



A consumer is the important visitor on our premises.
He is not dependent on us. We are dependent on him.
-Mahatma Gandhi

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building, Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate,
Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

Phone : ++91-044-2953 5806, 044-2953 5816 Fax : ++91-044-2953 5893

Email : tneocheennai@gmail.com Web site : www.tnerc.gov.in

Before The Tamil Nadu Electricity Ombudsman, Chennai

Present : Thiru. N.Kannan, Electricity Ombudsman

A.P.No. 14 of 2024

BY RPAD

Thiru V.Gopanna,
17/62, Gajapathy Street,
Shenoy Nagar,
Chennai – 600030.

. Appellant
(Thiru V.Gopanna)

Vs.

The Executive Engineer/O&M/ Thirumazhisai,
Chengalpet Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
Kavalcheri Road, Thirumazhisai,
Chennai – 600 124.

. Respondent
(Thiru R. Balamurugan, EE/O&M/Thirumazhisai)

Petition Received on: 06-03-2024

Date of hearing: 23-04-2024

Date of order:- 24-04-2024

The Appeal Petition received on 06.03.2024, filed by Thiru V.Gopanna, 17/62, Gajapathy Street, Shenoy Nagar, Chennai – 600030 was registered as Appeal Petition No. 14 of 2024. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 23.04.2024. Upon perusing the Appeal Petition, Counter affidavit, written argument, and the oral submission made on the hearing date from both the parties, the Electricity Ombudsman passes the following order.

ORDER

1. Prayer of the Appellant:

The Appellant has prayed to remove the stay wire placed in front of his plot.

2.0 Brief History of the case:

2.1 The Appellant has registered a complaint to remove the stay wire placed in front of his plot.

2.2 Based on the complaint, a field inspection was made by the Respondent and it was found that the stay wire is most essential for standing upright the LT line runs along two 11 KV HT lines.

2.3 Since the grievance was not settled with the Respondent, the Appellant filed a petition with the CGRF of Chengalpet Electricity Distribution Circle on 10.10.2023.

2.4 The CGRF of Chengalpet Electricity Distribution Circle has issued an order dated 02.02.2024. Aggrieved over the order, the Appellant has preferred this appeal petition before the Electricity Ombudsman.

3.0 Orders of the CGRF :

3.1 The CGRF of Chengalpet Electricity Distribution Circle issued its order on 02.02.2024. The relevant portion of the order is extracted below: -

“Order:

மேற்கண்ட பத்திகளில் இருந்து மனுதாரர் புகார் மனுவில் குறிப்பிட்ட இடத்தை கள ஆய்வு செய்ததில் அவர் வீட்டின் அருகிலுள்ள RSJ கம்பத்தில் இரண்டு திசைகளில் இரண்டு 11 KV உயர் மின்னழுத்த பாதையுடன் LT லைன் செல்கிறது. மூன்றாவது திசையில் இரண்டு HT லைன் மற்றும் நான்காவது திசையில் குறைந்த மின்னழுத்த பாதை செல்கிறது. 11 KV உயர் மின்னழுத்த பாதையுடன் LT லைன் செல்வதால் எதிர் திசையில் ஒரு ஸ்டே போடப்பட்டு உள்ளது. அந்த ஸ்டேவும், சாலையின் ஓரம்தான் போடப்பட்டுள்ளது.

மேற்கண்ட மின் கம்பம் நிமிர்ந்த நிலையில் நிற்பதற்கு இந்த ஸ்டே மிகவும் அவசியமான ஒன்றாகும். மனுதாரர் கோரிய ஸ்டேவை அகற்ற இயலாது என முடிவு செய்யப்பட்டு, இம்மனு முடிக்கப்படுகிறது.”

4.0 Hearing held by the Electricity Ombudsman:

4.1 To enable the Appellant and the Respondent to put forth their arguments, a hearing was conducted in person on 23.04.2024.

4.2 The Appellant Thiru V.Gopanna has attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

4.3 The Respondents Thiru R. Balamurugan, EE/O&M/Thirumazhisai of Chengalpet EDC attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

4.4 As the Electricity Ombudsman is the appellate authority, only the prayers which were submitted before the CGRF are considered for issuing orders. Further, the prayer which requires relief under the Regulations for CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman, 2004 alone is discussed hereunder.

5.0 Arguments of the Appellant:

5.1 The Appellant has stated that he bought the plot in RWD sunshine city, Thirumazhisai on December 2021. In 2022- 2023 they realigned the EB polls, during that time without his notice they placed the stay wire in front of the plot and this is illegal. He has stated that no person has the rights to block the legal property owned by private people.

5.2 The Appellant has stated that he raised complaint in TANGEDCO portal (<https://ccms.tangedco.org/>) raised complaint (No: 690978) on 30-Apr-2023 but still no action was taken. Since no action was taken, he has raised the CGRF grievance (1010231050445) in portal (<https://www.tnebltd.gov.in/>) on 10-Oct-2023.

5.3 The Appellant has stated that TNEB person submitted false letter in CGRF mentioning "Stay wire placed in corner of the road". With that letter CGRF members concluded that there is no issue. He stated that he has evidence which clearly shows how its blocking half of the plot entrance. It's surprising to see how they are giving false statement in writings. If stay wire is blocking like this how one can keep the entrance for the house. The Appellant has prayed to remove or keep the stay wire from his plot area.

6.0 Arguments of the Respondent:

6.1 The Respondent has submitted that one number RSJ 36" pole was existed with two numbers 11 KV line along with one number LT 3 phase 4 wire line in two

directions, Two numbers 11 KV line in the third direction and one number LT 4 wire line in fourth direction. The existing stay was placed on the side of the road, which is must to upright the pole. The above reply was given to Thiru.V.Gopanna.

6.2 The Respondent has submitted that Thiru.V.Gopanna, was informed to attend the Consumer grievance redressal forum on 21.12.2023. But Thiru.V.Gopanna was not attended the consumer grievance redressal forum. Hence the Chairman of the Consumer grievance redressal forum, Chengalpattu was decided that the stay is essential to keep the pole upright and the petitioner's request to remove the stay cannot be considered and hence this petition is closed.

6.3 The Respondent has submitted that now Thiru.V.Gopanna has requested to Tamilnadu Electricity Ombudsman, to remove or replace the stay wire. Hence it is submitted that as per the Board's instruction, to replace the existing stay wire to the new location, the DCW application through on line may be registered and the sanctioned estimate amount will be paid by the Thiru.V.Gopanna.

7.0 Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:

7.1 I have heard the arguments of both the Appellant and the Respondent.

7.2 The contention of the Appellant revolves around the placement of a stay wire in front of his plot in RWD Sunshine City, Thirumazhisai. He argue that the placement of the stay wire without his knowledge during the realignment of EB polls is illegal and constitutes a blockage of his legal property. Despite filing complaints with TANGEDCO and subsequently with the CGRF, alleging that the stay wire obstructs half of his plot entrance, no action has been taken. The Appellant contends that a false letter submitted by a TNEB representative to the CGRF misled the members into believing there was no issue. His main contention is the removal or relocation of the stay wire from his plot area to resolve the obstruction.

7.3 The Respondent asserts that there was an existing RSJ 36" pole with various electrical lines attached to it, including 11 KV lines and LT 3 phase 4 wire lines. They explain that the existing stay wire was placed on the side of the road, which is

necessary to support the pole. Further they claim that the stay was provided with guy insulator for safety purpose thereby avoiding electric shock. Also the existing stay wire was shifted and placed in public road and not in petitioners plot. Necessary photo copies were produced during the hearing.

7.4 Based on the arguments presented by both the Appellant and the Respondent, it can be concluded that the Appellant's contention regarding the placement of the stay wire in front of his plot in RWD Sunshine City, Thirumazhisai, was carefully examined. The Respondent provided evidence demonstrating that the stay wire was essential for supporting an existing RSJ 36" pole carrying various electrical lines which was erected with necessary safety measures including guy insulators to prevent electric shock hazards and now the same was shifted and placed on the public road which was no way hindrance to the Appellant's plot, supporting with the photo of the shifted version of stay wire.

7.5 The Appellant, upon seeing the photo displaying the position of the stay wire, which is now placed in a public area and no longer poses any hindrance to his plot, expressed satisfaction. In light of the relocation of the stay wire, the Appellant agreed that his grievance was resolved and informed that his appeal petition may be considered settled.

8.0 **Conclusion** :

8.1 The Appellant's concern for shifting of stay wire was resolved by the Respondent. Therefore, the appeal petition is treated as settled and closed.

8.2 With the above findings the A.P. No. 14 of 2024 is finally disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman. No costs.

(N.Kannan)
Electricity Ombudsman

“நுகர்வோர் இல்லையேல், நிறுவனம் இல்லை”
“No Consumer, No Utility”

To
1. Thiru V.Gopanna,
17/62, Gajapathy Street,
Shenoy Nagar, Chennai – 600030.

- By RPAD

2. The Executive Engineer/O&M/ Thirumazhisai,
Chengalpet Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
Kavalcheri Road, Thirumazhisai,
Chennai – 600 124.

3. The Superintending Engineer,
Chengalpet Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
No. 130, GST Road, Chengalpet – 603 001.

- By Email

4. The Chairman & Managing Director,
TANGEDCO,
NPKRR Maaligai, 144, Anna Salai,
Chennai -600 002.

– By Email

5. The Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building,
Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate, Guindy,
Chennai – 600 032.

– By Email

6. The Assistant Director (Computer)
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building,
Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate, Guindy,
Chennai – 600 032.

– **For Hosting in the TNERC Website**