



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. 46 of 2012

M/s Sreenivasa Balaji Papers Pvt Ltd.,
SF No.231/4, 231, Pechinaickenoor,
Muthunaickenpatty Post,
Narikalpatty (via),
Palani Taluk,
Dindigul – 624 618.

. . . . Appellant
(Rep by Thiru. P. Chandrasekaran)

Vs

The Superintending Engineer,
Dindigul Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
Meenakshinaickenpatty Post,
Dindigul - 624 002.

. Respondent
(Rep by Thiru. S. Stephen Arokiaraj,
EE/General/Dindigul)

Date of hearing: 4.12.2012

Date of Order : 13-5-2013

The appeal petition No. AP 46 of 2012 came up for final hearing before Electricity Ombudsman on 4.12.2012. Upon perusing the above appeal petition, Counter Affidavit filed by the Respondent and after hearing both sides, the Electricity Ombudsman passes the following order.

ORDER

1. Prayer of the Appellant:-

The Appellant prayed for the following :

- (i) To instruct the Superintending Engineer, Dindigul EDC, Dindigul to effect the HT service to its mill without any more delay.
- (ii) To pass order for payment of maximum penalty as per clause 43(3) of Electricity Act, 2003 read with chapter 2, clause 4(3)(1) of Distribution Standards of Performance considering their date of application as 21.3.2012.
- (iii) To pass suitable orders to compensate their loss as explained in their petition.
- (iv) To pass any order that Hon'ble Tamil Nadu Electricity Ombudsman , Chennai , as deemed fit and required.

2. Facts of the case:

The Appellant M/s Sreenivasa Balaji Papers Pvt Ltd., Pechinaickenoor, applied for a HT service connection for their paper mill. As there was delay in effecting the service connection, the appellant has filed a petition to Hon'ble TNERC for effecting the service. The hearing on the matter was held on 10.8.2012 and the orders of Hon'ble Commissions is reserved. In the meanwhile the petitioner gave an undertaking to avail the service on the wind feeder , but the service was not effected. The appellant filed a petition to CGRF of Dindigul EDC with the same prayers. The CGRF of Dindigul EDC has fixed the hearing date as 12.9.2012 . But the call letter was received by the appellant on 14.9.2012. The appellant asked for a revised date

for hearing but no reply was received till 5.10.2012. As 66 days were lapsed from the date of filing of the petition to CGRF, they filed the appeal petition to Electricity Ombudsman. The CGRF of the Dindigul EDC has passed its orders on 12.10.2012 wherein it has been stated that since the petition was already presented before the premier forum and direction issued by Hon'ble TNERC in this regard, it would not be wise to hear the petition again at CGRF of Dindigul EDC.

3. Contentions of the Appellant:

The Appellant has contended the following in his appeal petitions.

- i) They applied for HT service in 22 KV rating for a demand of 3500 KVA originally on 26.5.2011.
- ii) SE/DEDC, Dindigul vide his letter No.SE/DEDC/DGL/AEE/GL/AE1/TA3/F.HTDoc./D.1010/11, dt.5.7.2011 called for some clarification with respect to (i) petition of one Thiru. C. Ramachandran and (ii) Copy of the deeds of the other party land which are proposed to be used for the treatment of water.
- iii) They had submitted their reply to the objections raised by SE/DEDC, Dindigul Vide their letter dated 20.3.2012 along with the necessary documents.
- iv) As per the advice of SE/DEDC, Dindigul, they have submitted a fresh HT application in 22 KV rating for a demand of 3500 KVA on 21.3.2012, to maintain cordial relationship with the supplier.
- v) The SE/DEDC, Dindigul in the affidavit filed before the Hon'ble TNERC on 10.8.2012, has stated that the appellant had submitted the second

application on 1.4.2012 and it was informed to them that the application could not be registered due to the query regarding the lands etc., they hereby submit to the Hon'ble Tamil Nadu Electricity Ombudsman , Chennai that 1.4.2012 was Sunday and no TANGEDCO office will function on Sunday and receive the application. So from the above it is clear that SE/DEDC, Dindigul furnished wrong information in the affidavit. they submitted their second HT application on 21.3.2012 only.

- vi) As per clause 27(3) foot note of TN Distribution Code Requisitions for Supply of energy (applications), even if incomplete, and irrespective of whether they are handed over in person or by post, should be acknowledged in writing, if they are in order, they shall be registered immediately and acknowledged , if they are incomplete, the defects should be indicated and returned without registration.
- vii) As much as SE/DEDC, Dindigul had not returned the application indicating the defect immediately it was presumed that thier application is in complete shape without any defects or objections.
- viii) When the applications are not returned and found in complete shape SE/DEDC, Dindigul ought to have registered their application and further process had to be taken from Day 1 of submission of application as per Chairman TNEB Memo No.D224/2005 dated 16.5.2005 which was issued as per the regulation 34(1) of Distribution Code.
- ix) SE/DEDC, Dindigul on 21.4.2012 (ie) after a period of 32 days, called for the feasibility report from the field to be submitted within 3 days. As

per SE/DEDC, Dindigul letter dated 8.6.2012, it is learnt that EE Palani had submitted the feasibility Report on 18.5.2012, after a lapse of 28 days instead of 3 days.

- x) SE/DEDC, Dindigul had not replied anything for 2, ½ months till they submitted an application on 6.6.2012 requesting to early process their HT application and effect the service and enclosed a DD for Rs.500/- towards the application registration fee.
- xi) They represented their grievance to the Secretary, TNERC, Chennai on 4.6.2012 and they had sought information from SE/DEDC, Dindigul in this regard.
- xii) After a lapse of 2 ½ months from the date of application and their two representations, and letter from TNERC as narrated in the para 14 to 16 of their petition, SE/DEDC, Dindigul wrote two letters dated 8.6.2012 and sought clarification on the following subjects.
 - (a) Objection of Thiru. C. Ramachandran
 - (b) A FIR filed against the Directors
 - (c) Genuineness of the Pollution Certificate submitted by them
 - (d) Way leave problem.
- xiii) After satisfying that the application is in complete shape and called for and received the feasibility report raising the queries and clarification means it is clear that SE/DEDC, Dindigul is acting to satisfy some

external forces and not acting as per the rules, codes, instructions, and orders of the higher officials.

- xiv) They submitted their reply on 22.6.2012 to the clarifications sought by SE/DEDC, Dindigul in their two letters dated 8.6.2012, and resubmitted the DD for application registration fee.
- xv) SE/DEDC, Dindigul vide Lr.No.D846/12 dt.4.7.2012 , has not accepted their reply and he pointed out the reason for non acceptance for 3 points and left them silent in respect of the remaining 3 points. SE/DEDC, Dindigul returned the DD sent for the registration fee.
- xvi) It is learnt from the letters sent by SE/DEDC, Dindigul for the replies as well as letter sent by SE/DEDC, Dindigul for the clarification sought by them under Right to Information Act 2005, the reason for non registering of their HT application shall be grouped as below :
 - (a) Objection of Thiru. C. Ramachandran
 - (b) Genuineness of the Pollution Certificate submitted by them
 - (c) A FIR filed against the Directors
 - (d) Prevention in connecting their HT service in the near by 22 KV Wind Mill feeders.
 - (e) Way leave problem.
 - (f) A letter written by Thiru. K. Kittusamy, Toppampatty Union.
- xvii) Thiru. C. Ramachandran had resigned from his Director ship on 25.2.2010 and the same was accepted by the board of Directors of the Company on 27.2.2010. Also, the registrar of companies, Ministry of

corporate affairs accepted the same. Further, his signature was sent to forensic department by the company law board and the department revealed that the signature in the resignation letter is matched with the specimen signature. More over the Hon'ble company law board directed him to abstain from writing to bank and public authorities regarding the issues involved in the company affairs.

- xviii) SE/DEDC, Dindigul in this letter No.865/12 dt.7.7.2012 quoted Memo No.SE/IEMC/EE3/AEE1/F.Instruction/D857/2001 (Tech.Br) dt.3.1.2001 which contains working instructions of processing HT application. Clause C(vii) of the working instruction is clear that the letter of consent to establish industries issued by TN Pollution Board for applications coming under RED category of industries is essential. Our mill comes under Orange category and so delaying in registration and process of our HT application raising some or other doubts in the Pollution Certificate is nothing but purposefully delaying to effect the service to our industry.
- xix) As soon as the Electricity Act 2003, come into, the instructions issued prior to this Act based on Indian Electricity Rules 1956, Electricity Supply Act 1948 and Indian Electricity Act 1910 would become invalid, so the instructions quoted by SE/DEDC, Dindigul in the above para is not a valid order.
- xx) Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board initially granted permission on 26.9.2009 for two years quoting SF numbers to establish the industry.

The same was submitted to SE/DEDC, Dindigul . Further, one Thiru. C. Ramachandran sent a petition to the Pollution Control Board also objecting and requesting cancellation of the certificate issued by the board. The officials of the Pollution Control Board after visiting the site and after verifying all the records issued extension of Validity of Consent for establishment for one more year vide their letter dt.17.3.2012. Clause 7 to the general conditions enclosed along with the initial approval reads as follows :

“ Any change in the details furnished in the conditions has to be brought to the notice of the board and got approved by the board before obtaining consent to operate under the said Act”

Hence, the changes in the land will be incorporated in the order of consent to operate.

- xxi) SE/DEDC, Dindigul in his letter No.688/12 dt.8.6.2012 in para 2 has stated that a FIR is filed against the Directors of their industry and that is also a reason for non registration of HT application. The appellant had replied vide its letter dt.22.6.2012 (para 2) that only FIR is filed and not any case has been filed. We request the copy of orders/ instructions issued either by TNERC or TANGEDCO or both prohibiting the process of any application if any FIR in a Criminal case is filed against the Directors of the company. SE/DEDC, Dindigul in his reply letter No.846/12 dt.4.7.2012 has not replied for it and no copy of the orders/instructions issued in this regard has been supplied.

- xxii) There are 3 nos wind farm 22 KV feeders (Enercon 3 and Enercon 6 feeders in a single support and 22 KV NS feeder in a separate support). These three feeders were taken on the both sides of the road adjacent to their mill. So they requested SE/DEDC, Dindigul in para 2 of their letter dt.22.6.2012 to extend supply to their mill from one of the above three wind mill feeders. SE/DEDC, Dindigul in his letter No.846/12 dt.4.7.2010 para1, replied that Chief Engineer/Commercial Vide Memo No. CE/ Comm/ EET/ AEE1/ F.Jayalakshmi/DNo.460/10 dt.9.8.2012 has clearly instructed that extension of industrial /commercial service connections from wind farm feeders has to be avoided.
- xxiii) They brought to the kind notice of the Consumer Redressal Forum that the HT supply to the M/s Jayalakshmi Alloys India P Ltd., Pollachi for a load of 3500 KVA has been effected only in the wind mill feeder, so the memo of Chief Engineer/Commercial relied and intimated to them is void. Hence, that memo seems to be no longer in force.
- xxiv) Moreover two more HT services were connected in BEST WindMill Feeder of Andhiyur 110/22KV SS in Udumalpet Electricity Distribution Circle in May 2012 namely :-
- a. M/s Karpagavinayaga Textiles
 - b. M/s Ragupathy Spinniers, Kolarpatty.
- xxv) Many industrial and Commercial services as well as distribution transformers are connected to the Wind Mill Feeders. For example

the details of Distribution Transformers and services connected to the Wind Mill Feeders are given below :

- i) 22 KV Enercon Feeder 1 - 1 No Distribution Transformer
- ii) 2KV Enercon Feeder 3 - 3 No Distribution Transformer

LTCT Service Connected Details :

Service No.	Load
(i) 05292004710	110KW
(ii) 05292004431	111.41KW
(iii) 05292004432	97.98 KW\

The service No.05292004710 is effected in October 2010 which is after the issue of order by Chief Engineer/Commercial on 9.8.2010 So SE/DEDC, Dindigul had not either bothered about that order or that memo might had been with drawn and so the industrial service number 05292004710 was effected. More over it is bought to the kind notice of the Consumer grievance Redressal Forum that the LTCT services are treated on par with the HT services. So the interpretation of SE/DEDC, Dindigul for the Chief Engineer/Commercial's Memo or the LTCT service and their HT service are seems to be motivated.

- xxvi) Chief Engineer/Commercial in his memo dt.9.8.2010 has instructed that the extension of industrial / commercial service connections from the Wind Mill feeders has to be avoided. The Chief Engineer, Commercial had not stated as "should not be connected" because of the word can be avoided the Jayalakshmi Alloys India Ltd., Polachi

might had been connected and service effected in the Wind Mill feeder.

xxvii) Due to the prevailing geographical condition near their mill, Tangedco permitted and erected the Wind Mill feeders on both sides of the road, without any opportunity to erect any type of new lines at a later date for development in that areas by Tangedco even for the general public so with regard to that condition it becomes necessary and there is no other way to connect the loads even for the distribution transformers with LT network in the Wind Mill feeder. So only Chief Engineer/Commercial might have given instruction as avoided not as should not be connected. The same condition can apply in respect of their Mill also.

xxviii) The execution of HT line from the Wind Mill feeder is most economical than extending from the industrial feeder near VKS farms. More over reduction in erection of HT line causes not only more stability of supply but also reduction of line. The SE/DEDC, Dindigul in his letter communicated has stated that the appellant has to arrange necessary way leave to our own expenses for erection of new 22 KV HT Line, but SE/DEDC, Dindigul has not intimated so far as to the point from which it has been proposed to extend supply to their mill and as to which portion of area, the way leave has to be obtained by them.

xxix) As the Tangedco permitted to lay line on both sides of the public road and requested the applicant to get the way leave to take line in other

party land, it seems to be step-motherly treatment to the applicants like the appellant.

- xxx) SE/DEDC, Dindigul in his letter no.688/12 dt. 8.6.2012, enclosed one letter written by Thiru. K. Kittusamy, Thoppampatty to the Hon Minister, Govt. of TN and that is also a reason for the delay.
- xxxii) From the said letter itself it is clear that the said letter was written due to political enmity. The political enmity is not a bar or ban to process an application of a mill and effect the service. The individual in his letter quoted Pollution Control Certificate as another reason to stop the effecting of the service. The genuineness of Pollution Certificates has been explained in the earlier paragraphs. On 10.8.2012, the Hon'ble TNERC ordered to extend supply to their mill from the existing Wind Mill. The SE/DEDC, Dindigul submitted to the Commission that the applicant have to furnish an undertaking if they are ready to take service from windmill feeder.
- xxxiii) They contacted the office of the SE/DEDC, Dindigul and they obtained the prescribed form and handed over on 24.9.2012, the undertaking typed and signed in the stamp paper of value Rs100/-
- xxxiiii) They received the intimation for payment of registration fee and EMD vide SE/DEDC, Dindigul letter dt. 17.8.2012 and they remitted a sum of Rs.2800500/- vide receipt No.450D032157 dt.24.8.2012. After payment of the above amount no further information has been

received such as execution of agreement etc., even after a lapse of 43 days as on 5.10.2012.

xxxiv) They had invested huge amount in crores for building materials and infrastructure developments. Most of the investments were borrowed from banks, financial institutions etc, More over due to delay tactics adopted by SE/DEDC, Dindigul to process their application and effect the service to their mill they are forced to incur the losses in kind of money, marketing , Business etc.,

4. Contentions of the Respondent :

The Respondent has contended the following in his counter affidavit.

- (i) M/s Sreenivasa Balaji Papers Pvt Ltd., has already presented the same petition submitted to CGRF Dindigul EDC before the Hon'ble TNERC during the hearing of SMP No. 4 of 2012 and the same was admitted for hearing on 10.8.2012.
- (ii) As per the direction of Hon'ble TNERC during the arguments heard in SMP No. 4 of 2012 on 10.8.12 notice has been issued to M/s Sreenivasa Balaji Papers Pvt Ltd., for registration of application and remittance of EMD.
- (iii) The intending consumer has remitted Rs.28,00,500/- towards EMD and registration fee and the application has been registered as CD 015/2012-13 dt.24.8.2012.
- (iv) Concurrence has been requested from SE/NCES/Udumalpet on 28.8.2012 in which it was informed that supply to the above HT service

is proposed to be tapped from 22KV New Suzlon Feeder (generation Feeder) of 110/22KV Thalaiyuthu SS as per the direction of Hon'ble TNERC.

- (v) The SE/NCES/Udumalpet in his interim reply dated 17.9.12 has stated that, on receipt of Hon'ble TNERC order necessary approval will be obtained from the competent authority of TANGEDCO and there after concurrence will be issued.
- (vi) Second affidavit containing the above details has been submitted to Hon'ble TNERC on 22.9.2012.
- (vii) However, with the intention to avoid delay in processing the application , pending concurrence of SE/NCES Udumalpet, the load sanction proposal which comes under the sanction power of Chairman cum Managing Director /Tangedco Ltd., Chennai has been submitted to CE/D/Madurai on 10.10.2012 and the same has been submitted by CE/D/Madurai to CE/Commercial /Chennai on 26.10.2012.
- (viii) The comprehensive order of Hon'ble TNERC on SMP No.4 of 2012 was reserved and yet to be communicated.
- (ix) The CGRF Dindigul EDC has concluded and passed order to the petitioner on 12.10.12 and the extracts of order is as below :
- (x) "Since, the petition was already presented before the premier forum and the direction issued by Hon'ble TNERC in this regard, it would not be wise to hear the petition again at CGRF, Dindigul EDC. As per the Direction of Hon'ble TNERC, application has been registered as CD

015/2012-13, dt.24.8.2012 after collecting the registration fee and EMD.
Action is being taken to extend the supply to your industry. “

- (xi) It is brought in to the kind notice that, as per the regulation 17(4)(d) of Forum Regulations, no complaint to Electricity Ombudsman shall lie unless the complaint does not pertain to the same subject matter for which any proceeding before any court is pending or a decree or award or a final order has already been passed by any competent court.
- (xii) In the above circumstances, it is submitted that there is no delay on the part of Tangedco in processing the application as the comprehensive order of Hon'ble TNERC is not yet communicated till date.
- (xiii) Also, there is no question of penalty in this case and all the procedures in vogue are correctly followed by Tangedco.

5. Contentions of the appellant in the rejoinder :

The appellant has contended the following in his rejoinder :

- (i) The respondent Superintending Engineer, TANGEDCO, Dindigul in his letter dated 1.11.2012 to Electricity Ombudsman , Chennai has raised objection about their present petition as per regulation 17(4)(d). In this connection they submit that they had made four prayers with TNERC. The Hon'ble TNERC dealt only the effecting of the service and informed to settle the other prayers with Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum , Dindigul with whom the petition is pending. The Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Dindigul sent the enquiry notice dt. 7.9.2012 which reached their hands only on 14.9.2012. Where as the date of enquiry was 12.9.2012, they immediately intimated the same to the Consumer Grievance

Redressal Forum, Dindigul vide their letter dt.14.9.2012 and requested to fix some other date with due intimation well in advance.

(ii) Inasmuch as no reply was received from the Chairman, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Dindigul till 5.10.2012 (ie) after a lapse of 66 days from the date of registration of petition, they filed this petition to Electricity Ombudsman, Chennai on 6.10.2012 and sent a copy of the same to SE, TANGEDCO, Dindigul on the same day.

(iii) The letter dt.7.9.2012 and 12.10.2012 of the Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Dindigul are contradictory if the Chairperson felt to pass an order as like the order dt.12.10.2012, then it was not necessary to call for enquiry vide letter dt.7.9.2012. Hence, in the narrated circumstances they submit that SE, TANGEDCO, Dindigul passed the order dt. 12.10.2012 only after the receipt of their present appeal copy.

(iv) The direction of the Hon'ble TNERC had not been implemented and the service has not been effected as per the Standard of Performance. The Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Dindigul had not heard the appellant with reference to other prayers. This appeal is a fit case to be processed by the Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman.

(v) The Hon'ble TNERC vide notification No.TNERC/SPR/9/1, dt.21.7.2004 has fixed the time for effecting the service and execution of matter works etc., after taking into account of all the parameters of the supplier department, as per the table II in clause 4(3) of the Distribution Standards of Performance . The contention of

SE/Tangedco , Dindigul that there is no delay since he had made so many correspondences is not acceptable for the non – effecting of service.

(vi) The respondent in his counter enclosed the copy of the letter from CE//Madurai to CE/Comml/Chennai insupport of his action taken on their HT application in the letter page No.6 para 17&18 which mentions the genuiness of Pollution Certificate and non submission of ownership certificate for the lands mentioned in the Pollution Certificate as the reasons for non registering and processing the application in this connection they submit that they had not submitted any additional documents other than submitted on 21.3.2012 along with the application which has been processed now. The respondent might have processed it from 24.3.2012 and they might have got service in the month of May 2012 itself.

6. Hearing held by the Electricity Ombudsman:

In order to enable the Appellant and the Respondent to putforth their arguments in person, a hearing was held before the Electricity Ombudsman on 4-12-2012 . Thiru P. Chandrasekaran has represented for the appellant and Thiru. S. Stephen Arokiaraj, EE/General, Dindigul has represented for the respondent . Both the representatives of the appellant and the respondent have reiterated the contents of the appeal petition and the counter respectively.

7. Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman :

7.1 The respondent has argued that as per clause 17(4)(d) of the regulation for CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman, the Electricity Ombudsman cannot entertain the petition, as the final orders of Hon'ble TNERC on this subject matter is pending.

7.2 The appellant argued that, they have filed four prayers with Hon'ble TNERC and the Hon'ble TNERC has dealt only the effecting of the service and informed to settle the other prayers, with CGRF & Dindigul EDC. Hence, the appellant argued that the petition may be taken up for issuing orders. He also cited the daily orders of the Hon'ble TNERC and argued that as recorded in the above order, the undertaking to avail the supply in a Wind Mill feeder was already given to the respondent on 24.8.2012. But, the respondent has not effected the service till date. In the course of argument he informed that all the four prayers submitted before Electricity Ombudsman were also submitted to CGRF & Hon'ble TNERC.

7.3 As the respondent has pointed out the regulation 17(4)(d) of the Forum Regulation and argued not to entertain the appeal petition, the said regulation 17(4)(d) of the Regulations for Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman is extracted below :-

“(4) No complaint to the Electricity Ombudsman shall lie unless:

(a) The complainant had before making a complaint to the Electricity Ombudsman made a written representation to the forum of the licensee named in the complaint and either the forum had rejected the complaint or the complainant had not received any reply within a period of two months from date of filing of the grievance or the complainant is not satisfied with the reply given to him by the forum. This shall however not be applicable to the complaints of common nature described under clause 17 (1).

(b) The complaint is made within three months after cause of action has arisen.

(c) The complaint, which is not settled, is not in respect of the same subject, which was settled through the office of the Electricity Ombudsman in any previous proceedings whether received from the same complainant or along with one or more complainants or anyone or more of the parties concerned with the subject matter;

(d) The complaint does not pertain to the same subject matter for which any proceedings before any court is pending or a decree or award or a final order has already been passed by any competent court; and
(e) The complaint is not frivolous or vexatious in nature.”

7.4 On a careful reading of the said regulation 17(4)(d) of the Forum Regulations, it is noted that Electricity Ombudsman cannot entertain a petition if any complaint before any court is pending or a decree or award or a final order has already been passed by any competent court on the same subject.

7.5 It is noted that the Hon'ble TNERC has issued its order on SMP No. 4 of 2012 filed by the appellant on 30.1.2013.

7.6 The respondent in his letter dt.8.4.2013 has stated that he has filed an appeal petition before the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity under section 111 of the Electricity Act 2003 against the impugned order dt.30.1.2013 in SMP No. 4 of 2012 passed by the Hon'ble TNERC. The appeal is registered as appeal filing Register No.597 of 2013 and the matter is listed for admission before APTEL on 11.4.2013 along with application for stay of the impugned order.

7.7 The Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity in its daily order. dt. 23.4.2013 against A.P. No.75 of 2013 and I.A. No.122 of 2013 has dismissed the stay application and directed the Appellant to provide the service connection as undertaken before the Commission and pay the penalty of Rs.1000/- within 2 weeks. Further, the case was posted for final disposal on 15.5.2013.

7.8 As the subject matter of the above appeal petition is pending with Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity, as per Regulation 17(4)(d) of the Regulations of CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman, the Electricity Ombudsman cannot entertain the

above petition, for passing any orders. Hence, the above petition is treated as closed.

7.9 With the above findings, the AP 46 of 2012 is disposed off by the Electricity Ombudsman. No cost.

(A. Dharmaraj)
Electricity Ombudsman

To

- 1) M/s Sreenivasa Balaji Papers Pvt Ltd.,
SF No.231/4, 231, Pechinaickennoor,
Muthunaickenpatty Post,
Narikalpatty (via),
Palani Taluk, Dindigul – 624 618.
- 2) The Superintending Engineer,
Dindigul Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO(formerly TNEB),
Meenakshinaickenpatty Post,
Dindigul 624 002.
- 3) The Chairman, (Superintending Engineer),
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
Dindigul Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO(formerly TNEB),
Meenakshinaickenpatty Post,
Dindigul 624 002.
- 4) The Chairman & Managing Director,
TANGEDCO(formerly TNEB),
NPKR Malaigai,
144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.
- 5) The Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission
No.19A, Rukmini Lakshmipathy Salai
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.
- 6) The Assistant Director (Computer) - **FOR HOSTING IN THE WEBSITE**
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
No.19A, Rukmini Lakshmipathy Salai,
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.