

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
NORTHERN REGION, KOZHIKODE.**

(Formed under section 42(5) of Electricity Act 2003.)

Vydyuthibhavan, Gandhi Road, Kozhikode -673011

Telephone Number -0495 2367820 Email.cgrfkzd@kseb.in

PRESENT

SANDHYA DIVAKAR : CHAIRPERSON
RAJU .C.K : MEMBER (Licensee)
FRANCIS A.C : MEMBER (Law)

OP NO. 44/2025-26

PETITIONER :-

Smt. Smitha .E.T, Athulyam, Kallathody, Kulangarapeedika,
Guruvayurappan College – P.O., Kozhikode 673 014.

RESPONDENTS :-

1. The Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division,
Kunnamangalam, KSEB Ltd, Kozhikode District.
2. The Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Mukkam, KSEB Ltd,
Kozhikode District.

ORDER

Back Ground of the Complaint:

The Petitioner, Smt. Smitha .E.T, Athulyam, Kallathody, Kulangarapeedika, Guruvayurappan College – P.O., Kozhikode, requests the Forum to instruct section office to allocate her power for her EV charging station from 250kVA roadside transformer and strictly adhere to timelines mentioned by KSERC.

Argument of the Petitioner :

The Petitioner, Smt. Smitha. E T, wishes to start an EV charging station, on Mambatta, Mukkam bypass Road. Considering this requirement and a minor additional power requirement for “Gaza Polymer Industries” her son Ashwin K had enhanced the Road side Transformer “KAYITTAPOYIL BYPASS” from 100 kVA to 250kVA as per “Cost Data System,” (Exhibit P1). This was done in accordance with the guidance from Assistant Engineer of KSEB Section Office, Mukkam.

Once she finalized the technical and operational parameters for charging station, Petitioner approached the KSEB section office to apply for feasibility as instructed by EV Consultant. The Petitioner further states as follows:

- **At that time, a new Assistant Engineer had taken charge.**
- **During the Petitioner’s first visit, their feasibility application was not admitted.**
- **During the Second visit, only when EV Consultant informed Assistant Engineer that application had to be mandatorily admitted as per regulations, Assistant Engineer admitted the application on 29.07.2025 (Exhibit P2).**
- **Upon taking follow ups via official number; the Petitioner wasn’t given any proper or polite responses.**
- **On 27.08.2025 Petitioner received a feasibility certificate which mentioned details of work as “100kVA Transformer Installation at applicable premises”. This document had the date 18.08.2025 written on it (Exhibit P3).**

It is beyond reason to demand the Petitioner to install a 100kVA transformer unnecessarily. The Petitioner’s son has already enhanced the transformer via the OYEC method.

Hence the Petitioner requests the Forum to instruct Section office to allocate her power from 250kVA roadside transformer and also to maintain polite proper communications and strictly adhere the timelines mentioned by KSERC.

Argument of the Respondents:

Appreciating the entrepreneurial initiatives of both Mr. Ashwin K of Gaza Polymer Industries and Mrs. Smita E.T, the proponent of the EV charging station, Respondent submits the following:

- 1. For meeting the power requirement of Gaza Polymer Industries, Mr. Ashwin K (consumer number 1166086034779) caused the enhancement of the Kayittapoyil Bypass road transformer from 100 kVA to 250 kVA. Payment for this enhancement work was made to KSEB on 21.05.2024. The enhancement was specifically for the industrial load of Gaza Polymer Industries.*
- 2. The applicant and the customer are two different consumers and cannot be treated as a single entity in law. Any attempt to club Gaza Polymer Industries and the proposed EV charging station (owned by Mrs. Smitha E.T) under a single shorthand (e.g., “we”) is not legally tenable.*
- 3. The enhancement proposal dated 21 May 2024 (the year “2074” seen in one note appears to be a typographical error) did not include any provision for an EV charging station of 65kW. The licensee executing the enhancement was unaware of any such future EVCS project at the time of sanction, not was any such plan informed then.*

- 4. The proposed charging station site is approximately 400m away from the enhanced 250kVA transformer along the public road. The existing LT feeder between the transformer and Gaza Polymer Industries already supplies multiple consumers, including industrial and commercial loads and drinking-water schemes. Loads are tapped from the same line at various points. There are multiple new connection requests on this line and loading is expected to increase gradually.***
- 5. Supplying an additional 65kW EV-charging load from the existing long LT line will cause severe voltage drop and power-quality issues to existing consumers. At~85kW (3-phase), the current magnitude is of the order of~ 100A per phase; over~400m of LT, this further depresses voltages at consumer ends. In addition, starting/inrush currents from Gaza Polymer Industries machinery already cause significant voltage fluctuations. Consequently, the EV charging station itself will not receive acceptable supply quality owing to distance and cumulative LT voltage drop.***
- 6. The tapping of supply from this LT line is against the interest of the Petitioner itself M/s. Gaza Polymers and all the other consumers connected to this transformer.***
- 7. A site inspection was conducted by the undersigned Assistant Executive Engineer and Sub Engineer, (Er.Sunil). Voltages were measured at the transformer terminals and at the***

consumer premises (Gaza Polymer Industries). A substantial voltage loss along the LT section was recorded (~240V at the transformer and ~219V at the consumer premises). Even during off-peak conditions-when roughly one-quarter of the existing feeder capacity was being drawn noticeable voltage depression was observed at the far end. M/s. Gaza Polymer Industries also plans expansion, which further necessitates a dedicated transformer to avoid supply-quality issues that would adversely affect the industry itself.

- 8. The 250kVA transformer was enhanced exclusively to serve Gaza Polymer Industries industrial requirement. Given the distance, existing loading, and multi-consumer nature of the LT line, extending 65kW for an EV charging station from this LT feeder is not technically or legally justifiable. The appropriate and technically sound solution is to install a dedicated transformer of about 100kVA near the EVCS premises, ensuring the 65kW demand is met with proper voltage regulation and without degrading supply quality to existing consumers.*

In view of the above facts and field findings, it is humbly submitted that the Forum may record these facts and uphold the decision that the proposed EV charging station should be provided supply through a new, dedicated 100kVA transformer near the consumer premises, and that tapping

65kW from the existing long LT feeder emanating from the 250kVA Kayittapoyil Bypass transformer is not feasible.

In the light of these facts, the Respondent respectfully requests the Hon'ble Forum to dispose the case.

Summary of Hearing :

The first sitting in this OP was convened on 16.09.2025 FN at CGRF Court Hall, Vidyuthi Bhavanam, Kozhikode in which both the parties were present.

The nominee of the Petitioner enquired about the feasibility of providing a dedicated LT feeder from the existing transformer with an enhanced capacity of the existing transformer with an enhanced capacity of 250KVA and expressed their willingness to remit the requisite amount.

But, the Respondent put forth the following arguments:

- It is true that the 250KVA transformer has the requisite capacity; but, the site is located 400 meters away from the transformer.
- The existing HT/LT line is drawn with 9 meter PSC poles. To provide an additional feeder with LT ABC, the PSC poles should be upgraded to 12m/11m A poles.
- For a 70mm LT AB Cable, the voltage drop is 0.93V/A/meter. With 100A current and 400m length, the approximate voltage

drop at the site will be 37V which is much below the permissible limit.

- It would have been better if the Petitioner's son had installed a 100 KVA transformer in this site, instead of enhancing the capacity of transformer from 100KVA to 250 KVA.

The Petitioner's nominee stated that the enhancement was carried out as per the suggestions of then Assistant Engineer of Mukkam Section. He further suggested for exploring the possibility of dedicated LT feeder with OH bare conductor or with higher capacity AB cable. The Respondent agreed to looking into the matter and the OP is adjourned to 19-09-2025 FN.

In the Second sitting convened on 19.09.2025 FN at the Court hall of the CGRF(NR), the Respondent informed the Forum that the estimate for dedicated LT OH feeder comes to a huge amount of around 6 lakhs. The estimate and sketch are marked as Exhibit R1(1) – R1(4).

The Petitioner's nominee emphasized his argument as follows:

1. The Petitioner's son Mr. Ashwin. K, Proprietor of M/s. Gaza Polymer Industries, Consumer No.34779, had approached Electrical Section, Mukkam one year back for enhancement of his connected load from 42KVA to 64 KVA and also an

anticipated load enhancement to 95KVA within one year. He was advised to enhance the existing 100 KVA. The enhancement suggested by the then Assistant Engineer of Electrical Section, Mukkam, is up to 250KVA as Mr. *Ashwin K* had mentioned his intention to install an EVCS in the adjacent property in his mother's name. An amount of around 2.5 lakhs was remitted by the Petitioner's son then for this enhancement. Otherwise enhancement to 160 KVA would have been sufficient. At present, M/s. Gaza Polymer Industries have 16 numbers of regular staff and 8 numbers of part time employees and is contributing to the prosperity of the locality. In addition, associated employment such as loading and unloading, transportation etc., are also facilitated.

Further EVCS is a public amenity widely promoted by Government of India for the prosperity of the nation as well as due to its eco friendliness. Hence the present estimate of 6 lakh is irrational.

Then the Petitioner and the Respondent had a discussion and put forth the following proposal.

- A new 100KVA transformer will be installed at the location of the present 250KVA Kayittapoyil Bypass DTR. (At present this

transformer has not yet reached 50% load even on including the load of M/s. Gaza Polymers Industries).

- The 250KVA transformers will be shifted to the proposed site of EVCS.
- For materializing the work, one span of 11KV line also to be drawn, crossing the road to Petitioner's plot.
- The expenses for the above work will be borne by the Petitioner.
- But 250KVA transformer installed at Petitioner property will be a transformer owned by KSEBL and KSEBL can tap supply for other consumers from this transformer at any time.

Observation of the Forum:

Forum examined this mutually agreed arrangement thoroughly.

- The Petitioner will be paying the amount for installation of a 100KVA transformer. The Petitioner's son has already paid for the enhancement of a 100KVA transformer to 250KVA. The shifting charges also will be borne by the Petitioner. Hence neither the Petitioner nor the Licensee has any loss.
- Both the 100KVA and 250KVA transformers will be working more efficiently. And is beneficial for both the Petitioner as

well as for the consumers who are presently being fed from Kayittapoyil Bypass DTR.

Having considered all the documents submitted and the deliberations during the hearing, the Forum has come to the following conclusions leading to the decision:

Decision:

As mutually agreed by both the Petitioner and the Respondent the following arrangements are to be carried out:

- A 100 KVA new transformer is to be installed and to be energised at the location of present Kayittapoyil Bypass DTR.
- The 250 KVA Transformer, which is now functioning as Kayittapoyil Bypass DTR, is to be relocated to the Petitioner's property and to be energized drawing one span of 11 KV line, crossing the road to the Petitioner's property.
- The expenditure for the above works to be borne by the Petitioner.
- The Respondent is directed to prepare and submit the estimate for the above work within three days on receipt of this order and to obtain sanction for the same at the earliest.
- The compliance of this order may be intimated to the Forum within 30 days on receipt of this order.

The Petition is disposed accordingly.

Dated this the 19th day of September, 2025.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
Francis . A .C	Raju. C.K	Sandhya Divakar
Member (Law)	Member (Licensee)	Chairperson

Endt.on CGRF-NR/OP 44/2025-26/ 233

/ 24 .09.2025

Copy submitted to:

Smt. Smitha .E.T,
'Athulyam ',
Kallathody,
Kulangarapeedika
Guruvayurappan College-P.O.
Kozhikode – 673 014.

If the petitioner is not satisfied with the above order of this Forum, he is at liberty to prefer appeal before the State Electricity Ombudsman,D.H. Road, Offshore Road Junction Gandhi Square, Eranakulam, Kerala- 682016.(Ph: 0484 2346488) within 30 days from date of receipt of this order.

(By sepeed post)

2) The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division Kunnamangalam,
KSEB Ltd., Kozhikode District. (By Mail & Post)

3) The Assistant Engineer,
Electrical Section Mukkam,
K.S.E.B.L., Kozhikode District.

Copy Submitted to:

- 1) The Secretary, K.S.E.B.L, Thiruvananthapuram.
- 2) The Deputy Chief Engineer, TRAC, Thiruvananthapuram . (By Mail)

Forwarded

Sd/-

Chairperson