



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.tnerc.gov.in

BEFORE THE TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, CHENNAI

Present : Thiru. A. Dharmaraj, Electricity Ombudsman

Appeal Petition No. 21 of 2017

The Divisional Railway Manager,
Divisional Railway Manager's Office,
Electrical TRO Branch,
Traction Distribution,
Southern Railway, Salem Division,
Salem – 636 005.

..... Appellant

Vs

The Superintending Engineer,
Salem Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
K.N. Colony, Udayapatti,
Salem – 636 014.

..... Respondent

Appeal Petition No. 28 of 2017

The Divisional Railway Manager,
Divisional Railway Manager's Office,
Electrical TRO Branch,
Traction Distribution,
Southern Railway, Salem Division,
Salem – 636 005.

..... Appellant

Vs

The Superintending Engineer,
Dharmapuri Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
Salem Main Road, Opp to Collectorate,
Dharmapuri 636 705.

..... Respondent

Appeal Petition No. 29 of 2017

The Divisional Railway Manager,
Divisional Railway Manager's Office,
Electrical TRO Branch,
Traction Distribution,
Southern Railway, Salem Division,
Salem – 636 005.

..... Appellant

Vs

The Superintending Engineer,
Erode Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
948, E.V.N. Road,
Erode – 638 009.

..... Respondent

Appeal Petition No. 34 of 2017

The Divisional Railway Manager,
Divisional Railway Manager's Office,
Electrical TRO Branch,
Traction Distribution,
Southern Railway, Salem Division,
Salem – 636 005.

..... Appellant

Vs

The Superintending Engineer,
Tirupattur Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
2/4B, Balammal Colony,
Tirupattur-635 601

..... Respondent

Date of hearing : 13-6-2017

Date of order : 17-7-2017

The petitions dated 18.2.2017, 31.3.2017, 5.4.2017 and 31.3.2017 filed by the Divisional Railway Manager, Southern Railway, Salem Division were registered as Appeal petition No. 21 of 2017, 28 of 2017, 29 of 2017 and 34 of 2017 respectively. As the subject matter of the above appeals are similar, all the above appeal petitions have been taken for hearing on 13.6.2017. Upon perusing the appeal petitions counter affidavits furnished by the Respondents and after hearing both sides, the following common order is passed by the Electricity Ombudsman.

Common Order

1. Prayer of the Appellant:

(The prayer is same in all the four petitions except the date of measurement)

They dispute the measurement taken by MRT and request the Ombudsman to order

for nullifying the measurements and to withdraw the penalty imposed on them based on the non standard measurement.

2. Brief History of the case:

2.1 The MRT wing of the TANGEDCO in the respective circles have taken harmonics measurements and levied compensation charges for exceeding the limit prescribed for the current harmonics.

2.2 The Appellant has filed petitions before the respective CGRF of the circles concerned for withdrawal of the compensation charges levied based on the measurements done by MRT.

2.3 Citing regulation 17(4)(d) of the Regulations for CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman the CGRF of the circles concerned have ordered that they cannot entertain the said petitions stating that cases on the same subject matter are pending with Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P. No. 28977 of 2015 and also in M.P.No.25 of 2015 before Hon'ble TNERC.

2.4 Aggrieved by the Order of the CGRF of respective circles, the Appellant filed these appeal petitions before the Electricity Ombudsman.

3. Order of the CGRF :

As all the CGRF have issued similar orders, the order issued in the case of AP No. 21 of 2017 alone is extracted below:-

"In this regard, it is informed that as the court case filed by you in W.P.No.28977 of 2015 and M.P.No.1 of 2015 is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature of Madras

As per clause 17-(d) of TNERC Regulations for Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman 2004, "The complaint does not pertain to the same subject matter for which any proceedings before any court is pending or a decree or award or a final order has already been passed by any competent court"

Hence as per the above clause, your petition could not be considered in Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum now."

4. Argument of the Appellant furnished in the Appeal Petition:

4.1 Our petition to CGRF /Salem was rejected by SE/Distribution / Salem without even placing our petition before the CGRF. (If placed before CGRF we would have convinced the CGRF about the maintainability of our petition before CGRF)

4.2 The points raised in High Court petition and Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission petition is general in nature. The point raised in this petition is very specific and disputing the measurement taken by MRT Salem on Date 02 & 03.02.2016.

4.3 Regarding maintainability of the petition, the appellant has furnished the following arguments.

- a) There is no specific mention in Central Electric Authority's Regulations or in Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission supply code in respect of type and accuracy of the equipment to be used for measurement, method of measurement and duration of measurement.
- b) When there is no violation in Voltage Harmonics there is no justification for imposing penalty for increased current harmonics.
- c) A petition has been submitted to CEA to review the existing guidelines and CEA promptly formed committee to review the existing regulation. Hence it was submitted to postpone the implementation for Railways until the revised guidelines are notified.
- d) During the interim period, if harmonic filters are installed only to satisfy the interim period, Railways will loss heavy revenue on this.
- e) Internationally current harmonics limits are not insisted if Voltage harmonics are within limit.

f) Due to lack of clarity on the above points no other state in this country imposed harmonics limitation and penalized the consumers.

The above points were raised before the High court and Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission.

4.4 The petition submitted to the CGRF / Salem is regarding the non-observance of the rules notified by TANGEDCO while taking the harmonics measurements which was done on 02 & 03.02.2016 at EHT SC No.123 i.e. Salem Traction SS. This point was not included in the above High court petition or TNERC petition. These points were very specific for the measurement taken at EHT SC-123 i.e. Salem Traction SS on 02 & 03.02.2016.

4.5 Our contention before the Ombudsman is that the measurement taken by MRT at our EHT SC-123, Salem Traction SS on date 18.08.2015 is not as per the instructions given by the TANGEDCO.

4.6 As per the circular, load at the time of measurement should be above 75%, but the load during the measurement on the date 02 & 03.02.2016 was well below the norm and it was only 49.55%.

4.7 The duration of measurement should have been based on IEC 61000-3-6. As per the IEC, the measurement should have been taken for the period of one week which has not been followed.

4.8 The formula to compute TDD, along with the measurement details has not been furnished to us to compute Total Demand Distortion (TDD) and to verify its correctness.

4.9 Ongoing through all the above points mentioned, we dispute the

measurement taken by MRT on date 02 & 03.02.2016 and request the Ombudsman to order for nullifying the measurements and to withdraw the penalties imposed on us based on the above non-standard measurement.

5. Arguments furnished by the Respondent in the Counter:

- (i) Initially TANGEDCO issued a 3 months notice on 11.05.2012, that as per Tariff Order No 1. of 2012, adequate Harmonic suppression had to be provided for avoiding dumping of Harmonics. Further, TANGEDCO had intimated the EHT consumer that the Harmonic test would be conducted on 2.02.2016 and the same was acknowledged by the traction representative. But the Divisional Railway Manager, Traction have produced the letter dated 2.2.2016 stating that “not to allow to provide Harmonic test and if TANGEDCO needs to conduct Harmonic test, they are at liberty to do so but no witness signature shall be done on the test report”.
- (ii) TANGEDCO proceeded Harmonic test from 02.02.16 in the EHT SC No. 123. On 03.02.2016, the Southern Railway representative had produced a letter that, he was not authorized to witness the Harmonic test and no signature shall be done for any matter related to Harmonics testing. And M/s. Southern Railway representative refused to sign in the test certificate.
- (iii) Though the appellant is conversant on this subject which is clear from his statement that the load at the time of measurement should be above 75%, they did not provide 75% load instead the load at that time was only 49.55%.
- (iv) However, the Harmonic test was conducted in EHT SC No. 123 of the Divisional Railway Manager, Traction, Southern Railway, Salem from 02.02.2016, 12.10 Hrs to 03.02.2016, 12.10 Hrs (i.e) for 24 hrs under protest only. Test results are as follows.

Date of test : 02.02.2016, 12.10 hrs to
03.02.2016, 12.10 hrs

Sanctioned Demand : 8800 KVA

Last 12 month Average demand / Current : 8371.67KVA/76.106 Amps

Average current during measurements : 37.7135 Amps

Sl. No.	Description	5 th Harmonic Values	
		Allowable Limit	Measured
1.	Individual Voltage Harmonic Distortion (Max)	3%	0.96%
2.	Total Voltage Harmonic Distortion	5%	1.16%
3.	Total Current Harmonic Distortion (TDD)	8%	17.66%

Load at the time of measurement is 37.7135 amps which is 49.55%. From the downloaded data it was analyzed that, the load was varying from a maximum current of 67.47 Amps to a minimum current of 13.21 Amps and the average current works out to 37.71 Amps.

- (v) As per duration of Harmonics of measurement defined based on IEC 61000-3-6, para 4.4 for all EHT Consumer of 110 KV and above is 24 hours. Harmonics test was conducted for 24 hours as per IEC 61000-3-6, para 4.4.
- (vi) The measurement of harmonics was done by the power quality analyzer equipment and the TDD was calculated by inbuilt software only.
- (vii) As the total current Harmonics was more than the limit permitted, Harmonics compensation charges has been levied for the month of 02/2016 for an amount of Rs.23,17,400/-. As per interim order of WP No. 28977 of 2015, 50% amount was collected from 02/2016 to till date.

(viii) Further, it is submitted that, M/s. Southern Railway has filed WP No. 28977 of 2015 and MP No. 1 of 2015 in connection with levy of Harmonics surcharge in respect of the Railway Traction HT services in the State of Tamil Nadu and is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of judicature at Madras and hence the petitions dt.27.12.16 and 17.01.2017 received before CGRF /Salem was rejected as per Clause 17 (4) (d) of Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations for consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman, as reproduced below.

"the complaint does not pertain to the same subject matter for which any proceedings before any court is pending or a decree or award or a final order has already been passed by any competent court".

(ix) As the prayer in Appellant's AP No. 21/2017 and the prayers in WP No. 23483/2015 & 28977/2015 are same and as the said WP Nos are pending in the High Court of Judicature at Madras and interim order of stay is continuing, I request that, the prayer of the appellant may be turned down as per clause 17 (4) (d) of Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission's regulations for CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman 2004.

6. Hearing held by the Electricity Ombudsman:

6.1 To enable the Appellant and the Respondents to putforth their arguments in person, a hearing was held before the Electricity Ombudsman on 13.6.2017.

6.2 The Appellant was represented by the following persons :

- 1) Thiru M. Prabhakaran, Sr. D.EE/TRD
- 2) Thiru Ashish Dev Mathur, SSE/TRD/HQ/Salem
- 3) Thiru A.D. Thirumoorthy, Consultant

6.3 The Respondents were represented by the following persons :

1. AP. No. 21 of 2017
Tmy R. Padmavathy, Executive Engineer/MRT/Salem.
2. AP No. 28 of 2017
Thiru G. Velumani, Executive Engineer/Gen & MRT, Dharmapuri,
3. AP No. 29 of 2017
Tmy. S. Shanthi, Executive Engineer/MRT & SPL/Erode.
and
Thiru M. Mathivanan, Assistant Executive Engineer/MRT/EEDC/Erode.
4. AP No. 34 of 2017
Thiru A. Sekar, Executive Engineer/ O &M, Tiruppathur.
and
Thiru S.A. Zainulabudeen, Executive Engineer/MRT, Tiruppathur

7. Arguments putforth by the Appellant's representative on the hearing date:

7.1 Thiru A.D. Thirumoorthy, Consultant, reiterated the contents of the appeal petition.

7.2 The consultant informed that the cases in WP.No.28977 of 2015 and WP 23483 of 2015 have already been disposed by the Hon'ble High Court and therefore, the matter is not subjudice.

7.3 The consultant argued that they are only disputing that the TANGEDCO has not followed its own instructions in taking Harmonics measurements.

7.4 He argued that every circle is following their own norms, though, the type of load is Traction in all the above circles.

7.5 He argued that the duration of measurement in each circle is varying and none have taken measurements for one week as stipulated in IEC.

7.6 He also argued as they have disputed the measurements taken by the Appellant, he argued that the matter is not subjudice. He also argued that the cases have been disposed in the High Court, therefore there is no bar for the Electricity Ombudsman to entertain the case. (They have been asked to

furnish a copy of judgment. But, till date they have not furnished the copy of judgment).

7.7 He also informed that they have done harmonics measurements continuously for a week in the disputed service and found that the current harmonics is within limits which shows that the measurement done by the licensee is not correct. However, he has not furnished the said test results.

8. Arguments putforth by the Respondent representatives on the hearing date:

8.1 The respondents representatives have reiterated the contents of their counter.

8.2 They argued that as per the instructions they received that the cases referred in WP No. 23483 & 28977 of 2015 are still pending only.

8.3 They also argued that in the petition filed before Hon'ble TNERC by the Appellant in MP No. 25 of 2015 is still pending. Therefore, they argued that the subject matter is sub-judice only. Citing the above, they argued that the Electricity Ombudsman cannot entertain the said petition.

8.4 Regarding testing procedure they argued that they have followed the procedure given by their Head Quarters only.

8.5 They argued that in WP 28977 of 2015 and M.P. No. 25 of 2015, the railways have prayed for stay of the Harmonics charges till a comprehensive regulation is issued by CEA which includes the method of measurement also. Therefore, they have argued that the Electricity Ombudsman cannot entertain the petition as per regulation 17(4)(d) of the Regulation for CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman.

8.6 Regarding conducting test at 75% of the average load, the Respondents argued that the Appellant has not cooperated for conducting the tests. They only have to provide the necessary load for conducting the test. They alone know the period in which the required load could be met but have not suggested any period for conducting the tests. Therefore, due to their non cooperation the tests were conducted at the load available at the time of testing.

8.7 However, the EE/General/MRT/Dharmapuri informed that they have done the test at 71.3% of the average load and the Total Current Harmonics Distortion (TDD) measured is 14.34% which is beyond the limit.

8.8 The EE/MRT/Erode informed that load survey data of the said consumer was analysed for 12 months period. Out of total number of 20995 blocks (13410 blocks in 30 minutes demand and 7585 blocks in 15 minutes demand) the above EHT consumer has utilized more than 7576 KVA (ie) 75% of 10101.83 kva only in 429 blocks (110 blocks in 30 minutes demand and 319 blocks in 15 minutes demand) and it is about 2.04% of the total blocks over the 12 months period.

9. Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:

9.1 As the Respondents are citing regulation 17(4)(d) and arguing that the Electricity Ombudsman cannot entertain the above appeals as cases on the same subject matter is pending in the Hon'ble High court and in Hon'ble TNERC, I would like to decide about the maintainability of the petition first before going in to the merits of the case.

9.2 The Respondent argued that in WP No. 28977 of 2015 Railways have filed a case on the Harmonics issue and is pending in the Hon'ble High Court. Similarly, the Southern Railway has filed a case before the Hon'ble TNERC in MP No. 25 of

2015 and that is also pending.

9.3 The Appellant argued that the cases in the Hon'ble High Court of Madras have already been disposed and therefore the argument of the Respondent that case is pending in the High Court is not maintainable. However, they have not produced any copy of the order in support of their claim.

9.4 Further, the Appellant also argued that the case before the Electricity Ombudsman is that the Respondents have not conducted the test even as per their own procedure and therefore the test results are not binding whereas in the said pending cases. Railway has prayed for injunction from imposing surcharge on harmonics until revised regulations are issued by CEA. Therefore argued that the cases are different.

9.5 The prayers in respect of WP No. 28977 of 2015 is extracted below:-

36. In the interest of justice, it is just and necessary that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to grant an order of interim stay against the 1st respondent from imposing surcharge on harmonics until revised regulation are issued by CEA pending disposal of the above writ petition. If the same is not stayed, the petitioner will be put to great prejudice, irreparable loss and hardship. On the other hand, if the same is stayed, the Respondents will not be prejudiced.

37. For the reasons aforesaid, it is prayed that this Hon'ble High Court may be pleased to issue appropriate Writ, orders or Directions and in particular issue an order of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records culminating in the order dated 30.6.2015 passed in I.A. No. 1 of 2015 in MP No. 25 of 2015 by the 2nd Respondent, quash the same and consequently direct the 1st Respondent herein not to levy surcharge on harmonics with regard to Railway Traction substations of the petitioner in the State of Tamil Nadu and pass such other orders or directions to

meet the ends of justice.

9.6 In para 13 of the said writ petition 28977, the petitioner railway has stated the following:

13. I state that finding prima facie merit in the submissions of Railways that there are shortcomings in the very Regulations regarding stipulation of harmonic levels, method of measurement etc, CEA vide their office order No. CEA/5-41(02)/Secy-2014/448 dated 28.01.2014 have constituted a Committee for reviewing the "Central Electricity Authority (Technical Standard for Connectivity to the Grid) Regulations, 2007" under the Chairmanship of Chief Engineer (Distribution Planning and Development), CEA with Chief Engineer (Grid Management), CEA as Co-Chairman and representatives from various power sector entities, which includes STU of Tamil Nadu TANTRANSOCO and Railways with the following Terms of Reference.

- (i) To review and recommend the harmonic levels in CEA technical standards regulations.*
- (ii) To suggest the method of measurement of harmonics for the sake of uniformity across the utilities in the country.*
- (iii) To formulate the extent of the trespass of the harmonic limits inviting penal action.*
- (iv) To evolve mechanism for determining the contribution of various consumers to the harmonics levels at interconnection point in the grid.*
- (v) Any other issue related to harmonics*

9.7 On a conjoint reading of para 36 and para 13 of the WP No. 28977, it is noted that the Appellant has prayed for interim injunction on imposing surcharge on harmonics until revised regulations are issued by CEA. But as per the terms of

reference given to the committee for reviewing the Central Electricity Authority (Technical Standard for connectivity to the Grid) Regulation 2007, one of the terms of reference is to suggest method of measurements of Harmonics for the sake of uniformity across the utilities in the country. As, the terms of reference include the method of measurement, of Harmonics and the prayer is for interim injunction till CEA issued revised regulations, I am of the view that the subject matter of the case (i.e) testing procedure also covered in W.P.No.28977 of 2015.

9.8 In MP No. 25 of 2015, the prayers as per the petition of the Chief Electrical Distribution Engineer, Southern Railway is as below:-

“3.2 In view of the submissions above and considering the fact that, Hon’ble Commission may be pleased to ;

(i) Direct TANGEDCO not to levy surcharge for harmonics, as far as Railway Traction is concerned, till such time a final decision is taken by CEA on the revision of the Technical Standards for Grid Connectivity Regulation.

(ii) Direct TANGEDCO to refund the harmonic surcharges of Rs.73.98 lakhs already collected up to December 2014 from Railway Traction based on the Regulation under review.”

9.9 In para 2.2.7 of the MP. No. 25 of 2015, the following has been stated by the petitioner, Union of India, represented by (Viz.,) Chief Electrical Distribution Engineer, Southern Railway.

“2.2.7 Finding prima facie merit in the submissions of Railways that there is shortcomings in the very regulations regarding stipulation of harmonic levels, method of measurement etc., CEA vide their office order NO. CEA/5-41(02)/Secy-2014/448 dated 28.01.2014 have constituted a Committee for reviewing the “Central

Electricity Authority (Technical Standard for Connectivity to the Grid) regulations, 2007” under the Chairmanship of Chief Engineer (Distribution Planning & Development), CEA with Chief Engineer (Grid Management), CEA as Co-Chairman and representatives from various power sector entities, which includes STU of Tamil Nadu TANTRANSCO and Railways with the following Terms of Reference;

- (i) To review and recommend the harmonic levels in CEA technical standards regulations.*
- (ii) To suggest the method of measurement of harmonics for the sake of uniformity across the utilities in the country.*
- (iii) To formulate the extent of the trespass of the harmonic limits inviting penal action.*
- (iv) To evolve mechanism for determining the contribution of various consumers to the harmonics levels at interconnection point in the grid.*
- (v) Any other issue related to harmonics.”*

9.10 On a conjoint reading of para 3.2 and para 2.2.7 of MP No. 25 of 2015, it is noted that the Appellant has prayed not to levy surcharge for Harmonics, as far as railway traction is concerned till such time a final decision is taken by CEA on the revision of the Technical Standards for Grid Connectivity Regulation. As per the terms of reference given to the Committee constituted for reviewing the CEA (Technical Standard for Connectivity to the Grid) Regulation 2007, one of the reference is to suggest method of measurement of Harmonics for the sake of uniformity across the utilities in the country.

9.11 As the terms of reference to the Committee constituted for reviewing the regulation includes to suggest the method of measurement of Harmonics and the prayer is to direct the TANGEDCO, not to levy surcharge for Harmonics as far as

Railway traction is concerned till such time a final decision taken by CEA on the revision of the Technical Standards for Grid connectivity Regulation, I am of the view that the testing procedure (ie) the subject matter of the case is also covered in M.P.No.25 of 2015. The M.P. No. 25 of 2015 is still pending before the Hon'ble TNERC.

9.12 In this regard, I would like to refer regulation 17(4)(d) of the Regulations for CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman which extracted below:-

“17(4) No complaint to the Electricity Ombudsman shall lie unless:

(a) The complainant had before making a complaint to the Electricity Ombudsman made a written representation to the forum of the licensee named in the complaint and either the forum had rejected the complaint or the complainant had not received any reply within a period of 50 days from date of filing of the grievance or the complainant is not satisfied with the reply given to him by the forum.

Provided that this shall not be applicable to the complaints of common nature described under sub-regulation(1).

(b) The complaint is made within three months after cause of action has arisen.

(c) The complaint, which is not settled, is not in respect of the same subject, which was settled through the office of the Electricity Ombudsman in any previous proceedings whether received from the same complainant or along with one or more complainants or anyone or more of the parties concerned with the subject matter;

(d) The complaint does not pertain to the same subject matter for which any proceedings before any court is pending or a decree or award or a final order has already been passed by any competent court; and

(e) The complaint is not frivolous or vexatious in nature.”

9.13 On a careful reading of the said regulation 17(4) (d) of the Regulations for CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman, it is noted that Electricity Ombudsman shall not entertain a petition of the complaint pertain to the same subject matter for which any proceedings before any court or decree or award or final order has already been issued by any competent court.

9.14 As per my findings in para 9.11, the MP 25 of 2015 filed by the Union of India represented through Chief Electrical Distribution Engineer, Southern Railway on the same subject matter is pending before Hon'ble TNERC. Therefore, I am of the considered view that the Electricity Ombudsman cannot entertain the appeal petition No. 21 of 2017, 28 of 2017, 29 of 2017 and 34 of 2017 for passing an order as per regulation 17(4)(d) of the Regulations for CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman.

10. Conclusion :

10.1 As a case is pending before the Hon'ble TNERC in MP No. 25 of 2015 on the same subject matter, the Electricity Ombudsman cannot entertain the appeal petition Nos 21 of 2017, 28 of 2017, 29 of 2017 and 34 of 2017 for passing an order as per regulation 17(4) (d) of the Regulations for CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman.

10.2 With the above findings the AP. Nos 21 of 2017, 28 of 2017, 29 of 2017 and 34 of 2017 are finally disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman. No costs.

(A. Dharmaraj)
Electricity Ombudsman

To

1) The Divisional Railway Manager,
Divisional Railway Manager's Office,
Electrical TRO Branch,
Traction Distribution,
Southern Railway, Salem Division,
Salem – 636 005.

2) The Superintending Engineer,
Salem Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
K.N. Colony, Udayapatti,
Salem – 636 014.

3) The Superintending Engineer,
Dharmapuri Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
Salem Main Road, Opp to Collectorate,
Dharmapuri 636 705.

4) The Superintending Engineer,
Erode Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
948, E.V.N. Road,
Erode – 638 009.

5) The Superintending Engineer,
Tirupattur Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
2/4B, Balammal Colony,
Tirupattur-635 601

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

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

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