



# **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](mailto:tnerc@nic.in)

Web site : [www.tnerc.gov.in](http://www.tnerc.gov.in)

## **BEFORE THE TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, CHENNAI**

**Present : Thiru. S. Devarajan, Electricity Ombudsman**

**A.P. No. 53 of 2017**

Thiru. V. Murugan,  
Anantham Colony,  
7H, V.M. Chatram Road,  
Tirunelveli – 627 011.

. . . . . Appellant  
(Thiru. C.Selvaraj)

Vs

1) The Chief Engineer,  
Tirunelveli Region,  
TANGEDCO,  
Maharaja Nagar,  
Tirunelveli – 627 011.

2) The Superintending Engineer,  
Tirunelveli Electricity Distribution Circle,  
TANGEDCO,  
Maharaja Nagar,  
Tirunelveli – 627 011.

3) The Superintending Engineer,  
Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle,  
TANGEDCO,  
131 & 132, Ettaiyapuram Road,  
Tuticorin - 628 001.

. . . . . Respondents  
(Thiru. N. Narayanan, SE/TEDC/Tuticorin,  
Thiru. E. Petchimuthu, AEE/RC/Tirunelveli &  
Thiru. V. Subramanian, AEE/Comp/Tuticorin)

**Date of hearing: 20.10.2017**

**Date of order : 29.01.2018**

The Appeal Petition dt. 21.7.2017 filed by Thiru. V. Murugan, Anandam Colony, Tirunelveli was registered as Appeal Petition No. 53 of 2017. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 27.10.2017. Upon perusing the Appeal Petition, counter affidavit, written argument and of the oral submission made on the hearing date from both the parties, the Electricity Ombudsman passes the following order;

**Order**

**1. Prayer of the Appellant :**

The appellant prayed that for SC No.07-350-020-171, the billing statement for the entire period from the date of computerization made available in the website and requested compensation for not sending reply to his letter.

**2. Brief History of the case:**

2.1 The appellant has SC No.07-350-020-171 in Tuticorin Rural West section. When the appellant reviewed the account statement in the TANGEDCO website he noticed that only the current year details were present.

2.2 Therefore, the appellant represented the licensee vide his letter dated 17.04.2017 and 27.04.2017 addressed to Chief Engineer/Tirunelveli EDC. Since there was no proper reply from the licensee, the appellant approached the CGRF of Tuticorin EDC.

2.3 Since the appellant has not received any reply from the CGRF within a period of 50 days, he appealed to the Electricity Ombudsman as per regulation 17 (4) (a).

### **3. Argument of the Appellant furnished in the Appeal petition:**

3.1 A complaint was filed to the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent on 17.04.2017 that the S.C. No.07-350-020-171 and 07-003-312-946 accounts in the website, which displaying only the current year account. The previous year account cannot be seen at present. But, previously one can see the previous year's accounts too. Further the appellant narrated that the security deposit account in respect of the S.C. No. 07-350-020-171 is not in order. Also the complainant asked 4 points details from the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent.

3.2 A irregular and irrelevant reply had been received from the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent dated 25.04.2017. Again the appellant pointed out the lapses, irregularities and irresponsible behavior of the officials in his letter dated 27.04.2017.

3.3 As usual when the appellant checked the website after a week of his complaint he was shocked to notice that the entire details of the above said two S.C. Nos. have been bound blocked.

3.4 Subsequently the appellant lodged a complaint to the C.G.R.F on 26.05.2017. But the Chairman of the C.G.R.F. not yet conducted the hearing even after 50 days passed. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent also not properly replied to the appellant.

3.5 Moreover, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent has given wrong details through the print out supplied to the appellant. When the defect was pointed out, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent has indulged in to threaten the appellant alleging to face deterrent action.

3.6 However the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent has chosen to forward the complaint to the Superintending Engineers of Tirunelveli and Tuticorin circles.

3.7 It was informed by the Superintending Engineers that the details of the S.Cs are not available in the website, because of the deficiencies in the RAPDRP programme. It is unbelievable because, the details are found missing for the past 3 months.

3.8 Hence it is presumed that all the officials are concertedly trying to hide the actual problem. It is confirmed from their reluctance to response to the 3<sup>rd</sup> point raised in the complaint dated 17.04.2017.

3.9 Moreover it was further informed that the billing details prior to the date of introduction of RAPDRP are not available in the computer. If this contention is correct, then it is impossible for the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent to supply the print out of the billing details of the prior period.

3.10 Summarizing all the deficiencies and inconsistency, committed, by all the respondents, it would be clear that all are deliberately trying to hide the irresponsible and inept behavior and the lapses accumulated in the billing system.

3.11 By the above, concerted, and administratively corrupt attitude of the respondents, the consumers are forced to suffer without having to avail the benefit of the computerized billing system.

3.12 Hence it is requested before the Ombudsman to order for the relief prayed in the complaint to the C.G.R.F. In addition compensation may be ordered for the delayed information for two occasions about the hearing before the C.G.R.F.

#### **4. Arguments of the Respondents furnished in the counter affidavit :**

4.1 It is respectfully submitted that the aforesaid complaint has been filed before the forum by the appellant that the TANGEDCO website is displaying only the current year account. The account for the previous years cannot be seen at present, and also states that an irregular reply was given to him by CE/Distribution/Tirunelveli.

4.2 It is respectfully submitted that the averments stated in the appeal petitions are false and denied. At the outset it is submitted that the service numbers stated by the complainant have been migrated from Project BEST software scheme to RAPDRP software scheme from 11.04.2016 onwards. Hence the consumer ledger were available in the website from 11.04.2016 only in RAPDRP software upto 05/2017 even after the

complainant was replied by CE/Distribution/Tirunelveli on 25.04.2017 and 08.06.2017. This scheme has been implemented for system improvement purpose only and a suitable reply was given to the complainant for his complaint letter dated 17.04.2017 and 03.06.2017 vide this office letters dated 25.04.2017 and 08.06.2017 respectively. As the email letters dated 27.04.2017 and 04.07.2017 were not authenticated, no reply could be given to the appellant.

4.3 When this reply was given to the appellant by Chief Engineer/ Distribution/ Tirunelveli, the particulars of the above services with relevant details (SD etc.) were available in the RAPDRP software of TANGEDCO website from 11/2016 upto 05/2017.

4.4 During 06/2017, the service connection details of the entire consumers covered under RAPDRP areas all over Tamil nadu could not be viewed due to technical non-compliance of software. This has been addressed to I.T. wing of TANGEDCO Headquarters for rectification. It is informed by the I.T. wing that the sub-vendor i.e.IT Implementing Agency of RAPDRP software have filed various court cases in the Honourable High Court, Madras and the Honourable Supreme Court. The arbitration proceedings between TANGEDCO and IT Implementing Agency is under progress. As such development of RAPDRP software could not be rectified or developed. Software development rectification could be carried out only after outcome of court case filed by the sub-vendor.

4.5 Further, the complaint letter dated 17.04.2017 was only regarding the service connection no. 07-350-020-171 and not regarding the service connection no. 07-003-312-946 as alleged by the appellant. The allegations given by the appellant is false.

4.6 Reply to the four questions requested by the appellant was furnished vide this office letter dated 25.04.2017 (copy enclosed for reference). While sending reply to the consumer, the consumer ledger for the service requested by him was clearly available in the TANGEDCO website with all relevant details regarding the S.D. available also.

4.7 Though the actual fact was given as reply to the appellant and a copy of ledger for the period from 2007 was given to the appellant, an unauthenticated email letter dated 27.04.2017 was received at this office framing false and baseless complaints against CE/Distribution/Tirunelveli. The unauthenticated complaint even stated that CE/Distribution/Tirunelveli has stolen the details and sent to the appellant. It also narrated CE/Distribution/Tirunelveli as incapable. As such there was no grievance in the complaint letter dated 27.04.2017 but only baseless and false complaints against CE/Distribution/Tirunelveli were available. As this letter was also not authenticated, no reply could be sent by CE/Distribution/Tirunelveli for the baseless complaints made on CE/Distribution/ Tirunelveli as it was considered as an anonymous letter.

4.8 SE/Tuticorin EDC stated that "the CGRF meeting could not be conducted on 23.06.2017 as one CGRF member available could not attend the meeting and the same has been informed to the petitioner over phone and through Email. Also, the one CGRF member had resigned her membership from CGRF on 12.07.2017 which was informed by the Chairman/CGRF to the petitioner vide SE/Tuticorin's letter under reference D.No.952 dated 13.07.2017 and Email dated 13.07.2017. Only Chairman/CGRF is available.

4.9 The appellant was replied for his complaint letter dated 17.04.2017 and 03.06.2017 vide this office letters dated 25.04.2017 and 08.06.2017 respectively. As the letters dated 27.04.2017 and 04.07.2017 were not authenticated, the letters could not be replied. However, Headquarters were addressed to rectify the technical problem in the software vide this office letter dated 11.07.2017.

4.10 The appellant 's allegations are false and denied. No wrong details were given to the appellant. Only the available copy of the ledger in electronic form at this office was given to the appellant for the period from 2007 to 03/2016 as per the request of the appellant, and the appellant was not threatened.

4.11 As stated by the appellant, in his letter dated 03.06.2017 received at this office on 07.06.2017 stating that the details of his service could not viewed in TANGEDCO website RAPDRP software on 03.06.2017 was sent to the concerned Superintending

Engineers requesting to conduct a detailed investigation and send a reply to the appellant. Superintending Engineer/Tirunelveli, Superintending Engineer/ Tuticorin and EE/Urban/Tuticorin have sent their reply to the appellant vide their letters dated 20.06.2017, 14.07.2017 and 30.06.2017.

4.12 Though sufficient information has been given by the Chief Engineer that

- (i) The details of the service connection prior to 11.04.2016 present in Project BEST software was not available after 11.04.2016 as RAPDRP software was introduced to improve the system.
- (ii) It is also submitted that the particulars of the above services were available in the RAPDRP software of TANGEDCO website with relevant details such as SD etc. from 11.04.2016 upto 05/2017.
- (iii) During 06/2017, the service connection details of the entire consumers covered under RAPDRP areas all over Tamilnadu could not be viewed in the website due to some technical non-compliance of RAPDRP software.
- (iv) Moreover Superintending Engineers have also replied to the appellant that the details of the SC's are not available in the website RAPDRP software from 06/2017 onwards because of some technical non-compliance of RAPDRP software. Hence the allegation given by the appellant is not maintainable under law.

4.13 There is no necessity for the officers to try to hide the actual problem. In fact, there is some problem in the RAPDRP software notwithstanding latest development in the software scheme, and the defect will be rectified soon.

4.14 The billing details requested by the appellant are not available in the website of TANGEDCO RAPDRP software. But the copy of the ledger available at Regional office in electronic form was given to the appellant as per the request of the appellant.

## **5.0 Rejoinder of the Appellant :**

5.1 It is stated that the RAPDRP software was introduced on 11.4.2016, but it became technically non-complaint during June 2017. This sounds strange. It is also stated that the software could not be rectified because of the pending court cases.

5.2 A general sense which can be arrived at is that the software might be defective, inconsistent, non-compliant as on 11.4.2016 itself. Then how this incompatible software was allowed to be installed.

5.3 In para 2 of the counter, the Respondents have displayed their incapability to distinguish between consumer ledger in the intranet and the Account summery in the website.

5.4 For the third para of the counter, it is to be stated that the lapses and irregularities framed in the letter are not false and baseless, as it is an admitted fact by the Respondents themselves.

5.5 The para 5 of the counter needs special consideration. The mails sent by me were regarded as unauthenticated. But the third Respondent has also sent two such unauthenticated emails. Even the email said to have been sent by the Member of the Tuticorin CGRF conveying the Member's resignation must be unauthenticated as seen from the email dt. 13.7.2017 of the third Respondent.

5.6 It was also stated that the Head Quarters was addressed to rectify the technical problem by letter dated 11.7.2017. What the Respondents were doing during the period between 11.4.2016 and 11.7.2017 needs to be made clear by the Respondents.

5.7 Regarding para 6 of the counter, it is to be stated that wrong details was given by the C.E. The consumer ledger copy dated 25-4-2017 contains the SD amount as Rs.988/-. Whereas the Account summary taken during this period from the website shows the SD as Rs. 4531/-

5.8 Para 7 of the counter categorically corroborates the flagrant and total unawareness of the CE regarding the pathetic state of affairs of the billing system.

5.9 Para 9 of the counter deserves more concern. It is true, there is necessity for the officers to try to hide the actual problem. A news column published in the Dinamalar dated 24-10-2017 has given an alarming news about the precarious state of affairs of the Board that the central government aid of Rs. 417 crores allotted for RAPDRP scheme became a total waste. The RAPDRP software and the Respondents are all form part and parcel of this abuse of such huge fund.

5.10 Regarding para 10 of the counter, it was repeatedly claimed that RAPDRP software was implemented for system improvement and the copy of ledger available at region office (which also is seemingly incorrect), then why the previous details was not incorporated in the improved system, remain to be clarified by the Respondents.

5.11 Therefore it is prayed to pass orders as prayed for in the complaint and appeal, besides ordering payment of exemplary cost to the applicant for Rs. 5000/- and render justice.

## **6. Hearing held by the Electricity Ombudsman:**

To enable the Appellant and the Respondents to put forth their arguments in person, a hearing was conducted on 27.10.2017.

6.1 Thiru. C. Selvaraj has attended the hearing on behalf of the Appellant and putforth his side arguments.

6.2 Thiru. N. Narayanan, Superintending Engineer/Tuticorin EDC has attended the hearing on behalf of the Respondent -1 and putforth his side arguments.

6.3 Thiru. E. Petchimuthu, AEE/Regional Co-ordinator/Project BEST, O/o CE/D/Tirunelveli EDC and Thiru. V. Subramanian, AEE/Computer O/o SE/Tirunelveli EDC have attended the hearing on behalf of the Respondent 2 & Respondent -3 and putforth their side arguments.

**7. Arguments putforth by the Appellant on the hearing date:**

7.1 Appellant argued that the account summary pertaining to his S.C. No.07-350-020-171 and 07-003-312-946 are showing only the current year account, but previously one can view account summary of the past years also.

7.2 To his letter dated 17.04.2017, an irregular and irrelevant reply had been received from the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent dated 25.04.2017. Again pointing out the lapses and irregularities a second letter was sent to 1<sup>st</sup> respondent on 27.04.2017, but he has not received any reply for the same.

7.3 Further the appellant stated that he was shocked to notice that after a week of his complaint, the entire details of the above said two S.C. Nos. have been blocked by the respondents.

7.4 Therefore he lodged a complaint to the C.G.R.F on 26.05.2017. But C.G.R.F. have not even conducted the hearing.

7.5 Further, the Appellant has not accepted the arguments of the Superintending Engineers that the details of the S.Cs are not available in the website, because of the deficiencies in the RAPDRP software programme. The Appellant further argued then how the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent was able to supply the print out of the billing details of the prior period when the details were not actually available in the website.

7.6 Appellant requested to order for the relief prayed in the complaint to the C.G.R.F. In addition the appellant insisted compensation for non reply to his letters, besides ordering payment of exemplary cost to the applicant for Rs. 5000/-.

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

8.1 Respondents have replied that the service numbers stated by the appellant have been migrated from Project BEST software scheme to RAPDRP software scheme from 11.04.2016 onwards. Hence the consumer ledgers are available in the RAPDRP

software from 11.04.2016 and for the period upto 05/2017. Further suitable reply was given to the appellant for his complaint letter dated 17.04.2017 and 03.06.2017 vide this office letters dated 25.04.2017 and 08.06.2017 respectively. As the email letters dated 27.04.2017 and 04.07.2017 were not authenticated, no reply has been given to the appellant.

8.2 During 06/2017, the service connection details of the entire consumers covered under RAPDRP areas all over Tamil nadu could not be viewed due to technical non-compliance of software. This has been addressed to I.T. wing of TANGEDCO Headquarters for rectification. It is informed by the I.T. wing that the sub-vendor i.e.IT Implementing Agency of RAPDRP software have filed various court cases in the Honourable High Court, Madras and the Honourable Supreme Court. The arbitration proceedings between TANGEDCO and IT Implementing Agency is under progress. As such RAPDRP software could not be rectified or developed. Software development and rectification could be carried out only after the outcome of court case filed by the sub-vendor.

8.3 Though the actual fact was given as reply to the appellant and a copy of ledger for the period from 11/2007 was given to the appellant, an unauthenticated email letter dated 27.04.2017 was received at this office framing false and baseless complaints against CE/Distribution/Tirunelveli.

8.4 Further the respondent stated that the CGRF meeting could not be conducted on 23.06.2017 as one CGRF member available could not attend the meeting and the same has been informed to the appellant over phone and through Email. Thereafter the CGRF member also resigned her membership from CGRF on 12.07.2017 which was also informed to the Appellant. Since, only Chairman/CGRF is available, CGRF could not be conducted in the absence of quorum.

8.5 The billing details requested by the appellant are not available in the website of TANGEDCO RAPDRP software. But the copy of the ledger available at Regional office in electronic form was given to the appellant as per the request of the appellant.

## **9. Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:**

9.1 The appellant requested to order for the relief prayed in the complaint filed before the CGRF as detailed below;

i) The SC No.07-350-020-171 billing statement for the entire period from the date of computerization may be made available in the website.

ii) Compensation must be ordered for the non reply for both of his letter dated 17.04.17 & 27.04.17.

iii) Action may be ordered against the CE for furnishing misleading and untrue details.

Further when filing an appeal petition before the Ombudsman, the appellant prayed to order compensation for the delayed information on two occasions about the hearing before the CGRF. Also the appellant added another SC No. 07-003-312-946 which was not raised before the CGRF. Both the above two prayers which were not submitted before the Forum is not taken up for consideration. The prayers filed before the CGRF alone considered issue wise as follows:

## **10. Findings on the first issue:**

10.1 Appellant argued that the account summary pertaining to his S.C. No.07-350-020-171 is showing only the current year account, but previously one can view account summary of the past years also.

10.2 Respondents have replied that the service number stated by the appellant have been migrated from Project BEST software scheme to RAPDRP software scheme from 11.04.2016 onwards. Hence the consumer ledger is available in the RAPDRP software from 11.04.2016 and for the period upto 05/2017. The actual fact was given as reply to the appellant and a copy of ledger for the period from 11/2007 was given to the appellant.

10.3 The appellant argued then how the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent was able to supply the print out of the billing details of the prior period i.e. from 11/2007, when the details were not actually available in the website.

10.4 In response, the respondent have replied that the billing details requested by the appellant are not available in the website of TANGEDCO RAPDRP software. But the copy of the ledger available at Regional office in electronic form was given to the appellant as per the request of the appellant.

10.5 Further the appellant stated that he was shocked to notice that after a week of his complaint, the entire details of the above said S.C. number have been blocked by the respondents.

10.6 The respondent have stated that during 06/2017, the service connection details of the entire consumers covered under RAPDRP areas all over Tamil nadu could not be viewed due to technical non- compliance of software. This has been addressed to I.T. wing of TANGEDCO Headquarters for rectification. It is informed by the I.T. wing that the sub-vendor (IT Implementing Agency) of RAPDRP software have filed various court cases in the Honourable High Court, Madras and the Honourable Supreme Court. The arbitration proceedings between TANGEDCO and IT Implementing Agency is under progress. As such development of RAPDRP software could not be rectified or developed. Software development and rectification could be carried out only after the outcome of court case filed by the sub-vendor.

10.7 In view of the arbitration proceedings between TANGEDCO and IT Implementing Agency is under progress, the arguments of the respondents that RAPDRP software could not be rectified or developed is acceptable to me. Further the respondents have also assured that after the outcome of the court order, rectification will be carried out to facilitate the consumers to view their account summary for the previous years also.

## **11. Findings on the second issue:**

11.1 Appellant has stated that for his letter dated 17.04.2017, an irregular and irrelevant reply had been received from the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent dated 25.04.2017. Again pointing out the lapses and irregularities, a second letter was sent to 1<sup>st</sup> respondent on 27.04.2017, but he has not received any reply for the same. Therefore he requested to order compensation for the non reply for both of his letter dated 17.04.17 & 27.04.17.

11.2 Respondents have replied that suitable reply was given to the complainant for his complaint letter dated 17.04.2017 vide their office letter dated 25.04.2017. However, no reply has been given to the complainant for his authenticated letter dated 27.04.2017, since the same was sent without signature through e.mail.

11.3 As the appellant prayed to order compensation for non reply of his letter 27.04.2017, I would like to refer regulation 17 of Tamilnadu Electricity Distribution Standards of Performance Regulations, 2004 which is given below;

### *“ 17. Responding to Consumer’s Complaint*

*If any consumer makes a complaint in writing to the Territorial Engineer of the concerned licensee, then the Territorial Engineer concerned shall reply to the consumer within ten days after receipt of the letter. In case the Territorial Engineer requires to visit the site or consult any other officer to give a comprehensive reply, the Territorial Engineer shall explain to the consumer as to why a substantive response cannot be sent immediately and intimate the name, address and telephone number of the Officer dealing with the complaint. The Territorial Engineer shall also ensure that a substantive response is sent to the consumer within twenty days of receiving the complaint letter. ”*

11.4 On a careful reading of the above regulation, it is seen that if any consumer makes a complaint in writing to the Territorial Engineer of the concerned licensee, then the Territorial Engineer concerned shall reply to the consumer within ten days after receipt of the letter.

11.5 Further in case the Territorial Engineer requires to visit the site or consult any other officer to give a comprehensive reply, the Territorial Engineer shall explain to the consumer as to why a substantive response cannot be sent immediately and intimate the name, address and telephone number of the Officer dealing with the complaint. The Territorial Engineer shall also ensure that a substantive response is sent to the consumer within twenty days of receiving the complaint letter.

11.6 In the case on hand, the appellant has directly filed a complaint before the Chief Engineer / Tirunelveli Region vide his e.mail letter dated 27.04.2017 without approaching the Territorial Engineer for redressal of his grievances. The Territorial Engineer for his SC No. 07-350-020-171 is the Assistant Engineer/ Rural / West/ Tuticorin EDC. From the records it is found that the appellant has not filed any complaint with the Territorial Engineer.

11.7 The compensation will arise only when the licensee failed to respond to the consumer complaint within a time limit specified as per Regulation 17 of Tamilnadu Electricity Distribution Standards of Performance Regulations, 2004. Here, the appellant has not made a complaint in writing to the Territorial Engineer of the concerned licensee i.e. the Assistant Engineer/ Rural / West/ Tuticorin EDC. Therefore as per Regulation 17 of Tamilnadu Electricity Distribution Standards of Performance Regulations 2004, I am unable to award compensation to the Appellant.

## **12. Findings on the Third issue:**

12.1 The appellant has prayed to take action against the CE for furnishing misleading and untrue details.

12.2 The functions of the Electricity Ombudsman are specified in the Regulations for Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman, 2004. In the said regulations there is no provision to take action against the staff/officers of the Licensee.

**13. Observation :**

13.1 The contention of the Respondent that reply was not given to the Appellant's Email letters dated 27.4.2017 and 04.07.2017 as the emails are not authenticated is not acceptable. In the interest of redressal of the consumer's grievance, the Respondent should have replied suitably.

**14. Conclusion :**

14.1 In view of the findings given in the para 10, para 11 and para 12 above, I am unable to give any relief to the appellant.

14.2 With the above findings, the A.P.No.53 of 2017 is finally disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman. No cost.

**(S. Devarajan)**  
Electricity Ombudsman

To

1) Thiru. V. Murugan,  
Anantham Colony,  
7H, V.M. Chatram Road,  
Tirunelveli – 627 011.

2) The Chief Engineer,  
Tirunelveli Region,  
TANGEDCO,  
Maharaja Nagar,  
Tirunelveli – 627 011.

3) The Superintending Engineer,  
Tirunelveli Electricity Distribution Circle,  
TANGEDCO,  
Maharaja Nagar,  
Tirunelveli – 627 011.

4) The Superintending Engineer,  
Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle,  
TANGEDCO,  
131 & 132, Ettaiyapuram Road,  
Tuticorin - 628 001.

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

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