



## **TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

19- A, Rukmini Lakshmi pathy Salai, (Marshal Road), Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.

Phone : ++91-044-2841 1376 / 2841 1378/ 2841 1379 Fax : ++91-044-2841 1377

Email : tnerc@nic.in Web site : www. tneo.gov.in

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

**Present : Thiru. A. Dharmaraj, Electricity Ombudsman**

#### **Appeal Petition No.32 of 2012**

APT Global Marine Engineering Pvt., Ltd.,  
Chidambaram Main Road,  
Mettupalayam (P.O),  
Cuddalore – 608801

.....Appellant  
(Rep. by Thiru C.A. Doss, Advocate  
& Thiru S. Mariappan)

Vs

- 1) The Deputy Financial Controller,  
TANGEDCO,  
Cuddalore Electricity Dist., Circle,  
Capper Hills,  
Cuddalore-4
- 2) Accounts Officer/Revenue  
TANGEDCO,  
Cuddalore EDC,  
Cuddalore-4
- 3) Asst. Executive Engineer/O&M,  
TANGEDCO,  
Cuddalore EDC,  
Semmankuppam,  
Cuddalore-5

.....Respondent  
(Rep.by Thiru Rajaram/DFC(i/c) on 13.9.12  
& Thiru Panneerselvam/AEE on  
13-9-2012 & 3-10-2012)

**Dates of hearing : 13-9-2012 & 3-10-2012**

**Date of order : 27-11-2012**

The above appeal petition No.32 of 2012 came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 13-9-2012 & 3-10-2012 Upon perusing the above petition, counter, connected records, and after hearing both sides, the following order is passed by the Electricity Ombudsman.

## ORDER

**1. Prayer of the Appellant:** The Appellant prayed for the following:

- i) To set aside the orders passed by the CGRF, Cuddalore in complaint No.02/2011 dated 30-11-2011 received on 3-12-2011 and direct the CGRF to hear the case afresh.
- ii) to direct the licensee to ensure supply of energy in terms of contract.
- iii) to direct the opposite parties to issue revised demand during the period from 16.3.2011 to 28.11.2011.
- iv) to direct the respondents to refund the amount collected over and above as stated in (iii) above as per the Tamil Nadu Supply Code 2004.
- v) and grant all other just and necessary relief as deemed fit.

**2. Facts of the case:**

The Appellant's factory is engaged in production of Marine Engineering Products. They availed a HT service bearing SC No.135 which falls under the jurisdiction of Cuddalore EDC. The supply for the Industry is fed by 22 KV Karuveppanpadi feeder of 110/22 KV Semmankuppam SS. The above feeder is a rural feeder. The Appellant informed that 3 phase supply was made available for 3 hrs. in a day which resulted in non utilisation of the sanctioned load but the licensee is levying full demand charges. They complained that due to deficient power supply they are unable to maintain power factor. But power factor compensation charges were levied for the period from 16-3-2011 to 28-11-2011. They asked for waiver of the charges due to non supply of energy as agreed upon. The Appellant filed a petition to CGRF and the CGRF has held as follows.

*“மனுதாரர் 24 மணி நேர மும்முனை மின்சாரம் தேவைப்படின பங்கு வைப்பு தொகையின் கீழ் விண்ணப்பம் அளிக்கவும் அவ்வாறு மனுதாரர் விருப்பம் தெரிவித்து பங்கு வைப்பு தொகையின் கீழ் விண்ணப்பம் அளித்து மதிப்பிட்டு தொகை செலுத்தினால் 24 மணி நேர மும்முனை மின்சாரம் வழங்க எதிர் மனுதாரரால் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்படவேண்டும் என அறிவுறுத்தப்படுகிறது. மேலும் மனுதாரரின் உயரமுத்த மின் இணைப்பானது தொழில் மின் இணைப்பாக இருப்பதால் மனுதாரரின் மின் இணைப்பிற்கு மும்முனை மின்சாரம் வழங்கப்படும் கால மற்றும் நேர அளவை*

மனுதரர் கோரியுள்ளபடி அவரது தொழிற்சாலை இயங்கும் கால நேரத்தில் மாற்றி வழங்கினால் அதன் மூலம் தமிழ்நாடு மின் உற்பத்தி மற்றும் பகிர்மான கழகத்திற்கு, வரும் வருவாய் அதிகரிக்க செய்வதோடு, தொழில் வளர்ச்சி மேம்பாடு அடைய ஏதுவாக அமையும் என்பதால் மனுதாரரின் இக்கோரிக்கையை தலைமையகத்திற்கு அனுப்பி பரிசீலனை செய்ய பரிந்துரை செய்யுமாறு 3ஆம் எதிர்மனுதாரருக்கு இம்மன்றம் உத்திரவிடுகின்றது”

Aggrieved over the above orders, the appellant filed this appeal petition before Electricity Ombudsman.

### **3. Condonation of delay:**

3.1 The CGRF has issued its order on 30-11-2011. The Appellant has filed this appeal petition on 1-8-2012 after a delay of 212 days.

3.2 The appellant informed that the delay in filing the appeal petition is due to reconstruction of the factory after the damage caused by the cyclone Thane and time taken in collecting the details under RTI. He further stated that the delay is neither wanton nor wilful.

3.3 As per Regulation 8 of Regulations for CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman the appeal petition is to be filed within 30 days from the date of the order of the CGRF. However, the Electricity Ombudsman may entertain an appeal after the expiry of the said period of 30 days if the Electricity Ombudsman is satisfied if there was sufficient cause for not filing it within that period.

3.4 As the appellant has cited, cyclone Thane and collection of details under RTI as reasons for the delay,, the delay in filing the petition is condoned.

### **4. Contentions of the appellant :**

(i) The appellant filed an application for availing HT supply for a demand of 400 KVA on 20.7.2009 . He has paid the EMD, Development charges etc., The demand was reduced to 250 KVA forfeiting a sum of Rs.1,20,000/-

(ii) The appellant executed an agreement on 24.2.2011. The clause of the agreement states that the licensee has agreed to supply to the consumer on the Terms and Conditions of Distribution Code, Supply Code and Grid Code totalling in all to a maximum demand of 250KVA.

(iii) The HTSC No is 135 and energy has been provided on and from 16.3.2011. The service was fed by a rural feeder named Karaveppam Paddy feeder of 110/22 KV, Semmankuppam SS.

(iv) But the respondents now under TANGEDCO are not giving quality energy as undertaken by them. Even as per restriction and control on rural feeders of the Chairman's order dt 6.10.1983 and the subsequent order dt. 8.10.83 (LD -1) the respondents have not given supply as directed upon. There has been imperfection, inadequacy in the quality, nature and manner of supply which is required to be maintained in pursuance on the contract. Only there is 3 hours of uninterrupted power supply resulting in non /malfunctioning of the factory and impossibility to supply the sanctioned demand but demanding full payment charges.

(v) The appellant also is not able to maintain power factor due to the deficient power supply. Despite that the respondents are charging with compensation charges of Rs.70,378,77 for the period from 16.3.2011 to 28.11.2011 (LD-18).

(vi) The TANGEDCO cannot ask for estimate costs for constructing a fourth line after undertaking to supply uninterrupted power supply in the available lines as on 24.2.2011 as per the agreement.

(vii) The TANGEDCO has to ensure uninterrupted 3 phase supply atleast to the agreed time duration as per the contract dated 24.2.2011 during which time there was no indication of construction of a 4<sup>th</sup> line for availing uninterrupted power supply.

(viii) The licensee has not ensured the contracted demand even beyond the power shut down timings which compelled the appellant to incur expenditure to buy fuel for running the machinery. Thus the appellant has been incurring dual charges for running the machinery.

(ix) The CGRF has failed to see that the minimum charges can be only 20% of the billable demand or the recorded demand whichever is higher besides the actual consumption.

## **5. Contentions of the Respondent :**

The respondent has contended the following in his counter :

Counter for 1<sup>st</sup> prayer

(i) The CGRF has no power to change the availability period of the 3 phase supply and calculate the consumption charges as requested by the appellant.

(ii) As per the regulation of CGRF, the decision of the forum shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Act, the rules and regulations made thereunder, Supply Code, Distribution Code and the directions of the Commission. Hence, the order issued by the forum is as per the regulations only.

#### Counter for 2<sup>nd</sup> prayer

(iii) The petitioner HT service is fed from 22 KV Karuveppanpadi feeder from 110/22 Semmankuppam substation. The 22 KV Karuveppanpanpadi feeder is a rural feeder, and is connected with more numbers of agricultural services. The three phase supply is given in rotation basis as per instructions of Chairman's Memo No.SE/IEMC/EG/A6/PC/Gen1/316/83 dt.8.10.83. As per the R&C measures, the HT consumers connected in the rural feeders will not be subjected to demand and energy cut but will be subjected to grouping restrictions enforced from time to time by TNEB based on the generation and demand. The three phase supply given to the consumers is as per instructions of Load Despatch Centre based on the position of the grid. Whenever supply interruption was made due to break down in the feeder, the fault was attended immediately and supply resumed to the consumer.

(iv) The Consumer was supplied 3 phase power as per the agreement terms and conditions and as per the guidelines of Hon'ble TNERC.

(v) The Appellant was informed about the terms and conditions of supply before effecting the service. In letter No.SE/CEDC/Cud/AEE.GI/AE-2/F117 SC APT/D107/2010 dt.3.6.2010, the following has been intimated.

- a) Supply will be made available subject to peak hour restriction as and then in force.
- b) In case of emergencies, in the power system the load is liable to be staggered during working hours or cut off altogether to suit the system needs.

(vii) In the revised load sanction letter dated 25.2.2011 also, the following has been intimated:

- a) In case of emergencies in the power system the load is liable to be staggered during working hours or cut off altogether to suit the system needs.
- b) Supply will also be subject to the restrictions and control order in force from time to time.
- viii) The terms and conditions of supply are also specified in clause 7 of the agreement signed by the Appellant on 16-3-2011.

Counter for 3<sup>rd</sup> Prayer :

(i) The billings for the period 16-3-2011 to 28-11-2011 are done as per Tamil Nadu Supply Code provisions and the power factor compensation was also as per regulation 13.3. of the Distribution Code. Hence, there is no need to revise the demand.

(ii) The low power factor is due to supply of 3 phase power in short period cannot be accepted. It is noted that the Appellant has maintained power factor as per the requirement in some month (11/11, 4/12, 6/12 and 7/12) as given below:

Month	R-KVA	C-KWH	C-KVAH	rPF
3/11	107.40	732	1580	046
4/11	56.96	2960	4900	0.60
5/11	30.48	3756	4832	0.78
6/11	45.24	3840	4708	0.82
7/11	96.88	5200	6184	0.84
8/11	75.28	6468	7672	0.84
9/11	58.56	4568	5208	0.88
10/11	37.76	3732	4608	0.81
11/11	41.08	3544	3880	0.91
12/11	22.48	2700	3076	0.88
1/12	25.60	156	196	0.80
2/12	44.00	4048	4776	0.85
3/12	38.04	2320	2680	0.87
4/12	42.88	3332	3616	0.92
5/12	40.20	3616	4068	0.89
6/12	55.88	3588	3904	0.92
7/12	54.72	5436	5880	0.92

(iii) The Appellant was supplied with 3 phase power for 3 to 6 hours in all the above months but power factor was maintained to the required level on 4 months.

Hence, it is construed that the power factor was maintained only in the above 4 months by utilising the required capacitor.

iv) A sum of Rs.1,20,000/- was forfeited as the Appellant has reduced the sanctioned demand from 400 KVA to 250 KVA before availing the supply. The above forfeiture is as per Regulation 34(6) of the Distribution Code.

Counter for 4<sup>th</sup> Prayer :

The minimum charge was levied as per regulation 6 of the Supply Code only 20% of the demand charge could be levied only as per condition as given in the Regulation 6 of the Supply Code. The request of the appellant for the calculation of demand charges at 20% on the ground of non supply of three phase supply for the full period is not acceptable.

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

To enable both the Appellant and the respondents to put forth their views in person, a hearing was conducted on 13-9-2012 and 3-10-2012.

**7. Arguments of the Appellant:**

7.1 The Appellant was represented by Thiru C.A. Doss, Advocate and Thiru S.Mariappan.

7.2 The learned advocate reiterated the contents of the Appeal petition. He has also filed his written submission on both the above hearing dates.

7.3 The learned advocate argued that as per the Regulation 38 of Distribution Code, the licensee has to inform the R&C measures to the consumer. But the supply availability time was not informed to them. Had it been informed that the Rural feeder will have 3 phase supply only for a limited period then, they would have taken action to avail their service from a feeder other than a rural feeder. Further he argued as the appellant was not informed about the R&C measures, condition in Regulation 38 is not applicable to him.

7.4 With regard to power factor compensation, the learned advocate argued that as per Regulation 13(3) of the Distribution Code the licensee has to maintain the system pf at 0.9 and the licensee has to do the system improvement i.e. erection of VAR compensation to maintain the pf. Because of the failure of the licensee to carry

out improvements at strategic points to improve the power factor of the system only, the power factor could not be maintained at the consumer installation despite the erection of required capacity of capacitors. He also furnished a copy of the letter dated 1-10-2012 written by M/s.Mechelein Engineers who have supplied the automatic power factor control panel. He argued that their suppliers, have informed that as 3 phase supply was available for 3 to 4 hours a day, the automatic power control panel relay is in blocked condition during single phase period whereas the Transformer is in energised condition for the whole day which leads to low power factor. Hence he argued that if 3 phase supply is given for more time, the low power factor would not have arisen at all.

7.5 The learned counsel also cited proviso to clause 6 (b) of the Supply Code and argued that when the licensee is prevented from supplying electricity owing to cyclone, floods, storms fire, strike or lockout or other occurrences beyond the control of the licensee only 20% of the billable demand has to be charged. As reduction in supply availability time is beyond the control of the respondent the learned advocate argued for charging 20% of the billable demand as demand charges. He also argued that during the billing month of 1/2012, the Cuddalore Dist. was affected by Thane cyclone and hence eligible for application of the above regulation.

## **8. Argument of the Respondent**

8.1 The Respondent was represented by Thiru Rajaram, DFC incharge and Thiru Panneerselvam/AEE on 13-9-2012 and by Thiru Panneerselvam on 3-10-2012.

8.2 Thiru Panneer Selvam, AEE argued that supply was made available to the Appellant as per the availability and as per the R&C circulars. He informed as the Appellant was connected in the Rural feeder, 3 phase supply was given on rotation basis and also load shedding was done as per the instructions from the head quarters. He also informed that the supply position was informed to the Appellant orally whenever approached.

8.3 Regarding power factor compensation, he argued as per the regulations, the consumer has to maintain a power factor of 0.9% in his service and for not maintaining the power factor the consumer has to pay the compensation. He also argued that the supply availability time has no relevance on the power factor recorded. If sufficient capacitor was not erected or cut in according to the load in service, the power factor will be low and the Appellant is bound to pay the

compensation for not maintaining the power factor. With regard to system power factor he informed that the power factor measured at SS end will be normally 0.9 or more. But he informed that the network system power factor has no role on the consumer side power factor.

8.4 Regarding demand charges, he argued as per R&C instructions no quota has been fixed for the HT Industries on Rural feeder. Hence, 90% of the sanctioned demand or the actual demand reached whichever is higher is to be levied. Hence he argued that the demand charges levied are correct.

## **9. Written Argument of the Appellant:**

9.1 The Appellant has furnished his written argument and rejoinder to the written argument of the respondent on 3-10-2012. The contentions which are not covered in their appeal petition are furnished below :

(i) The reply for prayer 1 of the petition is general in nature and it is too vague. The averment that the case cannot be remanded to CGRF for fresh considerations is not sustainable. There are many judgments pronounced by the appellate authorities remanding the case to the original jurisdiction of the lower forum. The jurisprudence and the procedures before any tribunal or authority or court is to remand the matter for fresh consideration when required. Even rule 23 of order 41 CPC reiterates the same. The Ombudsman of Karnataka has remanded a case like this in AP No. 4 /2005. There is no force in the reply filed by the respondents.

(ii) It is also not correct to contend that 3 – phase supply is ensured on rotation basis. The supply is not provided from 6am to 12 noon in a week and from 12 noon to 6pm in the subsequent weeks. The table filed (for October 2011 - Annexure I) will substantiate their claim that there has been no regular supply of power as claimed by the respondents. The respondents were well aware that the connection is being extended from the existing rural feeder. But the respondent has claimed that there is no uninterrupted power supply for 6 hours.

(iii) It is also incorrect to claim the grievances of the consumer have been attended then and there. The grievance was informed to the respondents in March 2011 about which a complaint was forwarded to TNERC which was given on 9.4.2011 (page No.41 to 47 of the appeal ). If the respondents version are true then the appellant need not to write letters to the higher authorities . Fed up with the non

attendance to the grievances, the appellant was forced to write letter to the TNERC which guided the appellant to file a complaint before the CGRF. The copy of the letter dt. 4.6.2011 was also marked to the respondents in which the sufferings of the appellants were notified.

(iv) Even the terms and conditions and the agreements assure to supply quality service. There was no mention or a suggestion at the time of extending electricity supply proposing to avail a fourth line by paying appropriate amount for 24 hours uninterrupted 3 – phase power supply. The restriction and control order is not applicable to this appellant in these situations.

(v) The rules and regulations were never informed to this appellant. The clauses of terms and conditions quoted by the respondents is untenable in view of the Supply Code and Distribution Code. Terms and Conditions and clauses of agreement cannot be replaced for statutory provisions.

(vi) PF could not be maintained only due to irregular supply and intermittent disturbance in supply. Having failed to maintain supply to required quality the respondents cannot impose penalty for not maintaining power factor. The table provided by the respondents in the counter is misleading and erroneous. The appellant has installed appropriate PF corrections equipments which is available even today.

(vii) But the respondents have not carried out or proved that they have acted in accordance with clause 13(3) of TN Elec. Distribution Code. They have not carried out their system improvement measures and installing the VAR compensation equipments to meet the situations. PF is nothing but the ratio between real power and apparent power and PF means the ratio of KWH to the KVAH consumed during the billing month as per clause 2(1)(z) of TN Elec. Distribution Code. The appellant is maintaining the real power but the opposite parties have not ensured apparent power during the month. Therefore the respondents cannot impose penalty for not maintaining PF. In November 2011, the appellant was able to maintain PF because there was very minimal interruptions.

(viii) This appellant is using the capacitors. This has been substantiated by CEIG. Chennai in his letter dt.23.12.2010 which was replaced subsequently in April 2011. But the respondents have not ensured proper and quality supply.

(ix) Power availability notice is an eye wash since as per the internal correspondences of the respondents, power availability was not ready as per date in the notice.

(x) Supply should have been given within one month from the date of application as per section 43(1) of the Electricity Act, as reiterated in clause 27 of the TN Electricity Distribution Code. In case the licensee requires extension and improvement the time can be 60 days. But the respondent has not acted in accordance with the above provision but has activated energy only on 16.3.2011, i.e. after 1 year, 7 months and 26 days attracting payment of compensation.

(xi) Instructions have been issued not to collect development charges as per the memorandum No. X/CFC/DFC/R/AAO/TE1/TSC/068/2003, dt.13.8.2003, for the existing multi-tenant house services. There is an existing HT line. Hence, the licensee can collect development charges only for the required length of construction of lines. As per written version of respondents there is an existing line and hence development charges are not to be collected from the consumer/appellant.

(xii) This appellant has been writing and informing about the quality and standard of supply to respondents but there has been no reply or rectification of deficiency pointed out from March 2011. Hence, the respondents are liable to pay Compensation for not sending any reply on the consumer grievance as per order in appeal no. 18 2012 dt.30.8.2012 (regulation 21) The respondents have also failed to adhere to regulation 20 of TN Electricity Distribution Standards of Performance Regulations. No unique number was allotted to the grievance of the appellant.

(xiii) When KVA has been reduced by respondents they have to refund the EMD for the 200 KVA Rs.1,20,000/-

(xiv) Since power was actually ready only after 9.3.2011, the readiness expressed by the respondents is only window dressing and a sham exercise to escape failure to provide supply within time. Therefore, the sum of Rs.3,20,000/- collected before 16.3.2011, as monthly minimum charges have to be refunded.

## **10. Written Arguments of the Respondent :**

10.1 The petitioner has reported 3 phase supply was given 3 hrs per day. It is not correct. The petitioner HT service supply has been fed by 22 KV Karuveppam Paddy Rural Feeder fed from 110/22KV Semmankuppam Substation. The 3 phase

supply given in the feeder from 15.3.2011 to 30.11.2011 is furnished in the statement. From the statement, it is seen that, 3 phase supply was given for 3 hrs per day, for some days and 6 hrs per day for certain days and more than 6 hrs per day also in some days as per the grid condition and head quarter's instruction.

10.2 The petitioner has reported in his written submission point 13 that the power supply was actually ready only after 9.3.2011. While Materials were drawn and started the extension work of the HT line, Mettupalayam Village people objected the erection of HT pole and line to the petitioner industry. Hence, the work was stopped. After compromising the objections the works were started and completed on 18.11.2010. From the above it is clear that the works were completed on 18.11.2010 and first 90 days supply availability notice was issued by SE/CEDC/Cuddalore on 23.11.2010.

10.3 The respondents attended the grievance then and there many times orally and some time directly. The petitioner first reported his complaint to TNERC regarding interruption of power supply. For this, the petitioner was informed orally. due to the critical power supply position licensee was not able to give the 3 phase supply continuously. As the HT service is connected to the rural feeder, based on the instructions given from headquarters the 3 phase supply was given. The AEE/O&M/Semmanakuppam has informed his reply to the petitioner regarding supply position in his letters dt. 15.10.2011, 28.10.2011 and 11.11.2011.

10.4 As per clause 13(3) of the TNERC Distribution Code it shall be obligatory on the part of the consumer to improve the power factor of their connected loads to the required level in accordance with the provisions made in this code. Every consumer with a power factor less than the stipulated level may be suitably advised to rectify the situation by installing appropriate power factor correction equipments without prejudice to the levy of compensation charges as per the order of the Commission from time to time. Based on the above clause 13(3) of TNERC Distribution Code the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent has informed many times orally to the petitioner and consumer's representatives and written in the monthly meter reading register. Whenever the consumer has fails to maintain the power factor stipulated.

10.5 The respondent have furnished further written argument on 16.10.2012 the argument not covered in their previous argument alone furnished below :

(a) (i) The respondents have maintained the system power factor at the level of minimum 0.9 as per clause 13(3) of the TNERC Distribution Code as seen from the copy of the log sheets from 25.10.2011 to 26.10.2011 of Semmankuppam substation.

(ii) From the copy of the log sheets from 25.10.2011 to 26.10.2011 of Semmankuppam substation on 25.10.2011 availed 3 phase supply for 4.25 hrs (3.00 + 1.25) and on 26.10.2011 availed 3 phase supply for 9.00 hrs). It is clear all the feeders including 22 KV Karuveppan Paddy feeders are maintaining the system power factor most of the time from 0.9 to 1.0

(iii) During the hearing on 3.10.2012 the appellant has given the Mechelein Engineers letter regarding automatic power control panel. As per the letter the automatic power factor control relay (APFC Relay) is basically designed for three phase balanced load with voltage sensing taken from two of the three phases and current sensing from third phase for the power monitoring. Based on the three phase power factors the desired compensating capacitor unit is switched on by the relay. The APFC relay has in built time delay for switching on and off the capacitor unit for avoiding continuous and desired switching action for short surge loads or variations. In the event of absence of anyone phase or under loading condition (less than 10% of the load current) or a severe voltage unbalance condition (more than 20% voltage unbalance between phases), the APFC relay will not function (functions will be blocked) and showing error indications. But, the transformer is energised for the whole day leading to an average power factor for the unit.

(iv) The appellant has installed the automatic power factor control panel in his HT service connection. Hence, it is the responsibility of the appellant to maintain the stipulated power factor to avoid low power factor penalty.

(b) (i) The demand of billing charges raised by the respondents are based on the TNERC Supply Code and Distribution Code provisions.

(ii) The appellant stated that the interruption during 29.12.2011 to 31.1.2012 is due to Thane Cyclone may be considered and revision of demand charges may be ordered.

(iii) The Thane Cyclone supply interruption period is not covered in the CGRF petition period and hence, revision of demand charges could not be considered for the Thane Cyclone interruption periods.

(iv) Further, the appellant has not requested to disconnect the HT service connection during the Thane Cyclone affected period (29.12.2011 to 30.1.2012). Hence, the appellant request could not be considered as per clause 6 of the TNERC Supply Code.

#### **11. Rejoinder of the appellant for the written submission of the respondent :**

The appellant has furnished its rejoinder dt. 25.10.2012 for the written submission of the respondent . In the above, the appellant has contended the following :

(i) With regard to the above further written statement in which there is an admission about the installation of the APFC. It is submitted that only due to frequent interruption in the 3 phase supply provided by the respondents there is low power factor. Hence, there cannot be a penalty. Regarding the monthly minimum charges, the respondents have quoted clause 6(b) of TNERC Supply Code in a truncated way. (i) The consumer need not a make request for disconnection in times of natural calamity. (ii) The request of disconnection arises only for the other factors.

(ii) Regarding consumption of electricity for the reason that the TANGEDCO is prevented from supplying electricity owing to Cyclone etc., the TANGEDCO has to recover from the consumer a monthly minimum charge at 20% of the billable demand or recorded demand whichever is higher besides charges for the actual consumption of electricity. The respondents have conveniently left out the proviso to clause 6(b) which mandates only 20% of the billable demand due to Cyclone "Thane". Therefore, the TANGEDCO can recover demand charges only according to the said provisions to clause 6(b) of the Supply Code.

#### **12. Issues for consideration**

12.1 The Appellant has prayed for the following:

- i) to set aside the order passed by the CGRF Cuddalore in complaint No.02/2011 dt. 30.11.2011 and direct the CGRF to hear the case fresh.
- ii) to direct the licensee to ensure supply or energy in terms of contract.
- iii) to direct the respondents to issue revised demand during the period from 16-3-2011 to 28-11-2011 and

- iv) to direct the respondents to refund the amount collected over and above the above as stated in (iii) above as per Tamil Nadu Electricity Supply Code.

12.2 In the petition filed before the CGRF, the following are the prayers ;

- (i) Daily power supply available for only for 3 hrs continuously during day time . That also with interruptions on many days ( alternate change of timings on every week).

- (ii) Forced to pay monthly charges for entire sanctioned load even though we are supplied with 3 hrs power supply only.

- (iii) Penalty imposed for not maintaining power factor at 0.9 from the day one we obtained power supply and still persisting.

12.3 In the written argument, they have also prayed for compensation for delay in effecting the service and for not responding to the grievances as per standards of performance regulations. As the above prayers were not raised in the CGRF, it was explained to the Appellant that they have to raise the issue in the CGRF and then only they can appeal against the orders of CGRF if they are not satisfied with the orders of CGRF.

12.4 Similarly, the issue relating to forfeiture of the EMD of Rs.1,20,000 towards reduction of load, the issue relating to refund of Development charges and the issue regarding levying of monthly minimum charges for the supply notice period was also not taken as these issues have also been not raised before the CGRF.

12.5 The Appellant agreed to the above contention, and hence the above prayers were not taken for consideration in the appeal filed before the Electricity Ombudsman. Accordingly, the following prayers alone are taken up.

- (i) To set aside the orders of CGRF and direct the CGRF to hear the case afresh.

- (ii) To ensure supply to the industry as per Terms of contract

- (iii) Refund of amount paid by the appellant towards power factor compensation.

- (iv) The monthly minimum demand charges levied shall be reduced to 20% the billable demand as 3 phase supply was given only 3 to 4 hrs a day.

**13. Findings:** The findings of the Electricity Ombudsman on each of the prayer is furnished below :

13.1 Prayer (i): The Appellant has prayed to set aside the orders of CGRF and direct the CGRF to hear the case fresh.

13.1.1 As the Appellant has filed appeal petition aggrieved over the orders of the CGRF, his petition was registered and arguments of the Appellant as well as the respondent were also heard.

13.1.2 In this regard, the relevant regulation 16(a) of the Regulations for Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman 2004 is extracted below :

*“16(a) To receive the appeal petitions against the order of the consumer grievance redressal forum and consider such complaints and facilitate their satisfaction or settlement by agreement, through conciliation and mediation between a licensee and the aggrieved parties or by passing an award in accordance with the Act and Rules or Regulations made thereunder.”*

13.1.3 On a careful reading of the said regulation 16(a), it is noted that Electricity Ombudsman has to consider the appeal petition filed and facilitate a settlement by agreement through conciliation and mediation between the licensee and the aggrieved party or by passing an award accordance with Act, Rules, or regulation made thereunder. In view of the above, it is held that the appeal will be disposed by the Electricity Ombudsman based on the merits of the arguments putforth by the parties instead of remanding it to the CGRF.

13.2 Prayer 2(ii): The Appellant’s prayer is to ensure supply to their industry in terms of contract.

13.2.1 The learned advocate argued that the supply was available to them only for 3 hours or so in a day that too with interruption. He also argued that their industry is working from 9AM to 5PM. But during the working hours, the availability of power is about 3 hours or even less. He also informed that the licensee has never informed that the Rural feeders will have 3 phase supply only for six hours during day time. Had the respondent informed about the availability of power in advance, they would have established their industry in such a place or in a feeder where there is no such interruption of supply.

13.2.2 The Respondents argued that the above HT industry is connected to a rural feeder named Karuveppanpadi feeder fed off from 110/22 SS wherein Agricultural loads are predominantly connected. He informed as per the TNEB's circular, the feeder having industrial load (Both LT and HT) less than 70% of the total load will be treated as Rural feeders. As per the R&C orders the rural feeders will have 3 phase supply for 6 hours either from 6 to 12 hrs or 12 hrs to 18 hours on rotation basis. Further, as per the directions of the LD centre the load shedding will be done depending upon the grid conditions. Hence, he said that in certain days 3 phase supply was made available for about 3 hours in day time and whenever the supply position permits, 3 phase supply was given more than 6 hours on some days. Hence, he argued that the supply availability is depending upon the grid conditions and R & C measures enforced. He suggested that the Appellant may opt for running a 4<sup>th</sup> wire to have 3 phase supply for his industry. However, he informed on such case, the industry will have to restrict the use of their demand and energy depending on the percentage of power cut.

13.2.3 The Appellants learned advocate cited regulation 38 of the Distribution Code and argued that the licensee should have informed about the restriction and control to the appellant's industry. But they have not informed about the R & C measures and hence the regulation 38 cannot be applicable to their industry.

13.2.4 The respondent informed that they have already informed about the availability of power in rural feeder to the Appellant and in writing on 15-10-2011, 29-10-2011 and 11-11-2011.

13.2.5 As the learned advocate of the Appellant referred to the Regulation 38 of the Distribution code, the said regulation is extracted below:-

**“38. RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF ELECTRICITY:** *The consumer shall curtail, stagger, restrict, regulate or altogether cease to use electricity when so directed by the Licensee, if the power position or any other emergency in the Licensee's power system or as per the directives of SLDC/ SSLDC warrants such a course of action. The Licensee shall not be responsible for any loss or inconvenience caused to the consumer as a result of such curtailment, staggering, restriction, regulation or cessation of use of electricity. Notwithstanding anything contained in any agreement/ undertaking executed by a consumer with the Licensee or in the tariff applicable to him, the consumer shall restrict the use of electricity in terms of his/her maximum demand and/ or energy consumption in the manner and for the period as may be specified in any order that may be made by the Licensee on the instructions of State Government or the Commission.”*

13.2.6 On a careful reading of the said regulation 38, it is noted that consumer shall curtail, stagger, restrict, regulate or altogether cease to use electricity when so directed by the licensee if the power position or any other emergency in the licensee's power system or as per the directives of SLDC/ SSLDC warrants such course of action. The licensee shall not be responsible for any loss or inconvenience caused to the consumer as a result of such curtailment, staggering, restriction, regulation or cessation of use of electricity notwithstanding anything contained in the agreement / undertaking executed by a consumer with the licensee. Further, it has also been stated that R&C order has to be made by the licensee on the instruction of State Government or Commission.

13.2.7 With regard to the argument of the Appellant that he is not informed about the R&C measures, the respondent informed that Rural feeder supply position was informed to the Appellant orally and also pointed out that the Appellant has availed temporary supply for the construction works of the Industry in the same rural feeder. Hence, he is aware of the 3 phase timings of the said rural feeder. But, the written information was given only during October 2011 and November 2011. Further, he argued that in letter dated 3-6-2010 before effecting supply and in revised sanction letter dated 2-5-2011, it has been clearly mentioned that the R&C measures in force will be applicable to the Industry and also informed that in case of emergencies, in power system the load is liable to be staggered or cut off altogether to suit system needs. Hence, he informed that the Appellant is aware of the Restriction Control enforced in the Rural feeder. Further the R&C measures are published in newspaper also.

13.2.8 Here, the licensee has enforced R&C measures from 1-11-2008 as per the directions of Government and the Hon'ble Commission has also approved the above. As per Regulation 38 of Distribution Code, the licensee is authorised to issue R&C instruction on approval from Govt., or Commission and also if the power position warrants or any other emergency in licensee's power system, the licensee can restrict or regulate the supply position and the licensee is not responsible for any loss or inconvenience caused to the Consumer. As the supply availability time to Appellant was reduced due to the power shortage position of the licensee. I am unable to give any relief to the Appellant. However, the licensee shall ensure that

the supply shall be extended to the appellant as per the approved R&C measures. Any load shedding done as per regulation 15(6) of the Distribution Code beyond the approved hours due to Grid conditions shall be exercised only on exigent circumstance.

13.3 Prayer (iii): The Appellant requested for refund of the amount paid towards power factor compensation for the period from 16-3-2011 to 28-11-2011.

13.3.1 In order to arrive at a solution, the following are fixed as issues:

- i) whether the contention of the Appellant that the system power factor to be maintained by the licensee has effect on the power factor of the Appellant?
- ii) whether the supply availability time has any role on the power factor of the Industry?

### **13.3.2 Findings on first issue**

(a) The learned advocate representing the Appellant argued that the licensee has failed to carryout improvement measures at strategic points by undertaking useful system studies and installing required Var compensation equipments citing regulation 13(3) of the Distribution Code. Due to the above failure, though the Appellant has erected sufficient power factor correction equipments, the power factor could not be maintained.

(b) The Respondent informed that they are maintaining the power factor and the power factor is measured at SS end. He argued that the power factor of the system has no relevance on the power factor of the individual service.

(c) As the Appellant has referred to the regulation 13(3) of the Distribution Code, the said regulation is reproduced below : -

*“13(3) The Licensee shall monitor the voltage, frequency and power factor in the distribution system at different points, during the peak and off peak hours and take all reasonable measures for the improvement of the same, if it falls below the prescribed level continuously.*

**(3) Power Factor**: *The Licensee shall maintain the system power factor at the level of minimum of 0.9 at the interface/s and carry out system improvement measures at strategic points in the distribution system by undertaking useful system studies and installing the required VAR compensation equipment to meet the situation. The Licensee shall also counsel and advise consumers on the ways and means to improve the power factor in their respective systems to the required level. It shall be obligatory on the part of the consumers to improve the power factor of their connected loads to the required level in accordance with provisions*

*made in this code. Every consumer with a power factor less than the stipulated level may be suitably advised to rectify the situation by installing appropriate power factor correction equipment, without prejudice to the levy of compensation charges as per the orders of the Commission from time to time.”*

(d) On a plain reading of the said regulation it is noted that the regulation has two parts one is licensee's responsibility to maintain system power factor and other is consumers responsibility to maintain the power factor at his end. It is noted that the licensee has to maintain the power factor at the level of minimum 0.9 at the interfaces and install required VAR compensation equipment to meet the situation viz., to maintain the PF at minimum 0.9. The above is the responsibility of the licensee. The Second part is the responsibility of the consumer. It has been clearly mentioned that the licensee has to advise the consumer on the ways and means to improve the power factor in their system to the required level. It has also been stated that it is obligatory on the part of the consumer to improve the power factor in their system to the required level, in accordance with the provisions in the Code. Further, it has also be stated that the consumer with power factor lesser than the stipulated value has to be advised to install power factor correction instruments without prejudice to levy of compensation charges as per the orders of Commission from time to time.

(e) The learned advocate has pointed out the first part of the above regulation and argued that the low power factor in the appellant's HT service is due to not maintaining of system PF by the Appellant.

(f) But, it is not so. The power factor of the system network depends on the total load of all the consumers connected to the system and the reactive component of the loads connected. Whereas the power factor of a particular consumer is depending up on the load of the particular consumer and its reactive component. In otherwords, the power factor of the system network may be the combined aggregate of the PF of all the consumers loads connected to the network plus the network reactive component. In view of the above, I am of the considered opinion that the system power factor has no effect on the consumer power factor and the consumers power factor is depending only on the consumers loads.

(g) The AC power has three component viz., Active power measured in watts(W), apparent power measured in volt ampere(VA) and reactive power in reactive volt

ampere (VAR). The power factor is defined as the ratio of real power flowing to the load to the Apparent power in the circuit (i.e)  $\frac{\text{Real power (watts)}}{\text{Apparent power(VA)}}$  Apparent power is supplied to consumer installation. If the load is having unity PF then the real power is also same as that of Apparent power. Say for example for a real power of 1 KW, the Apparent power to be supplied by the licensee is 1 KVA if the load of the consumer is having unity power factor and the Apparent power is 1.25 KVA if the consumer load is having 0.8 power factor. The consumer will pay only for one KW whereas the apparent power supplied is 1.25 KVA and the current drawn will be more and consequently the line loss will be more. Hence, to compensate the above only, power factor compensation charges are levied.

### **13.3 Findings on the second issue**

(a) The learned counsel argued that due to availability of 3 phase supply only for a lesser duration, the power factor of their service is low. He informed that they have erected sufficient quantum of capacitors as seen from the CEIG report. He also pointed out that whenever the 3 phase supply availability time is more, the power factor is also on the higher side and hence argued that only due to non adoption of 3 phase supply for atleast, six hours is the reason for low PF in the Appellants industry. He also furnished a copy of the letter written by M/s.Mechelein Engineer, the suppliers of the Automatic power factor control panel in support of his argument.

(b) The AEE/O&M, Semmankuppam argued that there is no relation between the supply availability time and the power factor measured at consumer end. The power factor depends only on the capacitance provided by the Appellant and the reactive components of the load at the consumer end. He also argued that if the Automatic power factor control panel is not working properly then the quantum of capacitance cut in may not be sufficient to compensate the inductive load which in turn will result in low power factor. He also pointed out that in 11/11, 4/12, 6/12 and 7/12 the power factor maintained by the Appellant is more than the prescribed limit even though the supply available time is almost similar to other month. He also argued that as per

Regulation 13(3) of Distribution code, the consumer has to pay the capacitor compensation charges as fixed by the Commission.

*The Mechelein Engineers in their letter dated 1-10-2012 have stated the following:*

- i) The automatic power factor control relay (APFC Relay) is basically designed for three phase balanced loads with voltage sensing taken from two of the three phases and current sensing from the third phase for the power factor monitoring. Based on the three phase power factor, the desired compensating capacitor unit is switched on by the relay. The APFC relay has in built time delays for switching on and off the capacitor units for avoiding continuous and undesired switching on and off the capacitor units for avoiding continuous and undesired switching actions for short surge loads or variations.*
- ii) In the event of absence of any one phase or under loading conditions (less than 10% of the load current) or a sever voltage unbalance conditions (more than 20% voltage unbalance between phases), the APFC Relay will not function (function will be blocked) and shall be showing error indication.*
- iii) Your unit has been receiving three phase supply only for about 3 to 4 hours in a day and for the remaining duration of the day; you are experiencing either two phase or single phase power supply only. It is obvious that the APFC relay will remain in blocked state for most duration of the day. However the transformer is remaining energized for the whole of the day leading to an average low power factor for your unit.*

(c) On a careful reading of the above letter of M/s Machelein Engineer, the suppliers of automatic power factor control panel, it is noted that the above equipment is designed for 3 phase load and based on the three phase power factor, the desired value of the compensating capacitor unit is switched on by the relay. It has also been stated that in the absence of any one phase or under loading condition (less than 10% of the load) or a voltage unbalance condition (more than 20% voltage unbalance between phases), the APFC relay will not function. The Mechelein Engineers have also stated that as the industry is getting 3 to 4 hrs 3phase supply and getting either single phase or two phase power supply in the rest of the day, the APFC relay will remain in blocked state for most of the hours of the day. But, the transformer is energised for the whole of the day leading to average low power factor.

(d) It is observed from the above letter, the Automatic power factor compensation panel erected by the appellant will function properly only if 3 phase supply is available and load is more than 10% . But, the code provision does not specify which type of equipment is to be installed by the consumer. It only stipulates that

appropriate power factor correction equipment has to be installed by the consumer so as to maintain the power factor to the required level. Hence, it is obligatory for the consumer to erect suitable equipment to control the power factor of his service and he cannot say that the correction equipment will function only if 3 phase power supply is available and hence he is not liable for power factor compensation.

(e) Further, the power factor depends upon the quantum of load and its reactive component and does not relate to number of hours of supply. The Industrial loads such as motors, transformer are normally inductive type. Hence to compensate the inductive load suitable capacity of capacitors are to be added in the system. The required capacity of capacitor corresponding to the load in the service has to be in service along with the load to keep the power factor at the required level. Hence, it is the responsibility of the consumer to install the required power factor correction equipment suitable to his service.

(f) In view of the above, I am of the view that the supply availability time has no relevance on the maintenance of required level of power factor, so as to maintain the power factor.

(g) Further, as per clause 9.11.1.1(3) of Tariff Order No.3 of 2010 dt.31.7.2010, the average power factor of the consumer installation of the HT Industry shall not be less than 0.9 and if the average power factor of the HT Industry is less than the stipulated limit of 0.90, the following compensation has to be levied.

Below 0.90 upto 0.85	:	1% of the current consumption charges for every reduction of 0.01 in power factor from 0.90
Below 0.85 to 0.75	:	1 ½ % of the current consumption charges for reduction to every 0.01 is power factor from 0.90
Below 0.75	:	2% of the current consumption charges for reduction of every 0.01 is power factor from 0.90

(h) In view of my findings on issue one and two and as per clause 9.11.1.1(3) of the Tariff Order No.3 dt.31.7.2010, it is held that the power factor compensation levied by the licensee for the period from 16-3-2011 to 28-11-2011 is correct.

#### **13.4 Prayer (iv):**

13.4.1 The Appellant argued that the 3 phase supply was extended only for 3 hours only in a day and hence the minimum demand charges levied shall be reduced to 20% of the billable demand. During the hearing he informed that the refund of over and above the amount as stated in prayer (iii) means, the demand charges only.

13.4.2 The learned advocate argued as the supply availability time was about three hour, they are unable to use the sanctioned demand but paying 90% of the sanctioned demand as demand charges. As R&C measures are in force, he argued that the demand charges shall be 20% of the billable demand or the demand reached whichever is higher. He has cited regulation 6(b) of the Supply Code and argued for the above.

13.4.3 The Respondent argued as per regulation 6 of Supply Code the minimum monthly charges are to be paid by the consumer.

13.4.4. As the Appellant cited regulation 6(b), of the Supply Code, the relevant regulation is reproduced below:-

*“6. Minimum Charges- The consumer shall pay to the Licensee [minimum charges] in respect of every connection as detailed below. The minimum monthly charges are payable even when no electricity was consumed or supply disconnected by orders of Court or when the price of electricity supplied is less than the minimum charges.*

(a) x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

(b) *For the H.T services disconnected on the request of the consumer, the monthly minimum charges based on the KVA demand shall be the actual recorded demand ( when the disconnection is for part of a month) or such percentage of sanctioned demand declared by the Commission whichever is higher.*

*Provided that where the Licensee is prevented from supplying electricity owing to cyclone, floods, storms, fire, strike or lockout in the Licensees’ establishment or other occurrences beyond the control of the Licensee, or if the Licensee is satisfied that the consumer has been prevented from consuming electricity either in whole or in part for similar reasons, the Licensee may recover from the consumer minimum charges at twenty per cent of the billable demand or recorded demand whichever is higher besides charges for the actual consumption of electricity.*

*Provided further that where the consumer has been prevented from consuming electricity.—*

*(i) the consumer shall produce a certificate from the Labour Officer to that effect, indicating the period of lockout or strike or temporary closure and the date on which it was called off.*

*(ii) the consumer shall give prompt intimation of the commencement of the lockout or strike so that the Maximum Demand meter can be reset. In the case of temporary closure, the consumer shall give intimation of the closure. The consumer shall give intimation to the Licensee immediately after lifting of the strike, lockout or temporary closure. Provided also that, in the case of steel industries having more than one electric furnace in a HT service and when one or more electric furnaces are under total strike / closure, then the benefit of billing on the actual recorded demand or the percentage as may be notified by the Commission from time to time of the sanctioned demand less the KVA load of the furnaces under total strike or closure whichever is higher shall be given. This provision is not applicable when there is lockout*

13.4.5 On a careful reading of the above regulation, it is noted that where the licensee is prevented from supplying electricity owing to cyclone, floods, storms, fire, strike or lockout in the licensees establishments or other occurrences beyond the control of the licensee the licensee may recover from the consumer minimum charges at 20% of billable demand or recorded demand whichever is higher besides charges actual consumption of electricity.

13.4.6 The learned counsel argued that as the licensee was unable to supply the 3 phase power throughout the day, due to R&C measures, the above regulation may be adopted and demand charges may be levied accordingly.

13.4.7 In this regard, it is noted that in a case between M/s Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association and TNEB, the Electricity Ombudsman has dismissed the petition of the Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association which prayed for levying 20% of the billable demand as minimum charges quoting regulation 6(b) of the Supply Code, due to supply interruption vide order dt. 17.4.2007 in OP 18 of 2007.

13.4.8 As the subject is regarding billable demand, the tariff order No.3 dated 31.7.2010 is referred for getting clarity as the billing period falls when the above tariff order was in force.

13.4.9 In clause 9.11.11 General provision, applicable for high tension supply in para 4, the following has been specified.

*“(4) Billable Demand: In case of two part tariffs, maximum Demand Charges for any month will be levied on the kVA demand actually recorded in that month or 90% of the sanctioned demand which ever is higher. Provided, that whenever the restriction and control measures are in force, the billable demand in case of two part tariff for any month will be the actual recorded maximum demand or 90% of demand quota, as fixed from time to time through restriction and control measures, whichever is higher.*

*(5) In the case of supply under HT Tariff IA, IIA, and III, the use of electricity for bonafide purpose of lighting, heating and power loads in the residential quarters within the premises shall be metered separately by the consumers taking HT supply and paid to the Board at LT Tariff IC. The units shall be deducted from the total number of units registered in the main meter of HT supply for billing purposes. ”*

13.4.10 It is noted from the above that the billable demand is the demand actually recorded in that month or 90% of the sanctioned demand whichever is higher provided that whenever R&C measures are in force the billable demand will be the actual recorded maximum demand or the 90% of the demand quota fixed from time to time through R&C measures whichever is higher.

13.4.11 As per para 1(k) of Memo No.CE/Comml/EE/O&M/F.Powercut/D001/2008 dated 1.11.2008 there shall be no demand and energy cut for HT services in rural feeders since they are coming under single phasing arrangement.

13.4.12 As the Appellant Industry also is rural feeder, it has no demand or energy quota. Hence, the demand charges shall be the actual demand recorded in the months (or) 90% of the sanctioned demand whichever is higher.

13.4.13 In view of the above, I am of the view that the demand charges levied by the licensee is in line with the tariff order No.3 dated 31-7-2010 and is upheld.

13.4.14 The learned advocate argued that due to Thane Cyclone, there was interruption of supply from 29-12-11 to 31-1-2012 and hence, the demand charges may be levied as per regulation 6 (b) of the Supply Code.

13.4.15 The respondent argued that the Thane Cyclone period is after the issue of orders of CGRF and also argued that the appellant has not requested for disconnections during the Cyclone period and hence, his request will not be considered.

13.4.16 As the Thane Cyclone period falls after issue of the order of CGRF, I am of the view that the appellant has to file his petition on this issue to CGRF first and then file an appeal to the Electricity Ombudsman , if he is not satisfied with the orders of CGRF.

#### **14. Conclusion :**

14.1 The findings on the prayer discussed on para 13, above are furnished below :

Prayer (i) : In view of my findings in para 13.1.3 the appellant's petition is considered as an appeal petition and disposed by the Electricity Ombudsman.

Prayer (ii) : As per findings furnished in para 13.2.8 , it is held that the supply availability time to the HT industry connected to rural feeder is subject to R&C conditions only. However, the licensee shall ensure that the supply is made available to the appellant as per the approved R&C measures subject to grid conditions.

Prayer (iii) : In view of my findings in para 13.3, it is held that the power factor compensation levied by the licensee is in line with the regulations Distribution Code and Tariff Order No. 3, dt. 31.7.2010. Hence, I am unable to give any relief to the appellant.

Prayer (iv) : In view of my findings in para 13.4, it is held that the demand charges levied is in conformity with the Tariff Order No.3, dt.31.7.2010.

14.2 With the above findings the Appeal Petition No. 32 of 2012 is disposed off by the Electricity Ombudsman. No costs.

**(A. Dharmaraj)**  
Electricity Ombudsman

To

- 1 APT Global Marine Engineering Pvt. Ltd.,  
Chidambaram Main Road,  
Mettupalayam (P.O),  
Cuddalore – 608801
- 2) The Deputy Financial Controller,  
TANGEDCO,  
Cuddalore Electricity Dist.Circle,  
Capper Hills,  
Cuddalore-4
- 3) Accounts Officer/Revenue  
TANGEDCO,  
Cuddalore EDC,  
Cuddalore-4

- 4) Asst.Executive Engineer/O&M,  
TANGEDCO,  
Cuddalore EDC,  
Semmankuppam,  
Cuddalore-5
- 5) The Chairman & Managing Director,  
TANGEDCO,  
NPKRR Malaigai,  
144, Anna Salai,  
Chennai – 600 002.
- 6) The Secretary,  
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission  
No.19-A, Rukmini Lakshmi pathy Salai,  
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.
- 7) The Assistant Director (Computer) - **FOR HOSTING IN THE WEBSITE.**  
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission  
No.19-A, Rukmini Lakshmi pathy Salai  
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.