



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.tnerc.gov.in

BEFORE THE TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, CHENNAI

Present : Thiru. A. Dharmaraj, Electricity Ombudsman

Appeal Petition No.2 of 2017

Thiru R. Venkataraman,
RVR House,
1,2 & 3 Thirumalai Street,
Jai Balaji Nagar,
K.K. Nagar,
Chennai – 600 078.

..... Appellant
(Rep by Thiru . R. Venkataraman)

Vs

1) The Assistant Engineer / O & M, Pandanallur,
Thanjavur Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
1/11 Main Road, Kavanur,
Pandhanallur – 609 807.

2) The Assistant Executive Engineer / O & M,
North / Kumbakonam,
Thanjavur Electricity Distribution Circle / North
TANGEDCO,
Thiruvudai Marudhur Salai,
Rajan Thottam, Kumbakonam

3) The Executive Engineer / O & M,
North Kumbakonam,
Thanjavur Electricity Distribution Circle / North
TANGEDCO,
Thiruvudai Marudhur Salai,
Rajan Thottam, Kumbakonam

..... Respondents
(Rep by Thiru. Elanselvan, AEE/North/Kumbakonam,
Thiru.Kaliyanasundaram, AE/Pandanallur)

Date of hearing : 22-3-2017 & 6-4-2017

Date of order : 02-06-2017

The petition dated 2.1.2017 filed by Thiru R.Venkatraman, K.K. Nagar, Chennai – 78 was registered as Appeal Petition No.2 of 2017. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 22-3-2017 and 6-4-2017. Upon perusing the appeal petition, counter affidavit connected records and after hearing both sides, the Electricity Ombudsman passes the following order.

ORDER

1. Prayer of the Appellant:

The prayer of the appellant falling within the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman is to consider his request and pass orders to remove the service connection and save their land.

2. Brief History of the case:

2.1 SC No. 482-022-648 & 482-022-658 were effected in the name of President, Panchayat Board, Vannikudi. Both the services were utilised for pumping water for Mini overhead tanks.

2.2 Appellant informed that the said service connections were given in their patta land without scrutinising the application and requested for disconnection of the service.

2.3 The Appellant filed an online petition before the CGRF of the Thanjavur Electricity Distribution Circle. He received a notice on 8-8-2016 for a meeting to be conducted on 9-8-2016. Due to insufficient time, he has not attended the hearing.

2.4 As there was no Order from CGRF, the Appellant filed his petition before the Electricity Ombudsman on 5-1-2017. As more than 50 days has passed since submission of petition before the CGRF, the petition was registered as AP. No. 2 of 2017 as per regulation 17 (4) (a) of the Regulation of CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman.

3. Contentions of the Appellant :

3.1 In the Appeal petition, the Appellant has furnished the following :-

i) Service connection has been given in his Patta Land to the Panchayat President without scrutinizing the application without supporting document to prove the Ownership. Moreover the service connection is used Commercially for Breeding Fishes. His land is litigated due to the service connection released on a private patta. The norms stipulated in granting a connection was violated.

ii) The service connection was given against law without going through the computerised document and utilized the hand written paper given by the VAO. The officer who granted to be examined for violation of the law.

iii) When the complaint was raised the Executive Engineer did not take proper step to issue a show cause notice to the President / Consumer and the VAO to prove the Genuineness of the Certificate on the land, on the other hand he hesitated to disconnect the supply considering that the service connection has been given for a public utility. The officer should be suitably punished for the act leading to encroachments and causing litigation on his lands.

iv) The Basic instruction to get the Form I duly filled with enclosures are not followed leading to these kind of violations. Proper proof legally sustainable evidences are not carefully scrutinized to effect a service connection. There are several instances of

violations in the Pandanallur TANGEDCO Office, which has not come to the Department Notice.

3.2 In the petition addressed to the Superintending Engineer / Thanjavur Electricity Distribution Circle he has furnished the following contentions.

i) It is also brought to your notice that the above service connection intended for Colony Drinking Water is misused by the President and his men in pumping out water to the encroached land (Fish Pond) through overflow of the overhead tank and allowing to run day and night and breeding fishes on commercial basis for personal gain. This is a misuse, under the Electricity Act 2003 under section 135 (e) which amounts to Criminal proceedings against the said consumer. TANGEDCO officer has also neglected to carry out Inspection inspite of our complaints.

ii) Moreover the said water tank is not required for drinking purpose since there is a new high over tank with a capacity of more than 30,000 catering the need of the colony, under the service connection 482-022-803 which is in operation.

iii) Hence please investigate and arrange to take action against the consumer under the Act for misleading the TANGEDCO and obtaining a service connection without valid documents and also misusing the service connection.

4. Contention of the Respondent :

4.1 The service connection No. 482-022-648 & 482-002-658 (Mini OHT) were given to the Thirumangaichery panchayat vide receiving a proper application & Revenue documents from the panchayat president as per TANGEDCO norms on 01.09.2012 and 01.02.2013 respectively.

4.2 The Mini OHT service connection is to be disconnected if any non payment of CC charges (or) any one proper court order issued to disconnect this service other wise the above service disconnection is not feasible.

4.3 The service 482-002-648 utilised only for drinking water purpose and Sc. No. 482-002-658 not in use and also the service was physically field verified by the Assistant Executive Engineer /North / Kumbakonam and found that the water received from the service is used only for the drinking water and not to any other misuse.

4.4 The over head tank sc No. 482-022-803 is a capacity of 30000 litre and now working good condition and only used for drinking purpose.

4.5 While giving service to the Mini OHT Sc. No.482-022-648 an application with correct authorised department records were received without any omission.

4.6 The above two service was effected as per the TANGEDCO Norms and there is no need for any corrective action.

5. Hearing held by the Electricity Ombudsman:

5.1 To enable the Appellant and the Respondents to putforth their arguments in person, hearings were conducted on 22-3-2017 & 6-4-2017.

5.2 Thiru R. Venkatraman, the Appellant herein has attended the hearing on both the days and putforth his side arguments.

5.3 Thiru C. Elanselvan, Assistant Executive Engineer/North/ Kumbakonam the Respondent 2 herein and Thiru S. Kalyanasundaram, the Respondent 3 herein have attended the hearing and putforth their arguments. Thiru M. Rajakumar, Executive Engineer/North/Kumbakonam has authorised Thiru C. Elanselvan to attend the hearing on behalf of him.

6. Arguments putforth by the Appellant :

6.1 The Appellant reiterated the contents of his appeal petition.

6.2 The Appellant argued that the service connection No. 482-022-648 was effected in SF No. 22/5 of Vanniakudi village and the said land is owned by his wife Thirumathi Saraswathi.

6.3 He also informed that he is the General power of Attorney for his wife and in that capacity only he has filed the petition and agreed to furnish a copy of the power of Attorney for reference and furnished the same on (the next hearing date) 6-4-2017 along with authorisation letter dt. 3-3-2017 of Thirumathi Saraswathi.

6.4 Citing the VAO's certificate he argued that the service connection was effected based on a VAO' certificate without seeking the patta copy.

6.5 He also argued that the water stored in the Mini OHT was not used for drinking water purpose but the water stored in another OHT bearing SC No. 482-022-803 is utilised for supply of drinking water to the village people.

6.6 He also informed that the BDO of the Panchayat has informed that the said SC No. 482-022-648 is in SF No. 22/5 owned by Thirumathi Jeyalakshmi. Hence, it is established that the service was effected in his land and it needs to be disconnected.

6.7 He also agreed that the SC No. 482-022-658 is not in his land and there is no dispute over it. But pointing out the documents obtained for effecting the service, he argued that such documents have not been obtained while effecting SC No. 482-022-648.

6.8 On 6-4-2017 citing that BDOs letter dt.4-4-2017 & the Tahsildar's letter dt. 4.4.2017 furnished by the Respondent, the Appellant argued that as the Revenue authorities and the local body have confirmed that the SC No. 482-022-648 is effected in SF No.22/5, owned by them and not by local body the said service connection has to be disconnected and removed from the land. He also pointed out that the Respondent have brought only the Xerox copy of the documents obtained during effecting of services in

complete shape and without originals and argued the Respondents are not furnished the documents that are vital for the case.

7. Arguments putforth by the Respondents on the hearing dates:

7.1 Thiru C. Elanselvan, Assistant Executive Engineer / North, Kumbakonam reiterated the contents of the counter.

7.2 The Assistant Executive Engineer informed that the service connection No. 482-022-648 was effected in SF No. 16/7B a Pathai Promboke land as per VAO's certificate.

7.3 He argued that the service was effected in the name of President, Panchayat Board, for pumping water from the Borewell. As the service was effected for drinking water purpose, in the name of local body, the certificate issued by the VAO was taken as the required revenue documents.

7.4 In response to the question of the Electricity Ombudsman to confirm the correct survey number of the service effected area, the Respondent sought for time to furnish the revenue authorities certificate to confirm the survey number. Accordingly, the Respondent was directed to produce the documents indicating the survey number of the land where Sc. No. 648 was effected during the next hearing date 6-4-2017. He was also directed to produce the original document in respect of SC No. 648 & 658 for verification.

7.5 On 6-4-2017, the Assistant Executive Engineer / North Kumbakonam furnished the letter dt.4-4-2017 of the Tahsildar, Thiruvudaimaruthur, wherein it has been indicated that the SC No. 648 is in SF No. 22/5 owned by Thirumathi Saraswathi, W/o Venkataraman.

7.6 The Assistant Executive Engineer has also furnished a copy of letter dt. 4-4-2017 of the B.D.O. of Thirupananthal Panchayat Union wherein it was informed that the service was effected in SF No. 22/5 owned by Thirumathi Jayalakshmi. He has also stated that

Thiru Venkataraman, relative of Thirumathi Jaylakshmi has given No Objection letter on 17-8-2014 by e-mail for carrying out Rural Development works.

7.7 The Assistant Executive Engineer also informed that the B.D.O has requested him not to disconnect the service till a decision is taken on how the service was effected in the said survey number as the service is used for drinking water purpose and to avoid law and order problem.

8. Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman .

8.1 On a careful consideration of the rival submission, the issues to be considered are

- (i) Whether the contention of the Appellant that SC No. 482-022-648 is effected in SF No. 22/5 owned by Appellant's wife is correct ?
- (ii) Whether the service could be shifted ?

9. Findings on the first issue:

9.1. The Appellant argued that the SC No. 482-022-648 has been effected in Survey No. 22/5 owned by his wife Thirumathi Saraswathi.

9.2 The Respondent argued that the service was effected in the name of panchayat President Thirumangaichery Panchayat for Mini OHT to supply water to colony in SF No. 16/7B.

9.3 As there was dispute over the survey number in which the service effected, the Respondent was directed to furnish the certificate from the Revenue authorities.

9.4 Accordingly, the Respondent has submitted the copy of letter dt.4-4-2017 received from Thasildhar, Thiruvaidaimaruthur and the letter dt 4-4-2017 received from B.D.O Thirupanandhal during the hearing conducted on 6-4-2017. The extract of both the letters are given below:-

- (a) Thasildhar's letter dt.4-4-2017 addressed to Assistant Executive Engineer / Kumbakonam

“ தஞ்சாவூர் மாவட்டம், திருவிடைமருதூர் வட்டம், வன்னிக்குடி கிராமத்தில் மின் இணைப்பு எண். வி.கே.648 அமைந்துள்ள புல எண் மற்றும் அதன் உரிமையாளர் விவரம் கோரி பார்வை 1ல் காணும் கடிதத்தில் கோரியதன் போரில் இன்று 4.4.2017 குறுவட்ட அளவர் மேற்படி ஸ்தலத்தை நில அளவை செய்து பார்த்ததில் மின்இணைப்பு மற்றும் ஆழ்குழாய் கிணறு அமைந்துள்ள இடத்தின் புல எண்.22/5 எனவும், அதன் உரிமையாளர் வெங்கட்ராமன் மனைவி சரஸ்வதி என்பவர் பெயரில் வருவாய் கணக்குகளில் பதிவாகி உள்ளது என்ற விவரத்தை அன்புடன் தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.”

B.D.Os letter dt. 4-4-2017 addressed to Assistant Executive Engineer / Kumbakonam

“பார்வை 1ல் காணும் கடிதத்தில் திருப்பனந்தாள் ஊராட்சி ஒன்றியம், திருமங்கைச்சேரி ஊராட்சி வன்னிக்குடியில் அமைந்துள்ள ஆழ்குழாய் கிணற்றிற்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட மின் இணைப்பு அமைந்துள்ள இடம் பற்றிய விபரம் கோரப்பட்டுள்ளது.

வ.எண்.	விபரம்	புல எண்.	உரிமையாளர்
1	வன்னிக்குடி-ஆழ்குழாய் மற்றும் சிறு மின் விசை பம்பு அமைத்தல்	22/5	திருமதி. ஜெயலெட்சுமி

மேற்காணும் ஆழ்குழாய் மற்றும் சிறு மின்விசை பம்பு 2012-2013 பாராளுமன்ற உறுப்பினர் தொகுதி மேம்பாட்டு திட்டத்தில் அமைக்கப்பட்டது. இது உரிய மின்இணைப்பு எண்.482-022-648 ஆகும்.

மேற்காணும் இடத்தில் பொதுமக்களுக்கு குடிநீர் திட்ட பணிகள் போன்றவற்றை செயல்படுத்தும் போது பிரச்சனை ஏற்பட்டதால் இந்த இடம் தங்களுக்கு சொந்தம் என இடத்தின் உரிமையாளர் திருமதி. ஜெயலெட்சுமியின் உறவினரான திரு. ஆர் வெங்கட்ராமன் என்பவர் 17.8.2014 அன்று ஊரக வளர்ச்சி துறைகளின் பணிகளை செயல்படுத்துவதற்கு தடையின்மைச் சான்று மின்னஞ்சல் மூலம் தஞ்சாவூர் மாவட்ட ஊரக வளர்ச்சி முகமை, திட்ட இயக்குநர் அவர்களுக்கு வழங்கியுள்ளார் என்பதை தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.

தற்போது உள்ளாட்சி தேர்தல்கள் நடைபெறாத நிலையில் தனி அலுவலர் மேற்பார்வையில் ஊராட்சி நிர்வாகம் நடைபெற்று வருவதாலும் 2011 முதல் 2016 வரை ஊராட்சி மன்ற தலைவருடைய காலத்தில் இப்பணி செயல்படுத்தப்பட்டதாலும் வடகிழக்கு பருவமழை பொய்த்து குடிநீர் ஆதாரங்களில் போதிய நீர் இல்லாமல் ஊரக பகுதிகளில் குடிநீர் வழங்குவதில்

சிரமம் உள்ளதாலும் 2012-2013ல் எதனடிப்படையில் இப்புல எண்ணில் மின்இணைப்பு வழங்கப்பட்டது என்பதற்கு உரிய விசாரணை மேற்கொண்டு முடிவெடுக்கும் வரையிலும் நாளது வரை இம்மின் இணைப்பிற்கு நுகர்வு கட்டணம் செலுத்தப்பட்டுள்ள நிலையில் சட்டம் ஒழுங்கு பிரச்சனை ஏற்படாமல் இருப்பதற்கும் தற்பொழுது இம்மின் இணைப்பினை துண்டிக்காமலிருக்குமாறும் அன்புடன் கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.”

9.6 On a careful reading of the Thasildhar's letter dt.4-4-2017, it is noted that the service connection No. 648 is effected in SF No. 22/5 and it is owned by Thirumathi Saraswathi W/o Venkataraman.

9.7 On a careful reading of the B.D.O's letter, it is noticed that the service is effected in SF No. 22/5. But the B.D.O has mentioned the owner as Thirumathi Jayalakshmi relative of Venkataraman.

9.8 In the computer patta furnished by the Appellant the SF No. 22/5 is in the name of Thirumathi Saraswathi W/o Venkataraman only. The patta No. is 667 and as per the computer print out, the details were printed on 22-3-2017 at 10:33:34 am

9.9 It is noted from the letter of Tahsildhar / Thiruvudaimaruthur and B.D.O Thirupananthal that the service is effected only in SF No. 22/5. As the Thasildhar / Thiruvudaimaruthur and the computer patta specifies the owner of the land as Thirumathi Saraswathi, it is construed that the owner of the land in question is Thirumathi Saraswathi W/o Thiru Venkataraman.

9.10 In view of the details discussed in para above, it is held that the SC No. 482-022-648 is effected in SF No. 22/5 owned by Thirumathi Saraswathi W/o Thiru R. Venkataraman.

10. **Findings on the Second issue:**

10.1 The Appellant informed that the service connection No. 482-022-648 in the name of President Panchayat Board, Thirumangai Cherry is effected in SF No. 22/5

owned by his wife Thirumathi Saraswathi. Therefore, he argued that the licensee has effected the service without properly verifying the records and site. As the service was effected in their patta land, the Appellant argued that it has to be disconnected immediately.

10.2 The respondent argued that, as per the certificate of the VAO, the bore well is available in SF No. 16/7B pathai promboke land. Accordingly as per the application of the President Panchayat Board, Thirumangai cherry the service was effected for a Mini OHT to supply drinking water to a needy colony.

10.3 The Assistant Executive Engineer / North Kumbakonam informed that the B.D.O, Thirupananthal in his letter dt. 4-4-2017 has informed that the above Borewell and small power pumpset were executed obtaining NOC from Thiru R. Venkataraman, relative of Thirumathi Jeyalakshmi the owner of SF No. 22/5.

10.4 Further, the B.D.O has requested not to disconnect the service till a decision was arrived by conducting detailed enquiry, the BDO has also stated that as they are paying the CC charges promptly and to avoid law and order problem the service may not be disconnected.

10.5 As the Respondent has cited B.D.O's letter dated 4-4-2017, the same is extracted below:-

“பார்வை 1ல் காணும் கடிதத்தில் திருப்பனந்தாள் ஊராட்சி ஒன்றியம், திருமங்கைச்சேரி ஊராட்சி வன்னிக்குடியில் அமைந்துள்ள ஆழ்குழாய் கிணற்றிற்கு வழங்கப்பட்ட மின் இணைப்பு அமைந்துள்ள இடம் பற்றிய விபரம் கோரப்பட்டுள்ளது.

<i>வ.எண்.</i>	<i>விபரம்</i>	<i>புல எண்.</i>	<i>உரிமையாளர்</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>வன்னிக்குடி-ஆழ்குழாய் மற்றும் சிறு மின் விசை பம்பு அமைத்தல்</i>	<i>22/5</i>	<i>திருமதி. ஜெயலெட்சுமி</i>

மேற்காணும் ஆழ்குழாய் மற்றும் சிறு மின்விசை பம்பு 2012-2013 பாராளுமன்ற உறுப்பினர் தொகுதி மேம்பாட்டு திட்டத்தில் அமைக்கப்பட்டது. இது உரிய மின்இணைப்பு எண்.482-022-648 ஆகும்.

மேற்காணும் இடத்தில் பொதுமக்களுக்கு குடிநீர் திட்ட பணிகள் போன்றவற்றை செயல்படுத்தும் போது பிரச்சனை ஏற்பட்டதால் இந்த இடம் தங்களுக்கு சொந்தம் என இடத்தின் உரிமையாளர் திருமதி. ஜெயலெட்சுமியின் உறவினரான திரு. ஆர் வெங்கட்ராமன் என்பவர் 17.8.2014 அன்று ஊரக வளர்ச்சி துறைகளின் பணிகளை செயல்படுத்துவதற்கு தடையின்மைச் சான்று மின்னஞ்சல் மூலம் தஞ்சாவூர் மாவட்ட ஊரகவளர்ச்சி முகமை, திட்ட இயக்குநர் அவர்களுக்கு வழங்கியுள்ளார் என்பதை தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.

தற்போது உள்ளாட்சி தோ்தல்கள் நடைபெறாத நிலையில் தனி அலுவலர் மேற்பார்வையில் ஊராட்சி நிர்வாகம் நடைபெற்று வருவதாலும் 2011 முதல் 2016 வரை ஊராட்சி மன்ற தலைவருடைய காலத்தில் இப்பணி செயல்படுத்தப்பட்டதாலும் வடகிழக்கு பருவமழை பொய்த்து குடிநீர் ஆதாரங்களில் போதிய நீர் இல்லாமல் ஊரக பகுதிகளில் குடிநீர் வழங்குவதில் சிரமம் உள்ளதாலும் 2012-2013ல் எதனடிப்படையில் இப்புல எண்ணில் மின்இணைப்பு வழங்கப்பட்டது என்பதற்கு உரிய விசாரணை மேற்கொண்டு முடிவெடுக்கும் வரையிலும் நாளது வரை இம்மின் இணைப்பிற்கு நுகர்வு கட்டணம் செலுத்தப்பட்டுள்ள நிலையில் சட்டம் ஒழுங்கு பிரச்சனை ஏற்படாமல் இருப்பதற்கும் தற்பொழுது இம்மின் இணைப்பினை துண்டிக்காமலிருக்குமாறும் அன்புடன் கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.”

10.6 On a careful reading of the letter of B.D.O., Thirupananthal, it is noted that the B.D.O has informed that they have obtained NOC from Thiru Venkataraman relative of the Thirumathi Jeyalakshmi owner of the land in e-mail dt. 17-8-2014 for carrying out Rural Development works. The B.D.O has also informed that the above work was executed in the period 2011 to 2016 when the Panchayat Board was managed by the President elected by the people. The B.D.O has requested not to disconnect the service till a final decision is taken stating the following :-

(a) Due to failure of North east monsoon, that is no sufficient water in the drinking water sources and there is difficulty in supplying drinking water to rural area.

(b) to find out the basis on which during 2012-2013, the service was effected in the said SF number

(c) electricity charges are being paid.

(d) to avoid law and order problem

10.7 As the B.D.O. has stated that they have obtained NOC form Thiru R. Venkataraman, I would like to examine the e-mail dt 17-8-2014 which is extracted below:-

“With reference to the above a complaint raised by me on Misuse of public funds by the BDO Thirupanandal union was brought to your notice and still the complaint is pending.

The complaint was on the Misuse of Funds allotted by the Government to Private Patta land (Survey No. 22/5) belonging to our family without our consent. Objection was raised by us since the BDO along with the President at that time utilized the funds for converting that land to tank and to construct steps and so on. The above complaint is still pending and no reports were sent to the complainant.

*Inspite of the above issue, now, a TANGEDCO Electricity Transformer erected at that site has fallen and need to be supported by civil construction. Further, to request by the Thirumangacheri Panchayat President, I grant **“No Objection”** without prejudice for constructing the retainer wall to support the Transformer, realizing the urgent need and in support of your department to extend all support for rural development activities. The NOC is limited to the construction of the retainer wall to support the TANGEDCO Electricity Transformer only and no further claim on the Property can be claimed.*

10.8 On a careful reading of the said 'e' mail it is noted that Thiru R. Venkataraman has given NOC for construction of the retainer wall only. Therefore, the contention that Thiru R. Venkataraman has given NOC for effecting service connection in SF No. 22/5 is not correct.

10.9 Further, the NOC was issued on 17-8-2014 whereas the service connection No. 482-022-648 was effected on 1-9-2012 (ie) almost 2 years before the date of issue of NOC by Thiru R. Venkataraman.

10.10 In view of the details in para above, it is noted that NOC was not issued by the owner for effecting service connection in SF No. 22/5.

10.11 On a careful examination of the documents furnished by the Respondent, the service connection for MINI OHT was requested in SF No. 16/7 B only. But it has been established that the service was effected wrongly in SF No. 22/5 owned by Thirumathi Saraswathy, W/O R. Venkataraman.

10.13 As the service connection was wrongly effected in a private patta land bearing SF No. 22/5 instead of 16/7 B, I am of the view that the service connection has to be shifted from SF 22/5 to 16/7B. However, as the service connection is effected for a MINI OHT to supply drinking water to the local people and to avoid law and order problem as stated by B.D.O the licensee is requested to shift the service connection by giving a reasonable time to the local body for arranging to shift the service connection to SF No.16/7B for which alone the service was applied.

11. Observation:

It is noted that the Respondent have got the confirmation about the SF number where the service was effected only after the direction of the Electricity Ombudsman. In this regard, it is observed, when a consumer is raising an objection against effecting of service in his patta land, the licensee's officer should have confirmed the

SF number by getting the certificate from the concerned Revenue Authorities. Further, they should have issued a notice to the service connection owner to establish the ownership. But, in the instant case the Respondent have failed to do the above. Had the Respondents followed the above, the grievance of the consumer would have been solved and filing a petition before CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman would not have arisen.

12. Conclusion :

12.1 As SC No. 482-022-648 was wrongly effected in SF No. 22/5 owned by Thirumathi Saraswathi the service has to be removed from the said survey number and shifted to SF No. 16/7B for which the service was originally applied for.. Therefore, the Respondent is directed to take necessary action to shift the service to the correct survey number duly issuing notice to the service owner as per the rules in force. However, as the service connection is now utilised for pumping of drinking water to MINI OHT, a reasonable time shall be given for the shifting.

12.2 With the above findings, the AP No.2 of 2017 is finally disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman. No Costs.

(A. Dharmaraj)
Electricity Ombudsman

To

1) Thiru R. Venkataraman,
RVR House,
1,2 & 3 Thirumalai Street,
Jai Balaji Nagar,
K.K. Nagar,
Chennai – 600 078.

2) The Assistant Engineer / O & M, Pandanallur,
Thanjavur Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
1/11 Main Road, Kavanur,
Pandhanallur – 609 807.

3) The Assistant Executive Engineer / O & M,
North / Kumbakonam,
Thanjavur Electricity Distribution Circle / North
TANGEDCO,
Thiruvudai Marudhur Salai,
Rajan Thottam, Kumbakonam.

4) The Executive Engineer / O & M,
North Kumbakonam,
Thanjavur Electricity Distribution Circle / North
TANGEDCO,
Thiruvudai Marudhur Salai,
Rajan Thottam, Kumbakonam.

5) The Chairman,
(Superintending Engineer),
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
Thanjavur Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
No.1, Vallam Road,
Thanjavur – 613 007.

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

7) The Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
19-A, Rukmini Lakshmi pathy Salai,
Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.

8) The Assistant Director (Computer) – **For Hosting in the TNEO Website.**
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
19-A, Rukmini Lakshmi pathy Salai,
Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.