



A consumer is the important visitor on our premises.
He is not dependent on us. We are dependent on him.
-Mahatma Gandhi

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building, Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate,
Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

Phone : ++91-044-2953 5806, 044-2953 5816 Fax : ++91-044-2953 5893

Email : tneochennai@gmail.com Web site : www.tnerc.gov.in

Before The Tamil Nadu Electricity Ombudsman, Chennai

Present : Thiru. N.Kannan, Electricity Ombudsman

A.P.No. 35 of 2023

Thiru P.Ganapathi, Trustee,
M/s. Samvit Sagar Trust, Swami Shuddananda Ashram,
38, Girivalam Road, Adi Annamalai,
Thiruvannamalai – 606 604.

. Appellant
(Rep. by Thiru Niranjana Rajagopalan, Advocate)
Vs.

The Executive Engineer/West/ Thiruvannamalai,
Thiruvannamalai Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
Vellore Road, Vengikal,
Thiruvannamalai-606604.

. . . . Respondent
(Thiru S.Venkatesan, EE/West/Thiruvannamalai)

Petition Received on: 18-05-2023

Date of hearing: 19-07-2023

Date of order: 28-07-2023

The Appeal Petition received on 18.05.2023, filed by Thiru P.Ganapathi, Trustee, M/s. Samvit Sagar Trust, Swami Shuddananda Ashram, 38, Girivalam Road, Adi Annamalai, Thiruvannamalai – 606 604 was registered as Appeal Petition No. 35 of 2023. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 19.07.2023. Upon perusing the Appeal Petition, Counter affidavit, written argument, and 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 has prayed to set aside the order dated 13.04.2023 passed by the Thiruvannamalai Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum in Petition No. 1602231756605.

2.0 Brief History of the case:

2.1 The Appellant running M/s.Samvit Sagar Trust, has stated to change the Tariff from Tariff V to Tariff II-C and cancel the audit shortfall CC arrear charges in the SC No.206002456.

2.2 As the Appellant approached the Hon'ble High Court praying to quash the order issued by SE/Thiruvannamalai EDC to cancel audit shortfall CC arrears, wherein the Hon'ble High Court has directed the Appellant to file before CGRF.

2.3 The Appellant had filed an email complaint in the CGRF. The CGRF of Thiruvannamalai Electricity Distribution Circle based on the appeal filed by the Appellant dt 16-02-23 and subsequent hearing held on 31-03-2023 has issued an order dated 13.04.2023. Aggrieved over the order, the Appellant has preferred this appeal petition before the Electricity Ombudsman.

3.0 Orders of the CGRF :

3.1 The CGRF of Thiruvannamalai Electricity Distribution Circle issued its order on 13.04.2023. The relevant portion of the order is extracted below: -

"Order: (Operative portion)

மின் இணைப்பு எண், 02:206-002-456 மின் பளு.38 KW TF.V நாள் 03.07.2004 அன்று வணிக பயன் பாட்டிற்காக அளிக்கப்பட்டுள்ளது. 11.02.2008 அன்று நுகர்வோர் விண்ணப்பம் அளித்ததின் அடிப்படையில் 14.02.2008 அன்று வீதப்படி V ல் இருந்து II C க்கு மாற்றப்பட்டுள்ளது. 14.02.2008 முதல் 05.03.2017 வரை மின் இணைப்பு II C யில் இருந்த காலத்திற்கு மின் திருத்த குறைவுத்தொகை ஆகும். இதில் எந்த விதமான அபராத தொகையும் இல்லை தாங்கள் பயன்படுத்திய வீதப்பட்டியல் V-க்கு உண்டான மின்திருத்த நிலுவை தொகையாகும்.

தவறாக வீதப்பட்டிமாற்றம் செய்த இளநிலை பொறியா/இ.ப/கிராமியம்-2/ திருவண்ணாமலை மற்றும் உதவிசெயற் பொறியாளர் இ&

ப/வடக்கு/திருவண்ணாமலை அவர்களின் மீது வாரிய விதிமுறைகளின்படி நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்படும். ஆனால் நுகர்வோர் ஆகிய தாங்கள் வணிக பயன்பாட்டிற்கு (V) உண்டான மின் கட்டணத்தை செலுத்தாமல் வழிபாட்டுதலம் (IIC) மின் கட்டணத்தை செலுத்தி உள்ளீர்கள். ஆனால் தாங்கள் வணிக பயன்பாட்டிற்கான மின் கட்டணத்தை செலுத்தவில்லை 14.02.2008 முதல் 31.12.2016 வரையில் வீதப்பட்டியல் IIC யில் இருந்து வீதப்பட்டியல் V ஆக மாற்றிய இடைப்பட்ட காலத்திற்கான திருத்த நிலுவைதொகை (Audit Short levy of cc Charges) -Rs.7,80,441/-மற்றும் தாமத செலுத்த உபரிகட்டண தொகை Rs.8,31,197/-BPSC (Belated payment Surcharge) ஆக மொத்தம் ரூபாய் 16,11,638/- ரூபாய் பதினாறுலட்சத்து பதினோராயிரத்து அறுநூற்று முப்பத்து எட்டு மட்டும் செலுத்த வேண்டும் என உத்தரவிட்டு மனு எண் 1602231756605 நாள்.16.02.2023 ஆனது இம்மன்றத்தால் முடித்துவைக்கப்படுகிறது.

மேலும் மேற்கண்ட உத்தரவு பெறப்பட்ட 07 தினங்களுக்குள் மனுதாரரால் செலுத்தப்பட வேண்டிய தணிக்கை குறைவுத்தொகையினை வசூல் செய்ய நடவடிக்கை மேற்கொள்ளுமாறும் எடுக்கப்பட்ட நடவடிக்கையின் விபரத்தினை இம்மன்றத்திற்கு தெரிவிக்குமாறும் செயற்பொறியாளர்/இ.ப/மேற்கு/திருவண்ணாமலை அவர்களுக்கு அறிவுறுத்தப்படுகிறது.”

4.0 Hearing held by the Electricity Ombudsman:

4.1 To enable the Appellant and the Respondent to put forth their arguments, a hearing was conducted on 19.07.2023 through video conferencing.

4.2 On behalf of the Appellant, Thiru Niranjana Rajagopalan, Advocate attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

4.3 The Respondent Thiru S.Venkatesan, EE/West/Thiruvannamalai of Thiruvannamalai EDC attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

4.4 As the Electricity Ombudsman is the appellate authority, only the prayers which were submitted before the CGRF are considered for issuing orders. Further, the prayer which requires relief under the Regulations for CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman, 2004 alone is discussed hereunder.

5.0 Arguments of the Appellant:

5.1 The Appellant has stated that the Complaint Petition No. 1602231756605 was filed before the Thiruvannamalai Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) on 21.11.2022, as per Order of the Hon'ble Madras High Court dated

20.10.2022 in WP No. 15221 of 2017 & WMP Nos. 16511 and 16512 of 2017, wherein the Hon'ble High Court was pleased to direct the Appellant herein to prefer the Complaint before the CGRF within a period of 1 month from 20.10.2022, for appropriate relief and for this Hon'ble Forum to adjudicate the dispute.

5.2 The Appellant has stated that the CGRF by order dated 13.04.2023, directed the Appellant to pay the Audit short levy of CC Charges Rs.7,80,441/- (Rupees Seven Lakhs eighty thousand four hundred and forty one only) and belated payment surcharge of Rs. 8,31,197/-(Rupees Eight Lakhs thirty one thousand one hundred and ninety seven only, totalling to Rs. 16,11,638/-(Rupees sixteen lakhs eleven thousand six hundred and thirty eight only). Aggrieved by the same, the current Appeal is preferred.

5.3 The Appellant has stated that the details of the Complaint are attached herewith in the typed set of papers and the same may be read part and parcel of the Appeal. The Appellant prefers this Appeal against the Order dated 13.04.2023 passed by the Thiruvannamalai Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum in Petition No. 1602231756605 on the following among other grounds:

1. The CGRF ought to have considered the submissions made by the Appellant while passing the order. The impugned order had been passed without considering the merits of the complaint, instead it is a reiteration of the contents stated in the 2nd demand notice dated 17.02.2023.
2. The CGRF ought not to have allowed any sort of retrospective levy. Retrospective levy is illegal and it was not a part of the original orders dated 21.11.2016 and 18.04.2017 that was the subject matter of challenge before the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. No. 15221 of 2017.
3. The CGRF ought to have considered the fact that as per Section 5(4) of the Tamil Nadu Electricity Supply Code, 2004, belated payment surcharge can be imposed only if a bill is raised and a payment due is not paid. In the current case, an interim injunction was granted by the Hon'ble Madras High Court in W.M.P No. 16511 of 2017 in W.P. No. 15221 of 2017 by order dated 16.06.2017 restraining the Respondents from demanding Tariff under Tariff

V. Subsequently as per the final order dated 20.10.2022, the Respondents shall not recover any amount from the Appellant until the disposal of the appeal before the CGRF. Thus, when no bill could be raised and payment is not due, the imposition of belated payment surcharge does not arise.

4. The CGRF ought to have considered the fact that the belated payment surcharge was neither a subject matter of the Writ Petition nor the complaint. The CGRF had passed the order imposing the belated payment surcharge outside the scope of the complaint. The Belated Payment Surcharge was first raised only on 17.02.2023 by the Respondent after the complaint was preferred. The CGRF ought not to have incorporated the demands/ penalties that were imposed after preference of the complaint and the same is non-est in law.

The CGRF order is not a reasoned order. It fails to substantiate the change in tariff, retrospective levy and imposition of belated payment surcharge. Thus this is a sheer violation of principles of natural justice.

5. The CGRF ought to have considered the fact that the Appellant is not a commercial organization and it comes under the category of "actual places of public worship.....its environs and for the road and pathways leading to the temple". Thus the change from Tariff II-C to Tariff V is illegal.

The grounds raised in W.P. No. 15221 of 2017 and the Complaint filed before the CGRF may be adopted herein and may be read part and parcel of these grounds of appeal and it is not repeated herein for brevity.

5.4 The Appellant has prayed to set aside the order dated 13.04.2023 passed by the Thiruvannamalai Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum in Petition No. 1602231756605, allow the said Petition as prayed for, and pass such other orders as it may deem fit.

6.0 Arguments of the Respondent:

6.1 The Respondent has submitted that the Appellant has approached the Hon'ble High Court praying to quash the order made by the SE/Thiruvannamalai EDC asking for the Audit Shortfall CC Arrear charges of Rs.7,80,441/- wherein the

Hon'ble High Court has directed the Appellant to file an appeal before the CGRF within a period of one month.

6.2 The Respondent has submitted that the Appellant has approached the CGRF, Thiruvannamalai Circle praying for the same remedy to which CGRF has called both the parties on 31.03.2023 for the arguments and after careful perusal of the records submitted by EE/E&O/West/Thiruvannamalai, CGRF had ordered the Appellant to pay the amount along with belated payment surcharge, as raised by the EE/E&O/West/Thiruvannamalai.

6.3 The Respondent has submitted that the Appellant, aggrieved by the CGRF's order, had approached this Hon'ble Ombudsman. All the averments submitted in para 4 of the appeal petition are denied. It is nothing but misrepresentation of facts.

6.4 The Respondent has submitted that CGRF had carefully perused the records submitted before the forum and the passed the order to pay the Audit Shortfall CC charges along with the belated payment surcharge only after considering the fact that the premises have been inspected by a team of seven engineers along with the Manager of the Trust and only after the same the Tariff has been revised to Tariff-V.

6.5 The Respondent has submitted that it is pertinent to note that the electricity service number 206-002-456 has been utilized for the purposes of 30 nos. of Cottage Houses, Ladies & Gents Hostels, Meditation hall, Kitchen, Dining Hall, Laundry room, Office room, Staff Quarters and nowhere the service is being used for the actual purpose of worship of the devotees as mentioned by the TNERC Tariff order 1 of 2003 dated 15.03.2003. It is clearly mentioned as Tariff II-C is applicable to Actual place of worship and Teaching, Meditation or Yoga cannot be considered as Actual place of worship.

6.6 The Respondent has submitted that it is also pertinent to note that other such trusts like Ramana Ashram, Seshadri Ashramam, Santhimalai Trust, Yogi Ram Surathkumar Ashram have all been effected under Tariff -V category. The averment mentioned in para 4F of the appeal petition, the quote has been copied to the

convenience of the Appellant leading to misrepresentation of facts. The exact para has been extracted below:

This tariff is applicable to actual places of public worship including Trichy Rockfort temple, its environs and for the road and path ways leading to the temple".

6.7 The Respondent has submitted that the Hon'ble High Court has made a note in its order dated 20.10.2022, not to insist of any recovery of amount until the disposal of the appeal and disposed of the matter. And I humbly present that the belated surcharge was claimed only at the time of hearing before the CGRF on 31.03.2023 and not before that. The same was claimed if the scenario of appeal is ordered against the Appellant, he will be liable to pay the Audit shortfall charges (CC Arrears) along with the belated surcharge.

6.8 The Respondent has submitted that the change in Tariff for service connection no: 206-002-456 from Tariff V to II-C which effected on 04.02.2008 is only a clerical mistake by the then officer, to which the CGRF has ordered for a departmental action against him and that will not set free from compensating any loss made by the consumer/Appellant.

6.9 The Respondent has submitted that the Audit Shortfall charges and the belated surcharge amount has been charged as per the guidelines scaled by TNERC's Tariff order 01 of 2003 dated 15.03.2003 and this appeal petition is not maintainable under law and it is subject to dismissal.

6.10 The Respondent has prayed to dismiss the above Appeal Petition with costs and pass such further or other orders as may be fit and necessary in the facts of the circumstances of this case and thus render justice.

7.0 Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:

7.1 I have heard the arguments of both the Appellant and the Respondent. The Appellant claims that the Respondent failed to provide enough evidence to support their case regarding the change in tariff from IIC to V, as well as the application of retrospective levy and belated payment surcharge. The Appellant's position is that a

belated payment surcharge should only be imposed if a bill has been issued and not paid on time.

7.2 On the other side, the Respondent argues that the change in Tariff for service connection no: 206-002-456, from Tariff V to II-C on 14.02.2008, was just a clerical error made by the then licensee officers. Further the respondent asserts that departmental action will be taken against the officer, but this doesn't set free the Appellant from compensating any losses occurred to licensee.

7.3 Based on the arguments and documents presented, the following issues need to be decided:

- i) What tariff applies to an actual place of public worship?
- ii) Whether the Appellant's service connection can be considered as an actual place of public worship or not?
- iii) Are there any regulations to recover/refund in case of billing errors?
- iv) Under what conditions can BPSC on arrear be claimed during a legal dispute?

8.0 Findings on the first issue:

8.1 In the present case, the period of dispute is between 2/2008 to 12/2016 and hence in order to find out the applicable tariff for an actual places of public worship, it is appropriate to refer the Hon'ble Commission's Tariff order for the above period. The relevant tariff orders are given below:

T.P.No. 1 of 2002, dt 15-03-2003 with effect from 16-03-2003

6.0 Low Tension Tariff II-C

i) This tariff is applicable to actual places of public worship.

ii) The existing concessions to the actual places of worship having annual income less than Rs 1000 shall be continued under the same terms and conditions until further orders of the Commission.

iii) All consumers under this Category, having motor loads of 3 HP and more shall install adequate power factor improvement capacitors (ISI marked). Non-compliance shall invite compensation charges as per TNEB terms and conditions.

Tariff Order No.3 of 2010, dt 31-07-2010 with effective from 01-08-2010

“(1)This tariff is applicable to actual places of public worship, religious mutts, religious institution, Goshalas run by charitable trusts.

(2) All consumers under this category shall have ISI marked motor and motor loads of 3 HP and more shall install adequate power factor improvement capacitors (ISI marked). Non-compliance shall invite compensation charges as per Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission regulations.”

Tariff Order No.1 of 2012, dt 30-03-2012 with effective from 01-04-2012

“10.16.1 This tariff is applicable to actual places of public worship.

10.16.2 The existing concessions to the actual places of worship as already notified by GoTN having annual income less than Rs.1000 shall be continued under the same terms and conditions, until further Order of the Commission.”

T.P.No.1 of 2013, dt 20-06-2013 with effective from 21-06-2013

“i. This tariff is applicable to actual places of public worship including Trichy Rockfort temple, its environs and for the road and path ways leading to the temple.

ii. The existing concessions to the actual places of worship as already notified by GoTN having annual income less than Rs. 1000 shall be continued under the same terms and conditions, until further Order of the Commission.”

SMT - Order No.9 of 2014, dt 11-12-2014 with effective from 12-12-2014

“i. This tariff is applicable to actual places of public worship including Trichy Rockfort temple, its environs and for the road and path ways leading to the temple.

ii. The existing concessions to the actual places of worship as already notified by GoTN having annual income less than Rs. 1000 shall be continued under the same terms and conditions, until further Order of the Commission.”

8.2 From the definitions of the Tariff classifications for the said disputed period, it could be understood that the actual place of public worship alone is eligible to be categorized under Tariff IIC.

9.0 **Finding on the second issue:**

9.1 The Appellant argued that his Trust is not a commercial organization and it comes under the category of "actual places of public worship, its environs and for the road and pathways leading to the temple". Thus the change from Tariff II-C to Tariff V is illegal.

9.2 The Respondent has submitted that the electricity service number 206-002-456 has been utilized for the purposes of 30 nos. of Cottage Houses, Ladies & Gents Hostels, Meditation hall, Kitchen, Dining Hall, Laundry room, Office room, Staff Quarters and nowhere the service is being used for the actual purpose of worship of the devotees as mentioned in the TNERC's Tariff orders. It is clearly mentioned as Tariff II-C is applicable to Actual place of public worship and Teaching, Meditation or Yoga cannot be considered as Actual place of worship.

9.3 The Respondent also pointed out that other trusts such as Ramana Ashram, Seshadri Ashramam, Santhimalai Trust, and Yogi Ram Surathkumar Ashram are all categorized under Tariff-V. The Respondent further mentions that after a thorough inspection by a team of seven Engineers along with the Trust's manager, the Tariff was revised to Tariff-V, and the order to pay the Audit Shortfall CC charges along with belated payment surcharge was passed by the CGRF.

9.4 From the foregoing arguments of both, I would like to discuss the following observations from the documents and existing regulations.

9.5 It is noticed that the Appellant had got service connection for the Swami Shuddananda Ashram, 38, Girivalam road, Adi annamalai, Thiruvannamalai in the name of Ramakrishanan one of the trustee with service connection number 206-002-456 effected on 03-07-2004 with tariff V.

9.6 Also it is noticed that the Appellant trust have four service connection within the campus which are given below;

1. SC.No:02-206-002-713,TF:IIC,CL:5.62kw
2. SC.No:02-206-002-456,TF:V,CL:37.24kw
3. SC.No:02-206-002-103,TF:IV,CL:5Hp

4. SC.No:02-206-002-088,TF:IV,CL:5Hp

9.7 It is found that inside the Trust Campus there exists one service SC.No:02-206-002-713 under IIC for actual place of Public worship which was effected on 10-01-2008.

9.8 However, it is seen from the Appellant's document that based on his request letter dt 7-2-2008, the service SC.No:02-206-002-456 which was already in tariff V was changed by the then licensee officer on 14-02-2008 to Tariff IIC. Later it was changed to the purpose of usage under Tariff V based on the field report of team of respondent officers along with Manager of the trust on 06-03-2017.

9.9 Also it is noticed that the above revision of Tariff from IIC to V by giving proper intimation to the Appellant by the licensee officials on various dates i.e. 11-11-2016, 17-11-2016, 28-12-2016, 03-02-2017, 02-03-2017 and finally the tariff was changed on 06-03-2017.

9.10 As tariff for the appellant's service connection has been changed from Tariff IIC to Tariff V, it is necessary to discuss the applicability of tariff V for the appellant's service connection for the disputed short levy period which is discussed below

T.O.No. 1 of 2002, dt 15-03-2003

11.0 Low Tension Tariff V:

1) This tariff is applicable to all commercial establishments and consumers not covered in I-A, I-B, I-C, II-A, II-B, II-C, III-A(1), III-A(2), IIIB and IV

Tariff Order No.3 of 2010, dt 31-07-2010 with effective from 01-08-2010

9.11.21 Low Tension Tariff V:

1) This tariff is applicable to all commercial establishments and consumers not categorized under I-A, I-B, I-C, II-A, II-B, II-C, III-A(1), III-A(2), IIIB and IV

T.P.No.1 of 2013, dt 20-06-2013 with effective from 21-06-2013

6.21 Low tension tariff V

1) This tariff is applicable to consumers not categorized under I-A, I-B, I-C, II-A, II-B, II-C, III-A(1), III-A(2), IIIB, IV and VI.

SMT Order 9 of 2014, dt.11-12-2014 with effective from 12-12-2014

6.21 Low tension tariff V

i) This tariff is applicable to consumers not categorized under I-A, I-B, I-C, II-A, II-B, II-C, III-A(1), III-A(2), IIIB, IV and VI

9.11 From the above definition of Tariff V, it is understood that the consumers not categorized under I-A, I-B, I-C, II-A, II-B, II-C, III-A(1), III-A(2), IIIB, IV and VI shall be categorized under Tariff V. The appellant's service connection No.206-002-456 being used for the purpose various activities such as Cottage Houses, Ladies & Gents Hostels, Meditation hall, Kitchen, Dining Hall, Laundry room, Office room, Staff Quarters and correspondence course institution which could not be identified under the head of classification of actual place of Public worship under Tariff IIC and could be categorized under tariff V for the disputed short levy period. Further, the various mixed load identified with a single service can only be categorized under Tariff V.

9.12 From the above findings, I am of the view that the appellant's claim to categorize their service connection No.206-002-456 from Tariff V to Tariff IIC is not acceptable since its activities was not bonafide usage of Public worship under Tariff IIC. Further, the mixed load identified with the service connection viz. Cottage Houses, Ladies & Gents Hostels, Meditation hall, Kitchen, Dining Hall, Laundry room, Office room, Staff Quarters and Educational Institution can only be categorized under Tariff V.

10.0 Findings on the third issue:

10.1 The respondent had claimed the difference in Tariff arrears for the said service connection at a later date. In this regard, I would like to discuss Regulation 12 of Tamilnadu Electricity Supply Code which is reproduced as follows.

“12. Errors in billing

(1) In the event of any clerical errors or mistakes in the amount levied, demanded or charged by the Licensee, the Licensee will have the right to demand an additional amount in case of undercharging and the consumer will have the right to get refund of the excess amount in the case of overcharging.

(2) Where it is found that the consumer has been over-charged, the excess amount paid in such cases will be adjusted against future current consumption charges. If, even after such against future current consumption charges for two assessment periods, there is still a balance to be refunded, the refund will be made by cheque.

(3) Wherever the Licensees receive complaints from consumers that there is error in billing, etc. the Licensee shall resolve such disputes regarding quantum of commercial transaction involved within the due date for payment, provided the complaint is lodged three days prior to the due date for payment. Such of those complaints received during the last three days period shall be resolved before the next billing along with refunds / adjustments if any. However, the consumer shall not, on the plea of incorrectness of the charges, withhold any portion of the charges.”

10.2 From the plain reading of the above regulation, it is concluded that in the event of any clerical errors or mistakes in the amount levied, demanded or charged by the Licensee, the Licensee will have the right to demand an additional amount in case of undercharging.

11.0 Finding on the fourth issue:

11.1 The appellant has argued that as per Section 5(4) of the Tamil Nadu Electricity Supply Code, 2004, belated payment surcharge can be imposed only if a bill is raised and a payment due is not paid. Since in the current case, an interim injunction was granted by the Hon'ble Madras High Court in W.M.P No. 16511 of 2017 in W.P. No. 15221 of 2017 by order dated 16.06.2017 restraining the Respondents from demanding Tariff under Tariff V and hence argued that the imposition of belated payment surcharge does not arise.

11.2 In this regard, I would like to refer Regulation 5(4) of TNE Supply Code which is given below;

“5. Miscellaneous charges

*xxxx
xxxx*

XXXX

(4) Belated payment surcharge (BPSC)

All bills are to be paid in the case of HT consumers, within the due date specified in the bill and in the case of LT consumers, within the due date and notice period specified in the consumer meter card.

*** (ii) (a) Where any HT consumer neglects to pay any bill by the due date, he shall be liable to pay belated payment surcharge from the day following the due date for payment.*

Where any LT consumer (except services relating to Public lighting and water supply and other services belonging to Local Bodies) neglects to pay any bill by the last day of the notice period, he shall be liable to pay belated payment surcharge from the day following the last day of the notice period.

(b) Where the local bodies neglect / fail to pay any bills in respect of LT services for Public Lighting and Public Water Works, and other services of Local Bodies, the belated payment surcharge shall be applicable for the payments made beyond 60 days from the date of demand. In case of payment made beyond 60 days from the date of demand, the belated payment surcharge shall be payable from the day following the 60th day of demand.

(c) The surcharge shall be for a minimum period of fifteen days and where the delay exceeds fifteen days but does not exceed one month, it shall be for the number of whole months, and for any fraction of a month, it shall be proportionate to the number of days.

(iii) If the due date in the case of HT consumers and the last day of the notice period in the case of LT consumers falls on a holiday, the surcharge is payable from the day following the next working day."

**** Substituted as per Commission's Notification No TNERC/SC/7-7 dated 14.12.2007 (w.e.f. 9.1.2008) which before substitution stood as under :**

(i) Where any HT consumer neglects to pay any bill by the due date, he shall be liable to pay belated payment surcharge from the day following the due date for payment. Where any LT consumer neglects to pay any bill by the last day of the notice period, he shall be liable to pay belated payment surcharge from the day following the last day of the notice period. The surcharge shall be for a minimum period of fifteen days and where the delay exceeds fifteen days but does not exceed one month, it shall be for one whole month and where the delay exceeds one month, it shall be for the number of whole months and for any fraction of a month it shall be proportionate to the number of days.

**** (iv) In the case of LT Consumers (except Local Bodies) the surcharge shall be 1.5% per month for the outstanding arrears towards the price of electricity supplied. In respect of LT services belonging to Local Bodies, the surcharge shall be 0.5% per month for the outstanding arrears towards the price of electricity supplied.*

***** Substituted as per Commission's Notification No TNERC/SC/7-7 dated 14.12.2007 (w.e.f.9.1.2008) which before substitution stood as under :**

(iv) In case of LT consumers (except Local Bodies and Government Departments) the surcharge shall be 1.5% per month for the sum outstanding towards the price of electricity. In case of Local Bodies and Government Departments, the surcharge shall be 1% per month for the sum outstanding towards the price of electricity supplied.

(v) ***

(vi) In case of sums other than price of electricity supplied which are outstanding, surcharge shall be leviable at the discretion of the Licensee at a rate not exceeding 1.5 % per month.

(vii) In the case of short assessment included in a subsequent bill, surcharge shall accrue in the case of HT consumers, after the due date for the payment of the subsequent bill wherein the short assessment is included and in the case of LT consumers, it shall accrue from the day following the last day of the notice period.

(viii) In the case of short assessment permitted to be payable in installments, the surcharge shall accrue only when there is default in the payment schedule and the surcharge shall be worked out from the day following the day on which the installment fell due and shall be payable along with the amount of installment due.

(ix) Where the service connection stands terminated, the amount of Security Deposit and the interest accrued thereon shall first be adjusted against belated payment surcharge and the remainder if any, against other dues.

(x) The belated payment surcharge is payable only on any outstanding amount excluding belated payment surcharge component.

(xi) The belated payment surcharge shall not be levied on electricity tax and electricity tax shall not be levied on the belated payment surcharge."

11.3 From the plain reading of the above, it is understood that the defaulted consumers have to pay the BPSC in the case of short assessment and if they neglect to pay by the last day of the notice period, they shall be liable to pay belated payment surcharge from the day following the last day of the notice period.

11.4 From the given documents, it is found that an Audit Slip No.104, dated 17.02.2017 was raised by the Licensee's audit department. Based on audit slip, the respondent AE has issued a demand notice dated 02.03.2017 to the consumer for an amount of Rs.7,80,441/- towards difference in tariff arrears for the period from 02/2008. Subsequently, a reminder has also been sent on 18.04.2017. Only after a receipt of demand notice, the consumer had filed W.P.No.15221 of 2017 in the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Madras and got interim injunction on 16.06.2017. The Hon'ble High Court had issued an order on 20.10.2022 directing

the consumer to file an appeal before the CGRF within a period of one month from 20.10.2022. Since, the consumer has not approached the CGRF within a time period as directed by the Hon'ble Court, the AE/ O&M has issued 15 days notice to pay the said arrears of Rs.7,80,441/- vide his letter dated 07.02.2023. Subsequently, the appellant has filed an appeal before the CGRF on 16.02.2023. Therefore, the argument of the appellant that the subject matter of BPSC was outside the scope of the complaint is not acceptable.

11.5 Further, I would like to find, what was the content of the interim order issued by the Hon'ble High Court of judicature at Madras in W.P.No.15221 of 2017 and WMP No. 16511 of 2017 dt 16-06-2017

Order :

“ There shall be an order of interim injunction till then ”

And final orders on the above petitions on 20-10-2022

“Considering the above aspect and also the fact that alternative appeal remedy available before the consumer Redressal forum, the petitioner is directed to file an appeal before the consumer Redressal forum within a period of one month from today .Taking into account of the pendency of the writ petition, the limitation period of filling the appeal if any, shall be excluded on receipt of appeal filed by the petitioner, the consumer Redressal forum shall consider the same on merits and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. It is also to be noted that till the disposal of the appeal, the respondents shall not insist upon any recovery amount.

With the above observations, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.”

11.6 From the above, it is noticed that till the disposal of the appeal, the respondents shall not insist upon any recovery of amount. But there is no bar in demanding the legitimate revenue of the licensee such as BPSC and short levy at a later date in case of Errors in billing as per TNE Supply Code Regulations, 2004.

11.7 Now the issue to be decided is whether the licensee is eligible to demand BPSC when there is a legal dispute with interim stay. In this regard, I would like to

refer the judgment issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in M/s.Kanoria Chemicals and Industries Vs U.P State Electricity Board in SLP (C) no.6558 of 1990. The relevant paras are discussed below;

"JUDGMENT B.P. JEEVAN REDDY, J.

Civil Appeals [Arising out of SLP (C) Nos.6588/94, 21905-06/93, 21913-14/93, 6479/94 & 23250/94 Leave granted in Special Leave Petitions.

These appeals are preferred against the judgment of a Division Bench of the Allahabad High Court dismissing the writ petitions filed by the Appellants. The Appellants are large consumers of electricity.

By a Notification dated April 21, 1990, the Uttar Pradesh State Electricity Board had revised the electricity rates/tariffs under Section 49 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948. The Notification inter alia provided for payment of interest in case the bill amount is not paid within the specified period. Clause 7(b) read as follows:

"7(b) For delayed payment: In the event of any bill of whatever nature it may be not being paid by the due date specified therein, the consumer shall pay an additional charge per day of seven paise per hundred rupees or part thereof on the unpaid amount of the bill for the period by which the payment is delayed, beyond the due date specified in the bill, without prejudice to the right of the Board to disconnect the supply."

The validity of the aforesaid Notification was questioned in the Allahabad High Court by way of a writ petition filed by the Eastern U.P. Chamber of commerce and Industry, Allahabad and certain individual consumers. On the Interlocutory Application filed in the said writ petition, the High Court passed the following Order on July 25, 1990:

"In this case S/Sri Sudhir Agarwal and S.C. Budhwar have filed appearance on behalf of Respondents. They pray for and are granted two weeks' time for filing rejoinder affidavit. List this petition for disposal, if possible at the admission stage, on 16th August, 1990. This is necessary in view of recurrence of this matter in large number of cases and revenue in large scale being affected for electricity charges.

Meanwhile till 23-8-1990 unless recalled earlier, the operation of the notification dated 21.4.1990 shall remain stayed. The Respondents are restrained from realising the additional amount of electricity charges from petitioners in pursuance of the said notification. However, the petitioner shall continue to pay at the old rate."

[Emphasis added] The said order was continued by subsequent Order dated August 30, 1990 and September 7, 1990.

It appears that besides the above writ petition, several other writ petitions were filed questioning the aforesaid Notification. In every writ petition, there was an Interlocutory Application praying for stay of operation of the said Notification but there does not appear to be any uniformity in the interim orders made by the High Court in those writ petitions. For example, in Writ Petition No.300097 of 1990 filed by the Employer Association of Northern India, the interim order was to the following effect:

"Meanwhile effect shall not be given to the notification dated 21st April, 1990 as against the petitioners. However, it is made clear that in the event of failure of the writ petition the petitions shall deposit with the relevant authority within a period of one month from the date of dismissal of the writ petition the difference between the amount of electricity dues, which will be paid hereinafter by the petitioners under our order and the sum which may be calculated on the basis of the impugned notification."

[Emphasis added] All the said writ petitions challenging the said Notification were ultimately dismissed by a Division Bench on March 1, 1993.

From this stage onwards, we will refer to the facts and contentions in civil appeal arising from Special Leave Petition (C) No.6588 of 1990 [preferred by M/s. Kanoria Chemicals and Industries Limited], as representative of the facts and contention in all the matters being disposed of under this judgment. Though the individual facts vary, the questions arising in these appeals are common.

*After the dismissal of the writ petitions on March 1, 1993 as aforesaid, Kanoria says, it deposited the difference amount between pre-revised and the revised electricity rates. It did not, however, deposit the "additional charges" leviable under clause 7(b), referred to above, which are generally referred to - and referred to hereinafter - as "late payment surcharge". Thereupon, the Board issued a notice of demand calling upon Kanoria to pay the late payment surcharge in a sum of Rs.3,27,01,408.88p. [calculated upto February 28, 1993]. Similar demand notices were served upon other Appellants also. A fresh batch of writ petitions were filed by several consumers including the Appellants herein questioning the notices demanding late payment surcharge under clause 7(b). **The main contention of the Appellants before the High Court was that inasmuch as the High Court had stayed the operation of the Notification dated April 21, 1990 [by its Order dated July 25, 1990 as continued from time to time], clause 7(b) remained inoperative during the period July 25, 1990 to March 1, 1993 and, therefore, no late payment surcharge can be levied on the amount withheld by Appellants under the orders of the court, even though their writ petitions were dismissed ultimately.** According to the Appellants, it was not a case where the court enjoined the Board from collection the dues according to the aforesaid Notification, or was it a case where the collection of bill amount was stayed simplicitor. It was a case, they submitted, where the operation of the very Notification was stayed which meant that from the date of the stay order, clause 7(b) did not operate and was not effective till the dismissal of the writ petitions. Strong reliance was placed upon the decision of this Court in Adoni Ginning Factory v. Secretary, Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board [1979 (4) S.C.C. 560]. The said contention has been rejected by the Division Bench. R.A. Sharma, J., speaking for*

the Division Bench, first examined the nature and effect of the interim orders passed by courts pending disposal of substantive matters and then opined that in Adoni Ginning, **this Court cannot be said to have held that in the case of stay of operation of the Notification, interest does not accrue at all. Sharma, J. pointed out that the said decision was concerned only with the period during which an order of injunction restraining the Board from collecting the revised charges was in operation and this Court opined that an order of injunction does not prevent the accrual of interest provided by the relevant tariffs/rules.** Sharma, J. pointed out that the recoverability of the interest amount of the period covered by an order of stay of the Notification was not at all in issue in Adoni Ginning and, therefore, it cannot be said that there is any decision on the said question. Affirming the opt-repeated principle that a decision is an authority only for what it actually decides, the learned Judge opined that the consumers are liable to pay the late payment surcharge under clause 7(b) of the said Notification even for the period covered by the aforementioned order dated July 25, 1990 [as extended from time to time]. The learned Judge also pointed out that the interim orders passed in various writ petitions were not uniform and by way illustration set out in the interim order in Writ Petitionz No.30097 of 1990 [quoted by us hereinabove]. The correctness of the judgment is called in question in this batch of appeals.

Sri R. Vaidyanathan, who lead the arguments on behalf of the Appellants, submitted that the impugned decision of the High Court is clearly contrary to the principles enunciated by this Court in Adoni Ginning and cannot, therefore, stand. Counsel relied upon another order this Court dated April 23, 1996 in special leave Petition (C) No.9087-88 of 1996 [M/s. Hindalco Industries Limited v. State of Uttar Pradesh]. Learned counsel submitted that clause 7(b) of the Notification dated April 21, 1990 was penal in nature inasmuch as the late payment surcharge provided by it works out to 25.5 interest per annum. Such high rate of interest, learned counsel submitted, cannot but be characterized as penal.

Inasmuch as the decision in Adoni Ginning constitutes the sheet-anchor of the Appellant's case, it is necessary to closely examine the facts and ratio of the said decision. Electricity charges were enhanced by the Government of Andhra Pradesh under an Order dated 30th January, 1955. The enhancement was questioned by certain consumer by way of writ petitions in Andhra Pradesh High Court. The High Court stayed the operation of the Government Order enhancing the rates. The writ petitions came up for hearing before a learned Single Judge on February 22, 1957 and were allowed. The Government of Andhra Pradesh preferred writ appeals which were allowed by a Division Bench of that court on 19th December, 1958 upholding the validity of the enhancement. Thereafter, the Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Undertaking with effect from 1st April, 1959 issued bills to several consumer call in upon them to pay the arrears of enhanced charges. No demand was made under these notices for surcharge [for delayed payment of Bill amount] on the arrears. Meanwhile several consumers approached this court and obtained order of injunction restraining the Government/Board from realising from them the "amount of arrears occasioned by the enhancement of rates". Injunction was granted by this Court subject to certain conditions including the condition that in the event of the dismissal of their appeals, the Appellants shall pay the arrears with interest calculated @ one percent per annum. All the appeals were dismissed by this Court on 25th March, 1964. Thereafter, the Electricity

Board issued demand notices calling upon the consumers to pay surcharge @ twelve percent per annum on the arrears in respect of which they had obtained order of injunction pending their appeals before this court. On receipt of these demand notices, the consumers again approached the High Court by way of writ petitions questioning the demand. Their writ petitions were allowed by a learned Single Judge observing that no surcharge was leviable during the period when the order of injunction granted by this Court was operation. The writ appeal preferred by the Board were, however, allowed by a Division Bench against which decision some of the consumers approach this Court again. It is, therefore, clear that the only dispute in Adoni Ginning pertained to the liability of the consumers to pay surcharge @ twelve percent per annum on the amount not collected from them under the orders of injunction granted by this Court pending their appeals. It is significant to notice that the dispute in the said case did not pertain to the liability of the consumers to pay the surcharge amount for the period covered by the order of stay granted by the High Court; the Board did not choose to demand any surcharge for that period. The contention of the Appellants in Adoni Ginning was that by virtue of the injunction order granted by this Court, the consumers cannot be said to be in default in paying the electricity charges and, therefore, no surcharge was leviable. The contention was rejected by this Court [D.A. Desai and O. Chinnappa Reddy, JJ.]. The Court pointed out that according to clause (9), a consumer was liable to pay the bill amount within thirty days, in default of which he was liable to pay "an additional charge of one percent on the amount of the bill for every month delay or part thereof". The contention urged by the Appellant therein was repelled in the following words:

"The injunction granted by this court restrained the government from realising the arrears of enhanced charges..... All that the injunction did was to restrain the Board from realising the arrears which meant that the Board was restrained from taking any coercive action such as disconnection of supply of electricity etc. for the realisation of the arrears. The operation of G.O. No.187 dated 30th January, 1955, as such was not stayed. Thus the obligation of the consumers to pay charges at the enhanced rates was not suspended though the Electricity Board was prevented from realising the arrears. It was up to the consumers to pay or not to pay the arrears. If they paid the arrears they relieved themselves against the liability to pay surcharge. If they did not pay the arrears they were bound to pay the surcharge if they failed in the appeals before the Supreme Court. This was precisely what was pointed out by the Electricity Board in the Bills issued to the consumers after the Supreme Court granted the injunction. We may mention here that the Electricity Board is not demanding any surcharge on the arrears for the period during which the Andhra Pradesh High Court had granted stay. It was explained by the learned Counsel for the Electricity Board that no surcharge was claimed for that period as the operation of G.O.No.187 dated 30th January 1955 had itself been stayed at that time. Surcharge was claimed for the period during which the appeals were pending in the Supreme court since the Supreme Court did not stay the operation of G.O.No.187 but only restrained the Board from collecting the arrears.

That no stay of G.O.No.187 was ever intended to be granted by the Supreme Court is also clear from the circumstance that there was no injunction restraining the Electricity Board from collecting future charge at the enhanced rates. the Electricity Board was, therefore, right in claiming surcharge for the period the during which the appeals were pending in the

Supreme Court and not Claiming surcharge for the period during which the Writ Petition and Writ appeals were pending in the High Court."

*[Emphasis added] The learned counsel for the Appellants in the appeals before us rely upon the portions underlined in the above passage as a decision supporting their contention that where the operation of Government Order is stayed, no surcharge can be demanded upon the amount withheld. We find it difficult to agree. In our respectful opinion, the underlined portions do not constitute the decision of the court. They merely refer to the fact that the Board itself did not make a demand for surcharge amount in respect of the period covered by stay under its own understanding of the effect of the stayed order granted by the High Court and that it was justified in its opinion. The demand was , the court pointed out, in respect of the period covered by the order of injunction granted by this Court. **This Court held expressly that the grant of and injunction does not relieve the consumers of their obligation to pay the charges at the enhanced rates and, therefore, the demand for surcharge/interest for such period is not illegal.** The portions underlined cannot be understood as laying down the proposition that in respect of the period covered by stay, no demand can be made. No such proposition can be deduced from the said passage for the reason that the liability for the said was not at all in issue in the said decision. Unless put in issue and pronounced upon, it cannot be said that there was a decision on the said issue. There was no list between the parties with respect to the period covered by the stay order of the High Court. If so, it cannot be said that any decision was rendered by this court on the said issue or aspect, as it may be called. We, therefore, agree with the High Court that Adoni Ginning cannot be read as laying down the proposition that the grant of stay of a Notification revising the electricity charges has the effect of relieving the consumers/petitioners of their obligation to pay late payment surcharge/interest on the amount withheld by them even when their writ petitions are dismissed ultimately. Holding otherwise would mean that even though the Electricity Board, who was the Respondent in the writ petitions succeeded therein, is yet deprived of the late payment surcharge which is due to it under the tariff rules/regulation. It would be a case where the Board suffers prejudice on account of the order of the court and for no fault of it's. It succeeds in the writ petition and yet loses. The consumer files the writ petition, obtains stay of operation of the Notification revising the rates and fails in his attack upon the validity of the Notification and yet he is relieved of the obligation to pay the late payment surcharge for the period of stay, which he is liable to pay according to the statutory terms and conditions indeed form part of the contract of supply entered into by him with the Board. We do not think that any such unfair and inequitable proposition can be sustained in law. No such proposition flows from Adoni Ginning. It is a matter of common knowledge that several petitioners [their counsel] word the stay petition differently. On petitioner may ask for injunction, another may ask for stay of demand notice, the third on may ask for stay of collection of the amount demanded and the fourth one may ask for the stay of the very Notification. Such distinctions are bound to occur where a large number of writ petitions are filed challenging the same Notification. the interim orders made by the Court may also vary in their phraseology in such a situation. Take this very case while the consumers has asked for stay of operation of the Government Order revising the rates, those very consumers asked for an injunction when they came to Supreme Court. Furthermore, as pointed out rightly by the High Court, the order of the stay*

granted by the High Court in writ petitions questioning the validity of the Notification dated April 21, 1990 were not uniform. In the case of writ petition filed by the Eastern U.P. Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Allahabad, the operation of the Notification was stayed while in the case of the writ petition filed by the Employers Association of Northern India, it was directed that "effect shall not be given to the notification dated 21st April, 1990 as against the petitioner shall deposit with the relevant authority within a period of one month from the date of dismissal of the writ petition the difference between the amount of electricity dues to be paid hereinafter by the petitioner under our orders and the sum which may be calculated on the basis of the impugned notification". The words "sum which may be calculated on the basis of the impugned notification" in the later order clearly mean and include the late payment surcharge as well. The acceptance of the Appellants' argument would thus bring about a discrimination between a petitioner and a petitioner just because of the variation of the language employed by the court while granting the interim order though in substance and in all relevant aspects, they are similarly situated. It is equally well settled that an order of stay granted pending disposal of a writ petition/suit or other proceeding, comes to an end with the dismissal of the substantive proceeding and that it is the duty of the court in such a case to put the parties in the same position they would have been but for the interim order of the court. Any other view would result in the act or order of the court prejudicing a party [Board in this case] for no fault of its and would also mean rewarding a writ petitioner in spite of his failure. We do not think that any such unjust consequence can be countenanced by the courts. As a matter of fact, the contention of the consumers herein, extended logically should mean that even the enhanced rates are also not payable for the period covered by the order of stay because the operation of the very Notification revising/enhancing the tariff rates was stayed. Mercifully, no such argument was urged by the Appellants. It is understandable how the enhanced rates can be said to be payable but not the late payment surcharge are provided by the same Notification - the operation of which was stayed.

As has been pointed out by S.C. Agrawal, J., speaking for a three-Judge Bench in Shree Chamundi Mopeds Ltd. vs. Church of South India Trust Association, Madras [1992 (3) S.C.C.1], "while considering the effect of an interim order staying the operation of the order under challenge, a distinction has to be made between quashing of an order and stay of operation of an order. Quashing of an order results in the restoration of the position as it stood on the date of the passing of the order which has been quashed. The stay of operation of an order does not, however, lead to such a result. It only means that the order which has been stayed would not be operative from the date of the passing of the stay order and it does not mean that the said order has been wiped out from existence."

Sri Vaidyanathan relied upon an unreported order dated April 23, 1996 in Special Leave Petition (C) Nos.9087-88 of 1996 [Hindalco Industries v. State of U.P.]. We have seen the order but we do not find anything in the said order supporting the contention of the learned counsel.

Sri Vaidyanathan contended that the rate of 'late payment surcharge' provided by clause 7(b) is really penal in nature inasmuch as it works out to 25.5 percent per annum. Learned

counsel also submitted that the petitioners understood the decision in Adoni Ginning as relieving them of their obligation to pay interest for the period covered by the interim order and that since they were acting bonafide they should not be mulcted with such high rate of interest. We cannot agree that the rate of late payment surcharge provided by clause 7(b) is penal, but having regard to the particular facts and circumstances of this case and having regard to the fact that petitioners could possibly have understood the decision in Adoni Ginning as relieving them of their obligation to pay interest/late payment surcharge for the period of stay, we reduce the rate of late payment surcharge payable under clause 7(b) to eighteen percent. But this direction is confined only to the period covered by the stay orders in writ petitions filed challenging the Notification dated April 21, 1990 and limited to March 1, 1993, the date on which those writ petitions were dismissed.

For the above reasons, the appeals fail and are dismissed subject to the above mentioned direction with respect to the rate of levy of late payment surcharge under clause 7(b) of the Notification dated April 21, 1990.

Writ Petition (C) No.761 of 1993 Writ Petition (C) No.761 of 1993 too is dismissed for the same reasons. No costs."

11.8 It is seen from the above order, the TANGEDCO is eligible to collect BPSC along with arrears during the period of stay. Hence it has been pointed out that a distinction has to be made between quashing an order & stay of operation. Quashing of order results in the restoration of the position as it stood on the date of passing of the order which has been quashed. The Stay of operation of an order only means that the order which has been stayed would not be operative from the date of passing of the stay order and it does not mean that the said order has been wiped out from existence. From the forgoing paras it is understood that the demand of the arrears along with BPSC during the period of stay also can be claimed.

11.9 In view of the above findings, it is concluded that the Appellant should pay the short levy amount along with BPSC amount till the date of payment. Accordingly the respondent is directed to collect the Short levy by issuing proper notice as per supply code regulation.

12.0 Conclusion:

12.1 As per my findings in the paras above, the Appellant's prayer to set aside the Order dated 13-04-2023 passed by the CGRF Thiruvannamalai is rejected and the

licensee is directed to collect the remaining arrears by issuing necessary 15 days notice as per TNE Supply Code.

12.2 A compliance report in this regard shall be sent within 30 days from the receipt of this order.

12.3 With the above findings the A.P.No.35 of 2023 is finally disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman. No costs.

(N.Kannan)
Electricity Ombudsman

“நுகர்வோர் இல்லையேல், நிறுவனம் இல்லை”
“No Consumer, No Utility”

To

1. Thiru P.Ganapathi, Trustee,
M/s. Samvit Sagar Trust,
Swami Shuddananda Ashram,
38, Girivalam Road, Adi Annamalai,
Thiruvannamalai – 606 604.

- By RPAD

2. The Executive Engineer/West/ Thiruvannamalai,
Thiruvannamalai Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
Vellore Road, Vengikal, Thiruvannamalai-606604.

3. The Superintending Engineer,
Thiruvannamalai Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
Vellore Road-Vengikal, Thiruvannamalai-606 604.

- By Email

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

– By Email

5. The Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building,
Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate, Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

– By Email

6. The Assistant Director (Computer)
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building,
Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate, Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

– **For Hosting in the TNERC Website**