



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.tnec.gov.in

Before The Tamil Nadu Electricity Ombudsman, Chennai

Present : Thiru. N.Kannan, Electricity Ombudsman

A.P.No. 01 of 2025

Thiru P. Karthikeyan,
13, Ganga Avenue, Alapakkam,
Chennai – 600 116.

. Appellant
(Thiru P. Karthikeyan)

Vs.

The Executive Engineer/O&M/K.K.Nagar,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I,
TNPDC,
110KV Complex, K.K.Nagar, Chennai-600 078.

. . . . Respondent
(Thiru T.Velmurugan, EE/O&M/K.K. Nagar)

Petition Received on: 03-01-2025

Date of hearing: 06-02-2025

Date of order: 12-02-2025

The Appeal Petition received on 03.01.2025, filed by Thiru P. Karthikeyan, 13, Ganga Avenue, Alapakkam, Chennai – 600 116 was registered as Appeal Petition No. 01 of 2025. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 06.02.2025. 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 recalculate his bills from April 2024 based on the average consumption of the three months preceding April 2024. Additionally, the Appellant seeks a refund of any excess amounts collected, along with appropriate interest. Furthermore, the Appellant requests the waiver of additional charges and compensation for the time and resources spent in pursuing this grievance.

2.0 Brief History of the case:

2.1 The Appellant has prayed to recalculate bills from April 2024 based on average consumption of three months prior to April 2024, to refund the excess amounts collected in his SC No.240-014-1403.

2.2 The Respondent has stated that the old meter was replaced, and therefore, the question of recalculating the bills does not arise. Additionally, since the old meter was not defective, there is no basis for a refund of any excess amount.

2.3 Not satisfied with the Respondent's reply, the Appellant filed a petition with the CGRF of Chennai EDC/South-I on 30.09.2024.

2.4 The CGRF of Chennai EDC/South-I has issued an order dated 06.12.2024. 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 Chennai EDC/South-I issued its order on 06.12.2024. The relevant portion of the order is extracted below: -

“Order:

Based on the petitioner's representation about excess billing in S/c No. 240-014-1403 from April 2024 due to defective meter, the meter was sent to MRT. But the meter data could not be downloaded as the updated software was not available in MRT. The MRT has informed to replace the meter and billing may be done based on

the final readings available and the load usage conditions at site as per the rules and regulations of TNERC.

The Assistant Engineer/O&M/Valasaravakkam has provided the old meter (i.e.) meter no.TN33520 parallel with the new meter and found the old meter is working normal. Hence the forum concludes that the old meter replaced was working normal and hence the assessment from 04/2024 need not be revised based on the average calculation. From the consumer ledger it is found that the petitioner has paid the assessment during 10/2024 of Rs.8626/- on 14.11.2024.

The grievance of the petitioner has been addressed.

Hence, the petition is treated as closed.”

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 in person on 06.02.2025.

4.2 The Appellant Thiru P. Karthikeyan attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

4.3 The Respondent Thiru T.Velmurugan, EE/O&M/K.K. Nagar of Chennai EDC/South-I attended the hearing and put forth her 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 initially, TANGEDCO admitted they couldn't verify the meter's accuracy as the manufacturer (Landis & Gyr) was no longer associated with them. They promised to calculate bills based on previous averages but never fulfilled this commitment. Later, they insisted on full payment of disputed bills before meter replacement. Finally, they conducted a parallel meter test after collecting the disputed amount, conveniently declaring the old meter "normal".

5.2 The Appellant has stated that the order completely ignores the fact that TANGEDCO initially acknowledged their inability to verify the meter's accuracy due

to software limitations. TANGEDCO's failure to take timely action resulted in additional charges of Rs. 1,021/- being levied on him. The sudden spike in billing (from Rs. 2,000/- to Rs. 14,000/-) was not adequately investigated. He stated that his consumption pattern and household equipment (one AC and one fridge, no geyser) were mentioned but not considered in the final assessment.

5.3 The Appellant has stated that the parallel meter testing was conducted only after he was forced to pay the disputed amount. Critically, the copy of MRT CEDC/South-I report (Lr. No. AEX/MRT/M/AE/MRT/LAB/CEDC/S1/F. Doc/ D. No: 928/24 dated 18.10.2024) was not provided to me, despite this being a crucial document that forms the basis of their decisions. TANGEDCO has completely deviated from the original issue of excess/overrun billing to merely stating the meter is working, without providing any substantial test report.

5.4 The Appellant has stated that the parallel meter test was conducted by TANGEDCO themselves without any independent witnesses to verify:

- a) The proper connectivity of both meters
- b) The actual meter readings at the time of installation
- c) The accuracy of the reported readings

5.5 The Appellant has stated that a simple letter stating some values as meter readings, without proper verification or documentation, cannot be accepted as valid evidence. - This testing cannot retroactively validate readings from April to October 2024. The test was conducted in November when usage patterns are significantly different from peak summer months when the disputed bills occurred.

5.6 The Appellant has stated that TANGEDCO failed to replace the meter promptly when they knew they couldn't verify its accuracy. They made me pay disputed bills under duress, promising future adjustments. The CGRF order ignores TANGEDCO's written admission (dated 18.10.2024) that they couldn't verify the meter's accuracy. The order fails to address why I should bear the financial burden of TANGEDCO's technical limitations.

5.7 The Appellant has stated that he was forced to pay disputed bills without proper verification. Additional charges were levied due to TANGEDCO's delays. Written commitments for bill revision were denied. The entire process has caused significant financial burden and mental stress.

5.8 The Appellant has requested to direct TANGEDCO to recalculate bills from April 2024 based on average consumption of three months prior to April 2024, to refund the excess amounts collected with appropriate interest, to waive the additional charges of Rs. 1,021/- levied due to TANGEDCO's delays and seeks compensate for the time and resources spent in pursuing this grievance.

5.9 The Appellant has stated that the CGRF order effectively rewards TANGEDCO's evasive behavior and sets a dangerous precedent, allowing utilities to evade responsibility by creating technical barriers to verification and forcing consumers to pay disputed amounts. This approach undermines consumer rights and the principles of fair business practices.

5.10 The Appellant has stated that the CGRF order was not received via email, as stated in the order. He became aware of the order only through incidental checking of the status on the CGRF website. He requested to ensure justice and prevent such practices that unfairly burden consumers.

6.0 Arguments of the Respondent:

6.1 The Respondent has submitted that based on the complaint received from the petitioner Thiru.P.Karthikeyan regarding billing issue for the assessment month 06/2024 and 08/2024 in the service connection no. 240-014-1403, the meter was sent to Meter Testing Wing on 25.06.2024 for downloading the data. The concerned Assistant Executive Engineer/MRT Metering/CEDC/South-1 had reported on 18.10.24, that the meter data could not be downloaded due to non availability of updated software for meter make: Landis & Gyr and the company could not be contacted for data downloading support since the company is not supplying meter to TNPDC (Erstwhile TANGEDCO) for a long time and there is no support personnel from the company. The Assistant Executive Engineer/MRT had also informed to

replace the meter and the billing may be done based on the final reading available in the meter and the load usage conditions at site as per rules and regulations of TNERC.

6.2 The Respondent has submitted that already current consumption charges for the billing month of 06/2024, 08/2024 and 10/2024 had been assessed as per the reading recorded in the meter. In the MRT report also, it had been recommended to raise the bill based on the final reading. Hence calculation of bills based on previous month average or connected load does not arise for the above assessment period. As per the direction of CGRF during the hearing held on 24.10.2024, a meter was connected in series with the old meter (Make:Landis & Gyr) on 16.11.2024 and the reading/consumption in the both meters are given as below.

Service connection no. 240-014-1403

Date	Reading in new meter(Make.Visiontek, SI.No.01617519)	Units Recorded in new meter	Reading in old meter (Landys & gyr make, SI.No.no.TN33520)	Units recorded in old meter
16.11.2024 11.30 AM	308		23841	
18.11.2024 11.30 AM	326	18	23859	18
19.11.2024 12.00 PM	337	11	23870	11
20.11.2024 01.30 PM	346	9	23879	9
21.11.2024 01.30 PM	358	12	23891	12
22.11.2024 12.30 PM	365	7	23898	7
23.11.2024 01.30 PM	376	11	23909	11

From the above statement, it is found that the consumption recorded in both the meters are one and the same and it is concluded that the old meter was in good working condition.

6.3 The Respondent has submitted that since the meter data could not be downloaded, a new meter was fixed and connected in series with old meter to find out the accuracy in recording the consumption of old meter comparing with new meter. The new meter was fixed with the knowledge of consumer of the service connection no. 240-014-1403 and the report of parallel testing of meter has been sent to the petitioner on 27.11.2024 by Assistant Engineer/O&M/Valasaravakkam.

6.4 The Respondent has submitted that the meter was replaced with new one on 15.10.2024 as suggested by AEE/ MRT Metering, only because the meter data could not be downloaded.

6.5 The Respondent has submitted that the old meter replaced was in good working condition. Hence recalculation of bills from 04/2024 doesn't arise. As the old meter was not defective and replaced in good working condition, refund of excess amount collected will not arise. Since the 06/2024 & 08/2024 CC bill was paid by the consumer belatedly on 10.10.2024, BPSC and RC Charges with GST Rs.1021/- had been collected. As per the MRT report and the consumption recorded in the check meter connected, it is concluded that the meter was in good working condition only. So claiming of compensation by the Appellant will not arise.

6.6 The Respondent has submitted that the CGRF order was posted in the CGRF online portal on 13.12.2024. Based on this order, the consumer had filed an appeal petition in TNEO though the order was not sent by email as mentioned in the CGRF order. However the CGRF order was sent through email to the Appellant on 22.01.2025.

7.0 Written arguments submitted by the Appellant:

7.1 The Appellant has stated that the present appeal is filed against the order of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) bearing reference CGRF/CEDC/S-I/No.327/24, dated 06.12.2024. From the invoices of energy consumption, the recorded consumption details are as follows:

Month	units	Amount
December 2023	499	1719.00
February 2024	559	2422.00
April 2024	526	2158.00
June 2024	1709	14349.00
August 2024	1015	6997.00

October 2024	1152	8626.00
December 2024	558	2527.00

7.2 The Appellant has stated that the CGRF failed to examine the sudden and abnormal increase in energy consumption recorded between June 2024 and October 2024. The CGRF did not address the issue arising from the unavailability of Meter Reading Instrument (MRI) downloaded data, which is essential for verifying the accuracy of the meter readings. The CGRF's order has relied on paragraph 3.1 of the order issued by the Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission (TNERC) Ombudsman in A.P. No. 45 of 2024, which states: *"CMRI downloaded report is considered as Scientific Evidence."*

7.3 Furthermore, in the same order of the TNERC Ombudsman (A.P. No. 45 of 2024), at paragraph 9.2, it was observed that

"The Respondent also mentions their efforts to retrieve the defective meter data from the Meter Relay Testing Lab but states that this was unsuccessful due to a display failure. Despite this, I am of the view that the Meter Relay Testing (MRT) report is valid evidence according to the Section 35 of the Evidence Act 1872 which is discussed below: 35. Relevancy of entry in public record or an electronic record made in performance of duty. An entry in any public or other official book, register or record or an electronic record stating a fact in issue or relevant fact and made by a public servant in the discharge of his official duty or by any other person in performance of a duty specially enjoined by law of the country in which such book, register or record or an electronic record is kept is a relevant fact."

7.4 The Appellant has further stated that in the same order of the TNERC Ombudsman (A.P. No. 45 of 2024), at paragraph 10.4, was found that

"In this context, I would like to refer Regulation 11 of TNERC Supply Code Regulation which was in force during the defective period clearly states that, in the event of a defective meter, any one of the following methods may be taken into account when determining the average consumption. The relevant section is referred to below.

"11. Assessment of billing in cases where there is no meter or meter is defective:

(1) Where supply to the consumer is given without a meter or where the meter fixed is found defective or to have ceased to function and no theft of energy or violation is suspected, the quantity of electricity supplied during the period when the meter was not installed or the meter installed was defective, shall be assessed as mentioned hereunder,

(2) The quantity of electricity, supplied during the period in question shall be determined by taking the average of the electricity supplied during the preceding four months in respect of both High Tension service connections and Low Tension service connections provided that the conditions in regard to use of electricity during the said four months were not different from those which prevailed during the period in question"

7.5 The Appellant has stated that in the present case, it is observed that the Respondent has adopted the provision of TNE Supply Code Regulation 11(2) for computing the energy charges for the defective period based on the consumption pattern as per consumer ledger.

7.6 Furthermore, in the same order of the TNERC Ombudsman in A.P. No. 45 of 2024, at paragraph 11.3, it was found that

“In this context, to find whether there is any provision made in the TNERC regulation if at all there was any error in billing, Regulation 12 of TNE Supply Code which is relevant in this case is discussed below..

"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 by such consumer shall be computed from the date on which the excess amount was paid. Such excess amount with interest may be paid by cheque in the month subsequent to the detection of excess recovery or may be adjusted in the future current consumption bills upto two assessments at the option of the consumer. The sum which remains to be recovered after two assessments may be paid by cheque. Interest shall be upto the date of last payment

(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, with hood any portion of the charges."

7.7 The Appellant has stated that in the order of the TNERC Ombudsman in A.P. No. 57 of 2024, at paragraph 11.3, it was found that

"Hence, the Respondent is obligated to process the refund / demand in accordance with Regulation 12 of the TNE Supply Code, after arriving at the average calculation for the defective period as per Regulation 11(5), when conditions of working were similar to those in the period covered by the billing, if any excess amount has been charged, the same should be refunded as per the relevant provisions."

7.8 The Appellant has stated that the CGRF instructed the creation of new substantial evidence after the application was filed and a new meter was installed, and that too during the CGRF meeting, thereby breaching the principles of natural justice.

"9. Additionally, In the order of the TNERC Ombudsman in A.P. No. 45 of 2024, the Ombudsman, in paragraph 9.3, declared that "The MRT wing of the Licensee is authorized to determine the status of the meter after conducting a scientific test."

7.9 The Appellant has stated that the MRT downloaded data is the only admissible scientific evidence for verifying meter readings and consumption discrepancies. As per Section 35 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, MRT downloaded data constitutes a valid and reliable record for adjudication. The MRT Wing of TNPDL/TNEB is the sole competent authority authorized to assess and determine the status and accuracy of the meter. In cases where MRT data cannot be retrieved or is unavailable, TNERC Regulation 11(2) prescribes the methodology for computing energy consumption. TNERC Regulation 12 mandates the refund of any excess payments collected from the consumer.

7.10 The Appellant has stated that the impugned CGRF order is legally untenable as it contravenes TNERC regulations, established precedents set by the TNERC Ombudsman, and fundamental principles of natural justice.

7.11 The Appellant has prayed to direct TANGEDCO to revise the electricity bills from April 2024 onwards based on the average consumption of the three months/two billing cycles preceding April 2024, in accordance with TNERC regulations, to refund of Excess Payment: Order the refund of excess amounts collected, along with interest at the applicable rate, as per regulatory provisions, to direct to waive of Rs.1,021/- levied on account of delays attributable to TANGEDCO, which are beyond the consumer's control and to grant reasonable

compensation for the financial loss, time, and resources expended in pursuing this grievance, as per the principles of equity and natural justice.

8.0 Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:

8.1 I have heard the arguments of both the Appellant and the Respondent. Based on the arguments and the documents submitted by them the following are the issues to be decided.

1. What is the status of the meter during the disputed claim period of the Appellant i.e., since 06/2024?
2. What are the regulations regarding the meter condition for billing during the Appellant's disputed claim period?

9.0 Findings on the first issue:

9.1 The Appellant has stated that initially, TANGEDCO admitted they couldn't verify the meter's accuracy as the manufacturer (Landis & Gyr) was no longer associated with them. They promised to calculate bills based on previous averages but never fulfilled this commitment. Later, they insisted on full payment of disputed bills before meter replacement. Finally, they conducted a parallel meter test after collecting the disputed amount, conveniently declaring the old meter "normal".

9.2 The Appellant has stated that the parallel meter testing was conducted only after he was forced to pay the disputed amount. Critically, the copy of MRT CEDC/South-I report (Lr. No. AEX/MRT/M/AE/MRT/LAB/CEDC/S1/F. Doc/ D. No: 928/24 dated 18.10.2024) was not provided to him, despite this being a crucial document that forms the basis of their decisions. TANGEDCO has completely deviated from the original issue of excess/overrun billing to merely stating the meter is working, without providing any substantial test report.

9.3 The Respondent has submitted that based on the complaint received from the petitioner Thiru.P.Karthikeyan regarding billing issue for the assessment month 06/2024 and 08/2024 in the service connection no. 240-014-1403, the meter was

sent to Meter Testing Wing on 25.06.2024 for downloading the data. The concerned Assistant Executive Engineer/MRT Metering/CEDC/South-1 had reported on 18.10.2024, that the meter data could not be downloaded due to non availability of updated software for meter make: Landis & Gyr and the company could not be contacted for data downloading support since the company is not supplying meter to TNPDC (Erstwhile TANGEDCO) for a long time and there is no support personnel from the company. The Assistant Executive Engineer/MRT had also informed to replace the meter and the billing may be done based on the final reading available in the meter and the load usage conditions at site as per rules and regulations of TNERC.

9.4 The Respondent has further stated that as per the direction of CGRF during the hearing held on 24.10.2024, a meter was connected in series with the old meter (Make:Landis & Gyr) on 16.11.2024 and submitted the reading/consumption in the both meters are given as below.

Service connection no. 240-014-1403

Date	Reading in new meter (Make.Visiontek, SI.No.01617519)	Units Recorded in new meter	Reading in old meter (Landys & gyr make, SI.No.no.TN33520)	Units recorded in old meter
16.11.2024 11.30 AM	308		23841	
18.11.2024 11.30 AM	326	18	23859	18
19.11.2024 12.00 PM	337	11	23870	11
20.11.2024 01.30 PM	346	9	23879	9
21.11.2024 01.30 PM	358	12	23891	12
22.11.2024 12.30 PM	365	7	23898	7
23.11.2024 01.30 PM	376	11	23909	11

From the above statement, the Respondent argued that the consumption recorded in both the meters are one and the same and concluded that the old meter was in good working condition.

9.5 Further I would like to refer regulation 26(1) of TNERC supply code which is reproduced below;

“(1) As this Code is intended to deal with the working relations between the Licensee and the consumer, this Code shall be read along with the Distribution Code, the State Grid Code

and other relevant provisions of the Act, rules and regulations made there under pertaining to supply and consumption of electricity.”

9.6 Based on the above, I would like to refer relevant para 19 in CEA (Installation and Operation of Meters) Regulations, 2006 of Central Electricity Authority which has a power conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 55 and clause (e) of section 73 read with sub-section (2) of section 177 of Electricity Act, 2003, the Central Electricity Authority hereby makes the following regulations for regulating the installation and operation of meters.

“19. Additional meters.

In addition to any meter which may be placed for recording the electricity consumed by the consumer, the licensee may connect additional meters, maximum demand indicator or other apparatus as he may think fit for the purposes of ascertaining or regulating either the quantity of electricity supplied to the consumer, or the number of hours during which the supply is given, or the rate per unit of time at which energy is supplied to the consumer, or any other quantity or time connected with supply to consumer.”

9.7 The Appellant argued that their meter was defective. However, the Licensee maintained that the meter during the disputed period was functioning correctly. Also, they argued that they were unable to download the CMRI data from the meter due to software incompatibility with the manufacturer. To assess whether the meter was functioning properly, the Licensee arranged a parallel test with the consumer's knowledge. This action aligns with Regulation 19 of the CEA (Installation and Operation of Meters) Regulations, 2006, which pertains to determining the quantity of electricity supplied to the consumer. According to the comparison table, both meters recorded the same consumption readings during the period from 16.11.2024 to 23.11.2024. Therefore, it is concluded that the Appellant's claim of having a defective meter during the disputed period is unfounded.

10.0 Findings on the second issue:

10.1 The Appellant has prayed for a direction to TANGEDCO to revise the electricity bills from April 2024 onwards based on the average consumption of the three months or two billing cycles preceding April 2024, in accordance with TNERC

regulations. The Appellant has also requested an order for the refund of excess amounts collected, along with interest at the applicable rate as per regulatory provisions. Additionally, the Appellant seeks the waiver of Rs.1,021/- levied due to delays attributable to TANGEDCO, which were beyond the consumer's control, and reasonable compensation for the financial loss, time, and resources expended in pursuing this grievance, as per the principles of equity and natural justice.

10.2 The Respondent has submitted that the old meter, which was replaced, was in good working condition. Therefore, the recalculation of bills from April 2024 does not arise. Since the meter was not defective and was replaced while functioning correctly, the refund of any excess amount collected is also not applicable. The Respondent further stated that the consumer belatedly paid the June 2024 and August 2024 current consumption (CC) bills on 10.10.2024. As a result, BPSC and RC charges, along with GST amounting to Rs.1,021/-, were collected. Based on the MRT report and the consumption recorded in the check meter connected during the disputed period, it was concluded that the old meter was functioning properly. Therefore, the Respondent argued that the Appellant's claim for compensation is not valid.

10.3 In this context, the Appellant argued that the bill should be revised based on the average consumption of the three months or two billing cycles preceding April 2024, in accordance with TNERC regulations. However, from the findings of the first issue, it has already been established that the Appellant's meter was in proper working condition. Therefore, computing the average as per TNERC Supply Code 11 does not apply to the present case. Further, during the dispute of the defective period to assess the quantum of energy consumed, the data of the downloaded detail if available can play a role to decide.

10.4 Various orders cited by the Appellant on the written statement refers only to the cases pertaining to the defective meter, which were not fit to correlate in this context. However, during the hearing, the Appellant was asked whether he had challenged the meter under dispute. It was reported that the Appellant had not contested the functionality of the disputed meter.

10.5 In this case, the meter was found to be functioning correctly, as established from the findings of the first issue. Therefore, there is no need to revise the bill based on the average consumption in accordance with Regulation 11 of the TNERC Supply Code. As a result, the Appellant is obligated to make payments to the Licensee as per Regulation 4(1) of the TNERC Supply Code, which is reproduced below:

“(1) Tariff related charges, namely,-

(i) The price of electricity supplied by him to the consumer which shall be in accordance with the tariff rates as the Commission may fix from time to time, for HT supply, LT supply, temporary supply and for different categories of consumer....”

Since the Respondent's action is found to be in order, the Appellant's claim for a refund of the excess amount is rejected. The Appellant is also not entitled to claim compensation.

11.0 Conclusion:

11.1 Based on the findings above, I concur with the orders of the CGRF, and the Appellant's claim is rejected.

11.2 With the above findings the A.P. No. 01 of 2025 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. Karthikeyan,
13, Ganga Avenue, Alapakkam,
Chennai – 600 116.

- By RPAD

2. The Executive Engineer/O&M/K.K.Nagar,
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I,
TNPDC,
110KV Complex, K.K.Nagar, Chennai-600 078.

3. The Superintending Engineer, - By email
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I,
TNPDCI,
110KV SS Complex, K.K.Nagar, Chennai-600 078.
4. The Chairman & Managing Director, - By Email
TNPDCI,
NPKRR Maaligai, 144, Anna Salai, Chennai -600 002.
5. The Secretary, - By Email
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building,
Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate, Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.
6. The Assistant Director (Computer) – **For Hosting in the TNERC Website**
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building,
Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate, Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.