



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. 78 of 2024

Thiru R.Srinivasan,
S/o. Late Thiru M.Raman,
No.7/4, T.N.Nagar, 1st Street, Palanipet,
Arakonnam – 631 002, Ranipet District.

. Appellant
(Thiru R.Srinivasan)

Vs.

The Executive Engineer/O&M/Arcot,
Vellore Electricity Distribution Circle,
TNPDC,
No 18 , New Vellore Main Road, Arcot - 632503.

. Respondent
(Thiru S.Vijayakumar, EE/O&M/Arcot)

Petition Received on: 20-11-2024

Date of hearing: 08-01-2025

Date of order: 20-01-2025

The Appeal Petition received on 20.11.2024, filed by Thiru R.Srinivasan, S/o. Late Thiru M.Raman, No.7/4, T.N.Nagar, 1st Street, Palanipet, Arakonnam – 631 002, Ranipet District was registered as Appeal Petition No. 78 of 2024. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 08.01.2025. 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 restore the agriculture service connection in the name of his father Late Thiru Raman.

2.0 Brief History of the case:

2.1 The Appellant has prayed to restore the agriculture service connection in the name of his father Late Thiru Raman.

2.2 The Respondent has stated that the name transfer to Munirathinam was effected during 1997 based on the documents submitted and he is utilizing the agricultural service till now.

2.3 As the grievance of the Appellant was not settled by the Respondent, the Appellant approached the CGRF. The CGRF of Vellore Electricity Distribution Circle issued an order dated 19.10.2024. Aggrieved over the order, the Appellant preferred this appeal petition before the Electricity Ombudsman.

3.0 Orders of the CGRF :

3.1 The CGRF of Vellore Electricity Distribution Circle issued its order on 19.10.2024. The relevant portion of the order is extracted below: -

“Findings and Orders of the Forum :

The documents submitted by both parties has been perused by this forum. The registered documents dated 18.05.1990 executed by Venkatesan in favour of Raman connected to Survey No.244/3A shows that the Sc. No.75 was executed by the Venkatesan in favour of Raman at the same time the registered documents executed by Venkatesan in favour of Munirathinam in the year 1995 (30.10.1995) shows the Sc. No.75 was executed by the Venkatesan in favour of Munirathinam, based upon the documents Munirathinam applied for name transfer and got SC.No.266-010-19 (old. No.75) in his name in the year 1997 and enjoying the same since 1997 to till date.

It clearly shows the execution of Sc. No.75 by the Venkatesan in favour of Raman as well as Munirathinam is legally untenable. Even though, there is no objections raised by the said Raman till the petitioner approaching this forum. Further the said Raman did not make

any application for name transfer to his name since from the date of purchase of land from Venkatesan (i.e from 1990) connected to the Sc. No.266-010-19 (old. No.75) further there is an inordinate delay in approaching this forum in this issue.

Therefore, this forum is not inclined to interfere in this issue to cancel the Sc. No. 266-010-19 (old No.75) stands in the name of Munirathinam and further this forum directs the petitioner to seek remedy regarding this issue before the appropriate court of law. Hence, the petition has been disposed thereof.”

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 08.01.2025 through video conferencing.

4.2 The Appellant Thiru R.Srinivasan attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

4.3 The Respondent Thiru S.Vijayakumar, EE/O&M/Arcot of Vellore Electricity Distribution Circle 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 when the property was registered in the name of Late. Thiru.M.Raman vide document No.558/1990 along with agricultural service connection old No.75, New No.266-010-017 and 1/8 th share in the well in the 1st occasion by Venkatesan and again only the agricultural service connections No.75 registered by Venkatesan in favour of Munirathinam in the year 1995 (30.10.1995) based upon the documents produced by Munirathinam applied for name transfer. The meter box is still there in the old location of TNEB Poll near by the pump shed. Moreover, the EE/O&M/Arcot in a reply dated 17.12.2022 to his letter dated 17.11.2022 a reply sent to him stating that false documents produced and name transfer effected. The agricultural service connection shifted to different survey

number far away from the Survey No.224/3A/2. But as per "Tamil Nadu Regulatory Commission's supply code (6) Service/Line, structure and equipments shifting para (3)" Shifting of an existing service connection involving change in door number or sub door number or survey number shall be considered as a new service connection only.

5.2 The Appellant has further stated that notice from his father Raman has already been given a letter dated 19.03.2004 in person at SE/Vellore EDC,, AEE/O&M/Mambakkam and then AE/O&M/Pennagar. But no action/correspondence made.

5.3 The Appellant has stated that in view of the above circumstances, he disagree with the findings and orders of CGRF informing reasons as furnished below:-

- The registered documents executed by Thiru. Venkatesan 2nd time in favour of Munirathinam on 30.10.1995 shows the S.C.No.75 was executed by Venkatesan in favour of Thiru. Munirathinam based upon the documents, Munirathinam applied for name transfer and got SC.No.226- 010-19 (Old No.75) in his name in the year 1997 and enjoying the same since 1997 to till date.
- It clearly shows the execution of S.C.No.75 by Venkatesan infavour of Raman as well as Munirathinam is legally untenable. There is an inordinate delay in approaching this forum in this issue.
- The Forum directs the petitioner to seek remedy regarding this issue before the appropriate court of law.

5.4 The Appellant has stated that the CGRF not mentioned anything for shifting of agriculture service connection. The mistake of name transfer and shifting of service made on the part of Tamilnadu Power Distribution Corporation Limited and hence the remedy regarding this issue before the court of law may be cleared by

Tamilnadu Power Distribution Corporation Limited only. Further, no information revealed about the claim of compensation.

6.0 Arguments of the Respondent:

6.1 The Respondent has submitted that the agricultural service connection no. 266-010-19(old no. 75) mentioned by Thiru R. Srinivasan S/o. late Raman is in the name of Thiru. K. Munirathinam S/o Kailasa Gounder, Aiyiramangalam village of Oddanthangal Distribution in Pennagar section(TANGEDCO WEBSITE). As the petition of the petitioner regarding shifting and Name transfer of the above-mentioned service, the records has been verified and found that the name transfer was done in 26.02.1997 from Thiru. M. Venkatesan S/o. Muruga Gounder to Thiru K.Muniratinam S/o. Kailasa Gounder. The above details were ascertained from details mentioned in the green card (Name Transfer order done vide Order No. AAO/ART/RD/AS-4/SC. No. 75/19/NT/97 Dt.26.02.1997.)

6.2 The Respondent has submitted that on Field inspection of the above service, it is found that the service was initially effected in Aiyiramangalam Village of oddanthangal distribution, oddathangal SS-II. In the service pole, two service Main Boxes were found bearing service No. 28 & 75. But the service main box bearing Sc. No. 75 (at present 266-010-19) was found without any service wire from pole & no motor is connected in the well. But the other service main box is intact with service wire from pole & motor is connected in the open well. The above service no. 28 is in the name of Thiru Palani Gounder & the open well is situated on the SF No. 224/3A. The above details were gathered from field enquiry & FMB sketch. As per the petition of the petitioner, the service is not in that place, but it is physically found in SFNo.193/2C of Aiyiramangalam Village & in the name of Thiru. K. Muniratinam S/O Kailasa Gounder, as per the system record. The above Details also gathered from the field enquiry.

6.3 The Respondent has further submitted that on persual of documents submitted by the petitioner, the above agricultural service with SC. no 75 (present SC. No. 266-010-19)along with well mound in Aiyiramangalam in the SF. No.

224/3A was found to be purchased by Thiru. M. Raman S/o Muruga Gounder Perumanthangal from Thiru Venkatesan S/o Muruga Gounder Perumanthangal on 02.05.1990. Once again, the above agricultural service along with SC. No. 266-010-19(old no. 75) was purchased in the name of Thiru K. Muniratinam S/o. Kailasa Gounder Aiyiramanagalam from Thiru Venkatesan S/o Muruga Gounder Perumanthangal & Thirumathy Malliga W/o. Venkatesan vide DOC. No. 718/30.10.1995. The purchase deed states service connection number as old sc.no. 75 & new sc. No. 19.

6.4 The Respondent has submitted that the purchase deed further states that the agricultural service was purchased along with punsei land of 3.54 acres which is situated in the same Aiyiramangalam village in SF no. 193/2c, vide DOC. No. 722/ Dt.30.10.1995. Hence, it is come to known that the same above-mentioned agricultural service was indulged in purchase deed for two different people at two different dates.

6.5 Thus, it is come to known that, as per the latest purchase deed of the above agricultural service, the name transfer was done from Thiru. Venkatesan S/o Muruga Gounder, Perumanthangal, to Thiru K. Muniratinam S/o. Kailasa Gounder, Aiyiramanagalam vide name transfer sanction no. AAO/ART/RB/AS4/SC. No. 75/19/NT/97 Dt.26.02.1997. Also, it is found, that the above-mentioned agricultural service connection in SF no. 193/2c of Aiyiramangalam village was LIVE. As per field investigation & enquiry it is found that the above-mentioned agricultural service connection was also has been shifted from one SF no. to another SF. No. Also, there were no supporting documents for shifting was found on searching the official Registers, regarding the shifting of the above mentioned agricultural service connection. The same has been conveyed to the petitioner & submitted to the higher officials through Letter.

6.6 The Respondent has submitted that the above-mentioned appeal petitioner, Thiru. R. Srinivasan S/O Late Raman attended the Arcot division level Grievance meeting on 07.09.2023, with a prayer petition, for cancelling the already wrongly done name transfer, to The Superintending Engineer of Vellore EDC. As per

instructions of The Superintending Engineer of Vellore EDC, regarding the prayer petition of the petitioner, for cancelling the already wrongly done name transfer, a legal advice (appropriate guidance) has been sought from The Legal Advisory Cell, Chennai vide Letter (Lr.No.444 Dt. 04.10.2023). On reply, to the guidance seeking letter to The Legal Advisory Cell, the guidance letter was received on 16.10.2023, stating that, There is no possibilities of re name transfer as of now, since the name transfer was done before, nearly 25 years has been passed ago.

6.7 The Respondent has submitted that in this regard, does the petitioner need a solution for this situation, he is advised for appropriate legal action to be carried out. Subsequently, the relevant details have been communicated to the above-mentioned petitioner vide letter (D. no. 5779/06.11.2023). Further petition was submitted to the Honorable Chairman CGRF and The Superintending Engineer Vellore EDC and on that behalf, the investigation was held on 19.10.2024. It is humbly submitted, that The Honorable Chairman CGRF and the Superintending Engineer Vellore EDC ordered that the Thiru.Muniratinam purchased Sc. No. 266-010-19 (old no. 75) from Thiru Venkatesan on 30.10.1995 & name transferred to his name on 1997 and he is utilizing the agricultural service still now, whereas Thiru Raman purchased the agriculture service from Thiru Venkatesan on 1990 & has not applied for Name transfer still now and has lately approached The CGRF, and hence there is no possibility of cancelling the Name transfer Order in the name of Muniratinam, further the petitioner if needs a solution in this regard he is ordered, to approach The COURT.

7.0 Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman

7.1 I have heard the arguments of both the Appellant and the Respondent. Based on the arguments and the documents submitted by them, the following conclusion is arrived.

7.2 The appellant contends that the agricultural service connection (S.C. No. 75) originally registered in the name of Late Thiru M. Raman was transferred and subsequently shifted improperly. He claims that when the property was registered in

1990, it included the agricultural service connection and a share in a well. However, the service connection was later transferred in 1995 based on documents provided by Thiru Munirathinam, despite irregularities. The appellant highlights that the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board (TNEB) still maintains the meter box in its original location, and the Executive Engineer, in a reply dated 17.12.2022, confirmed that false documents had been submitted for the name transfer. Additionally, the service connection was shifted to a different survey number, violating the Tamil Nadu Regulatory Commission's supply code.

7.3 The appellant also points out that his father, Raman, had raised concerns regarding this issue as early as 2004 by submitting letters to various officials, including the SE/Vellore EDC, AEE/O&M/Mambakkam, and AE/O&M/Pennagar. Despite these submissions, no action or response was received, indicating a lack of due diligence by the authorities. He disagrees with the findings of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF), which suggested that the issue should be addressed in a court of law. The appellant emphasizes that the transfer of the service connection by Thiru Venkatesan to both Raman and Munirathinam is legally untenable and points to the delay in resolving the matter as an additional concern.

7.4 Furthermore, the appellant criticizes the CGRF for failing to address the improper shifting of the agricultural service connection. He asserts that the Tamil Nadu Power Distribution Corporation Limited is responsible for the mistake in the name transfer and the unauthorized shifting of the service connection. He also notes that no information was provided regarding his claim for compensation, and he believes the corporation must resolve the matter without burdening him with legal proceedings.

7.5 The respondent argues that the agricultural service connection (S.C. No. 75, now 266-010-19) is currently registered in the name of Thiru K. Munirathinam, based on a valid name transfer conducted on 26.02.1997. This transfer was supported by official records, including a green card and a name transfer order. During a field inspection, it was found that while the service main box for S.C. No. 75 is present at the location, it is not connected to any motor or service wire,

indicating no active use at the site. The investigation further revealed that another service connection, No. 28, is functional at the open well on Survey No. 224/3A, under a different individual, Thiru Palani Gounder.

7.6 The respondent highlights that the agricultural service in question was subject to two separate purchase deeds. The first, in 1990, recorded its purchase by Late Thiru M. Raman, the appellant's father, from Thiru Venkatesan. The second, in 1995, documented its sale to Thiru K. Munirathinam. Both deeds mention the same service connection number, creating a legal ambiguity. The respondent confirms that the name transfer to Munirathinam was conducted based on the deed submitted by Thiru Munirathinam and that the service remains operational at Survey No. 193/2C as per field inspections and system records.

7.7 Furthermore, the respondent informed that the service connection was shifted from one survey number to another but states that no supporting documents for this shift could be located in official records. This was communicated to the appellant, and the matter was escalated to higher authorities. The appellant's grievance regarding the alleged wrongful name transfer and shifting of the service was also addressed during a grievance meeting in September 2023. Legal advice was sought, and it was determined that a re-transfer of the service connection is not feasible after 25 years.

7.8 The respondent asserts that the appellant's father, Raman, failed to apply for a name transfer when he allegedly purchased the service in 1990. The delay of more than two decades in raising the issue further weakens the appellant's case. The respondent argues that the CGRF and the Superintending Engineer have concluded that the name transfer to Thiru Munirathinam was conducted correctly and upheld the current status. They recommend that the appellant pursue legal action if he seeks further resolution, as administrative remedies have been exhausted.

7.9 In this case, the appellant has requested the cancellation of the name transfer made in favor of Thiru Munirathinam and its restoration to his father

Raman's name, along with relocating the service connection to its original location. However, it is noted that the appellant's father, despite purchasing the land along with the EB connection, motor, and well in his name, failed to initiate the name transfer process. After a prolonged delay of 25 years, the appellant is now seeking to cancel the name transfer, which is not acceptable.

7.10 The purpose of the name transfer procedure in TANGEDCO is to facilitate the transfer of service connections due to the sale or purchase of property, or upon the demise of an individual, transferring the service to their legal heirs based on valid documentation. The disputed agricultural service connection, identified as New No. 19 (Old No. 75), was originally owned by Thiru Venkatesan, S/o. Muruga Gounder. Thiru Venkatesan subsequently sold the property, including the well and the service connection, through two separate sale deeds: one to the appellant's father, Late Thiru Raman, in 1990, and the other to Thiru K. Munirathinam in 1995.

7.11 Following this, in 1997, Thiru K. Munirathinam successfully applied for a name transfer and relocation of the service connection. Since then, for over 27 years, the service connection has remained in the name of Thiru Munirathinam without any pending disputes or legal cases until it was brought before the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF). The appellant now seeks to restore the service connection (New No. 19, Old No. 75) to his late father, Thiru Raman. However, upon scrutiny of the relevant documents, it has been observed that the service connection in question was never in the name of Late Thiru Raman.

7.12 The appellant has not been able to substantiate his claim that the service connection was originally in his father's name and was subsequently transferred to Thiru Munirathinam in 1997. In light of these facts, the appellant's request lacks merit and cannot be entertained. TANGEDCO's role is limited to processing name transfer requests based on the submission of proper documentation. In this case, the name transfer to Thiru Munirathinam was carried out based on the submission of the required documents at that time.

7.13 It is concluded that the name transfer performed by TANGEDCO in favor of Thiru Munirathinam was conducted in accordance with established procedures and is deemed valid. The appellant's claim to transfer the service connection from Thiru Munirathinam to his late father, Thiru Raman, is therefore rejected.

8.0 Conclusion:

8.1 As outlined in the findings above, the name transfer to Thiru Munirathinam was carried out by TANGEDCO based on valid documentation and is deemed procedurally correct. Since there is no evidence to indicate that the service connection was ever registered in the name of the appellant's father, Late Thiru Raman, the request to restore the service connection in his father's name is hereby rejected.

8.2 With the above findings A.P.No.78 of 2024 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 R.Srinivasan,
S/o. Late Thiru M.Raman,
No.7/4, T.N.Nagar, 1st Street, Palanipet,
Arakonnam – 631 002, Ranipet District.

- By RPAD

2. The Executive Engineer/O&M/Arcot,
Vellore Electricity Distribution Circle,
TNPDC,
No 18, New Vellore Main Road, Arcot - 632503.

3. The Superintending Engineer,
Vellore Electricity Distribution Circle,
TNPDC,
10th East Main Road, TNEB,
Gandhi Nagar, Vellore-632006.

- By Email

4. The Chairman & Managing Director, – By Email
TNPDC,
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.