

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**

4<sup>th</sup> 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](mailto:tneochennai@gmail.com) Web site : [www.tnec.gov.in](http://www.tnec.gov.in)

**Before The Tamil Nadu Electricity Ombudsman, Chennai**

**Present : Thiru. S. Devarajan, Electricity Ombudsman**

**A.P.No. 78 of 2021**

Tmt Grace Franklin,  
P.No. 6, 7th Street, Metro Nagar Extn.,  
Alapakkam, Chennai – 600 116.

. . . . . Appellant  
(Rep. by Thiru Jobinston)

Vs.

The Superintending Engineer,  
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/West,  
TANGEDCO,  
33 KV Thirumangalam Complex,  
Anna nagar, Chennai - 600 040.

. . . . Respondent  
(Rep. by Thiru S.Anbarasu, EE/O&M/Anna Nagar(i/c))

**Petition Received on: 30-09-2021**

**Date of hearing: 18-11-2021**

**Date of order:- 28-02-2022**

The Appeal Petition received on 30.09.2021 filed by Tmt Grace Franklin, P.No. 6, 7th Street, Metro Nagar Extn., Alapakkam, Chennai – 600 116 was registered as Appeal Petition No. 78 of 2021. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 18.11.2021. 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 arrest the return supply immediately and prayed for compensation for not resolving the issue, negligence, danger of Electrocutation and damage to the devices.

### **2.0 Brief History of the case:**

2.1 When the appellant has noticed the electrical shock in his house he made a complaint with the Respondent, AE/TANGEDCO. But no one has attended appellant's problem.

2.2 Hence the appellant has filed a petition with the CGRF of Chennai EDC/West on 23.07.2021. The application was not taken on the file of the Chairman, CGRF, Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/West. Hence, the appellant preferred this appeal petition before the Electricity Ombudsman.

### **3.0 Hearing held by the Electricity Ombudsman:**

3.1 To enable the Appellant and the Respondent to put forth their arguments, a hearing was conducted on 18.11.2021 through video conferencing.

3.2 On behalf of the Appellant Thiru Jobinston has attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

3.3 On behalf of the respondent Thiru S.Anbarasu, EE/O&M/Anna Nagar(i/c) of Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/West has attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

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

#### **4.0 Arguments of the Appellant :**

4.1 The Appellant has stated that he has noticed that there was an electrical shock when charging a Phone. Upon inspecting with the "Tester" the appellant found that there was Electricity on the device while charging.

4.2 The Appellant has stated that he called the FOC and complained TNEB. However, his complaint was declined saying that it is not an issue affecting the area. The Appellant has employed a team of electricians to check if the issue is with internal wiring. Electricians isolated the UPS, removed all the wiring and junction box and checked all the devices installed in the premises in the last year. After, all these steps, the issue persisted.

4.3 The Appellant has stated that he personally checked different shops and houses. The problem confirmed to be affecting all the area. He contacted the Respondent, AE over phone on July 21st. He promised that Lineman would visit and check. However, no one came.

4.4 In response to CGRF Petition No. 2307211742625, the following steps were taken by the TANGEDCO. i)Return supply of 70-80V was confirmed with the help of the Multi Meter by the AE, (ii) It was also confirmed that the issue is in at least 3-4 houses in the street, (iii) Replaced the transformer, (iv) Cable maintenance and (v)Extra Neutral grounding near the transformer. But the issue persisted. Then he was asked to provide separate Neutral grounding for the UPS within the premises. Even after this, the issue still did not resolve.

4.5 Due to this the connected device heats up rapidly and it costed Phone device worth 60,000.00 INR and other devices like boilers. The neighbouring houses spent money on changing the complete wiring on their respective houses. The Kids and Women in the house feel electrical shock every time they touch a connected device.

4.6 The Appellant has prayed to arrest the return supply immediately, to employ an independent team of experts to check all the houses as he doesn't trust the local TANGEDCO staffs as they don't check and report issues properly and lack of skills and also prayed for compensation for not resolving the issue, negligence,

danger of Electrocutation and damage to the devices.

**5.0 Arguments of the Respondent:**

5.1 The Respondent has submitted that the premises at Plot number 6, 7<sup>th</sup> Metro Nagar Extension, Alapakkam, Chennai 600 118, pertaining to the petitioner Tmt. Grace Franklin had been inspected thoroughly by Assistant Engineer/O&M/Maduravoyal as and when the complaint was received. Upon inspecting and testing with the tester it was observed that there was electricity on the device while charging. It is to be noted that the petitioner's complaint does not point out that there was a shock while using any other Gadgets other than phone charger.

5.2 The Respondent has submitted that each and every time TANGEDCO officials responded swiftly to the petitioner's complaint and have examined thoroughly and explained that the problem was not with TANGEDCO end. In fact, as referred by the petitioner himself all the gadgets from Transformer to the consumer end were tested and overhauled in order to ascertain that the problem was not due to TANGEDCO power.

5.3 The Respondent has submitted that Assistant Executive Engineer/O&M/Maduravoyal had even demonstrated to the petitioner by isolating the consumer end by disconnecting the incoming cable. It was noticed that supply indication was sensed with tester at the phone charger end when the inverter was switched on.

5.4 The Respondent has submitted that he has confirmed that the problem might either be with the phone charger or with the wiring at the consumer end. In spite of explaining the facts on several occasions and repeated painstaking inspections, the petitioner has wrongly, confirmed and adhered to preconceived notions.

5.5 The Respondent has submitted that as per section 30(1) of distribution code, the consumer's installation should invariably comply with the statutory provisions contained under section 53 of the Act relating to wiring and equipment.

The responsibility with regard to maintenance or testing of equipment and wiring on consumer's premises shall lie upon the consumer.

5.6 The Respondent has submitted that thorough enquiry was conducted among the dwellers in and around the petitioner's house and there was no complaint from any other consumers as referred by the petitioner.

## **6.0 Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:**

6.1 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.

6.2 The Appellant in his arguments has stated that there was an electrical shock when charging a phone and upon inspecting it was found that there was Electricity on the device while charging. Appellant called the FOC and complained. However, his complaint was declined saying that it is not an issue affecting the area. The Appellant has employed electricians to check the internal wiring, junction box and checked all the devices installed in the premises, however, the issue persisted.

6.3 The Appellant filed a CGRF Petition and AE inspected the appellant's premises and he was asked to provide separate Neutral grounding for the UPS within the premises. Even after this, the issue still did not resolve.

6.4 The respondent in his arguments has stated that the petitioner's complaint does not point out that there was a shock while using any other Gadgets other than phone charger. The Assistant Executive Engineer/ O&M/Maduravoyal had demonstrated to the petitioner by isolating the consumer end by disconnecting the incoming cable. It was noticed that supply indication was sensed with tester at the phone charger end when the inverter was switched on and hence confirmed that the problem might either be with the phone charger or with the wiring at the consumer end.

6.5 The Appellant has prayed to arrest the return supply immediately, to employ

an independent team of experts to check all the houses as he don't trust the local TANGEDCO staffs as they don't check and report issues properly and lack of skills and also prayed for compensation for not resolving the issue, negligence, danger of Electrocutation and damage to the devices.

6.6 The Respondent has submitted that as per section 30(1) of distribution code, the consumer's installation should invariably comply with the statutory provisions contained under section 53 of the Act relating to wiring and equipment. The responsibility with regard to maintenance or testing of equipment and wiring on consumer's premises shall lie upon the consumer and hence requested to dismiss the appeal petition.

6.7 During the hearing on 18.11.2021, it was ordered to conduct a joint inspection, in order to know the clear situation. In response to this, the team comprising of AEE/O&M/Madhuravoyal, AE/O&M/Porur garden with Petitioner's representative conducted inspection on 24.11.2021. The inspection report dated 14.12.2021 is furnished below:

*(extract from Inspection Report)*

*"a) While checking on 24.11.2021 in consumer premises, the entire load was disconnected and checked the metering point for its healthiness. No abnormality was noticed. Normal voltages appeared in all phases on the meter. Afterwards, loads were connected and load points were checked. Normal voltages and load currents were noticed in the metering point. The Voltage readings are R-223 V, Y-221 V, B-219 V and load currents are R-0.06 A, Y-0.73 A, B-8.17 A and N-0.7 A respectively. It seems that the un-balanced loads were connected in the system. On observing the supply position for one hour in consumer premises, it was noticed that no abnormality or fluctuations or leakage of supply in the system. In the same manner, the inspection had been carried out on 21.10.2021 as done above.*

*b) After checking was completed in consumer premises, the adjoining electricity points were also inspected in the presence of petitioner's representative to ascertain the electricity supply conditions. The inspected LT service connection A/c Nos., are 404-007-765, 404-007-745 and 404-007-215. During inspection, no abnormality or fluctuations or leakages are observed in any point of supply.*

*c) Also, the entire LT network was checked by the team on that date and found that normal condition is maintained in the system.”*

6.8 On perusal of inspection report, it is noticed that normal voltages appeared in all phases on the meter, no abnormality or fluctuations or leakage of supply in the system. Further in the presence of appellant’s representative, the adjoining electricity points with SC No.404-007-765, 404-007-745 and 404-007-215 were also inspected to ascertain the supply conditions and observed no abnormality or fluctuations or leakages in any point of supply. Further, it seems that the complaint pertains to individual in nature and no other consumers have represented for abnormality or fluctuations or leakage of supply in the system.

6.9 From the foregoing paras, I am of the view that there is no abnormality or fluctuations or leakages in any point of supply in the consumer premises as well as in the adjoining area as per inspection report. With regard to rectification works, I would like to refer regulation 30(1) of TN Electricity Distribution Code which is furnished below:

“30. CONSUMER’S INSTALLATION:

*(1) The consumer’s installation should invariably comply with the statutory provisions contained under section 53 of the Act relating to wiring and equipment. The responsibility with regard to maintenance or testing of equipments and wiring on consumer’s premises shall lie upon the consumer.”*

6.10 From the above, it is clear that the responsibility with regard to maintenance or testing of equipment and wiring on consumer’s premises shall lie upon the consumers.

6.11 In the case on hand, there is no abnormality or fluctuations or leakages in any point of supply in the consumer premises as well as in the adjoining area. Hence, it is the responsibility of the appellant to rectify the defects if any in his premises including wiring duly taking into account of the safety aspects into consideration.

## **7.0 Observation:**

7.1 It is seen that the Respondent has tested exhaustively all the options available from the Transformer to the consumer meter box. But the Appellant has not reported whether the earthing at his premises was checked and maintained as per ISI standards. From the joint inspection report it is observed that the Appellant has not installed Earth Leakage Circuit Breaker (ELCB) or Residual Current Device (RCD). The installation of RCD in the consumer premises has been made mandatory by the Hon'ble TNERC in the press release dated 05.07.2021. The Respondent is directed to issue a notice to the Appellant to install RCD within a month from the date of receipt of the notice.

7.2 The Licensee may issue common circular to all the officials to ensure installation of RCD by the consumers in their premises in a time bound manner and wide publicity may also be given to the public in this regard in order to ensure safety of the consumers.

## **8.0 Conclusion :**

8.1 As per my findings in para 6, there is no abnormality or fluctuations or leakages in any point of supply in the consumer premises as well as in the adjoining area. Hence, it is the responsibility of the appellant to rectify the defects if any in his premises including wiring duly taking into account the safety aspects into consideration.

8.2 With the above findings the A.P. No.78 of 2021 is finally disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman. No Costs.

**(S. Devarajan)**  
Electricity Ombudsman

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

To  
1. Tmt Grace Franklin,  
P.No. 6, 7th Street, Metro Nagar Extn.,  
Alapakkam, Chennai – 600 116.

2. The Superintending Engineer,  
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/West,  
TANGEDCO,  
33 KV Thirumangalam Complex,  
Anna nagar, Chennai - 600 040.

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

– By Email

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

– By Email

5. The Assistant Director (Computer) –**For Hosting in the TNERC Website**  
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,  
4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building,  
Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate,  
Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.