



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.79 of 2015

Tmt. V. Kamalakumari,
No.114, Sundarar Street,
Thiruvalléswarar Nagar,
Anna Nagar (West),
Chennai - 600 040

... Appellant
(Rep by Tmt. V. Kamalakumari)

Vs

1) The Superintending Engineer,
Chennai EDC/West,
TANGEDCO.
110/33/11 KV Thirumangalam SS Complex,
Anna Nagar, Chennai-40.

2) The Executive Engineer/O&M,
Anna Nagar,
Chennai EDC/West,
TANGEDCO,
1100 A,H Block, 5th street, Ranganathan Garden,
Anna Nagar, Chennai-600 040.

3) The Asst. Executive Engineer,
Anna Nagar / Construction,
Chennai EDC/West,
TANGEDCO,
1100 A,H Block, 5th street, Ranganathan Garden,
Anna Nagar, Chennai-600 040.

4) The Asst. Engineer/O&M,
Thiruvalluvar Nagar
Chennai EDC/West,
TANGEDCO,
1100 A,H Block, 5th street, Ranganathan Garden,
Anna Nagar, Chennai-600 040.

... Respondents
(Rep by Thiru M.Mahendran, EE/O&M/Anna Nagar,
Thiru A.Venkatesan, AEE/Const/Anna Nagar &
Thiru R.Velumani, AE/O&M/ Thiruvalluvar Nagar)

Date of hearing 28-12-2015 & 18-2-2016

Date of order : 5-5-2016

The petition dated 1-10-2015 filed by Tmt.V.Kamalakumari, Anna Nagar West, Chennai-40 was registered as appeal petition No.79 of 2015. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 28-12-2015 and 18.2.2016. Upon perusing the appeal petition of the Appellant counter affidavit of the Respondent and after hearing both sides, the Electricity Ombudsman passes the following order.

ORDER

1. Prayer of the Appellant

The Appellant prayed to take necessary action to check the working condition of the meter in SC.N o.162-022-1072 and refund the excess amount collected in respect of assessment period from 11/13 to 7/14 and also replace the meter with a good working condition meter.

2. Brief History of the case

2.1 The Appellant is the tenant of the premises having an electric service connection bearing No.162-022-1072. The service connection is coming under the jurisdiction of the Respondents.

2.2 The Appellant filed a petition before the CGRF of Chennai EDC/West complaining for refund of the excess amount collected from her for the period from 11/13 to 6/14 stating that the consumption recorded during the above assessment periods are abnormal. She also requested for replacement of the meter as it records abnormal consumption.

2.3 The CGRF of Chennai EDC/West in its Order dt. 4-9-2015 has ordered that the request of the petition to refund the excess amount collected is not feasible of compliance as the recording of meter from 11/13 to 7/15 assessment is in order.

2.4 Aggrieved by the order of the CGRF, the Appellant filed this appeal petition before the Electricity Ombudsman.

3. Contentions of the Appellant

3.1 The Appellant has contended the following in the Appeal petition.

3.1 CGRF issued order stating that meter is correct and the consumption pattern is according to the connected load and not feasible for refund. The same is not correct. As per TNERC supply code, the first level responsibility vested with AE to verify the abnormal consumption and not at the end of the consumers.

3.2 Checked the meter readings and found that her service connections has connected with the old meter and with new static meter. This is an evidence that meter recording assessed in 11/13 is not from her old meter recording. Thus the CGRF order stating the final reading and counter against clerical error is incorrect.

3.3 The connected load down loaded by the AE being referred in CGRF order is not in use for 24 x 7 hrs. The following Electrical installation connected/installed in her house:

WIFI Modem	-	1 No. (Dec.2013)
washing machine	-	1 No.
AC 1.10	-	1 No.
Power/660 w		
Ceiling Fans	-	4 No.
Mixer	-	1 No.
Grinder	-	1 No.
Refrigerator (double door)	-	1 No.
Water heater	-	2 Nos.
TV	-	1 No.
Tube lights	-	5 Nos.
CFL Tube light	-	4 Nos.
Laptop	-	1 No.
mobile	-	1 No.

From the date of possession of this house (Feb.2010) the above appliances were used.

3.4 Subsequently due to high voltage TV power and panel damaged and not in use for two years from Dec.2012 to December 2014. – The IFB washing machine could be operated only at 220 v. Hence the machine not used every day, once in 15 days two times will be used for 1 ½ hours One Geyser not in use for six months. Everyday maximum one hour geyser will be in use at 20 minutes interval.

3.5 No one will be at home in day time and usage of AC only during May and June of every year, when her daughter comes for vacation. During May 2013, May and June 2014 she also did not come for vacation due to project. Only from 22nd May to 15th September, 2015 her daughter was at home. So, AC was used for maximum hour of

eight hours per day. (22-5-2015 to 15-9-2015). The AC also given for service from 17-6-2015 to 24-6-2015. The lighting load recorded and AC usage recorded can be verified. On 14-7-2015 3.30 pm to 15-7-2015 7.00 pm her daughter was admitted in Hospital.

3.6 The abnormal consumption stated in the consumer Forum by ADE and Chairperson was AC usage. This AC was installed at the time of possession in the House and the usage was same at that time. But the unit recorded was not abnormal. So as per TNERC supply code the supply usage of Domestic load would not be upto the recorded consumption. This has to be worked out and render justice to the abnormal consumption.

3.7 AE and foreman has recorded check reading from 26-5-2014 for five days and even after replacement of new meter after the first reading (abnormal) ADE has noted the check reading in his diary for five days. After her written complaint only there is reduction in the recorded unit. Based on the recordings/assessment, she had given written request to refund the excess billed amount, the competent authorities have not replied and in CGRF order they stated that since they replied for the first letter, second request not replied and the refund was not feasible.

4. Contentions of the Respondent

4.1 The Respondent has contended the following in the counter affidavit.

4.2 4 Nos. LT Service Connection Nos.162-022-327, 162-022-858, 162-022-1072, 162-022-1073 were effected in the name of Thiru.A.Arokiasamy at No. 114, Sundarar Street, Thiruvalleeswarar Nagar, Chennai - 40. Thiru.A.Arokiasamy, the

house owner gave an oral complaint regarding high consumption during 5/2014 for the Service Connection No.162-022-327 only and not for any other Service Connection. Then the premises was inspected by Asst.Exe. Engineer/Construction/Anna Nagar along with Assistant Engineer/O&M/Thiruvalleeswarar Nagar and found that the meters were in good working condition. As the above services provided with high quality meters, the same was replaced with static meters on 11.06.2014 under RAPDRP scheme.

4.3 A representation dt.14.08.2014 was received from the Appellant Tmy.V.Kamala Kumari the tenant of the above premises wherein she had complained that abnormal billing has been made in the LT Service Connection No.162-022-1072 for the past five bi- monthly readings due to defective meter (11/13 to 7/14) and abnormal consumption noticed even after replacement of defective meter and also she represented to check the power supply to their premises.

4.4 Based on the petitioner's representation dt. 14.08.14, the premises was again inspected by Asst.Engineer/O&M/Thiruvalleeswarar Nagar and the meter data for the Service Connection No.162-022-1072 was downloaded through CMRI and the same was analyzed by the Asst.Exe.Engineer/MRT and reported that the meter was working in good condition. The supply to the premises was checked by Asst. Exe. Engineer/Construction/Anna Nagar and Asst. Engineer/O&M/ Thiruvalleeswarar Nagar and found normal voltage in 3 phase. Hence the Appellant was intimated by Asst. Engineer/O&M/Thiruvalleeswarar Nagar vide his letter dt.29.09.14 that the consumption recorded in the meter was according to the usage of connected load in their premises and no excess amount was collected in the above Service Connection number.

4.5 The contention of the Appellant that abnormal consumption recorded in the meter from 11/13 to 7/14 due to defective meter is denied. The working of the existing high quality meter in the LT Service Connection No.162-022-1072 was in good condition and the same was replaced by static meter for accuracy in billing under RAPDRP scheme only and not due to defective as stated by the Appellant.

4.6 He denies the allegation of the Appellant that wrong reading recorded in 11/13 assessment and assessed units for an amount of Rs4,140/- was wrongly entered in the unit column as 4140 units and subsequently the wrong reading was continuously recorded for further assessment. He submitted that reading recorded for 11/13 assessment and subsequent assessment were as per reading recorded in the meter. The meter in the LT Service Connection No.162-022-1072 was inspected by Asst. Exe. Engineer / Construction/Anna Nagar and Asst. Engineer/O&M/Thiruvalleeswarar Nagar on 10.06.14 and noted the check reading as 33551 in the consumer ledger and the existing high quality meter in the above service connection was replaced with static meter on 11.06.14 and final reading noted in the RAPDRP ledger as 33596, which is found tallied with final reading recorded in the consumer ledger of the above service connection.

4.7 He denies the contention of the Appellant that the electronic equipments were damaged during the period December 2012 to December 2014 due to high voltage. He submitted that no complaint was received either from owner or from tenants of the Service Connection Nos. 162-022-327, 162-022-858, 162-022-1072, 162-022-1073 upto 5/2014.

4.8 A complaint was received from the Appellant to check the meter due to high consumption during 7/2014 assessment. The meter was inspected by Asst.Engineer/O&M/ Thiruvalleeswarar Nagar on 1.8.2014 and informed the Appellant that the performance of the meter was in order.

4.9 As per the equipment list furnished by the Appellant in the appeal petition, the approximate total connected load in the Appellant premises works out to 7.5 KW. If the consumer consumes 60% of the load ($7.5 \times 0.6 = 4.5$ KW) in 12 hours per day, the consumption per day would be around 54 units (4.5×12 hrs = 54).

4.10 On reviewing the consumption pattern of the service connection 162-022-1072 from Feb.2010, the Appellant consumed higher consumption for 7/2010,9/2010 and from 9/2011 to 5/2012 assessment. As compared to previous consumption pattern and usage of connected load by the Appellant, the consumption recorded in the existing high quality meter and newly fixed static meter were found in order.

4.11 The Appellant premises was Inspected on 15.09.2015 and found that there is no voltage fluctuation. The voltage measured at consumer end are as follows.

Rph - 242 V

Yph - 241 V

B ph - 241 V

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 conducted before the Electricity Ombudsman on 28-12-2015 and 18-2-2016.

- 5.2 Tmt.V.Kamalakumari the Appellant herein has attended hearing on both the days and putforth her side arguments.
- 5.3 Thiru M.Mahendran, EE, O&M, Anna Nagar, attended the hearing on 28-12-2015.
- 5.4 Thiru A.Venkatesan, AEE/O&M, Anna Nagar and Thiru R.Velumani, Asst.Engineer/O&M, Thiruvallieswarar Nagar have attended the hearing on both the days and putforth their side arguments.

6. Arguments putforth by the Appellant on the hearing dates

- 6.1 Thiru V.Kamalakumari, the Appellant herein reiterated the contents of her petition.
- 6.2 She argued that the consumption of 4140 units recorded during 11/2013 assessment period is very high when compared to her previous consumptions.
- 6.3 The Appellant informed that there is no new addition of appliance during the above period. The average consumption of 72 units per day is not possible. Hence argued that the meter may be defective.
- 6.4 Based on her complaint over phone, the officials of the TANGEDCO has noted check reading for 5 days and then after convincing that there was abnormal reading of consumption only they changed the meter. But now they are arguing that the meter was changed not due to defect but based on RAPDRP programme.
- 6.5 The AE has inspected the service after changing of the meter also based on her complaint. After the AEs inspection, there was reduction in her bills.

- 6.6 The Appellant also argued that the assessment staff has wrongly noted the charges as reading during 11/2013 assessment period.
- 6.7 The Appellant also argued that she is agreeable for conducting a challenge test in the high quality meter.
- 6.8 The Appellant also argued that the existing static meter is also not working properly. She is willing to have a challenge test.

7. Arguments of the Respondent

- 7.1 Thiru M.Mahendran, EE, Anna Nagar reiterated the contents of the Appeal petition.
- 7.2 The EE argued that the High quality meter was changed as per the RAPDRP programme only and not based on defectiveness of the meter.
- 7.3 With regard to the contention of the Appellant that wrong reading was noted, the EE argued that when comparing the check reading noted as 33551 by the AEE and AE on 10-6-2014 and the final reading noted while changing the meter with the entries of the consumer ledger, they are tallying. Hence, the EE argued that there is no error in noting down the meter reading.
- 7.4 The EE also informed that after changing the meter on 11-6-2014, the Appellant complained about high consumption. Accordingly, the data of the meter were down loaded and found to be alright.
- 7.5 Executive Engineer/O&M/Anna Nagar also argued that the maximum demand recorded on 7-7-2014 is 7.84 kw at 11.30 am. Hence, the consumption was high during 7/2014 assessment period and the MD has come down to 5.06 kw on 19.7.2014 at 7.30 pm. Hence, argued that the consumption is depending upon the usage of the consumer only and the meter is working alright.

- 7.6 On 18.2.2016 the AEE/Const. informed that the high quality meter removed from the service was already devoluted to stores and hence, it is not possible to conduct challenge test on the said meter.
- 7.7 Regarding the healthiness of the existing static meter he argued that the meter is in good condition only. However, if the consumer wants to have a challenge test, the same will be arranged as per the procedure in vogue.
- 7.8 He also informed that the service was inspected along with the representative of the Appellant and found that the static meter alone connected in the service and the old meter was not in service as contented by the Appellant.

8. Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman

8.1 On a careful consideration of the arguments putforth by the Appellant and the Respondent, the following are the issues to be decided.

- (i) whether the high quality meter installed in SC.No.162-022-1072 was changed due to defectiveness?
- (ii) whether the contention of the Appellant that static meter installed in the service is not working properly is correct?
- (iii) whether any relief could be given to the Appellant ?

9. Findings on the first issue:

9.1 The Appellant argued that the consumption of 4140 units recorded in 11/2013 was very high when compared to the consumptions recorded in the said service prior to 11/2013. She argued that it is about six times of the 9/2013 consumption. She also argued that the CC amount of Rs.4140/- was wrongly entered as consumption.

9.2 She argued that per day consumption of 72 units in her service is not possible and there was no extra load connected during that period. She also pointed out that the reading of 4140 units is more than double the consumption of subsequent bimonthly consumption also. Hence she argued that the high quality meter installed in her service was defective from 11/2013 assessment period onwards.

9.3 The Appellant also argued that based on her complaint, the licensee has arranged for the check reading for five days from 26-5-2014. The meter was changed on 11-6-2014. Hence she argued that the meter was changed due to defectiveness based on the check readings noted by the licensee staff.

9.4 The Respondent argued that the high quality meter in the said service is in good working condition only.

9.5 The Respondent argued that the meter was replaced by a static meter for accuracy in billing under RAPDRP programme only.

9.6 The Respondent argued that the consumption recorded in the meter are the actual consumption of the premises only. The connected load as per the details of the Appellant is about 7.5 kw. Hence for the above connected load the consumption recorded seems to be correct.

9.7 As the Respondent has informed that the high quality meter removed from the service was devoluted to stores and is not available to conduct a challenge test, the defectiveness or otherwise of the meter has to be analysed based on the available data only.

9.8 In the absence of any test results to establish the correctness of the meter, I would like to analyse to consumption pattern of the said meter to arrive at a conclusion

of its healthiness. The consumption recorded in the said service from 2010 to 2015 are furnished below :-

Sl.No.	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
1	-	800	1210	900	1540	890
3	9	650	1310	910	1610	760
5	0	500	1380	840	2160	1350
7	2080	1070	910	700	3056	2090
9	2800	1690	980	680	1240	1990
11	1360	1430	850	4140	1070	1050
Total Units	6249	6140	6640	8170	10676	8130
Annual average consumption	-	1023	1167	1362	1779	1355

9.9 On a careful examination of the table it is noted that the consumption is not uniform it varies from 500 units to 4140 units the annual average consumption of the service from 2011 to 2015 is worked out and furnished below :

		<u>% increase/decrease over the previous year</u>
2011 :	1023 units	
2012 :	1167 units	14%
2013 :	1362 units	17%
2014 :	1779 units	31%
2015 :	1355 units	(-)24%

9.10 The annual average consumption was increasing by 14%, 17% & 31% for the year 2012, 2013 and 2014 respectively over the previous year and the annual average consumption of 2015 has reduced by 24% over the average annual consumption of 2014. However, the 2015 average annual consumption is comparable with the consumption of 2013. Hence, I am of the view that there is no appreciable deviation in the average annual consumption pattern.

9.11 However, it is observed that the consumption of 4140 units during 11/2013 assessment period seems to be on the higher side when compared with the previous and subsequent consumption. It is also observed that except during 11/2013, the consumption recorded in all other assessment periods in the year 2013 is less than 1000 units only. The total consumption for the year 2013 is 8170 units whereas the consumption for 11/2013 alone is 4140 units. Hence, it is observed that the consumption during 11/2013 is very high.

9.12 It was reported that the high quality meter was replaced by a static meter on 11-6-2014. Therefore, the total consumption of 3056 units recorded during 7/2014 assessment includes the consumption recorded by the high quality meter from 10.5.2014 to 11.6.2014 and the consumption recorded by the static meter from 11.6.2014 to 19.7.2014. The details are as below :

High quality meter

Final meter reading as on 11-6-2014	:	33596
Meter reading as on 18-5-2014	:	32520

Therefore, consumption for 23 days	:	1076 Units

Therefore average consumption per day	:	47 Units

Static meter

Initial reading as on 11-6-2014	:	0
Reading as on 19-7-2014	:	1980
Consumption recorded for 38 days	:	1980 units
Therefore average consumption per day	:	52 units

9.13 It could be seen from the above, that in the bimonthly period, of 7/2014, the average consumption per day recorded in high quality meter is 47 units and the same for a static meter in the service is 52 units. Here, I would like to inform that the static meter recording is more accurate and hence the average consumption per day may be slightly higher when it was in service. Further the pattern of usage in the respective period may also reflect on the average per day. As the energy recoded in the high quality meter is slightly (ie) about 9.6% less than the static meter, I am of the view that the high quality meter in service was recording normally and could not be declared as defective. Further, I would also like to point out, that the maximum demand recorded for the said period in the static meter is 7.84 kw which also makes to conclude that the recorded consumption was relevant to the utilization and the meter is in good condition.

10. Findings on second issue:

10.1 The Appellant argued that the first month consumption recorded in the static meter is abnormal and is high when compared to her usage. Hence she argued that the meter is also defective and need to be changed.

10.2 The Appellant argued that static meter installed in her service has to be tested for its healthiness. She is willing to have a challenge test on the static meter.

10.3 The Respondent argued that the static meter installed in the service was inspected by the AE/O&M Thiruvallieswarar Nagar on 1-8-2014 based on the complaint of the Appellant and informed the Appellant that the meter is in order.

10.4 The Respondent also argued that based on the representation dated 14-8-2014, the premises was again inspected by the AE/O&M, Thiruvallieswarar Nagar and the

meter data for the SC.No.162-022-1072 was downloaded through CMRI and the same was analysed by AEE/MRT and reported that the meter was working in good condition. The respondent also argued that as per the down loaded details the function of the meter is alright. However, if the Appellant is willing to have a challenge test, the same could be done as per the procedure in vogue.

10.5 There is no test result to establish that the static meter installed in the disputed service is in good working condition. In this connection I would like to refer regulation 7(9) of the Supply Code . The said regulation 7(9) of the Supply Code is extracted below:

“7(9) If the consumer considers that the meter is defective, he may apply to the Licensee to have a special test carried out on the meters at any time and the cost of such a test shall be borne by the Licensee or the consumer according as the meter is found defective or correct as a result of such a test. The aforementioned special test for the disputed energy meters including the suspected/defective meters shall be carried out in the Third Party testing laboratory accredited by National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratories (NABL) and till such time the Third Party Meter Testing Arrangement is established, the licensee shall have the special test conducted by the Chief Electrical Inspector to Government of Tamil Nadu. The meter shall be deemed to be correct if the limits of error do not exceed those laid down in the relevant rules made under the Act. The consumer may also be allowed to install a check meter after recalibration by the Licensee. Such check meter shall be of high quality, high precision and high accuracy and sealed by the Licensee. Whenever the Licensee’s meter becomes defective the check meter reading may be taken for billing.”

10.6 On a careful reading of the said regulation, if the consumer considers that the meter is defective , the consumer may apply to the licensee to have a special test

carried out on the meter and the cost of such a test shall be borne by the licensee or the consumer accordingly as the meter is found defective or correct as a result of such test. The above test has to be conducted in the Third party testing laboratories accredited by National Accreditation Board for testing and calibration laboratories (NABL) and till such time, the Third party meter testing arrangement is established, the licensee shall have the special test conducted by the Chief Electrical Inspector to Government of Tamil Nadu. The meter shall be deemed to be correct if the limits of the error do not exceed those laid down in the relevant rules made under the Act.

10.7 As the licensee is stating that the meter is in good working condition as per downloaded data and the Appellant is insisting that the meter is defective and agreeable to have a challenge test, the licensee may arrange to conduct a special test on the meter to confirm the correctness of the meter.

10.8 In the amendment to M.P.No.41 of 2003, dt.8.9.2009, the following has been stipulated with regard to challenge test.

“ (i) xxx xxx xxx

The challenge test shall be done either at Government Electrical Standards Laboratory (GESL) run by Chief Electrical Inspector to Government of Tamil Nadu or at National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratory (NABL) accredited laboratories and the place of such challenge test shall be left to the discretion of the consumer. The charges for challenge test shall be as per the rates in force at GESL and NABL accredited laboratories.

xxx xxx xxx

(iv) Charges for the Challenge Test made at Government Electrical Standards Laboratory (GESL) or at National Accreditation Board for Testing and Calibration Laboratory (NABL) shall be as per the rates in force at GESL or NABL, as the case may be, which shall be collected by the licensee from the consumer for whom the said Challenge Test was made.”

10.9 On a careful reading of the above, it is noted that the challenge test shall be conducted either at Govt. Electrical Standards Laboratory (GESL) or at any one of the

National Accredited Laboratories and the place of challenge test shall be left to the discretion of the consumer. The charges for challenge test shall be as per the rates in force at GEPL and NABL accredited laboratories. The licensee is directed to inform the testing charges applicable for testing the meter at GESL and NABL accredited laboratories to the Appellant and conduct the special test on the disputed meter at the laboratory opted by the Appellant. Based on the test results the condition of the static meter whether in good condition or not shall be decided.

11. Findings on the Third issue:

11.1 The Appellant argued that the high quality meter is defective and hence, the excess charges collected from her based on consumption recorded for the period from 11/2013 to 6/14 shall be refunded to her.

11.2 The Respondent argued that the meter is not defective and hence the charges collected for the said period is correct.

11.3 As per my findings on the first issue, the high quality meter in service was in good working condition and not defective. As the meter is in good working condition, the consumption recorded in the meter are to be treated as the actual consumption of the service only. As the high quality meter in service for the period from 11/2013 to 6/2014 assessment period is in good working condition, I am unable to allow any relief to the Appellant.

11.4 In the absence of any test results, the high quality meter previously installed in the said service was held as not defective, comparing its performance with the static meter now available in the said service. But, the healthiness of the said static meter could be verified by conducting a special test on the meter, if the Appellant desire so.

Hence on getting special test result of the static meter, if it is found that the static meter is defective, then, the High quality meter previously installed in the said service and declared as in good working condition comparing with the performance of the above static meter has also to be treated as defective only. In such case, the consumption for the disputed period shall be arrived based on the Regulation 11 of the Supply Code and the excess amount if any collected from the Appellant for the said period has to be refunded to the Appellant.

12. Conclusion:

12.1 In view of my findings furnished in para 11.3, I am unable to interfere with the orders of the CGRF of the Chennai EDC/West.

12.2 However, if the Appellant applied to the licensee for conducting a special test on the static meter now in service and if the test results indicate the meter as defective, then the High Quality meter declared as in good working comparing the performance with the static meter has also to be treated as defective only. In such case, the consumption for the disputed period shall be arrived based on Regulation 11 of the Supply Code and the excess amount if any collected from the Appellant for the said period has to be refunded to the Appellant.

12.3 With the above findings, the AP.No.79/2015 is finally disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman. No costs.

(A. Dharmaraj)
Electricity Ombudsman

To

1) Tmt.V.Kamalakumari,
No.114, Sundarar Street,
Thiruvallieswarar Nagar,
Anna Nagar (West),
Chennai - 600 040

2) The Superintending Engineer,
Chennai EDC/West,
TANGEDCO.
110/33/11 KV Thirumangalam SS Complex,
Anna Nagar, Chennai-40.

3) The Executive Engineer/O&M,
Anna Nagar,
Chennai EDC/West,
TANGEDCO,
1100 A,H Block, 5th street, Ranganathan Garden,
Anna Nagar, Chennai-600 040.

4) The Asst. Executive Engineer,
Anna Nagar / Construction,
Chennai EDC/West,
TANGEDCO,
1100 A,H Block, 5th street, Ranganathan Garden,
Anna Nagar, Chennai-600 040.

5) The Asst. Engineer/O&M,
Thiruvalluvar Nagar
Chennai EDC/West,
TANGEDCO,
1100 A,H Block, 5th street, Ranganathan Garden,
Anna Nagar, Chennai-600 040.

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

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

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