



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

MONDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**PRESENT
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA**

WRIT PETITION No.22269 OF 2025

Between:

M/s.Kaluvala Granites, Rep. by its Managing Partner, K.Obula Reddy,
S/o.K.Pullu Reddy, Aged about 48 years, R/o.Sy.No.149/2, Budawada,
Chimakurthy Mandal, Prakasam District, Andhra Pradesh.

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Energy Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi, Amaravati,
A.P., and others.

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner : Mr.K.Gani Reddy

**Counsel for the Respondents: G.P. for Energy
Mr.V.V.Satish,
Standing Counsel for APEPDCL**

The Court made the following ORDER:

The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is non-consideration of the representation dated 10.3.2025 made by it by the respondent No.3.

2. Mr.S.Prem, learned arguing counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia* submits that the petitioner is availing power supply to its Unit/Factory vide Service Connection No.4744604000578. He submits that the petitioner was regularly paying the electricity bills, but for the purpose of remodeling and undertaking certain repair works to the machinery, the Unit was closed from June 2023 to December 2023. However, the monthly electricity bills were raised to a tune of Rs.4,15,933/- towards short-fall and the petitioner owing to financial difficulties and as the said amount is not payable, did not clear the said bills. Be that as it may. The learned counsel submits that the petitioner made a representation dated 10.3.2025 seeking the indulgence of the Discom Authorities to withdraw the short-fall amount and to restore the power supply. He submits that as the said representation did not yield any result, the petitioner is constrained to file the present writ petition.

3. On the other hand, Mr.Abdul Matheen, learned Junior Standing Counsel for the A.P.C.P.D.C.L., representing respondent Nos.2 to 7 submits that the writ petition is not maintainable and in fact, the petitioner has a remedy under Section 42(5) of the Electricity Act, 2003. He submits that the petitioner can as well approach the Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, in the event the short-fall amount is not payable. He also submits that in fact the short-fall amount raised by the respondent Authorities is in accordance with the Terms and Conditions of the supply. Making the said submissions, the learned counsel seeks dismissal of the writ petition.

4. This Court has considered the submissions made and perused the material on record.

5. At the outset, as rightly pointed out by the learned Junior Standing Counsel, under the Andhra Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Vidyut Ombudsman and Consumer Assistance Regulation, 2016 (Regulation 3 of 2016), the grievance of the consumers with regard to the electricity charges etc., can as well be agitated before the concerned Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum. In fact, the said Regulation also provides for further adjudication of the consumer's grievance in the event of adverse orders by the said Forum. Under para Nos.18 and 19 of the said Regulation, the Ombudsman is empowered to pass orders on the Representation made by the consumer/ complainant. Therefore, this Court is inclined to relegate the petitioner to the concerned Redressal Forum for appropriate action. If the petitioner approaches the Forum, the case of the petitioner shall be considered in accordance with Law and the relevant terms and conditions of supply.

6. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner states that as the petitioner-Unit is now ready to carry on its operations but for the non-availability of power supply and a direction for restoration of power supply, pending adjudication of the matter by the Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum. Considering the said submission, this Court deems it appropriate to direct the respondent Authorities to restore power supply, subject to payment of Rs.2,25,000/- (Rupees Two lakhs twenty five thousand only). Needless to observe that the payment made by the petitioner would be subject to outcome of the orders to be passed by the Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum.

7. With the above directions, the writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petition pending, if any, shall stand closed.

February 16, 2026
vasu

NINALA JAYASURYA,J