



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 : tneochennai@gmail.com Web site : www.tnerc.gov.in

Before The Tamil Nadu Electricity Ombudsman, Chennai

Present : Thiru. N.Kannan, Electricity Ombudsman

A.P.No. 49 of 2024

Thiru S.Rajasekar & Tmtty.B. Kanthimathi,
Plot No.15C, Nehru Street,
Rajarajeswari Nagar, Madanandapuram,
Porur, Chennai – 600 125.

..... Appellant
(Thiru S.Rajasekar)

Vs.

The Executive Engineer/O&M/Porur,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I,
TANGEDCO,
110/33 KV SRMC SS Complex,
Porur, Chennai - 600 116.

..... Respondent
(Rep. by Thiru P.Prabakaran, AEE/O&M/Porur)

Petition Received on: 27-06-2024

Date of hearing: 22-08-2024

Date of order: 05-09-2024

The Appeal Petition received on 27.06.2024, filed by Thiru S.Rajasekar & Tmtty. B. Kanthimathi, Plot No.15C, Nehru Street, Rajarajeswari Nagar, Madanandapuram, Porur, Chennai – 600 125 was registered as Appeal Petition No. 49 of 2024. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 22.08.2024. 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 requested a refund for the excess amount charged due to the delay in providing solar net metering for service number 263-005-2146.

2.0 Brief History of the case:

2.1 The Appellant has requested a refund for the excess amount charged for additional units consumed under the solar net metering service no. 263-005-2146.

2.2 The Respondent has stated that the solar panels should be connected to the load only after obtaining approval from TANGEDCO, which is correct from a safety perspective. Therefore, the petitioner's request for a refund is not feasible.

2.3 Since the grievance was not resolved with the Respondent, the Appellant filed a petition with the CGRF of Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I on 18.03.2024.

2.4 The CGRF of Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I issued an order dated 30.05.2024. Aggrieved by the order, the Appellant has filed this appeal petition before the Electricity Ombudsman.

3.0 Orders of the CGRF :

3.1 The CGRF of Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I issued its order on 30.05.2024. The relevant portion of the order is extracted below: -

"Order: (Operative portion)

The petitioner has represented before CGRF regarding delay in effecting solar service connection in S/c No.263-005-2146.

The Respondent (Executive Engineer/O&M/Porur) has reported that the photo uploaded by the petitioner in National portal was not reflected in TANGEDCO portal which was rectified in the IT wing on 25.03.2024 and the net meter was fixed on 26.03.2024 in S/c No.263-005-2146.

From the above it is clear that there is no delay in licensee side for effecting solar service connection in S/c No.263-005-2146. Also the grievance of the petitioner to effect solar service connection was attended.

During the meeting the petitioner has requested for refund of current consumption charges for 1000 units which was paid due to delay in effecting solar service connection. The

forum concludes that the above request of the petitioner is not feasible since the photo uploaded by the petitioner was not reflected in the TANGEDCO portal.

Also the petitioner has actually consumed the units and hence refund of amount does not a rise.

With this the petition is treated as closed.”

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 22.08.2024.

4.2 The Appellant Thiru S.Rajasekar attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

4.3 On behalf of the Respondent, Thiru P.Prabakaran, AEE/O&M/Porur, Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I 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 had raised request for fixing of Net meter on 17th January 2024 and subsequently paid net meter charges on 18th January 2024 itself. It's been two months since payment of charges for net meter yet to be done for his solar installation done on 6th February 2024. He had approached AE/Porur II on 4th March, 2024 and raised the issue in person. Since then two weeks have passed and he is incurring EB charges inspite of fixing Solar panel request to fix Net meter immediately as he is going to bear this EB charges from 6th February, 24 for the delay from TNEB.

5.2 He had applied for net meter on 17.01.2024 for 7.2 kw in National portal. On 17th he had applied in TNEB. But he got solar net meter after delay of two months.

Everything was uploaded on 06.02.2024. But his March month billing was normal service. Hence he sent to the section office on 04.03.2024. They told that they have not received completion report from the National portal. He had paid for solar service within 15 days. But he was fixed meter only on 26.03.2024. Within this two months, he had consumed 2000 units. The unit imported from 06.02.2024 to 26.03.2024 was 951 units. He had paid for 1000 units extra for want of meter. Hence requested for refund for these 1000 units.

5.3 The Appellant has stated that there was delay of over two months for installation of net meter and he claimed that Chairman, CGRF agreed delay on part of IT wing, in what way the consumer has to bear the charges for delay from TNEB IT wing and no internal follow up between TNEB officials. Therefore requesting for refund pertaining to 1000 units consumed.

6.0 Arguments of the Respondent:

6.1 The Respondent has submitted that petitioner Thiru. S. Rajasekar, & B.Kanthimathi, P.No. 15C, Nehru Street, Rajarajeswari Nagar, Madhanandapuram, Porur, Chennai- 125, has applied the petition before the CGRF of Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I vide petition dt. 18.03.2024 regarding refund of amount which was extra consumed units, for solar net metering service no. 263-005-2146/ Tariff-IA.

6.2 The Respondent has submitted that the petitioner applied solar net meter in existing service No. 263-005- 2146/Tariff IA/8KW on 17.01.2024 through National portal for availing subsidy and necessary charges also paid by petitioner on 18.01.2024 and site inspected on 19.01.2024 and Feasibility entered on same day @ 19.01.2024 and it was observed that the P.V. Panel and necessary accessories also erected in the premises before approval of TANGEDCO side.

6.3 The Respondent has submitted that the estimate for provision of solar meter (Bi-directional meter) from static meter in existing service No. 263-005-2146 was

submitted and the above estimate was sanctioned on 28.02.2024 and same was entered in web portal.

6.4 The Respondent has submitted that the petitioner have been advised to upload the details of plant installation in the National web portal. The fact was also informed to petitioner vide f.எண்.உ.பொ./இ & ப - போளூர் -II/ கோ/ CGRF Petition / அ.எண். 217-23-24. நாள்: 19/03/2024). But petitioner said the details of plant installation already uploaded.

6.5 The Respondent has submitted that the petitioner informed that the details of plant installation was already uploaded in National web portal. As per the petitioner information, the plant installation details have not been reflected in the TANGEDCO web portal from National portal. Since the petitioner applied solar net metering through National web portal. The entire responsibility to rectify the discrepancies arises will be petitioner side only.

6.6 The Respondent has submitted that a mail was sent to IT Wing /HQ Chennai on 22.03.2024 regarding the plant installation details was not reflected in TANGEDCO web portal even though petitioner have been uploaded in the National web portal. After the discrepancies attended on 25.03.2024 by the National web portal in concurrence with the IT wing/HQ Chennai, and the solar Bi-directional meter was provided and service effected on 26.03.2024.

6.7 The Respondent has submitted that in the petitioner stated that the export units was not considered in the CC bill due to non effecting of solar bi-directional meter, even though the petitioner was already connected the solar panel with load. Due to solar panel will connect with loads only after approval obtained from TANGEDCO side, which is correct in safety aspects. Hence the petitioner request for refund of amount is not feasible.

6.8 The Respondent has prayed that considering the above points and circumstances, he requested to direct the petitioner not feasible to refund of amount due to the amount paid by the petitioner has actually consumed unit only, and delay for effecting the solar net metering is not reflecting the details in TANGEDCO portal

from National Web portal. TANGEDCO is not responsible for the delay, since the consumer is applied through National Portal for availing subsidy.

7.0 Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:

7.1 I have heard the arguments of both the Appellant and the Respondent. Based on the arguments and the documents submitted by them the following conclusion is arrived.

7.2 The Appellant claims that he had requested the installation of a net meter on January 17, 2024, and paid the charges the following day. Despite this, the net meter for his solar installation, which was completed by him on February 6, 2024, had not been provided with solar net metering. On March 4, 2024, he approached the AE/Porur II office to raise the issue, but no immediate action was taken. Consequently, he continued to incur regular electricity charges, even though he had installed solar panels. The Appellant argues that this delay by TNEB caused him to pay unnecessary electricity charges from February 6, 2024, onwards. He points out that he applied for the net meter for a 7.2 kW system on January 17, 2024, through the National portal and did not receive the TNEB meter until March 26, 2024.

7.3 During this period, although he claimed uploaded all necessary documents by February 6, 2024, his March bill was calculated as a regular service. Upon raising the issue with the section office on March 4, 2024, he was informed that the completion report had not been received from the National portal. As a result, despite paying for the solar service in a timely manner, his meter was only installed after a significant delay. He consumed 2000 units during this two-month period, with 951 units imported from February 6, 2024, to March 26, 2024, leading to an overpayment for 1000 units due to the delay in installing the net meter. The Appellant asserts that this delay is due to internal fault within TNEB, particularly in the IT wing, and seeks a refund for the extra 1000 units of electricity consumed during this period.

7.4 The Respondent stated that the Appellant, Thiru S. Rajasekar and B. Kanthimathi, applied for solar net metering on 17.01.2024 through the National

Portal in order to avail a subsidy. After the necessary charges were paid, the site was inspected, and the feasibility of the project was established on 19.01.2024. However, the solar PV panels and the required accessories were installed on the premises before approval was granted by TANGEDCO. This premature installation occurred without considering the proper procedural steps for safety, as the solar panels should only be connected after approval.

7.5 The estimate for the provision of a bi-directional solar meter was submitted and sanctioned on 28.02.2024 and the same was entered in the web portal of Licensee. In the meantime, the petitioner was advised to upload the plant installation details to the National Portal and the same was informed him vide f.எண்.உ.பொ./இ & ப - போளூர் -II/ கோ/ CGRF Petition / அ.எண். 217-23-24. நாள்: 19/03/2024). Although the petitioner claimed these details had already been uploaded to the National portal, but the same details were not reflected on TANGEDCO's web portal. Informed the petitioner that resolving non reflection of installation from National web portal to TANGEDCO web portal it was the petitioner's responsibility, as the application was made by him through the National Portal.

7.6 To address this issue, a mail was sent to the IT Wing at TANGEDCO's headquarters in Chennai on 22.03.2024. By 25.03.2024, the discrepancies were corrected in coordination with the National Portal, and the solar bi-directional meter was installed on 26.03.2024. Despite this, the petitioner raised concerns that the export units from the solar panel were not considered in the electricity bill, as the meter had not been installed earlier. However, TANGEDCO maintained that the solar panels are to be connected to the load after the proper safety approvals were obtained, which was in line with their safety procedures.

7.7 The Respondent contends that the petitioner's request for a refund is not feasible. The delay in activating the solar net metering service was due to issues with the National Portal and not TANGEDCO's fault. The petitioner was charged for the actual electricity consumed during this period, and since the solar panels were

connected only after approval, there is no basis for a refund. Therefore, the Respondent argues that the petitioner's request for a refund should be denied.

7.8 Based on the arguments presented by both parties, it is understood that the Appellant applied for solar net metering on 17.01.2024, and the solar installations were completed on 06.02.2024. A solar meter was installed at his service on 26.03.2024. According to the Respondents' counter arguments, the solar net meter was installed on 26.03.2024 without delay, once the installation details were reflected on the National portal and TANGEDCO web portal on 25.03.2024.

7.9 During the hearing, when asked whether his installed solar arrangements were connected to the licensee's network without executing an agreement, the Appellant confirmed the same and argued that there was nothing wrong with it. Under these circumstances, I wish to discuss the following points in detail:

- 1) Whether the action of the Appellant to install the solar panels on grid before approval of the licensee is right ?
- 2) Whether there was any delay on the part of the licensee to effect net metering on the Appellant Premises.

8.0 Findings on the first issue:

8.1 There was an issue before this ombudsman whether the Appellant action of installing solar panel before executing necessary agreements and testing safety protection logic before commissioning. Hence I would like to refer the relevant paras in Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission (Grid Interactive Solar PV Energy Generating Systems) Regulations, 2021 under the head 15. Procedure for Application and Registration and under the head 8. Inter-Connection with the Grid, Standards and Safety, which are reproduced as below:

“15 Procedure for Applications and Registrations

xxx

15.12 The Appellant and licensee shall enter in to agreement in the prescribed format after the solar system installed but before it is synchronized with the network.

15.13 The commissioning of the GISS shall be carried out in the presence of representatives of Consumer/Owner of GISS and concerned officer of the Distribution licensee .The commissioning certificate shall be signed by all the above named parties.”

8.2 In this case, the appellant registered under the PM Surya Mukti Bijli Yojana scheme through the MNRE National Portal on January 17, 2024. However, the appellant did not execute the required agreement as specified and commissioned the solar panels without the presence of the licensee, bringing the installed solar panels into parallel operation on February 6, 2024. It was subsequently noticed that the safety checks required by the licensee, such as ensuring the automatic isolation of the Grid Isolation Switch System (GISS) when there is no grid supply, were not carried out. Instead, the appellant blames the respondent for the delay in effecting solar net metering on the service.

8.3 In this context, I would like to refer further relevant Regulations 8. Inter-Connection with the Grid, Standards and Safety,

“8. Inter-Connection with the Grid, Standards and Safety:

*8.1 ****

8.2 The Distribution Licensee shall ensure that the inter-connection of the Renewable Energy Generating System with its Network conforms to the specifications, standards and other provisions specified in the CEA Technical Standard for Connectivity of the Distributed Generation Resources) Regulations, 2013, the CEA (Measures relating to Safety and Electric Supply), Regulations, 2010, and the Tamil Nadu Electricity Grid Code 2005, as amended from time to time;

xxx

8.5 In case any GISS plant is found to be running in parallel with the supply system of the distribution licensee without approval then supply of such consumer may be disconnected with 3 days notice and the supply shall be restored only after the plant is isolated from the supply system of the licensee. Such consumer may apply for GISS plant in the next financial year but his application will be kept at the bottom of the list of applicants. Such consumer will be permitted to set-up the plant only if after allotting the capacity to all successful applicants above him, there is still capacity available for allotment;”

xxx

8.7 The solar power generator and equipment shall meet the requirement specified in the CEAS (Technical Standards for connectivity below 33 KV) (of the Distributed Generation Resources) Regulations, 2013 and as amended from time to time. The responsibility of operation and maintenance of the solar power generator including all accessories and apparatus lies with the solar power generators. The design and installation of the GISS should be equipped with appropriately rated protective devices to sense any abnormally in

the system and carryout automatic isolation of the GISS from the grid. The inverters used should meet the necessary quality requirements. The protection logics should be tested before commissioning of the plant. Safety certificates for the installation should be obtained from the appropriate authorities:

8.8 The automatic isolation of the GISS should be ensured for no grid supply and low or over voltage conditions and within the required response time.... xxxx.”

8.4 From the provided content, it is clear that specific safety and technical standards must be adhered to when installing a solar panel system. The protection logic should be tested before commissioning the plant and verified by the licensee. If a prospective consumer violates these requirements, their existing supply may be disconnected with a three-day notice. Supply will be restored only after the plant is isolated from the licensee's supply system. The consumer may apply for a Grid Isolation Switch System (GISS) plant in the next financial year, but their application will be placed at the bottom of the list of applicants.

8.5 In this case, the appellant's actions constitute a clear violation of safety regulations. The appellant connected his installation to the grid on February 6, 2024, without executing the required agreement, and continued operating until the actual commissioning date on March 26, 2024. Additionally, I express my displeasure with the respondent's failure to implement necessary corrective measures as per GISS regulations. Despite the fact that it was revealed during the CGRF hearing that the appellant had connected his solar installation on February 6, 2024, the respondent did not take appropriate action. The respondent should have issued a disconnection notice, as required under paragraph 8.5 of the Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission (Grid Interactive Solar PV Energy Generating Systems) Regulations, 2021, to prevent any potential safety issues.

9.0 Finding on the second issue:

9.1 The appellant contends that the delay in effecting solar net metering for his service connection is a procedural lapse on the part of the licensee. Although he applied for the solar connection on January 17, 2024, and installed the solar panels on February 6, 2024, he claims the delay was due to the licensee's procedural issues. The respondent counters this by stating that the appellant applied for solar

net metering on January 17, 2024, through the MNRE National Portal. After the necessary charges were paid, the site was inspected, and the feasibility of the project was confirmed on January 19, 2024. Hence, I would like to refer the related regulation which is discussed below;

“15. Procedure for Application and Registration:

15.1 The distribution licensee shall implement a web-based application processing system for processing the applications of GISS, for both new and additional plant capacities;

15.2 The distribution licensee shall facilitate the process for setting up GISS system at consumers' premises. In this regard, the licensee shall prominently display on its website and in all its offices, the following:

(i) detailed standardized procedure for installation & commissioning of GISS;

(ii) a single point of contact to facilitate the eligible consumers in installation of GISS system from submission of application form to commissioning;

(iii) complete list of documents required to be furnished along with such applications;

(iv) applicable charges to be deposited by the applicant;

(v) empanelled list of service providers for the benefit of consumers who want to install GISS through service providers;

(vi) empanelled list of meter vendors;

(vii) financial incentives to the prosumers, as applicable under various schemes and programmes of the Central and State Government;

(viii) standard Connection Agreement(s);

15.3 xxx

15.4. In case the application form submitted in hard copy form, the same shall be scanned and uploaded on the website as soon as it is received;

15.5. Acknowledgement with the registration number for that application shall be generated and intimated to the applicant within three working days of receipt of application. In case of applications being received online, the acknowledgement with the registration number shall be generated and communicated to the applicants through email:

15.6. In case of any deficiencies in the application form, the same shall be intimated within 3 working days from the date of receipt of application. The consumer shall rectify the defects and resubmit within 7 days to retain the registration number. If the application form is not submitted with rectification within 7 days the application shall stand cancelled and the registration fee shall be forfeited;

15.7. The application shall be deemed to be received on the date of generation of acknowledgement with registration number;

15.8. The distribution licensee shall evolve technical feasibility within 15 working days from the date of registration of application;

15.9. The technical feasibility shall be conducted on the following aspects and any other factors which the licensee considers appropriate :

i AC Voltage level at which connectivity is sought;

ii Sanctioned Load / Contract Demand of the Applicant;

iii Rated Output AC Voltage of the proposed Renewable Energy Generating System;

iv Available cumulative capacity of relevant Distribution / Power Transformer;

If found technically feasible, the Distribution Licensee shall, within 5 working days of the completion of the feasibility study, convey its approval for installing the Renewable Energy Generating System. The approval shall indicate the maximum permissible capacity of the System, and shall be valid for a period of 6 months from the date of approval, or such extended period as may be agreed to by the Distribution Licensee. If found not technically feasible the reason for the same shall be intimated to the applicant within 20 working days from the date of registration of the application.

15.10 The Applicant shall, within the period of validity of such approval, submit the work completion report, along with relevant details (such as technical specifications, test reports received from manufacturer/system provider, safety certificate from CEIG as may be applicable etc.), and hand over the Generation/consumer meter with a request to the Distribution Licensee (if the meter is not already tested) for the testing and commissioning of the Renewable Energy Generating System;

15.11 The Distribution Licensee shall complete the testing of generation/consumer meter, hand over the generation meter back to the applicant to be installed in the system by the applicant and the Licensee shall complete testing and commissioning of the System within 20 working days from receipt of such request and shall install the bidirectional meter and synchronise the Renewable Energy Generating System within 10 days thereafter.

15.12 The applicant and Licensee shall enter in to agreement in the prescribed format after the solar system is installed but before it is synchronized with the network;

15.13 The commissioning test of the GISS shall be carried out in the presence of representatives of consumer/owner of GISS, and concerned officer of the distribution licensee. The commissioning certificate shall be signed by all the above named parties;

15.14 The Commissioning certificate must contain the following details

- i. Details of Solar PV panels including name of the manufacturer, type, size/capacity, number of the panels, etc.;*
- ii. Details regarding inverter, such as Make, rating, type, sl.no etc.,*
- iii. Total capacity of the GISS;*
- iv. Details of meter installed along with details such as Make, types ,rating, accuracy, serial number etc.;*

15.15 The formal of contract agreement and installation certificate shall be placed in the web portal of the licensee;

15.16 The application tracking mechanism based on the unique registration number shall be provided by the distribution licensee through web-based module or any other mode to monitor the status of processing of the application like receipt of application, site inspection, meter installation, commissioning, etc;

15.17 Consumer shall have the option of purchasing the requisite meter from authorised vendors which has been tested and sealed by the licensee or the meter shall be tested at licensee's lab with time limit stipulated or got tested by the consumer at other authorised lab;

15.18 The timelines as specified in these regulations shall be adhered to by the Licensee;”

9.2 Upon reviewing the documents related to this case, it is noted that the appellant registered his application on January 17, 2024, through the National Portal to avail the subsidy from TANGEDCO and made the necessary payment on January 18, 2024. The respondent entered the feasibility report into the web portal on January 19, 2024. The technical feasibility report was issued to the appellant within three days, which is well within the 15-day time frame stipulated by the regulations. Therefore, the delay in the process appears to lie with the appellant, who needed to communicate his solar installation within the prescribed time schedule.

9.3 In this case, the appellant, who wished to avail the subsidy, submitted his application on January 17, 2024, through the MNRE National web portal. This portal is integrated with the licensee's web portal to facilitate seamless service and prompt action by the respondent's territorial engineer. The appellant claimed that he installed the solar panels at his premises on February 6, 2024, and updated this information on the National portal. This update should have naturally reflected on the licensee's web portal for the territorial engineer to view. However, it was noted

that this information did not appear on the licensee's portal. The respondent informed the appellant of this issue on March 19, 2024, according to the documents provided.

9.4 Instead of acknowledging the technical issue, the appellant argued that it was the respondent's responsibility to coordinate with the National portal to retrieve the uploaded details necessary for processing the subsidy. However, it is noted that consumers can view their application status on the MNRE portal using their individual login. The portal provides a flow chart with detailed information from application registration to various stages such as feasibility reports, vendor selection, work commencement, solar installation details, inspection, project commissioning, subsidy request, and subsidy disbursal. Thus, if any process is pending, the consumer can see this information, placing responsibility on both the appellant and his vendor to ensure that the installation details were accurately reflected on the licensee's portal. In this case, the respondent acted promptly once the technical issue was resolved on March 25, 2024, and the service was commissioned on March 26, 2024.

9.5 Therefore, the Appellant's contention that the delay in implementing his solar service was caused by the Respondent is rejected. Furthermore, the Appellant's request for a refund of the deemed generation of 1,000 units from 06.02.2024 to 26.03.2024, related to solar net metering service no. 263-005-2146—i.e., before the execution of the solar agreement and prior to the installation of the solar bi-directional meter—is not in accordance with GISS regulations and is thus rejected.

10.0 Conclusion :

10.1 Based on my findings, the Appellant's claim regarding the delay in implementing the solar net metering service no. 263-005-2146 is rejected, along with the request for a refund for the 1,000 units claimed to have been generated during the delay period, before the solar agreement was executed and prior to the installation of the solar bi-directional meter.

10.2 With the above findings A.P.No.49 of 2024 is disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman.

(N. Kannan)
Electricity Ombudsman

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

To

1. Thiru S.Rajasekar & Tmt.B. Kanthimathi,
Plot No.15C, Nehru Street, Rajarajeswari Nagar,
Madanandapuram, Porur,
Chennai – 600 125.

- By RPAD

2. The Executive Engineer/O&M/Porur,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I,
TANGEDCO,
110/33 KV SRMC SS Complex,
Porur, Chennai - 600 116.

3. The Superintending Engineer,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I,
TANGEDCO,
110KV SS Complex, K.K.Nagar,
Chennai-600 078.

- 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**