

A consumer is the important visitor on our premises.
He is not dependent on us. We are dependent on him.
-Mahatma Gandhi



TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building, Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate,
Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

Phone : ++91-044-2953 5806, 044-2953 5816 Fax : ++91-044-2953 5893

Email : theo Chennai@gmail.com Web site : www.tnerc.tn.gov.in

Before The Tamil Nadu Electricity Ombudsman, Chennai
Present : Thiru. N.Kannan, Electricity Ombudsman

A.P.No. 05 of 2025

Thiru J. Shanmuga Sundaram,
D. No. 236, Cauvery Street, New Ward, No.19,
Bhavani – 638 301.

. Appellant
(Thiru J. Shanmuga Sundaram)

Vs.

1. The Executive Engineer/O&M/Bhavani,
Gobi Electricity Distribution Circle,
TNPDC,
Urachikottai Power House, Bhavani Main Road,
Bhavani-638301.

2. The Assistant Executive Engineer/North / Bhavani,
Gobi Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I,
TNPDC,
47, Varanapuram St, Bhavani-638301.

3. The Assistant Engineer/O&M/Town/Bhavani,
Gobi Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I,
TNPDC,
47, Varanapuram St, Bhavani-638301.

. . . . Respondent
(Thiru v. Muniraj, AEE/North/Bhavani
Tmt. R. Yasodha, AE/O&M/Town/Bhavani)

Petition Received on: 21-01-2025

Date of hearing: 12-03-2025

Date of order: 17-03-2025

The Appeal Petition received on 21.01.2025, filed by Thiru J. Shanmuga Sundaram, D. No. 236, Cauvery Street, New Ward, No.19, Bhavani – 638 301 was

registered as Appeal Petition No. 05 of 2025. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 12.03.2025. Upon perusing the Appeal Petition, Counter affidavit, written argument, and the oral submission made on the hearing date from both the parties, the Electricity Ombudsman passes the following order.

ORDER

1. Prayer of the Appellant:

The Appellant has prayed to temporarily disconnect the service connection No. 04-326-018-22 provided to his house located at Cauvery Street.

2.0 Brief History of the case:

2.1 The Appellant has prayed to temporarily disconnect the service connection provided to his house located at Cauvery Street.

2.2 The Respondent has stated that, based on the above application, the AE/O&M/Town/Bhavani inspected the premises and confirmed that Tmt. J. Kanchana has been residing there for the past 24 years as per the court order.

2.3 Not satisfied with the Respondent's reply, the Appellant filed a petition with the CGRF of Gobi EDC on 10.09.2024.

2.4 The CGRF of Gobi EDC has issued an order dated 23.12.2024. Aggrieved over the order, the Appellant has preferred this appeal petition before the Electricity Ombudsman.

3.0 Orders of the CGRF :

3.1 The CGRF of Gobi EDC issued its order on 23.12.2024. The relevant portion of the order is extracted below: -

“Order:

5.1 இருதரப்பு வாதங்கள் மற்றும் ஆவணங்களையும் ஆய்வு செய்ததில் , மனுதாரர் கூறிய வீட்டில் திருமதி .காஞ்சனா என்பவர் குடியிருந்து வருவது ஆவணங்கள் மற்றும் மின்உரிமத்தாரர்களின் ஆய்வின் மூலம் தெரிய வருகிறது

5.2 மேலும், மின்உரிமம்நாரர்கள் தெரிவித்த கூற்றை இம்மன்றம் ஏற்றுக் கொள்கிறது. எனவே, தமிழ்நாடு ஒழுங்குமுறை ஆணைய விதிகளின் படி மனுதாரரின் தற்காலிக மின் துண்டிப்பு கோரிக்கையை நிராகரித்து , இம்மன்றம் உத்தரவிடுகிறது.

5.3 மனுதாரர் தெரிவித்த பாதுகாப்பு தொடர்பான குறைகளை , மின்உரிமத்தாரர்கள் ஆய்வு செய்து , தமிழ்நாடு ஒழுங்குமுறை ஆணைய விதிகளுக்குட்பட்டு உரிய நடவடிக்கை மேற்கொள்ள இம்மன்றம் உத்தரவிடுகிறது."

4.0 Hearing held by the Electricity Ombudsman:

4.1 To enable the Appellant and the Respondent to put forth their arguments, a hearing was conducted on 12.03.2025 through video conferencing.

4.2 The Appellant Thiru J. Shanmuga Sundaram attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

4.3 The Respondents Thiru V. Muniraj, AEE/North/Bhavani & Tmt. R. Yasodha, AE/O&M/Town/Bhavani of Gobi EDC attended the hearing and put forth her arguments.

4.4 As the Electricity Ombudsman is the appellate authority, only the prayers which were submitted before the CGRF are considered for issuing orders. Further, the prayer which requires relief under the Regulations for CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman, 2004 alone is discussed hereunder.

5.0 Arguments of the Appellant:

5.1 The Appellant has prayed to quash order of CGRF, Gobi circle order passed on 23.12.2024 signed on 27.12.2024 dispatched on 30.12.2024 for the reason mentioned below;

a) for not following procedures & rules and regulation mentioned as per commission's notification No. TNERC/CGRF&EO/6-1 dt 03.10.2005 as the order so passed is illegal, unsustainable in law and also against the principles of natural justice.

b) CRGF, Gobi circle forum has no powers and not competent authority to make order (beside pass order only under rule 2(f)) which are affecting my legal & lawful enjoyment and possession of my property which is my birth right & even my legal right's was conferred to me by the Bhavani II ADM court case no: 475/2004 through a permanent injunction order which is still in force.

c) Chairman and all Member's of the forum has passed order not even seeing details of my admitted complaint & its attachment & the reply made by licensee officer's were not true/false in nature by simple visible eye means para 2.1 his house is "cauvery street" from 1993 still now not & para 2.2 receipt "ERD3261A151747-2 nos" paid on 30.08.2024 not in 01.08.2024 and its cc-arrears & RC charges were paid on 03.09.2024 only after their temporary disconnection of electronic meter for EB service (L73/LB23/043260 1823) only on 02.09.2024 that too not collecting all charges before disconnection by AE, bhavani which is also against their as per commission's notification No. TNERC/SC/7-4 dated 25.5.2007 under regulation 5, service/line, structure and equipments shifting charge.

5.2 The Appellant has prayed to issue order for temporary disconnection of the EB connection service number: (L72/LB22/0432601822) to carry out repairing & maintenance of house wiring which <50 yrs & to demolish the unapproved buildings & also to change the supply wire from the post to EB meter point and also to install ELCB as per TNERC norms& safety purpose section 14,15,16, 28,37 & 53 of the electricity act 2003.

5.3 The Appellant has prayed to order for the compensation to me as per TNERC for the deficiency in service by AE, Bhavani town and AEE,Bhavani North for Rs. 2000/- for not shifting of meter within 15 days from the date of appl. ie 01.08.24 (32808246658666) notification no. TNERC/SPR/9/1 dated 21.07.2004 under sec 7 & also per commission's notification No.TNERC/SC/7-4 dated 25.5.07 (w.e.f. 13.6.2007) under 5. service / line, structure and equipments shifting charge "no shifting of an existing service connection is permissible unless all arrears in the service connection are paid, if so demanded by the licensee" and rs 25000/- for my mental anguish.

5.4 The Appellant has prayed to order the Gobi forum to strictly to follow rules to incorporate in their order (if any written argument of the complaint is filed on hearing) and to pass order with specific rule & regulations with its numbers in their norms rather than in general & also to pass order mentioning with majority of votes of its forum members to make the decision and to mention their phone number & e-mail id in their all orders so that justice prevails for aggrieved/complainant.

5.5 The Appellant has prayed to order for an enquiry for the false reply & statement made by licensee officer's misleading the forum to make wrong mentioning in their order about my property add as "தேர் வீதி " which is "cauvery street" from 1993 and receipt ERD326IA1S1747-2 nos" paid on 30.08.2024 not in 01.08.2024 and about Kanchana D/o. Venkatesan (native of Salem district) who has various identity obtained using forged documents even after my explanation with proof that her husband name is "Palanisamy" and her habitat is always at 346, Kaveri st, Bhavani and reply & statements given by the licensee is false informations and facts which is unlawfully & illegal.

5.6 The Appellant has prayed that central electricity authority notification new Delhi, the 8th June, 2023 no. CEA-PS-16/1/2021-CEI division- CEA (measures relating to safety and electric supply) regulations, 2022 under chapter 14 general safety requirements

a) Section 14. general safety requirements pertaining to construction, installation, protection, operation and maintenance of electric supply lines and apparatus - (1) all electric supply lines and apparatus shall be of sufficient rating for power, insulation and estimated fault current and of sufficient mechanical strength, for the duty cycle which they may be required to perform under the environmental conditions of installation, and shall be constructed, installed, protected, worked and maintained in such a manner as to ensure safety of human beings, animals and property.

b) Section 15. Service lines and apparatus on consumer's premises - (1) the supplier shall ensure that all electric supply lines, wires, fittings and apparatus belonging to him or under his control, up to the point of commencement of supply,

which are on a consumer's premises, are in a safe-condition and in all respects fit for supplying electricity and the supplier shall take precautions to avoid danger arising on such premises from such supply lines, wires, fittings and apparatus.

c) Section 16. Switchgear on consumer's premises (2) every electric supply line other than the earthed or earthed neutral conductor of any system or the earthed external conductor of a concentric cable shall be protected by a suitable switchgear by its owner.

d) Section 28. Accidental charging. (1) the owners of all circuits and apparatus shall so arrange them that there shall be no danger of any part thereof becoming accidentally charged to any voltage beyond the limits of voltage for which they are intended.

e) Section 37. Supply and use of electricity. (1) the electricity shall not be supplied, transformed, converted, inverted or used or continued to be supplied, transformed, converted, inverted or used unless the conditions provided in sub regulations (2) to (8) are complied with. (2) the following controls of requisite capacity to carry and break the current shall be installed as near as possible after the point of commencement of supply so as to be readily accessible and capable of completely isolating the supply to the installation, such equipment being in addition to any control switch installed for controlling individual circuits or apparatus, namely: supplied at voltage control 1) below 11 kv. switch fuse unit or a circuit breaker by consumers. 2) 11 kv and above. a circuit breaker by consumers. (as above section are also implemented & accepted by TNERC rule and regulations-especially mandatory provision for RCD in all service connections amendments to the Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Code-Notification No. TNERC/DC/8-28, dated 24-12-2020 (w.e.f. 27-1-2021)-(LR. NO.TNERC/DD(L) F. notification/D. No. 1438/2021))

5.7 The Appellant has stated that even after his application on 29.07.2024 and informing about this to AE/AEE, Bhavani/Town/North has not taken any steps still now to see whether it is safe to provide supply to his premises at 236, cauvery street, Bhavani (as his house wiring are above 50 yrs old & torn wire's from the pole

to the point of supply) as informed on march 2023 while the letter sent to commissioner, municipality regarding my building conditions and about corroded electric pole at his south east corner of his plot to them).

6.0 Arguments of the Respondent:

6.1 The Respondent has submitted that on 01.08.2024, the SC No. 04-326-018 - 22 has been inspected by the Assistant Engineer/Operation and Maintenance/Town/Bhavani, based on the application given by the petitioner Thiru J.Shanmuga Sundaram to disconnect the above domestic service temporarily. At the time of inspection, it is noticed that Tmt J. Kanchana (second wife of petitioner's father) is residing in the above premises. As per the Chief Engineer/Commercial/Chennai's instructions issued as follows.

“Regulation 27 (4) of the Tamilnadu Electricity Distribution code, 2004 interalia, provides that a person in lawful occupation of a premises is entitled to electricity service connection, with or without the consent of the owner of the premises.”

6.2 The Respondent has submitted that notice issued to the petitioner Thiru J.Shanmuga Sundaram regarding the building in TS ward C, Block 16, TS No.29 (Near Ration Shop)'s to remove the 60 years old terrace roof and tiled roof by the Commissioner / Bhavani Municipality.

6.3 The Respondent has submitted that the application for temporary disconnection of SC No 04 326 018.22 is registered by the applicant. Based on the above application, the Assistant Engineer/Operation and Maintenance/Town/Bhavani has inspected the above premises and found that Tmt J.Kanchana is residing in the above premises. It is came to know that occupier Tmt.J.Kanchana is second wife of petitioner's father.

6.4 The Respondent has submitted that the representation is received from the occupier Tmt.J.Kanchana W/o. Jayabalan on 31.07.2024 in which the details stated by above occupier as follows.

- For the last 24 Years, residing in the above premises along with Husband as per Judgment order issued by Hon'ble District / Court / Bhavani.

- And that opponent party is take illegal steps to vacate the house and Disconnect the service.

6.5 The Respondent has submitted that after that it is informed to the petitioner Thiru.J.Shanmugasundaram as follows by AE/O&M/Bhavani.The service cannot be disconnected in the premises since Tmt.Kanjana is residing in the premises as lawful occupier. In addition to that next higher officer AEE/North/Bhavani is also inspected the premises and confirm the occupancy. Electricity is very basic amenity. And then the petitioner has applied the appeal to the appellant forum (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum) vide CGRF Petition No. CGRF/017/2024 Dated. 10.09.2024. For the above CGRF Petition trial posted on 05.11.2024 and the detailed Enquiry has been conducted by CGRF forum and the final order is issued on 23.12.2024.

7.0 Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:

7.1 I have heard the arguments of both the Appellant and the Respondent. Based on the arguments and the documents submitted by them, the following conclusion is arrived. As the Electricity Ombudsman is an appellate authority for CGRF orders, only the prayer submitted at CGRF alone is taken for argument. No new prayer submitted here is considered.

7.2 The appellant has challenged the CGRF, Gobi Circle's order, arguing that it was issued without following TNERC's prescribed procedures and is legally unsustainable. He contends that the forum lacked the authority to pass orders affecting his lawful possession of the property, which has been protected by a permanent injunction order. He further claims that the forum members failed to consider his complaint details while accepting misleading statements from the licensee.

7.3 The appellant claims that the temporary disconnection of his electricity service was not handled as per the prescribed regulations. He asserts that the service was disconnected without collecting all the outstanding charges beforehand, which is in violation of TNERC regulations. Furthermore, he has requested

temporary disconnection of another service connection to facilitate maintenance and repair work, including rewiring, demolition of unauthorized structures, and installation of an ELCB as per TNERC safety norms. He insists that these safety measures are necessary and should be implemented immediately.

7.4 Additionally, the appellant seeks compensation for the deficiency of service provided by the officials of Bhavani Town, arguing that the shifting of the meter was delayed beyond the prescribed time limit of 15 days. He claims that the delay caused him inconvenience and mental distress, for which he is seeking financial compensation. The appellant has also alleged that the licensee officials have provided false information and misleading statements regarding his property address and payment receipts.

7.5 The appellant further refers to the Central Electricity Authority's safety regulations and highlights the legal obligation of the electricity provider to ensure that electrical infrastructure, including supply lines, apparatus, and switchgear, is in a safe condition. He argues that the supply to his premises should have been reviewed for safety compliance, considering that the wiring in his house is over 50 years old and potentially hazardous. Despite informing the authorities about corroded poles and deteriorating wiring conditions, he alleges that no action has been taken, thereby compromising electrical safety. He urges immediate steps to assess and rectify safety risks before continuing the power supply, emphasizing compliance with safety norms to prevent electrical hazards.

7.6 The respondent argues that the appellant's request for temporary disconnection of SC No. 04-326-018-22 cannot be granted because the premises are lawfully occupied by Tmt. J. Kanchana, who has been residing there for 24 years as per Court judgment. As per Regulation 27(4) of the Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Code, 2004, a person in lawful occupation of a premises is entitled to an electricity service connection, irrespective of the owner's consent. The respondent emphasizes that electricity is a basic necessity and cannot be disconnected arbitrarily.

7.7 During an inspection by the Assistant Engineer/O&M/Bhavani, it was confirmed that Tmt. Kanchana was residing in the premises, and her representation dated 31.07.2024 stated that the appellant was attempting to evict her by seeking the disconnection of the service. The Assistant Engineer informed the appellant that disconnection could not be approved due to the lawful occupancy of the premises. The inspection findings were further confirmed by the next higher authority, the Assistant Executive Engineer/North/Bhavani.

7.8 The respondent highlights that the appellant filed an appeal with the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) under Petition No. CGRF/017/2024, dated 10.09.2024. The CGRF conducted a detailed inquiry on 05.11.2024 and issued its final order on 23.12.2024, concluding that the disconnection request was not justified. Therefore, the respondent maintains that the electricity supply must continue to be provided to the lawful occupier and that the appellant's request lacks merit.

7.9 The appellant has requested the temporary disconnection of his electricity service connection to facilitate essential maintenance and safety measures. He asserts that the wiring in his premises is over 50 years old and poses a potential hazard. To ensure compliance with TNERC safety norms, he seeks to carry out rewiring, demolition of unauthorized structures, and installation of an Earth Leakage Circuit Breaker (ELCB). He insists that these safety measures are necessary and should be implemented immediately.

7.10 Before briefing the subject for discussion, I would like to discuss the following points. The appellant Thiru.J.Shanmuga Sundaram is the son of Thiru.Jayabalan and there existed a dispute between the two vide O.S.No.90/2012 and the relevant para of the order is reproduced below.

"21. முடிவில் வாதி தன் வழக்கினை தகுந்த சாட்சிகள் மற்றும் சான்றாவணங்கள் மூலம் நிரூபணம் செய்துள்ள காரணத்தால் பிரதிவாதியோ அவருடைய ஆட்களோ எவ்வகையிலும் வாதியை தாவா சொத்தின் அனுபவத்திலிருந்து சட்டப்படியே அல்லாமல் வெளியேற்றக் கூடாது என நிரந்தர உறுத்துக் கட்டளை

பரிகாரம் பிறப்பித்து உத்தரவிடப்படுகிறது . தரப்பினர்களின் உறுவு முறைகளை கருத்திற்கொண்டு செலவுத் தொகைகளை தரப்பினர்களே ஏற்க வேண்டும்”

From the above judgment, it is noticed that Thiru Jeyabalan, who is the father of the Appellant is entitled to reside at the premises. It is also noticed from the judgment Tmt. J.Kanchana is the second wife of the Thiru Jeyabalan.

7.11 Further, the respondent has verified the documents for lawful occupation of Tmt.J.Kanchana in the premises and also found as per the Residence Certificate document enclosed by the Respondent where the Appellant requested to disconnect the electricity service connection 326-018-22 in the above occupied premises as the EB service connection is in his name. In this context, I would like to examine the sufficient reasons for disconnecting the electricity supply being utilized by someone.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS FOR DISCONNECTION

Sl. No.	Provision	Reason
1	Section 56 of Electricity Act 2003 Regulation 21 of TNE Supply Code	Non payment of dues
Court Directions		
2	Specific order of disconnection issued by the Court.	

7.12 Further, I am examining Tamil Nadu Electricity Supply Code Regulation 21(1). The regulation is provided below.

“21. Disconnection of supply

Section 56 of the Act with regard to disconnection of supply in default of payment reads as follows :

“ (1).Where any person neglects to pay any charge for electricity or any sum other than a charge for electricity due from him to a Licensee or the generating company in respect of supply, transmission or distribution or wheeling of electricity to him, the Licensee or the generating company may, after giving not less than fifteen clear days notice in writing, to such person and without prejudice to his rights to recover such charge or other sum by suit, cut off the supply of electricity and for that purpose cut or disconnect any electric supply line or other works being the property of such Licensee or the generating company through which electricity may have been supplied, transmitted, distributed or wheeled and may discontinue the supply until such

charge or other sum, together with any expenses incurred by him in cutting off and reconnecting the supply, are paid, but no longer.”

According to the above regulation, it is understood that electricity supply can be disconnected only under circumstances where the consumer has failed to pay the required charges or is using electricity in an unauthorized manner. Furthermore, it is also indicated that disconnection should be carried out only based on “Specific order of disconnection issued by the Court” i.e. disconnection order duly mentioning the exact service connection number.

7.13 The judgments and orders of the Hon'ble Madras High Court, along with the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Electricity Act, contain similar precedents regarding such cases. Several legal cases have arisen in the past concerning the interpretation and application of this regulations, and some of those cases are referred below.

“(i) In S.A.Ponnappan —vs- J.A. Bath urujaman and two others in W.A.No.1396 of 2007 dated 15.04.2009 (TNEB case) reported in 2009 (2) TNCJ 411 (Mad), the Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court has held as follows :-

"10. The above provision makes it clear that an intending consumer, who is in lawful occupation, can apply to the Electricity Board, with the consent of the landlord, for supply of electricity. In case if the owner refused to give consent letter or he is not in station, the consumer shall produce a proof that he is in lawful occupation of the premises and also execute an indemnity bond in Form 6 of the Annexure Ill of this Code indemnifying the Electricity Board against any loss on account of disputes arising out of effecting service connection.

11. In such view of the matter, when there is a provision as enacted by the State Electricity Regulatory Commission in accordance with Section 86 of the Electricity Act, 2003 (Central Act 36 of 2003), certainly the lawful occupant has a right to have the electricity supply and if he is compelled to lead his life in darkness, it would amount to make him lead an animal life, which is not the purport of the Constitution. Therefore, we are of the view that the said Clause confers such valuable right to the occupant."

(ii) When a consumer for many years was directed to produce documents pursuant to a complaint alleging production of fabricated documents to get service connection, the Hon'ble High Court, Madras, in WP No.29586 of 2015 dated 21.09.2015, has held as follows :-

"5. It is very unfortunate to note that based on the complaint received from Seviappan which does not disclose any material evidence, the fifth respondent has issued notice to the petitioner to produce the relevant documents. In fact, the fifth respondent should have called upon the complainant to produce the relevant document with regard to his claim in respect of the said property. Assuming for a moment that even if there is a dispute, the respondent has got no jurisdictional power to decide about the issue and if it all, only the Civil Court can decide the issue. Moreover, the electricity service connection is not given recently but it was given about 15 years ago. When that is the position, the issuance of notices by the fifth respondent is unjustified, unwarranted and to be deprecated and it is accordingly, deprecated."

(iii) In A.Nazeer Ahmed —vs- Assistant Engineer (North Division), TNEB, Vaniyambadi and another in W.P.No.1040 of 2013 dated 03.04.2013, it has been held as follows :-

"3. Even assuming that an eviction order has been obtained by the second respondent against the petitioner, unless and until, the same is executed and delivery is obtained by the second respondent, the petitioner who is still holding the property is entitled for the electricity service connection. Therefore, in my considered view, merely because the eviction order has been obtained by the second respondent against the petitioner, the electricity service connection which is available shall not be disconnected."

In previous judgments, it has been established that electricity supply cannot be disconnected in a premises where a person is in occupation.

7.14 As it is confirmed by the documents submitted and site inspection conducted by the AE and the same was accepted by the appellant during the hearing that there is a lawful occupant in the premises, electricity supply disconnection as requested by the appellant is not possible under the existing rules and regulations. The CGRF also issued order by rejecting the prayer of the Appellant for disconnection. In view of the above findings, I too concur with the orders of the CGRF. Hence the

Appellant's prayer is rejected. Further, the compensation prayer of the appellant is also rejected since the same was not placed before the CGRF.

8.0 Conclusion:-

8.1 Based on the above findings, the Appellant's claim to disconnect the service connection is rejected.

8.2 With the above findings the A.P. No. 05 of 2025 is finally disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman. No Costs.

(N. Kannan)
Electricity Ombudsman

“நுகர்வோர் இல்லையேல், நிறுவனம் இல்லை”
“No Consumer, No Utility”

To

1. Thiru J. Shanmuga Sundaram,
D. No. 236, Cauvery Street,
New Ward, No.19,
Bhavani – 638 301.

- By RPAD

2. The Executive Engineer/O&M/Bhavani,
Gobi Electricity Distribution Circle,
TNPDC, L,
Urachikottai Power House, Bhavani Main Road,
Bhavani-638301.

3. The Assistant Executive Engineer/North / Bhavani,
Gobi Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I,
TNPDC, L,
47, Varanapuram St, Bhavani-638301.

4. The Assistant Engineer/O&M/Town/Bhavani,
Gobi Electricity Distribution Circle/South-I,
TNPDC, L,
47, Varanapuram St, Bhavani-638301.

5. The Superintending Engineer,
Gobi Electricity Distribution Circle,
TNPDC, L,
Thirpur main road, Vettaikaran kovil,
Gobi 110/11KVSS campus,
Nagadevanpalayam (PO), Gobi-638476.

– By Email

6. The Chairman & Managing Director,
TNPDC,
NPKRR Maaligai, 144, Anna Salai, Chennai -600 002.

– By Email

7. The Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building,
Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate, Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

– By Email

8. The Assistant Director (Computer) – **For Hosting in the TNERC Website**
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
4th Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building,
Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate, Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.