

**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 (LICENCEE)

FRANCIS. A. C : MEMBER (LAW)

OP 74/2025-26

PETITIONER :-

**Sri. AMEERUDHEEN K.,
KARATTU HOUSE,
KODIYATHUR P.O,
MUKKAM,
KOZHIKODE - 673602**

RESPONDENTS :-

- 1. THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
ELECTRICAL SUB DIVISION,
KUNNAMANGALAM, KSEB LTD.,
KOZHIKODE DISTRICT**
- 2. THE ASSISTANT ENGINEER,
ELECTRICAL SECTION, PANNIKODE,
KSEB LTD, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT**

ORDER

Background of the case:-

The Petitioner, Sri. Ameerudheen K., Karattu House, Kodyathur P.O., Mukkam, Kozhikode-673602, Application No: 216772906101 under Ele. Section, Pannikode, complaints before the forum about the continued delay and unlawful conditions being suggested in connection with his application for a new electricity connection and prays before the forum to take proper action.

Argument of the Petitioner :-

The Petitioner states that he had applied for a new electricity connection under Section 43 of the Electricity Act 2003 (Application No.216772906101) at KSEB Pannikode Section, Kozhikode. Even after submitting all required documents, site access details and proof of pathway rights and despite fulfilling all statutory requirements, the electricity connection has not been provided to the Petitioner so far. Recently the Petitioner was contacted by the Assistant Engineer, Pannikkode and the Assistant Executive Engineer, Kunnamangalam who suggested that he should consider a “compromise” involving exchange or adjustment of land/road space with the

opposite party in order to proceed with the electricity connection.

Hence the Petitioner respectfully submit that

- 1. Land or road exchange is a civil matter and does not fall within the scope or authority of KSEB.**
- 2. KSEB officials are not empowered under the Electricity Act, 2003 or the supply code to insist upon or to negotiate land exchange or to compromise between private parties.**
- 3. Electricity supply under Section 43 of the Electricity Act 2003 cannot be denied or delayed on the ground that the applicant has not agreed to a private settlement or land arrangement.**

The Petitioner further submits that he has a lawful pathway right (4/5 share) and all matters relating to land ownership or compromise are irrelevant to the grant of electricity connection. Hence he proceeds with a formal complaint before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) regarding the violation of Section 43 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Along with his complaint the Petitioner has attached copies of all relevant documents, including:

- Application for new electricity connection.**
- Representations submitted earlier.**
- Proof of pathway rights.**

➤ **Relevant communications received from KSEB.**

The Petitioner requests higher authorities of KSEB to kindly take note of the above facts and ensure that his application is processed strictly in accordance with the Electricity Act 2003, without insisting on any conditions that are not sanctioned by law. He also states that the complaint in his email is being sent to all concerned authorities for transparency and for appropriate administrative action.

Argument of the Respondent:-

In his version, the First Respondent states as below:

- ◆ **The Petitioner had applied for a new electricity connection at Electrical Section, Pannikkode under Section 43 of the Electricity Act, 2003. During preliminary field verification, it was reported that the proposed service line route passes through a pathway jointly owned by the Petitioner and Sri. Nasar and objection was raised by the co-owner.**
- ◆ **1st Respondent received a letter from the Assistant Engineer requesting intervention and proposal to refer the matter to ADM. The Petitioner was informed that without consent or**

lawful clearance, execution may not be feasible. Ist Respondent contacted the Petitioner and Sri. Noushad, representative of Sri. Nasar, over telephone. The objection regarding the pathway was reiterated by the objecting party, who insisted that the service line shall not pass through the existing pathway unless it is shifted to the extreme left side of their property.

- ◆ Hence Ist Respondent attempted to facilitate an amicable resolution between both parties in good faith to avoid further delay. However both parties maintained their respective stands and no consensus could be arrived at.**
- ◆ The Petitioner was informed that without consent of the objecting party or lawful clearance from the competent authority the execution of the work is not feasible as per rules. All procedural steps including reference to the Additional District Magistrate for property crossing permission have been initiated. The matter was already forwarded to the Additional District Magistrate for appropriate decision.**
- ◆ The delay occurred was solely due to the objection raised and absence of consent. Upon receipt of lawful clearance, the service**

connection will be affected without further delay.

- ♦ **The Respondents have acted strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Electricity Act and Supply Code and no deficiency of service is attributable to the Respondents and requests the Forum, that this complaint may be dismissed owing to these facts.**

Observation & Analysis :

The hearing in the case was first scheduled on 28th January 2026. But the Petitioner requested for rescheduling it to a date after 02.02.2026, as he has University Exams during the last week of January 2026; the hearing is rescheduled to 03.02.2026.

In the hearing dated 03.02.2026 both the parties were present. Forum observed that the proof of pathway rights submitted by the Petitioner is not acceptable as it is not the certified copy of the sale deed. Further the OP was filed before the forum on 05.01.2026. But, the Respondent has already taken up the matter before the Hon'ble ADM on 27.12.2025 itself. According to section 164 of the Electricity Act 2003, District Magistrate is the statutory authority to pass appropriate orders in

such disputes, hence this forum is not in a position to intervene in this matter.

Having considered all the documents submitted and the deliberations during the hearing and based on the aforesaid observations and analysis, the Forum has come to the following conclusion leading to the decision.

Decision:-

The Petition is dismissed.

The Petition is disposed accordingly.

Dated this the 03rd day of February 2026.

Sd/-

Sd/-

Sd/-

FRANCIS A.C.

RAJU C.K.

SANDHYA DIVAKAR

Member(LAW)

Member(LICENSEE)

CHAIRPERSON

Endt.on CGRF-NR/OP 74/2025-26/400

Dt 05/02/2026

Forwarded to:

- 1) SRI.AMEERUDHEEN K,
KARATTU HOUSE,
KODIYATHUR P.O.,
MUKKAM,,
KOZHIKODE - 673602,

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

- 2) THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
ELECTRICAL SUB DIVISION, KUNNAMANGALAM,
KSEB LTD, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT.
(By Email&Post)

- 3) THE ASSISTANT ENGINEER,
ELECTRICAL SECTION, PANNIKODE,
KSEB LTD, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT
(By Post)

Copy submitted to:

1. THE SECRETARY, KSEB Ltd,
VYDYUTHI BHAVANAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
(By Post)
2. THE DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER, TRAC, KSEBL,
VYDYUTHI BHAVANAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
(By Email)

Forwarded

Sd/-

Chairperson.