.G  
DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER  
CHAIRPERSON

Forwarded

Sd/-

CHAIRPERSON  
(DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER)

No: CGRF/KTR/OP No.65/2024/680      Dated :30/01/2025

Delivered to:

1. Sri. Joy Abraham, Carmel, Vadakkedthakavu, Adoor .PiN-691526
2. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, Adoor.
3. The Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section,Adoor.

Copy to:-

1. The Secretary, KSERC, KPFC Bhavanam, Vellayambalam, TVPM.
2. The Deputy Chief Engineer, Electrical Circle, Pathanamthitta.
3. The Executive Engineer, Electrical Division, Adoor.