



TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

19- A, Rukmini Lakshmi pathy 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

BEFORE THE TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, CHENNAI

Present : Thiru. A. Dharmaraj, Electricity Ombudsman

Appeal Petition No.72 of 2015

Thiru Rajendran Chingaravelu,
Plot No.4074 (SF No.84011)
Metropolis 3rd Cross Street,
Srinivasan Main Road,
Ram Nagar North Extension,
Madipakkam, Chennai.

. Appellant
(Rep by Party in Person)

Vs.

1. The Chairman & Managing Director,
TANGEDCO,
NPKRR Maaligai,
144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 2.

2. The Assistant Engineer/O&M,
Madipakkam,
TANGEDCO,
Madipakkam, Chennai – 91.

. Respondent
(Rep. by Tmt. Maheswari, AE/O&M/Madipakkam)

Date of hearing : 12.11.2015

Date of Order : 14.12.2015

1. In the petition dt.4.9.2015, Thiru. Rajendran Chingaravelu has stated that he is owner of a residential flat of stilt + 3 floor and has applied for a service connection for the above flat. But, the 2nd respondent has refused to receive the application for service

connection holding that as per the 2006 High Court direction in Consumer Action Group Vs the State of Tamil Nadu application will not be received without the completion certificate from CMDA for buildings approved by CMDA. On further enquiry, they found that all TANGEDCO officers under the management of the licensee and 1st respondent herein insist the same, which affects all multi residential complex flat owners across the state and thus stated this as a complaint of common nature and hence directly filed before the Electricity Ombudsman.

2. As per regulation 17(1) of the Regulations for CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman complaints of common nature (which may be considered applicable to more than one forum) can be directly brought upto Electricity Ombudsman by any of the consumer or by a state level consumer association in the form as prescribed in Annexure-III. Accordingly, the petition dt.4.9.2015 fled by Thiru. Rajendran Chingaravelu was registered as A.P.No. 72 of 2015.

3. The above petition was sent to the Respondent for furnishing the counter vide letter dt.14.9.2015.

4. The Second Respondent (viz) the Assistant Engineer/O&M/Madipakkam has furnished the counter.

5. To enable the Petitioner and the Respondents to putforth their arguments in person, a hearing was held before the Electricity Ombudsman on 12.11.2015. The petitioner herein appeared as party in person and Tmt. V. Maheswari, Assistant Engineer/O&M/Madipakkam, the Respondent-2 herein appeared on behalf of the Respondents and putforth their arguments.

6. The Superintending Engineer/Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South in his letter dt.4.10.2015 has informed that Thiru. Rajendran Chingaravelu has already filed a complaint before CGRF of Chennai EDC/South and which was registered as CGRF No.153/2015 on 1.9.2015 and hearing in that matter is likely to be conducted during last week of October 2015.

7. As a petition on the same subject matter was already filed before the CGRF, the petitioner was directed to clarify the reasons for filing petitions before the CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman separately on the same subject matter.

8. The petitioner accepted that he has filed a petition before the CGRF also. However, he argued that the petition before the CGRF is for his own cause (ie) for obtaining the service connection for his own flat but, the petition filed before the Electricity Ombudsman is for a common cause (ie) the prayer is general to direct the licensee to effect service connection without insisting of completion certificate from the CMDA. Hence, argued both has to be disposed by the respective quasi-judicial authorities treating them as separate petition.

9. As the petitioner has filed a petition before the CGRF on the same subject matter and simultaneously filed another petition before the Electricity Ombudsman on the same subject matter, I am of the view that the petitioner is seeking remedy simultaneously from two authorities in respect of the same subject matter. Further, as Assistant Engineer/O&M/Madipakkam was also cited as Respondent, it is understood that the petition is for his own cause. Hence, the petitioner is advised to file his appeal petition after receipt of the CGRF order, if he is not satisfied with the orders of the

CGRF. He may also file a petition if he has not received any reply from the CGRF within 50 days from the date of filing of the petition.

11. With the above observation, the A.P.No.72 of 2015 is closed as dismissed. No Costs.

(A. Dharmaraj)
Electricity Ombudsman

To

1) Thiru Rajendran Chingaravelu,
Plot No.4074 (SF No.84011)
Metropolis 3rd Cross Street,
Srinivasan Main Road,
Ram Nagar North Extension,
Madipakkam, Chennai.

2) The Chairman & Managing Director,
TANGEDCO,
NPKRR Maaligai,
144, Anna Salali,
Chennai – 2.

3) The Assistant Engineer/O&M,
Madipakkam,
TANGEDCO,
Madipakkam,
Chennai – 91.

4) The Superintending Engineer,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South,
TANGEDCO (formerly TNEB),
110 K V SS Complex, K.K. Nagar,
Chennai - 63.

5) The Chairman,
(Superintending Engineer),
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South,
TANGEDCO (formerly TNEB),
110 K V SS Complex, K.K. Nagar,
Chennai - 63.

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