



TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

19- A, Rukmini Lakshmipathy Salai, (Marshal Road),
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.

Phone : ++91-044-2841 1376 / 2841 1378/ 2841 1379 Fax : ++91-044-2841 1377
Email : tnerc@nic.in Web site : www.tneo.gov.in

Present : Thiru A. Dharmaraj, Electricity Ombudsman

Appeal Petition No.26 of 2015

Thiru E.Ramesh,
No.4, Self help Industrial Estate,
Keelkattalai,
Chennai- 600 117

Vs.

... Appellant
(Rep. by Thiru K.Seshadri
Advocate)

The Executive Engineer / O&M
TANGEDCO
Chennai EDC/South,
Tambaram,
Chennai-600045

The Asst. Executive Engineer/O&M,
TANGEDDCO,
Chennai EDC/South,
Pallavaram,
Chennai-600043

The Assistant Engineer/ O&M,
Chennai EDC/South,
Keelkattalai,
Chennai -600117.

... Respondent
(Thiru R.Venkataraman,
Asst. Executive Engineer, Pallavaram &
Thiru. S. Selvam, AE/Keelkattalai)

Date of hearing : 29-05-2015

Date of Order : 2-07-2015

The petition dt. 23-2-2015 filed by Thiru E. Ramesh, Keelkattalai, Chennai-117 was registered as Appeal Petition No.26 of 2015. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 29-5-2015. Upon perusing the Appeal petition, Counter affidavit and after hearing both sides, the Electricity Ombudsman passes the following order :

ORDER

1. Prayer of the Appellant :

The Appellant prayed that the Electricity Ombudsman may consider the facts and circumstances and the documents furnished hereunder and pass order, directing the DCIAO to withdraw the audit shortfall amount and thus render justice.

2. Brief History of the case :

2.1 The Appellant is the owner of service connection number 316-006-307 (old no.259-268-1322). The sanctioned load of the above service connection is 25 HP.

2.2 The third respondent has issued a demand notice for a sum of Rs.3,40,710/- towards shortfall amount for the billing period from 6/2008 to 12/2009.

2.3 The Appellant filed petition before the AE informing that the reduction in consumption during the above period is due to reduction in utilisation by the tenant who utilised the said service connection during the disputed period and requested for withdrawal of shortfall amount claimed. But the audit shortfall was not dropped.

2.4 The Appellant filed a petition before the CGRF of Chennai EDC/South and the CGRF has dismissed the petition of the Appellant.

2.5 Aggrieved over the Order of CGRF of Chennai EDC/South the Appellant filed this appeal petition duly paying Rs.85,178/- towards 25% of the shortfall amount levied.

3. Contention of the Appellant in the Appeal petition:

3.1 Due to financial problems in meeting the expenses for his children education, he could not run the industry on his own. Under the said circumstances he is forced to enter into lease agreement to let out the premises with L.T. Industrial service connection on 1-3-2007 for a period of one year to one Thiru S.M.Srinivasan of M/s.Aktchaya Industries and the said tenant had been enjoying the said service connection till 30-4-2008 and vacated and handed over the vacant possession to him.

3.2 On 5-5-2008 one Thiru R.Govindaraj of M/s.Rajeswari Metals entered into the Lease Agreement for a period of three years commencing from 5-5-2008 to 4-5-2011. The said Thiru R.Govindaraj was not able to procure orders for fabrication works and he could not even able to pay rents every month on due dates. Because of frequent

default in payment of rent, he asked them to vacate the premises even before the expiry of lease period of three years by cancelling the lease agreement on 25-8-2009.

3.3 During the tenancy period of the said Thiru R.Govindarajan, the current consumption was low when compared with the consumption of the earlier tenant Thiru S.M. Srinivasan, as there was lesser usage of power due to lesser work in the premises and no industrial load was under usage.

3.4 On the basis of the Audit slip No.18 dated 9-2-2011, the 3rd respondent herein in Lr.No.AAO/RA/III/BA/AC No.259/268/1322D/2578 dt. 24-3-2011 has instructed him to pay 3,40,710/- being the difference in short billing during the period from 6/2008 to 12/2009.

3.5 On 27-9-2011 he has also given his detailed reply to the AE/Medavakkam, who was then the officer in charge of the area and he has also furnished relevant lease deeds to prove his bona-fide that there was no reason to raise the said short billing amount, where neither himself nor the tenant was responsible for short billing. The only reason for lesser consumption was lesser usage of motors and other accessories in the let out premises.

3.6 The AE/O&M/Keelkattalai and AEE/Medavakkam had inspected the premises and tested the condition of the meter and sent their report stating that there was no malfunction found out during 6/2008 to 12/2009 nor there was any remarks of the defectiveness nor sluggishness in the meter, entered in the Meter Defective Register.

3.7 It is pertinent to state that the meter in question was not referred for testing by Accredited Testing Laboratory as contemplated under the Supply Code 2004 nor sent to CEIG, Chennai to ascertain the correctness or otherwise of the meter. After a thorough examination of the meter and the usage of loads the AE and AEE had sent their report for withdrawal of the Audit Shortfall amount.

3.8 Based on the report dated 28-8-2012 of the AEE/Medavakkam, the EE/ Tambaram on 4-9-2013 requested the DCIAO to withdraw the short fall amount of Rs.3,40,710/-.

3.9 On receipt of reply from the EE, Tambaram, the DCIAO in his letter dated 4-01-2014 has instructed to collect the said short fall amount. He submit that consequent to the letter from the DCIAO, the AAO, Tambaram has included the amount in the system for collection and when his tenant approached to pay the CC

charges for the month of August 2014, the collection Officer refused to accept the consumption bill without the payment of Audit Short Fall.

3.10 Under the said circumstances he was forced to approach the CGRF, South, (SE/CEDC/South) on 14-10-2014 under section 42(5) of the Electricity Act 2003 for redressal of his grievances against the demand for Audit Short Fall.

3.11 The Chairman, CGRF has called for an enquiry on 23-12-2014. As his representative could not attend the enquiry on 23-12-2014, the enquiry was held on 23-1-2015 at 15.00 hrs. in the office of the SE/CEDC/South. During enquiry, the EE/Tambaram and AEE/Pallavaram were present and his representative was also attended the enquiry. The Chairman has not examined any one of the officers present nor any documents perused during the hearing. He has simply directed his representative to produce documentary evidence as proof of low consumption.

3.12 He has submitted his explanation for low consumption from 6/2008 to 12/2009. The tenant being a small unit doing fabrication of Bureaus, no other evidences could be produced to the CGRF. He humbly submits that the reports of the AE/Keelkattalai, AEE/Pallavaram would go to show that there are no grounds to claim Audit Short Fall from him.

3.13 On 10-2-2015 the Chairman, CGRF without any findings has disposed his complaint. The Chairman has not examined any of the Board's Officer about the low consumption nor perused the reports of the AE, Keelkattalai, AEE/ Medavakkam and EE/Tambaram before disposing the complaint. The order passed by the Chairman is non speaking order bereft of reasons.

3.14 The short fall has been claimed first time on 9-2-2011 after a lapse of limitation period of 2 years as contemplated under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act 2003. The Hon'ble Chairman has not taken into account that the meter was in healthy condition and was recording normally. No abnormality was found out during the period in question. The hon'ble Chairman has not taken into account the reports sent by the Field Officers to the DCIAO.

3.15 The Hon'ble Chairman CGRF ought to have taken into account that collection of average consumption charges as claimed under audit Slip arises only when the supply was effected without meter or the meter provided by the Board becomes defective vide Regulation 11 of the Electricity Supply code 2004. In his case, no such events occurred. Therefore, payment of average consumption charges will not arise.

3.16 In any view of the matter, the decision of the Hon'ble Chairman of CGRF is unsustainable under law, therefore it requires modification by this Hon'ble Ombudsman.

4. Contentions of Third Respondent in the counter :

4.1 The third respondent has filed the counter affidavit on behalf of all the respondents.

4.2 The above Appeal Petition is not maintainable either on law or on facts. He further states that the petitioner being an agreement holder is bound by the provisions of Tamil Nadu Electricity Supply Code 2004, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Code 2004 and as such estopped from disputing the demand.

4.3 At the outset the Audit observation was raised on the Caption head "Assessment of Billing in case where there is no meter or meter is Defective" as per Supply Code Provision 11 and the Sub-Clauses envisaged therein. In the instant issue the Meter in the Service connection No.259-268-1322 became defective from 5/2010 to 4/2011. Hence, according to the Supply Code Provision average usage of two bimonthly consumption for non-C.T. services was levied as short fall for the period 5/2010 to 4/2011. Hence the audit observation was made in accordance with Supply Code Provisions only.

4.4 Further submit that the Lease agreement entered with S.M.Srinivasan of M/s. Aktchaya Industries for the period of one year and subsequently Lease agreement entered with R.Govindaraj of M/s.Rajeswari Metals by the petitioner for the period from 5.5.2008 to 4.5.2011 and the above lease agreement details were not properly produced before the Board and the same lease agreements submitted by the petitioner after the issue of the Audit slip.

4.5 The petitioner stated in his affidavit in para 3 the above said Mr.R.Govindaraj not properly utilized Electricity and not able to procure orders for fabrications works and the above said lease agreement cancelled on 25-8-2009. The above said person use the Electricity for 1 year and 3 months only and the same was not properly intimated to the Board and the petitioner has intimated all the facts only after issuing the Audit Slip. The petitioner was enjoying electricity and hence the petitioner cannot absolve himself from the levy imposed by Audit.

4.6 Reliance is placed upon Supply Code Provision 17 under the caption Head “Agreement with respect to supply – issues on recovery of charges” and the sub-proviso’s envisaged therein wherein the Licensee namely TANGEDCO has the right to recover the dues from the consumer till the Termination of the agreement. In the instant issue at no point of time there was termination of agreement between the Licensee and the consumer.

4.7 In regard to the petitioner stand in point No.11 of the affidavit that the claim is time barred and no dues could be recovered from a consumer for a period beyond 2 years, reliance is placed upon TANGEDCO order dt. 11-10-2011 issued upon with reference to the Judgements of various High Courts for collection of short fall of CC charges even for a period beyond 2 years.

4.8 Summarizing the entire sequence of events, when in as much as there is no denial of usage of energy by the petitioner for the period in question, and when in as much as the levy and the right to collect the short fall is as per Supply Code provisions and keeping in view of the quantum of losses suffered by TANGEDCO the Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue directions deemed fit for collection of the Audit short fall.

5. Hearing held by the Electricity Ombudsman:

5.1 To enable the Appellant and the Respondents to putforth their arguments in person, a hearing was scheduled on 13-5-2015. As the Appellant’s advocate requested for postponement of the above hearing, the hearing was conducted on 29-5-2015.

5.2 Thiru K.Seshadri Advocate has attended the hearing on behalf of the Appellant and putforth his arguments.

5.3 Thiru K.Venkataraman, AEE, Pallavaram the Respondent-2 and Thiru S. Selvam, AE, Keelkattalai, the Respondent-3 herein have attended the hearing and putforth their side arguments.

6. Argument putforth by the Appellant’s representative on the hearing date:

6.1 Thiru K.Seshadhri, Advocate reiterated the arguments furnished in the Counter.

6.2 The learned advocate argued that the reduction in consumption during the disputed period is only due to change in tenancy and not due to any defect in the meter. He informed that the following are tenancy details.

From 1.3.2007 to 30-4-2008	M/s.Aktchaya Industries owned by Thiru S.M. Srinivasan.
From 5.5.2008 to 25-8-2009	M/s.Rajeswari Metals owned by Thiru Govindaraj
From 27-1-2010 to 26-1-2013	M/s.Aktchaya Industries owned by Thiru S.M. Srinivasan.

6.3 The learned Advocate argued that the meter has become defective only during 8/2010 and not during the disputed period. Further he argued that the Respondent have not produced any test results from the accredited lab to establish that the meter was defective in the said period.

6.4 The learned Advocate also argued that the field officers have stated that they have inspected the site and found that there was no malfunction of the meter during the period from 6/2008 to 12/2009, while recommending to drop the audit short fall.

6.5 The learned Advocate also pointed out the meter defective period mentioned by the Respondent as 5/2010 to 4/2011 in the counter affidavit is not relevant to the period in question.

6.6 Regarding the limitation, the learned Advocate argued that as the short fall for the period from 6/2008 to 12/2009 was raised on 24-3-2011, he argued that the claim is beyond the limitation period of two years and the claim has to be set aside on the above ground also.

6.7 Regarding the APTEL's judgement dated 14.11.2006 in Appeal No. 202 and 203 of 2006 he argued that the above is not applicable to this case, as the meter defectiveness was tested and established in the said case but in the case on hand no test was conducted to prove the meter as defective. Hence, he argued that the above case is not applicable to this case.

7. Arguments putforth by the Respondents :

7.1 The AEE/Pallavaram reiterated the contents of the counter.

7.2 The AEE/Pallavaram informed that the downloaded details are not available for the meter which was in service during the disputed period.

7.3 The AEE argued that the Appellant has not produced any record such as production details to substantiate that the reduction in consumption is due to less usage. As the consumption has reduced to less than thousand units during the disputed period when compared with the previous consumption which was more than 7000 units, the AEE argued that the meter is defective only.

7.4 The AEE also argued that the power factor is very low during the disputed period and is in the order 0.08 to 0.56. Hence, he argued that the meter could be defective only.

7.5 Regarding the limitation, the AEE furnished a copy of their CFC's letter dt. 11-10-2011 and argued as per various judgements quoted in the said circular, the short fall claim is not time bared.

8. Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:

8.1 On a careful consideration of the rival submissions, I find the issues to be decided are :

- (i) whether the meter is defective during the disputed period ?
- (ii) what is the relief to be given?

8. Findings on the first issue:

8.1 The Appellant argued that the consumption recorded in the said service is depending on the usage by his tenants. As there was change in tenancy, there was reduction in consumption during the disputed period. The learned Advocate argued that the disputed period falls on the tenancy period of M/s.Rajeswari Metals owned by Thiru Govindaraj who has occupied the above service premises from 5-5-2008 to 25-8-2009.

8.2 The learned advocate also argued that no test was conducted in accredited lab to establish that the meter was defective.

8.3 The learned Advocate also cited the recommendations of the officer of the licensee to drop the audit short fall and argued that as per the field officers recommendation, the meter is not faulty and hence argued that the audit short fall levied is wrong.

8.4 The Respondent argued that the consumption is low during the period from 6/2008 to 12/2009. The AEE/ Pallavaram argued that the consumption which was more than 7000 units per assessment period upto 4/2008 assessment period has suddenly reduced to less than 1000 units from 6/2008 to 12/2009. Hence he argued that such reduction could be due to meter defect only.

8.5 The AEE also argued that the Appellant has not informed the change in tenancy to the licensee. Only after raising the audit short fall they have informed that the reduction in consumption is due to change in the tenancy. Hence, he argued that the above argument of the Appellant could not be considered.

8.6 He also argued that the power factor recorded during the disputed period is also very less (ie) varying from 0.08 to 0.56. Hence, he argued that the meter could be defective only.

8.7 He also informed that no down loaded details are available for the above meter to check the condition of the meter during the defective period.

8.8 He also argued that the Appellant has not produced any documentary evidence such as production details etc., to show that there was less utilisation in the service during the disputed period.

8.9 As there was no test result or down loaded details to confirm the defectiveness of the meter, we have to analyse the consumption pattern and other documents to arrive at a conclusion about the condition of the meter during the disputed period.

8.10 The Appellant has produced the copies of the three agreement executed by them in proof of the change in tenancy. The details are furnished below:

(A) Lease Deed dt. 1-3-2007 :

(i) Lessor : Thiru E.Ramesh

(ii) Lessee : M/s.Aktchaya Industries represented by its
Managing Director, Thiru S.M.Srinivasan

- (iii) Lease period : 3 years from 1-3-2007 (ie) 1-3-2007 to 28-2-2010.
- (iv) Schedule : All the piece and parcel of land and building bearing door No.5, Pillaiyar Koil St., Keelkattalai, Chennai - 600117 having plinth area of about 2620 sq.ft. with 25 HP power HP commercial connection line and 1 HP suguna motor together with land measurable to the extent of 3950 sq.ft. or thereabouts.

But, the lessee has vacated the premises and handed over the same to lessor on 30-4-2008 as per the lessee's statement recorded in the above lease deed. In other words, the above premises was leased by M/s.Akchaya Industries from 1-3-2007 to 30-4-2008.

(B) Lease Deed dt. 5.5.2008 :

- (i) Lessor : Thiru E.Ramesh
- (ii) Lessee : M/s.Rajeswari Metals represented by its proprietor
Thiru R.Gonvindaraj
- (iii) Lease period : Three years commencing from 5-5-2008
- (iv) schedule of : All the piece and parcel of land and building bearing
Property door No.5, Pillaiyar Koil St., Keelkattalai, Chennai - 600117 having plinth area of about 2620 sq.ft. with 25 HP power HP commercial connection line and 1 HP suguna motor together with land measurable to the extent of 3950 sq.ft. or thereabouts.

As per the statements recorded in the lease deed, the lessee has vacated the premises on 25.8.2009.

(C) Lease Deed dt. 21-1-2010

- (i) Lessor : Thiru E.Ramesh
- (ii) Lessee : M/s.Aktchaya Industries represented by its
Managing Director, Thiru S.M.Srinivasan
- (iii) Lease period : 3 years from 27-1-2010
- (iv) Schedule : All the piece and parcel of land and building bearing

door No.5, Pillaiyar Koil St., Keelkattalai, Chennai - 600117 having plinth area of about 2620 sq.ft. with 25 HP power HP commercial connection line and 1 HP Suguna motor together with land measurable to the extent of 3950 sq.ft. or thereabouts.

8.11 As per this deed, the premises were again leased by M/s.Akchaya Industries from 27-1-2010.

8.12 On a careful examination of the details of all the three lease deeds furnished, M/s.Rajeswari Metals are the tenants during the disputed period and M/s.Aktchaya Industries have rented the premises before M/s.Rajeswari Metals rented the premises and after they vacated the above premises. The lease periods are detailed below :

- (i) M/s Aktchaya Industries. . . from 1.3.2007 to 30.4.2008
- (ii) M/s Rajeswari Metals from 5.5.2008 to 25.8.2009
- (iii) M/s Aktchaya Industries. . . .from 27.1.2010 to 26.1.2013

8.13 Now, I would like to analyse the consumption recorded in the said premises. The consumption details are tabulated in tenancy wise as below :-

<u>M/s.Aktchaya Industries</u> (First spell)		<u>M/s.Rajeswari Metals</u>		<u>M/s.Aktchaya Industries</u> (Second spell)	
<u>Period</u> (Lease commenced on 1-3-2007)	<u>Consumption</u>	<u>Period</u> (Lease commenced on 5-5-2008)	<u>Consumption</u>	<u>Period</u> (Lease commenced on 27-1-2010)	<u>Consumption</u>
4/2007	7450 units	6/2008	0(Door lock)	2/2010	5711
6/2007	6120	8/2008	710(for 6/2008 & 8/2009)	4/2010	11386
8/2007	6140	10/2008	560	6/2010	10530
10/2007	7000	12/2008	540	8/2010 to 10/2011 (Ave: 10530 units)	
12/2007	10060	2/2009	480	meter was defective.	
2/2008	8170	4/2009	630	12/2011	26656
4/2008	9960	6/2009	280	2/2012	6040
Vacated the premises on 30-4-2008		8/2009	220	4/2012	16080
		Vacated the premises on 25-8-2009			
		12/2009	364		

8.14 On a careful analysis of the consumption recorded in M/s.Aktchaya Industries first tenancy period (1-3-2007 to 30-4-2008) it is noted that the consumption is varying between 6120 units to 10060 units. On a careful analysis of the consumption recorded in M/s.Rajeswari Metals tenancy period from 5-5-2008 to 25-8-2009 the consumption varies from 220 units to 630 units. It is also observed without any change in the meter, the consumption was recorded as 5711 units during 2/2010 when M/s.Aktchaya Industries have rented the premises again on 27-1-2010. In the next bimonthly period of 4/2010 also the consumption recorded is 11386 units. During third assessment period after M/s.Aktchaya Industries rented the premises (i.e. during 6/2010 assessment period) the meter stopped at a reading of 76540 with a consumption of 10530 units. It is observed from the above details that the meter which has recorded 220 units to 630 units per assessment period during the tenancy period of M/s Rajeswari Metals has recorded a consumption upto 11386 units when the next tenant M/s Aktchaya Industries have leased the premises. Hence, it is obvious that the meter has worked alright upto 4/2010 assessment and stopped working after reaching the reading of 76540 during the 6/2010 assessment period. The above reading was taken on 29-6-2010. The meter would have stopped its function either after recording the reading as 76540 on 29-6-2010 or it would have reached 76540 before 29-6-2010 and thereafter there is no recording. Hence there is every possibility that the meter could become defective during 6/2010 assessment period and not before. In this regard, it is to be noted that in the counter affidavit, the respondent has also argued that the meter is defective from 5/2010 to 4/2011.

8.15 As per my observations in the previous para, the meter could be defective during 6/2010 assessment period onwards. But the disputed period in the case before me is from 6/2008 to 12/2009. Hence, I am of the view that the meter is alright during the disputed period and the reduction in consumption is due to less usage by M/s. Rajeswari Metals, who are the tenants during the entire period in dispute except during 10/2009 & 12/2009. The tenancy period of M/s.Rajeswari Metal is from 5.5.2008 to 25.8.2009 and the next tenant has taken over the premises only on 27.1.2010.

8.16 Further, it is to be pointed that as per the remarks of AE/ Keelkattalai in his letter dt. 29-2-2012, the meter is neither defective nor sluggish and the variation in consumption is due to actual usage only. He also further stated that the above Industrial service might have been inspected by him but no remarks such as meter defective or sluggish was entered in the meter register recorded in the section. The relevant para of the said letter is extracted below :

“The difference of current consumption in three periods (ie. before audit, during audit and after audit) high, low and high create a suspect. This above difference, because of their actual usage only and not for the meter neither defect nor sluggish.

Further it is reported that the said account number Industrial service might have been inspected including myself and no remarks such as defective (or) sluggish received or entered in meter defect register maintained in this section.”

8.17 The Asst.Executive Engineer also stated that the same in his letter dt. 19-3-2012 addressed to EE/Tambaram and recommended to withdraw the audit short fall Amount.

8.18 As the meter has recorded low consumption during the entire period of lease when it was leased to M/sRajeswari Metal and has recorded high consumption as soon as M/s.Aktchaya Industries has rented the premises and upto 6/2010 assessment period till it becomes defective, I am of the view that the meter is in good working condition during the disputed period. Here, I would like to record that in the absence of any test results or downloaded details based on the consumption recorded only, I have arrived at the above conclusion.

9. Findings on second issue:

9.1 As per my finding on the first issue, the meter is not defective in the disputed period. Hence, the consumption recorded in the meter is the actual utilisation of the user who has rented that premises. As the recorded consumption has already been paid by the consumer there is no short fall to be paid by the consumer. Hence the demand notice dt. 24-3-2011 levying a short fall amount of Rs.3,40,710/- for the period from 6/2008 to 12/2009 is set aside.

10. Observation :

10.1 On a careful analysis of the consumption recorded in the said service connection, it is observed that the consumption was 9960 units in 4/2008 and has come down to 710 units in 6/2008 & 8/2008 assessment put together and was lesser than 700 units for about subsequent one year. But, the licensee officers have not taken any action to find out the reason for such a huge drop in consumption and recorded the reasons for the drastic reduction in consumption. Again the consumption has increased to 5711 units in 2/2010 and 11386 units in 4/2010. Had they checked the meter and recorded the facts the audit would not have issued such a audit slip. But the field officer have not taken any action either to test the meter or to analyse the reason for reduction in consumption and then increase in consumption after a certain period. The licensee is therefore, requested to direct his officers to check the meter and examine the reasons for drop or increase in consumption whenever abnormal variation in consumption is observed in any service connection and to record the facts which may result in early detection of meter defects.

11. Conclusion:

11.1 As per my finding on the first issue meter fixed in the service was not defective during the disputed period. Hence, the short fall amount of Rs.3,40,710/- levied is set aside. As the Appellant has already paid a sum of Rs.85,178/- towards 25% of the short fall amount, the same shall be refunded to the Appellant within 30 days from date of receipt of this order. A compliance report on the above shall be sent within 45 days from the date of receipt of this order.

11.2 With the above findings, the AP.No.26 of 2015 is finally disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman. No cost.

(A. Dharmaraj)
Electricity Ombudsman

To
Thiru E.Ramesh,
No.4, Self help Industrial Estate,
Keelkattalai,
Chennai- 600 117

2) The Executive Engineer/O&M,
Tambaram Division,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle / South,
TANGEDCO(formerly TNEB),
Mullai Nagar, Tambaram,
Chennai – 45.

3) The Assistant Executive Engineer/O&M,
Pallavaram,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South,
TANGEDCO(formerly TNEB),
Ashok line, 110 KV SS Complex,
Near Railway Station, Pallavaram,
Chennai – 43.

4) The Assistant Engineer/O&M,
Keelkattalai,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle / South,
TANGEDCO(formerly TNEB),
No.7, Pillaiyar Koil Street,
Keelkattalai, Chennai – 117.

5) The Chairman & Managing Director,
TANGEDCO,
NPKR Malaigai,
144, Anna Salai,
Chennai – 600 002.

6) The Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission
No.19A, Rukmini Lakshmi pathy Salai
Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.

7) The Assistant Director (Computer) - **FOR HOSTING IN THE TNEO WEBSITE PLEASE**
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
No.19-A, Rukmini Lakshmi pathy Salai,
Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.