



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. 58 of 2024

Thiru Sivasankaran Ganesan,
No.4, First Floor, Ram Flat,
Dr. Vasudave Garden,
Nethaji Nagar, Thiruvanmiyur,
Chennai – 600 041.

.....Appellant
(Thiru Sivasankaran Ganesan)

Vs.

1. The Assistant Engineer/O&M/Adyar,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-II,
TANGEDCO,
No.80, L.B.Road, SS Complex,
Thiruvanmiyur, Chennai-600 041.

2. The Executive Engineer/O&M/Adyar,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-II,
TANGEDCO,
110KV Tidel SS Complex,
Taramani, Chennai - 600 113.

..... Respondents
(Thiru V. Gajendran, AE/O&M/ Adyar
Thiru A.Ramu, EE/O&M/Adyar)

Petition Received on: 08-08-2024

Date of hearing: 19-09-2024

Date of order: 01-10-2024

The Appeal Petition received on 08.08.2024 filed by Thiru Sivasankaran Ganesan, No.4, First Floor, Ram Flat, Dr. Vasudave Garden, Nethaji Nagar, Thiruvanmiyur, Chennai – 600 041 was registered as Appeal Petition No. 58 of

2024. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 19.09.2024. 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 waive the bills for the month of March and May in the SC No.217-010-929.

2.0 Brief History of the case:

2.1 The Appellant has approached section office to rectify the non displaying meter.

2.2 The Respondent has stated that based on the appellant's complaint he had inspected on 02.02.2024 and found the meter is working normal and check reading was updated again inspected on 10.04.2024 and noticed as defective.

2.3 Hence the Appellant has filed a petition with the Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-II on 01.06.2024.

2.4 The CGRF of Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-II has issued an order dated 09.07.2024. 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 Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-II issued its order on 09.07.2024. The relevant portion of the order is extracted below: -

"Order:

"The petitioner is directed to pay the amount due to Respondent for the consumed units by him within 3 days from the date of receipt of this order.

The Respondent is directed to collect the amount dues from the petitioner as per the Regulation 12 of the TNE Supply Code Regulations on Errors in billing and Departmental action deemed fit to be initiated against the erring assessor and the revenue supervisor, who are responsible for the revenue loss.

The compliance report shall be furnished to this forum within 10 days from the date of receipt of this order.”

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 on 19.09.2024 in person.

4.2 The Appellant Thiru Sivasankaran Ganesan attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

4.3 The Respondents Thiru V. Gajendran, AE/O&M/ Adyar and Thiru A.Ramu, EE/O&M/Adyar, Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-II attended the hearing and put forth their 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 the initial written complaint was submitted to AE on February 2, 2024 and another written complaint was provided to AE on April 4, 2024. A CGRF online petition (106241907636/170) was filed on June 1, 2024 and CGRF complaint request was sent via email on June 6, 2024.

5.2 The Appellant has stated that a hearing notice was received on June 20, 2024. The faulty meter was replaced on June 20, 2024, the CGRF hearing was conducted on June 26, 2024. A counter affidavit from the respondent was received via registered post (RT072306183IN) on July 1, 2024 and the CGRF order copy was received via email on July 16, 2024.

5.3 The Appellant has stated that he noticed high consumption in January's assessment and found the meter display not working. He submitted written complaints to AE for excess billing, non-display meter, and requested a meter change. Despite corrections in readings, no action was taken his complaints or meter changed. -Subsequent assessments (March and May) showed high consumption, and he repeated his complaints. The non-display meter was not changed for almost 5 months (JAN to JUN), despite his repeated requests, leaving him unable to regulate his consumption.

5.4 The Appellant has stated that the CGRF online complaint led to the meter being replaced on June 20, 2024. However, TNEB insists that the bill must be paid, arguing that the meter's defect was only in the display and not in the consumption. On Verifying the MRT downloaded data, the MRT wing had confirmed that the removed meter was defective due to "segment problem", the MRT report is extracted as follows:

If this is the case, it raises questions about when the problem began and how the readings were manually assessed during this period.

5.5 The Appellant has stated that MRT shows incorrect billing in past assessments (i.e., manual reading mistakes from last year itself). CGRF forum has wrongly accused him of enjoying electricity without paying the charges for two bimonthly, despite his repeated complaints, continuous follow-up, consistent billing records and evidence to the contrary. CGRF Forum also accused him of purchasing an additional meter or Bluetooth device for personal use in response to his question about how consumers can monitor their consumption from a non-display meter.

5.6 The Appellant has stated that CGRF Forum ordered him to pay the bill based on MRT within 3 days, without considering his requests for extension or appeal which he sent an email on 28 Jun 24. The petitioner is directed to pay the amount due to Respondent for the consumed units by him within 3 days from the date of receipt of this order. Counter affidavit was submitted after CGRF hearing, which should have been done before, i.e. Hearing conducted on 26 Jun 24 and the Counter Affidavit of the Respondent has received through Register Post

(RT072306183IN) on 1"Jul 24. Last 3 assessments (JAN, MAR and MAY) initial readings were deleted and updated on what basis?

Month	Initial Bill Date	Revised Bill Date
JAN Assessment	29th Jan 24	3 rd Feb'24
MAR Assessment	28th Mar 24	2 nd May 24
MAY Assessment	28th May 24	24 th Jun'24

5.7 The Appellant has stated that additionally, why hasn't the meter been changed. Non-regulated consumption charges are unfair, and he questioned who should pay for them. The random notation of a reading is unjust. On Verifying the MRT downloaded data, the MRT wing had confirmed that the removed meter was defective due to "segment problem", the MRT report is extracted as follows:

Reading Month & Date		Billed Units	Actual Units as per MRT	Already bill raised	As per MRT
28.07.23	07/2023	637	634	3083	3056
28.09.23	09/2023	711	714	3749	3776
26.11.23	11/2023	543	755	2294	4145
28.01.24	01/2024	425	785	1275	4415
30.03.24	03/2024	1126	814	7936	4690
30.05.24	05/2024	920	704	5750	3686
				24087	23768

5.8 The Appellant has stated that faulty meter and excess billing have caused him undue financial burden and stress. TNEB's inaction on his complaints and delayed meter change are unacceptable. Complaint given on 2nd Feb & 4th Apr. But meter changed on 20th Jun 24. -MRT data inconsistencies and incorrect billing need to be addressed. The MRT report wasn't taken on the correct assessment date (the end of the assessment month), but instead, the report date is at the beginning of the assessment month, and the readings were calculated manually. Additionally. there was a significant discrepancy compared to the November assessment from last year. This inconsistency is alarming and has left him doubting the accuracy of the previous bills as well, especially those manually recorded in May and July of 2023.

5.9 The Appellant has stated that the demand for MRT reading charges is unwarranted, as the issue lies with TNEB'S inaccurate handling of meter readings. Procedural irregularities in CGRF hearing and counter affidavit submission, and there were discrepancies in billing records.

Reading Date		As per ledger KWH			As per MRT KWH		
03/2024	30.03.24	44232	43106	1126	44492	43678	814
05/2024	30.05.24	45152	44232	920	45196	44492	704

5.10 On comparing the MRT data and the assessor recorded reading in the consumer ledger, the MRT download data a mismatching with the physical assessment, it is ascertained that the reading had been recorded wrongly by the assessor in 01/2024 which resulted in accumulated units in the assessment month of 03/2024. However, according to the MRT data, there were mismatches since November of last year. He stated that CGRF Forum's unfair accusations and order are biased and lack transparency.

5.11 The Appellant has requested to investigate this matter and direct TNEB and CGRF Forum to:

1. Correct the billing errors and adjust his bills accurately or request an adjustment of his bills to reflect his average consumption based on historical data.
2. Withdraw the false accusation made by the CGRF forum.
3. Withdraw the demand for MRT based charges.
4. Waive the fines for non-payment, considering the circumstances (due to the faulty meter and manual errors).
5. Provide a clear explanation for the delayed meter change and inaction on complaints
6. Take corrective action to prevent such incidents in the future
7. Review the CGRF Forum's order and consider his appeal
& Clarify the basis for deleting and updating initial readings in the last 3 assessments
8. Determine who should pay for non-regulated consumption
10. Provide compensation for assault, payment for fine, and financial burden and stress
11. MRT confirmed that the meter was faulty due to segment failure. He is still wondering how they were able to assess the readings all this time.

5.12 The Appellant has stated that on verifying the MRT downloaded data, the MRT wing had confirmed that the removed meter was defective due to “segment problem”. The Appellant has prayed to waive the bills for March and May due to their negligence in not taking action on his complaint letter about the faulty meter.

6.0 Arguments of the Respondent:

6.1 The Respondent has submitted that Thiru Sivasankaran Ganesan (tenant), residing at No. 4, Ram Flat Dr. Vasudeva Gardens, Nethaji Nagar, Thiruvananthapuram, Chennai- 41 had filed an offline CGRF petition No. 103241907636 dt. 01.06.2024 for meter/segment fault and requested to change the faulty meter in the SC No. 217-010-929. In connection with the above petition, the detailed report was submitted to the forum and CGRF hearing was conducted on 26.06 2024 and CGRF order was issued on 09.07.2024.

6.2 The Respondent has submitted that as per the CGRF order, the petitioner had paid the pending balance payment on 16.07.2024. Now he has filed appeal petition to TNEO. In this regard, the detailed report is as follows. The petitioner had approached the section office on 02.02.2024 and raised an oral dispute that the meter is faulty and not working from 12/2023. Based on the billing complaint, the petition was reviewed on time and as a result, the 1st respondent had verified the meter healthiness and the check reading were updated on 02.02.2024 as KWH: 43146. However, reading display was sluggish and not noticeable as it had segment problem, but the assessments consumption were carried out through Bluetooth device using EB mobile app where the data found to be in order. The fact about the meter condition was informed to the petitioner stating the meter data was normal.

6.3 The Respondent has submitted that meanwhile, the assessment was taken properly in the meter bearing Sl. No.1502807, Make: AVON, Static 3ph meter for the month of 01/2024 and 03/2024 and the recorded consumption in the master were updated in the ledger. Again, the petitioner had given a written complaint on 04.04.2024 and he stands in his point and refused to accept the reality of the consumption and the truthiness of the meter reading and opposed the high

consumption and protested that the consumption would be below 500 units and due to his continuous annoyance to revise the consumption the readings were deleted and entered low consumption units for both consecutive months. The deletion report has been enclosed herewith.

6.4 The Respondent has submitted that the meter was taken to MRT lab for testing and download. As per the MRT report received via mail dt 21.06.2024, the meter data which was retrieved found to be normal. However the meter had only segment defect. The segment problem does not affect the consumption pattern of the meter. As per MRT downloaded data report, KWH final reading as on 20.06.2024 is found to be 45468.03. The manual calculation for difference in the reading is shown as follows:

Reading Month & Date		As per assessment KWH			As per MRT KWH			Deleted readings
07/2023	28.07.23	41427	40790	637	41424	40790	634	FR
09/2023	28.09.23	42138	41427	711	42138	41424	714	
11/2023	26.11.23	42681	42138	543	42893	42138	755	
01/2024	28.01.24	43106	42681	425	43678	42893	785	43696
03/2024	30.03.24	44232	43106	1126	44492	43679	814	44475.58
05/2024	30.05.24	45152	44232	920	45196	44492	704	

6.5 The Respondent has submitted that the MRT report data available only for particular dates as the reset period is 60 days. Hence with the available accurate data from MRT report, the average bill for 1 day has been calculated and per day average has been considered between each cycle for the assessment dates for the service from 07/2023. The consumption pattern of the petitioner usage is averagely 750-800 units and is steady from MRT report. Moreover, the deleted actual reading and the reading arrived based on MRT report are almost same.

Reading Month & Date		Billed Units	Actual Units as per MRT	Already bill raised	As per MRT
28.07.23	07/2023	637	634	3083	3056
28.09.23	09/2023	711	714	3749	3776
26.11.23	11/2023	543	755	2294	4145
28.01.24	01/2024	425	785	1275	4415
30.03.24	03/2024	1126	814	7936	4690
30.05.24	05/2024	920	704	5750	3686
				24087	23768

As per assessment, amount already paid from 07/2023 to 01/2024 = Rs. 10,401/- As per MRT report, amount to be paid = (Rs 23,768-Rs.10,401) = Rs. 13,367/-.

6.6 The Respondent further submitted that the assessment already entered for the month of 03/2024 & 05/2024 billed for an amount of Rs 7,936 + Rs.5,750 = Rs.13,686/-, but as per MRT report, the revised bill shown as above is Rs.13,367/-. Since the bill is raised already for the month of 03/2024 and 05/2024, the petitioner was requested to pay the generated bill of Rs.13,686/-, the difference in the amount of Rs.319/- (13686-13367) was credited as adjustment in the SC No. 217-010-929 on 19.07.2024 after payment of dues.

6.7 The Respondent finally submitted that meter was replaced on 24.06.24 as per the recommendation from MRT. As per the MRT ascertained reading, the consumption pattern of the petitioner is steady that the average unit consumed is around 750. As per the appeal from the petitioner, no bills may be adjusted and compensation would be provided. As the technologies have developed over the time, the blue-tooth device using mobile app in replacement of HHD for downloading the data from the meter also made effective and ease which makes the assessment entry flawlessly. Only due to the petitioner's continuous exasperations in the section office, the readings were deleted and manual reading as requested by the petitioner were updated.

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 contends that he submitted multiple complaints regarding his display issue with electric meter, beginning with a written complaint on February 2, 2024, followed by another on April 4, 2024. Despite these complaints, no action was taken, and the meter was not replaced until June 20, 2024, following the filing of an

online petition with the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) in June. The appellant noticed unusually high consumption starting in January 2024, and although he raised concerns about the non-display meter, no corrective measures were taken. Subsequent assessments in March and May showed continued high consumption, causing the appellant financial burden and stress.

7.3 The appellant also points to inconsistencies in the meter readings, highlighting that the MRT report confirmed the meter was display defective due to a "segment problem." This led to incorrect billing and manual errors in the assessments, with some initial readings being deleted and updated without explanation. Despite this, the CGRF forum ordered the appellant to pay the bills based on MRT data within three days, without giving due consideration to his requests for extensions or appeals. The appellant further argues that the CGRF forum unfairly accused him of using electricity without paying for it, despite his consistent billing records and repeated complaints.

7.4 The appellant is requesting that TNEB and CGRF correct the billing errors, adjust his bills accurately, withdraw the accusations made against him, and waive the fines for non-payment, given the faulty meter and manual errors. He also seeks compensation for the financial burden and stress caused by these issues and urges corrective actions to prevent similar incidents in the future. Lastly, the appellant requests a clear explanation for the delayed meter change and demands that TNEB withdraw the charges for MRT readings, which he claims are unwarranted.

7.5 The respondent argues that the appellant, a tenant at the specified premises, filed a complaint regarding meter display and recording on February 2, 2024, and later on April 4, 2024. The respondent stated that the meter had a "segment problem" affecting the display but asserts that the actual consumption recorded by the meter was accurate and not impacted by the defect. The respondent states that the assessments were conducted through a Bluetooth device using the EB mobile app, and the data collected was found to be in order.

7.6 According to the respondent, despite the appellant's repeated claims of high

consumption, the meter readings were accurate, and the MRT (Meter Testing Report) confirmed that only the segment of the display was defective, not the meter's consumption recording capabilities. The meter was tested and the consumption pattern, as confirmed by the MRT data, showed consistent usage of around 750–800 units. The respondent also provided consumption and billing details, showing that the manual readings matched the MRT data and discrepancies were minor.

7.7 The respondent maintains that the appellant is responsible for the bills during the disputed period and that the difference of Rs. 319/- between the actual and MRT-based billing was credited to the appellant's account after the payments were made. In conclusion, the respondent argues that the appellant's claims are unfounded, as the meter's consumption was accurately recorded, and there is no basis for adjusting the bills further in accordance with the MRT report and the assessments carried out.

Based on the arguments of the appellant and respondent, the facts to be decided are twofold:

1. Whether there was any issue with the meter and its recording?
2. Whether the appellant claim that he was excessively charged during the disputed period is correct?

8.0 Findings on the first issue:

8.1 The appellant raised concerns regarding high consumption and a faulty meter display, lodging complaints in February and April 2024. In response, the AE inspected the site on 02.02.2024 and recorded a check reading, stating that the meter was functioning normally. However, following a repeated complaint on 04.04.2024, the AE inspected the meter again on 10.04.2024 and noted that the meter was defective. On 13.06.2024, another check reading was taken, confirming that the meter had a segment problem, and the display was not fully readable. Finally, the meter was replaced on 20.06.2024 due to the segment display issue.

8.2 The respondent acknowledged the appellant's concerns, and though the initial inspection in February found the meter to be normal, the subsequent inspections in April and June identified a display issue. The MRT report confirmed that there was normal recording but has issue of segment display problem of character which was reproduced below ;

“SC:217-010-929, Make: AVON, SL No. 1502807, Capacity (10-60A): Meter data found in Normal. However further the meter had segment defective problem. But meter data are received through CMRI. As per downloaded data KWH reading as on 20.06.34 is 45468.03.”

8.3 In this context, I would refer to the Evidence act 1872 section 35 which is discussed below.

“35. Relevancy of entry in public record or an electronic record made in performance of duty. An entry in any public or other official book, register or record or an electronic record stating a fact in issue or relevant fact and made by a public servant in the discharge of his official duty or by any other person in performance of a duty specially enjoined by law of the country in which such book, register or record or an electronic record is kept is a relevant fact.”

According to the above, any register or record is evidence under the law of the country. The MRT wing of the Licensee is the unit that will decide the status of the meter after conducting a test. Hence as per the Evidence Act, I would rely upon the meter downloaded report by MRT which is scientific data.

8.4 The MRT report confirms that after testing, the meter was found to be in normal working condition, though its display had a segment problem. However, this segment issue did not affect the accuracy of the recorded consumption. The actual consumption data was retrieved through CMRI downloaded data, which is scientifically accurate. While there was a display segment problem, the meter was accurately recording the consumption data. Despite the display issue, the meter's internal memory registered the correct consumption.

8.5 In view of the finding I would like to refer TNERC supply code regulation 11 (1) which is reproduced below

“11. Assessment of billing in cases where the meter is defective:

(1) Where the meter fixed is found defective or burnt or to have ceased to function and no theft of energy or violation is suspected, the quantity of electricity supplied during the period when the meter was defective, shall be assessed based on the data downloaded through CMRI from the defective meter and scrutiny of those data , load curve etc., besides taking into consideration of site condition to corroborate the assessment so made. Wherever such downloading of data could not be done, the reason for not getting the meter tested or the reason for not downloading the data from the defective or burnt meter shall be recorded and signed by the designated authority by the Licensee. Wherever the data could not be downloaded, the quantity of electricity supplied during the period when the meter was defective, shall be assessed as mentioned hereunder.”

8.6 In this case the meter recording was normal and its display of character /numeric there was segment error which is a situation where that LCD of the display unit pixel problem reveals no perfect display of character and number. In this case the respondent noticed on 10-04-2024 which no way affect the recording the consumption. Though the meter was not completely defective as per regulation 11(1) of TNE Supply code for recording or burnt or ceased to function but I agree it is an issue for viewing the meter display character from the Energy meter which I feel needs replacement.

8.7 It is clear from the findings that the appellant raised legitimate concerns about the meter's display issue, but the respondent delayed addressing the issue. Although the segment problem did not affect the meter's ability to record consumption accurately, the display failure was noted by the respondent on 10.04.2024, and yet the meter was not replaced until 20.06.2024, which constitutes a delay in service. This delay reflects a deficiency in service on the part of the respondent.

8.8 Under this circumstances, I would like to refer Distribution standards of performance Regulation which provides relevant compensation:

“21. Compensation

The Licensee is expected to achieve the performance prescribed. If a Licensee fails to meet the standards specified for various service areas, the affected consumer is entitled for compensation by the Licensees as stipulated in the Act. The compensation payable is set out in the table below, namely:-

S.No.	Events	Payable to consumer for the delay
***	***	***
***	***	***
10.	Responding to consumer's complaint	Rs.50/- for each day of delay subject to a maximum of Rs.500/-”

In light of this, the appellant is entitled to compensation as per the DSOP regulations for the delay in responding to consumer's complaint. Hence as per Regulation 21(10) of the Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Standards of Performance Regulation 2004, I propose an award of compensation of maximum Rs.500/- to the Appellant to be paid by the Licensee.

9.0 Findings on the second issue:

9.1 The Appellant claimed that he had been excessively charged for the disputed period. In this case the MRT has furnished the quantity of electricity supplied during the disputed period through CMRI down loaded data which was a scientific data. Therefore, the appellant's claim that he had penalized for excess billing has to be got verified based on the actual consumption data obtained through CMRI, as it reflects the correct usage.

9.2 The MRT, which is the authorized and competent authority for verifying such matters, confirmed that there was no error in the actual recording of electricity usage. The consumption data was accurately retrieved through CMRI, and the readings reflected the actual usage. The statement furnished by the respondent is found correct. Therefore, the appellant's billing was based on the correct consumption figures, and no excessive charges were levied despite the display problem. Hence it can be concluded that the appellant was not charged excessively.

9.3 Further, it is noticed from the respondent 1 document that he had deleted consumption of the appellant without verifying CMRI downloaded data and made lower consumption figures based on the appellant protest over the billing consumption. It remains unclear on what records or proof the deletion was done, especially considering that the meter readings were accurately recorded. This action of the respondent 1 for having revised the consumption without any scientific basis needs appropriate action to be taken by the licensee.

9.4 During the hearing, the appellant argued that he should not be liable to pay excess charges for a meter that had a display segment problem. He further

requested a refund of the BPSC and RC charges that were levied on him, contending that the excess billing issue should have been resolved first and stating that he would not pay the bill until the matter was addressed. However, it was established that the appellant had failed to pay the current consumption (CC) charges on time, which resulted in the BPSC and RC charges. The appellant had also not paid the CC charges for the billing periods of 03/2024 and 05/2024, and made payment only on 16.07.2024 after receiving the CGRF order instructing him to pay the pending dues.

9.5 In this context, I would like to refer regulation 10 of TNERC Distribution Standards of Performance Regulations, 2004 which is reproduced below:

“10. Complaints in Billing, etc.,

(i) Any complaints in billing received prior to the due date for payment shall be resolved before the next billing along with refund/adjustments, if any. However, the complaints in respect of arithmetic error if any received three days prior to the due date for payment shall be set right within the due date for payment.

(ii) The consumer shall not, on the plea of incorrectness, withhold any portion of the amount billed.”

9.6 Therefore the appellant does not have unilateral authority to withhold CC payments after having utilized the electricity for the month of March and May 2024. The resolution of billing disputes does not absolve him from the responsibility of paying the electricity consumed. Hence the action of Respondent for collecting the dues of the CC charges along with BPSC and RC charges is justified.

10.0 Conclusion:

10.1 Based on the MRT report and the findings discussed, the appellant was not excessively charged. Hence, there is no basis to waive the bills for March and May 2024 as requested by the appellant. Therefore, the appellant's prayer is rejected.

10.2 The Licensee is directed to pay a compensation amount of Rs.500/- to the Appellant towards not responding to the Appellant's representation on service deficiency. The compensation shall be paid within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.

10.3 A compliance report in this regard shall be furnished within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.

10.4 With the above findings A.P.No.58 of 2024 is disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman.

(N. Kannan)
Electricity Ombudsman

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

To

1. Thiru Sivasankaran Ganesan,
No.4, First Floor, Ram Flat,
Dr. Vasudave Garden,
Nethaji Nagar, Thiruvanmiyur,
Chennai – 600 041.

- By RPAD

2. The Assistant Engineer/O&M/Adyar,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-II,
TANGEDCO,
No.80, L.B.Road, SS Complex,
Thiruvanmiyur, Chennai-600 041.

3. The Executive Engineer/O&M/Adyar,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-II,
TANGEDCO,
110KV Tidel SS Complex,
Taramani, Chennai - 600 113.

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

- By Email

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

– By Email

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

– By Email

7. 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**