



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. 13 of 2012

Thiru. S. Kumarasamy,
Advocate,
51. Malayampalayam,
Dhalavapalayam Post,
Karur Dist.

. Appellant
(Rep by Appellant himself)

Vs

The Superintending Engineer,
Karur EDC,
TANGEDCO (formerly TNEB),
No.3, Kovai Road,
Karur – 639 002.

. Respondent
(Rep by V.L. Viswanath/AEE/O&M
Pugalur)

Date of Hearing : 14.6.2012

Date of Order : 10.8.2012

(1) Thiru. S. Kumarasamy has applied for Agricultural service connections for his well at SF No.315/9 & 318/11. The load applied for both the well is 5 HP. The applications have been registered as 47 dt. 10.7.1996 and 49 dated 10.7.1996. The 30 days notice for entering the readiness was issued for the above application on 29.10.2010. The appellant has applied for change of survey number from 315/9 to 564/3 in respect of application registration No.49

dt.10.7.1996 and from SF No.318/11 to 695/B9 in respect of application registration No.47 dt 10.7.1996. But, the respondent have not accepted the change in survey number of the wells and intimated the appellant to avail service in the wells for which the applications were originally made . The appellant filed a petition to CGRF of Karur EDC. The CGRF of Karur EDC has also confirmed the orders of the licensee . Hence, the appellant has filed this petition to the Electricity Ombudsman.

(2) A hearing was held before the Electricity Ombudsman on 14.6.2012, to enable the appellant and the respondent to purforth their arguments in person.

(3) The appellant himself presented his case. He argued that on receipt of the notice requesting entering of readiness, he contacted the local EB office for change of well . As he was informed that change of well is feasible, he has taken pain to obtain the necessary documents from various authorities and furnished the same to the licensee. But, they have not rejected his application for change in well but asked for some more documents and finally informed that it is not feasible. Had they informed the fact on the first occasion itself, he would not have spent his time and money for the above. Hence, he pleaded that the change of well may be considered.

(4) The respondent was represented by Thiru. V.L. Viswanath Assistant Executive Engineer/O&M/ Pugalur. He informed that as per Memo No.SE/RE&I(D)/EE/RE/AEE/ F/Doc/D180/2010, Dt.13.12.2010, the change of SF No. was not permitted. He also informed that there was sufficient water in one

well for which shifting was required. As per rules if sufficient water is available in the well then change in SF is not permitted.

(5) The Electricity Ombudsman pointed out that as per the Memo referred by the respondent the change of well is not permitted for the purchasers of the agricultural land from the original applicants (who had applied to the then TNEB now TANGEDCO) after expiry of the 90 days readiness notice issued to the original applicants. But the present case is shifting of a well to a new land purchased by the applicant himself after issue of readiness notice. Hence, both are different. The AEE/O&M/Pugalur said on the same analogy, the change of well which is available in a land purchased after issue of 90 days readiness notice may not be considered. However, the respondent's representative informed that other circular if any in this regard will be furnished by him along with his written arguments.

(6) The Superintending Engineer/Karur EDC in his letter dated 10.7.2012 has informed the following :-

During the counseling conducted on 10.7.2012 in SEs chamber, the EE/O&M/Rural / Karur has agreed to effect one number agricultural service connection at S.F.No.695/B9 instead of S.F. No. 318/11 and Thiru. Kumarasamy, the appellant also agreed for the above. The SE/Karur EDC also informed that the appellant has withdrawn the appeal petition by duly enclosing a letter dt.10.7.2012 received from the appellant.

(7) Thiru. S. Kumarasamy in his letter dt.10.7.2012 has informed that the EE/O&M/Karur has agreed to effect agricultural service for his well in S.F.

No.695/B9 instead of S.F.No.318/11 against the application No.47 dt.10.7.1996, in the presence of SE/Karur EDC . As he is agreeable for the above, he informed that he is withdrawing the Appeal Petition No.13 of 2012.

(8) As the appellant has withdrawn the petition, the Appeal Petition No. 13 of 2012 is dismissed as Withdrawn.

(A. Dharmaraj)
Electricity Ombudsman

To

- 1) Thiru. S. Kumarasamy,
Advocate,
51. Malayampalayam,
Dhalavapalayam Post,
Karur Dist.
- 2) The Superintending Engineer,
Karur EDC,
TANGEDCO (formerly TNEB),
No.3, Kovai Road,
Karur – 639 002.
- 3) The Chairman & Managing Director,
TANGEDCO,
NPKRR Malaigai,
144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.
- 4) The Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission
No.19A, Rukmini Lakshmipathy Salai,
Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.
- 5) The Assistant Director (Computer) - **FOR HOSTING IN THE WEBSITE.**
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission
No.19A, Rukmini Lakshmipathy Salai
Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.