



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**

4<sup>th</sup> Floor, SIDCO Corporate Office Building, Thiru-vi-ka Industrial Estate,

Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

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

Email : [tneochennai@gmail.com](mailto:tneochennai@gmail.com) Web site : [www.tnecr.tn.gov.in](http://www.tnecr.tn.gov.in)

**Before The Tamil Nadu Electricity Ombudsman, Chennai**

**Present : Thiru. N.Kannan, Electricity Ombudsman**

**A.P.No. 06 of 2025**

Tmt. C.Rukkumani,  
Block No.44/5, CPWD Quarters,  
Thirumangalam, Chennai – 600 040.

. . . . . Appellant  
(Rep. by Thiru E. Vasanth Kumar)

Vs.

The Executive Engineer/O&M/Anna Nagar,  
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/West,  
TNPDC,  
1100 A,H Block, 5th street, Ranganathan Garden,  
Anna Nagar, Chennai-600 040.

. . . . . Respondent  
(Thiru S. Anbarasu, EE/O&M/Anna Nagar)

**Petition Received on: 20-01-2025**

**Date of hearing: 12-03-2025**

**Date of order: 18-03-2025**

The Appeal Petition received on 20.01.2025, filed by Tmt. C.Rukkumani, Block No.44/5, CPWD Quarters, Thirumangalam, Chennai – 600040 was registered as Appeal Petition No. 06 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 a bill revision for three additional assessment periods (May, July, and August 2023) based on the faulty meter recording seeking full reimbursement of the excess bill amount and challenge test fee via cheque or bank transfer instead of future bill adjustments.

### 2.0 Brief History of the case:

2.1 The Appellant has prayed a bill revision for three additional assessment periods (May, July, and August 2023) based on the faulty meter recording seeking full reimbursement of the excess bill amount and challenge test fee via cheque or bank transfer instead of future bill adjustments.

2.2 The respondent has stated that the MRT reports from May and September 2023 confirmed the meter was in good condition, making the claim for bill revision before November 2023 unjustified.

2.3 Not satisfied with the Respondent's reply, the Appellant filed a petition with the CGRF of Chennai EDC/West on 11.09.2024.

2.4 The CGRF of Chennai EDC/West has issued an order dated 30.12.2024. 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 Chennai EDC/West issued its order on 30.12.2024. The relevant portion of the order is extracted below: -

**“Order:**

*“As per the above findings, the forum directs the respondent to revise the bill for the period from 21.09.2023 to 26.06.2024. In service connection no.162-023-382 based on the third party challenge test report within 7 days from the date of receipt of this order.*

*Further, as per regulation 7 of the TNE Supply Code, the cost of challenge test has to be reimbursed to the petitioner if the test results contrary to the test report of the Distribution Licensee. Since, in this case, the contrary report has been received, the forum directs the respondent to make necessary arrangement to reimburse the above amount in accordance with regulation 7 of the TNE Supply Code within 7 days from the date of receipt of this order.*

*A Compliance report shall be submitted to the forum within 12 days from the date of receipt of this order.*

*With this, the petition is disposed of.”*

#### **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 in person on 12.03.2025.

4.2 On behalf of the Appellant Thiru E. Vasanth Kumar attended the hearing and put forth his arguments.

4.3 The Respondents Thiru S. Anbarasu, EE/O&M/Anna Nagar of Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/West 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 stated that in the May 2023 assessment month, he received a very high electricity bill than usual. He noticed that power consumption was nearly twice than normal. Prior to this, the number of units consumed was always around 500 during the whole 1 year period (Feb 2022 Mar 2023) since he moved into this residence.

5.2 The Appellant has stated that his home member count (4) has been the same throughout the whole period and his residence is a 2 BHK. High power consuming

electronic appliances that they have at their home are geyser, refrigerator, washing machine and AC. He bought his AC on May 2022 (10 months before this issue began to occur). Their electricity usage has always been modest.

5.3 The Appellant has stated that regarding this problem, he submitted his first complaint to the Assistant Engineer (AE), O&M/TWS Nagar section, CEDC/ WEST, in Anna Nagar on 17.05.2023. Based on his complaint, on 24.05.2023, they downloaded data from their meter at their local lab and stated that meter and reading is normal based on MRT report. He wanted to wait and see if the meter records such high power consumption continuously. After 2 more billing cycles, they observed that the recorded power consumption have been twice than normal consistently.

5.4 The Appellant has stated that he created his first petition on 18.09.2023 in CGRF to take this matter further, Petition No is 1809231455847. Due to this, they again downloaded the data from their meter at their lab. This second MRT report also stated that the meter is in good condition. As MRT reports showed that their meter is healthy at two different times, he thought that the problem might be due to their house wiring or appliances.

5.5 The Appellant has stated that he skipped attending the CGRF petition's hearing due to the above reason as well as he didn't have any solid proof for his argument at that time. CGRF order for his first petition was made on 04.11.2023. In that, they concluded the meter is in good condition based on MRT report alone and closed the petition.

5.6 The Appellant has stated that he hired technicians to inspect his house wiring and appliances. They all asserted that appliances are working properly and wiring is good. Then he complained again to the same AE, Section office, on 22.01.2024 with the above information, but he rejected it, insisting that problem might be with the house wiring and definitely not with the meter.

5.7 The Appellant has stated that once he heard about 3rd party challenge from his relative, he wanted to give it a try. So, on 12.04.2024, he submitted a letter to AE

requesting 3rd party challenge test of his meter. If he had heard about this 3rd party challenge test sooner, he would have applied for it. He stated he paid Rs. 5000/- for this test online. On 24.06.2024, his meter was taken to the Government Electrical Standards Laboratory, Thiru Vi Ka Industrial Estate, Guindy. On 25.06.2024, after testing lab official stated that meter is incorrectly recording power consumption twice than normal. Next day, on 26.06.2024, a worker from TNEB installed new energy meter (Meter No. 5441591) to his house power supply.

5.8 The Appellant has stated that on 28.06.2024, based on challenge test result, he submitted a request letter to AE. Since their service connection is registered in the name of 'The Assistant Engineer', this request letter was approved by the Assistant Engineer, CPWD, Thirumangalam.

5.9 The Appellant has requested to reimbursement of meter challenge test fee, necessary bill revision for the period of inaccurate recording of consumption and reimbursement or adjustment of excess charges in subsequent bills and copy of challenge test and very recent MRT test reports of the old meter.

5.10 The Appellant has stated that he didn't get any response from AE for 75 days since submitting the above letter. He reminded him 3 times in between and he always said that we will get response in next 2-3 days. So, he created his second petition in CGRF on 11.09.2024 for the above grievance.

5.11 The Appellant has stated that he got the CGRF order only by email on 06.01.2025. In that, CGRF members directed the licensee to revise the bill only for the last 5 assessment periods (10 months) and reimburse the excess bill amount paid. But he requested bill adjustment for 8 assessment periods (16 months). To comply with this, nearly Rs. 24,000 (Rs. 19,000 for excess bill in 5 assessment periods and Rs. 5,000 for challenge test) was credited in his service connection account as "AD002-Excess Bill Adjustment". His Jan 2025 bill was adjusted from this amount.

5.12 The Appellant has requested bill revision for the previous 3 assessment periods and reimbursement. The CGRF directed the licensee to revise the bill from

21.09.2023 to 26.06.2024 (5 assessment periods). In the CGRF order, they speculated that inaccurate recordings could have been occurred after the reading recorded as on 20.09.2023. This reading was from the MRT report which was downloaded on 30.09.2023 due to his 1st CGRF petition. This MRT report stated that "the meter was in good condition". But the challenge test report on 25.06 2024 stated that meter is recording twice than actual consumption. So, it contradicted the MRT report. According to Tamil Nadu Electricity Supply Code Regulation 7 (point 9), 3rd party lab challenge test report is final.

5.13 The Appellant has stated that he can infer that MRT report is inaccurate and it can't detect such "double recording" problem. So, those two MRT reports (24.05.2023 & 30.09.2023) can't be taken into account to determine when the inaccurate recording began.

5.14 The Appellant has stated that further, CGRF speculated that inaccurate recording started on 20.09.2023 but he created his 1<sup>st</sup> CGRF petition on 18.09.2023, two days before the speculated date. In the petition, he already mentioned that meter is recording twice than normal for the last 3 assessment periods. This also supports his argument that this issue had been occurring even before the speculated date if it doesn't support, then please explain how did he predict this "double recording" issue and mention it in the petition earlier than speculated date. How can the said problem only arise after he complained about it twice before (17.05.2023 and 18.09.2023)?

5.15 The Appellant has stated that from the power consumption pattern of his house in the 3 year span which is presented below, one can also clearly see that usage has doubled between May 2023 and July 2024 assessment period (16 months). After the installation of new meter in the end of June 2024, recording has been back to normal (below 500 units).

5.16 The Appellant has stated that he bought his AC in May 2022 (summer) and he didn't buy any other high power consuming appliance since then. So, the issue can't be because of AC usage. Even if we compare power consumption record by seasons we

can see this discrepancy. So, based on his very first complaint (dt 17.05.2023) and above reasons, he request to direct Licensee to revise the bill for the 3 assessment periods-May, July, Aug 2023. If he use the same "divide units by 2" method to recalculate bills for the above 3 periods, the excess amount paid will be around Rs. 14,000.

5.17 The Appellant has stated that reimbursement of excess bill amount paid via cheque or bank fund transfer instead of future bill adjustments. The total excess bill amount and challenge test fee that he paid is more than Rs.35.000/-. Of this, Rs. 24,000 is credited to his service connection account just recently. He stated that as he has to evacuate the quarters in 2 years due to his father's retirement, he can't exhaust the total amount with the future bills based on his usage pattern. He doesn't want to lose his hard-earned money. In the CGRF hearing, the chairman said they can't order the licensee on such matter.

5.18 The Appellant has requested to order direct reimbursement of total excess bill amount to him via cheque or bank fund transfer. Since his service connection is registered under "The Assistant Engineer of CPWD Quarters, Thirumangalam, he already got an approval from him for the direct reimbursement to his bank account. He already submitted his bank account details and the above approval letter to AE, Section Office.

## **6.0 Arguments of the Respondent:**

6.1 The Respondent has submitted that the premise at No.44/5, CPWD Qtrs, Thirumangalam, Chennai- 600040 is owned by GOVT OF INDIA(CPWD) and the LT SC No. 09-162-023-382 under TF IA was obtained in the name of ASSISTANT ENGINEER/ELECTRICAL to the above premises.

6.2 The Respondent has submitted that the premise's flat 5 in block 44 said to have been allotted to Thiru Egambaram from Feb 22 and the same have been occupied by his family during Feb 22. Tmy. C.Rukmani is the wife of Th. Egambaram and hence,

she might be one of the enjoyer of the above LT service connection as observed in the field inspection.

6.3 The Respondent has submitted that a letter dt.17.05.2023 written by Tmy. Rukmani was received by Assistant Engineer/O&M/Thiruvalleeswarar Nagar in which it was remarked that they had received the bill charges on higher side and requested to check the meter condition.

6.4 The Respondent has submitted that as per the request, the metering point & its meter were checked by Thiru. Raja, Line Inspector, Thiruvallleswarar Nagar section. During inspection, it was noticed by the staff that the meter in LT Sc No. 09-162-023-382 was visibly working in good condition and the same was informed to the applicant at site.

6.5 The Respondent has submitted that as the applicant hadn't satisfied the reply of the staff, the meter was sent to MRT vide Lr. No. AEE/Cons/ANR/F.MRT/CR. No.233/2023, dt. 20.05.2023 for analysing the performance of the meter. The data of the meter was down loaded & analysed at MRT wing on 20.05.2023.

6.6 The Respondent has submitted that the MRT wing has furnished the report vide Lr. No: AEE/MRT/M/AE/Lab/F. Meter/D.200/2023 dt.24/05/2023 based on the analysis from the downloaded data stating that the meter is in good condition and no abnormalities were noticed.

6.7 The Respondent has submitted that the above meter status was informed to the applicant. Meanwhile, the CC bill for 05/23 was settled by them on 22.05.2023 before due date.

6.8 The Respondent has submitted that Thiru.D.Ekambaram, the allottee of the above premises, has filed the petition in CGRF/CEDC/West on 18.09.2023 through on line mode stating the consumption is doubled and the consumed units were around 15/day in LT SC. No. 162 023 382.



6.9 The Respondent has submitted that the meter in the above service was once again sent to MRT on 20.09.2023 vide Lr.No. AEE/Cons/ANR/F.MRT/CR. No.153 /2023, dt. 20.09.2023 and the data of the meter were down loaded to analyse the performance of meter.

6.10 The Respondent has submitted that the MRT wing has furnished the report on 30.09.2023 vide Lr. No: AEE/MRT/M/AE/Lab/F.Meter/D.992/2023 dt. 30.09.2023 stating no abnormalities was noticed in the meter and the meter is in good condition. The same was informed to the applicant on 30.09.2023 vide letter dt.30.09.2023 from AE/Thiruvallieswarar Nagar.

6.11 The Respondent has submitted that the CGRF/West EDC, based on the above fact, has conducted the hearing on 27.10.2023 and issued its order on 04.11.2023. The CGRF order (operative portion) is reproduced below.

*"As per the above findings, the meter in service connection No.162-023-382 is in good condition and no abnormalities were noticed as per the MRT meter data downloaded report. Hence, the amount charged towards current consumption is found correct. Further, it is noted from the MRT downloaded report that the KW is recorded in service connection no.162-023-382 is more than the sanctioned load of 3 KW. Hence, the respondent is hereby directed to take necessary action, in accordance with regulation 5(2) (ii) of the TNE Supply Code."*

6.12 The Respondent has submitted that Tmy.C.Rukmani has once again represented to AE/Thiruvallieswarar Nagar on 12.04.2024 to go for third party challenge test on the performance of the meter stating recorded consumption is higher than the actual daily usage. Based on the above, a request letter was addressed to M/s Government Electrical Standards Laboratory, Thiru Vi Ka Industrial Estate, Guindy, Chennai 32 vide Lr. No. AE/TWS NAGAR/F. Consumer/ D. No.200 Dt. 29.05.2024 for conducting the challenge test on the meter's performance with the following meter details.

Make: VISIONTEK;

Cap: Single phase, 5-20 Amps;

Type: Static meter with MD recording facility;

6.13 The Respondent has submitted that the demand for challenge test was received from the Chief Electrical Inspector to Government, Government Electrical Standards Laboratory, Thiru-Vi-Ka Industrial Estate, Guindy, Chennai-32 vide Letter No. 501/EIT/GESL/2024 Dated. 04.06.2024 with a request to submit the meter on 24.06.2024 for calibration. The demand Charges of 5,000/- was paid by the petitioner vide E-Challan Receipt No. 20240610014902 dt. 10.06.2024 for the above purpose. As per the request, the meter was handed over on 24.06.2024 to CEIG Lab for calibration. On testing of meter, the report was received from CEIG, Lab vide letter Number 583/EIT/GESL/2024 Dt. 25.06.2024. In the report, it was stated as below.

*"the AC static KWH meter submitted for calibration could not be calibrated due to power measured and energy recorded in the meter exceeds 2 times of actual value. Hence the meter is returned herewith without calibration".*

6.14 The Respondent has submitted that on receipt of the report from the CEIG Lab, a new meter was fixed on 26.06.2024 since the report point out the recorded energy is double the actual value. Online petition has been filed by one Thiru Vasantha Kumar S/o. Ekambaram in CGRF/CEDC/West circle on 13.09.2024 with the following request.

- a. Reimbursement of meter challenge test fee.
- b. Necessary bill revision and adjustment of excess charges.
- c. Copy of challenge test and MRT test report of the old meter.

6.15 The Respondent has submitted that the released meter in LT Sc No. 162-023-382 was sent to NABL Lab/TNPDCL situated in 129-Wallajah Road, Chennai 02 vide Lr.. No. AEE/Cons/ANR /F. Consumer /D. No.360/2024-25dt. 17.10.2024 to ascertain the present status of meter performance. Based on the tests conducted in NABL Lab, the report was received from the Executive Engineer/ NABL vide Lr. No. EE/TTL/ AEE/ F. WO- 052/24-25/ D. NO. 118/24 dt. 18.10.2024 in which the following was stated.

"Physical condition of the meter was found good. By injecting voltage and current, the following was observed.

- a. The power measured by the meter was twice that of the actual value.
- b. The energy recorded by the meter was around twice that of the actual value."

6.16 The Respondent has submitted that the CGRF/Chennai EDC west has issued its order on 30.12.2024 for the hearing conducted on 25.10.2024. The operative portion of the order is as follows.

*"As per the above findings, the forum directs the respondent to revise the bill for the period from 21.09.2023 to 26.06.2024 in Sc No.162-023-382 based on the 3d party challenge test report within 7 days from the date of receipt of this order.*

*Further, as per regulation 7 of the TNE supply code, the cost of challenge test has to be reimbursed to the petitioner if the test results contrary to the test report of the Distribution Licensee. Since, in this case, the contrary report has been received, the forum directs the respondent to make necessary arrangement to reimburse the above amount in accordance with regulation 7 of TNE supply code within 7 days from the date of receipt of order."*

In addition, the following was also declared in the above order.

1. As per the CEIG Lab and NABL/TNPDCL. test results, the meter recording is found abnormal from 11/2023 assessment period and hence, challenge test fee of Rs.5000/- paid by the petitioner is eligible to refund.

2. In addition, necessary bill revision is eligible from 11/2023 assessment as inaccurate recording was found in the meter.

3. As per MRT report on 24.05.2023 & 30.09.2023 and CGRF order dated 4.11.2023, the meter was in good condition up to 09/2023 assessment period. Thereafter, the meter recording is inaccuracy. So, from the period 11/2023 to 07/2024 may be considered for revision of CC Bill considering 50% of unit recorded in the meter. Hence, the bill revision may be given as below.

Sl. No.	Assessment Month	Assessed units	Amount already paid	As per test report 50% of assessed units	Reassessed amount	Difference amount after reassessed
	11/2023	912	5670	456	1461	4209
	01/2023	871	5260	436	1341	3919
	03/2024	774	4316	387	1067	3249
	05/2024	906	5610	453	1443	4167
	07/2024	783	4760	391.5	1305	3544
<b>Total re-assessment amount for adjusted</b>						<b>18999</b>

6.17 The Respondent has submitted that based on the CGRF order dt. 30.12.2024 an adjustment was given for Rs. 23,999/- (Including testing fee Rs 5000) in the LT SC No. 162 023 382 on 10.01.2025 and the same was intimated to the petitioner.

6.18 The Respondent has submitted that the tests conducted in CEIG Lab and NABL/TNPDCL had not revealed the exact period from which the defect was occurred in the meter. However, as per MRT declaration on 24.05.2023 & 30.09.2023 as well CGRF order dated 04.11.2023, the meter was in good condition up to 09/2023 assessment period. More over the petitioner also accepted the above fact during 09/2023, since no appeal was made for the CGRF order dated 04.11.2023. From the test results of MRT, CEIG Lab, NABL/ TNPDCL and CGRF order dated 04.11.2023 it is concluded that the meter recording is found abnormal from 11/2023 assessment period only. i.e. meter performance was in good condition up to 09/2023 assessment. The above facts and records have shown that the prayer of the petitioner is not justifiable and feasible one.

6.19 The Respondent has prayed to dismiss the prayer of the petitioner in LT service connection No. 09-162-023-382 and dismissed the Appeal Petition No.06 of 2025 as may deem it fit and proper and thus render justice.

## **7.0 Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:**

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

7.2 The appellant contends that his electricity meter incorrectly recorded double the actual power consumption from May 2023 to June 2024, leading to significantly higher electricity bills. Despite his consistent electricity usage pattern and the absence of new high-power-consuming appliances since May 2022, his consumption records showed a sudden and unexplained increase. After multiple complaints and technical inspections of his house wiring and appliances, he was assured that everything on his end was

functioning properly. However, initial tests conducted by the electricity board's Meter Relay Testing (MRT) team in May and September 2023 falsely reported that the meter was in good condition, which led to the dismissal of his complaints.

7.3 Unsatisfied with these reports, the appellant later discovered the possibility of a third-party challenge test and proceeded with it in April 2024, paying a fee of Rs. 5000. The test, conducted at the Government Electrical Standards Laboratory in June 2024, confirmed that his meter was indeed recording consumption at twice the actual rate. Following this confirmation, the faulty meter was replaced with a new one, and subsequent billing reflected normal electricity usage, aligning with his historical consumption pattern. Based on these findings, the appellant formally requested a bill revision and reimbursement of the excess charges paid during the period of inaccurate meter readings.

7.4 The Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) responded to his petition by directing the electricity board to revise the bill for only five assessment periods, from September 2023 to June 2024, and reimburse the excess charges accordingly. However, the appellant argues that the incorrect meter readings had begun in May 2023, and therefore, the bill revision should extend to the three earlier assessment periods of May, July, and August 2023 as well. He supports this claim by pointing out that he had already raised complaints regarding excessive billing before the CGRF's speculated starting point of September 2023. He also emphasizes that the MRT reports, which stated that the meter was functioning correctly, were proven unreliable since the third-party challenge test results contradicted them.

7.5 Additionally, the appellant seeks direct reimbursement of the excess amount paid, totaling more than Rs. 35,000/-, including the challenge test fee, rather than having it adjusted against future bills. Since his service connection is registered under the Assistant Engineer of CPWD Quarters and he will have to vacate the premises in two years due to his father's retirement, he fears that he will not be able to fully utilize the credited amount through bill adjustments. He has already obtained approval for a direct reimbursement and submitted his bank details to the concerned authorities.

Despite repeated follow-ups, his request has not been addressed satisfactorily, prompting his appeal for an order to facilitate direct payment.

7.6 The respondent argues that the electricity service connection in question is registered under the name of the Assistant Engineer, Electrical, for CPWD quarters and that the appellant, as an occupant of the allotted flat, is only a user of the service. The initial complaint regarding high electricity consumption was received in May 2023, and upon inspection by the field staff, the meter appeared to be functioning normally. To further verify the accuracy of the meter, it was sent for testing to the Meter Relay Testing (MRT) wing in May 2023. The MRT report confirmed that the meter was in good condition and did not exhibit any abnormalities. This was communicated to the appellant, who subsequently settled the electricity bill for May 2023 before the due date.

7.7 Despite the MRT's findings, the appellant raised another complaint in September 2023, alleging continued excessive billing. In response, the meter was once again tested by the MRT on 30th September 2023, and the report once again concluded that the meter was in proper working condition. Based on this, the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) conducted a hearing in October 2023 and issued an order on 4th November 2023, confirming the accuracy of the meter and stating that the billed charges were correct. The CGRF also observed that the recorded power consumption exceeded the sanctioned load of 3 KW and directed necessary action as per the regulations.

7.8 Subsequently, the appellant requested a third-party challenge test in April 2024, arguing that the meter was still recording higher consumption than actual usage. The request was forwarded to the Government Electrical Standards Laboratory, and the challenge test was conducted in June 2024. The test report indicated that the meter was recording twice the actual consumption, leading to the replacement of the faulty meter on 26th June 2024. Following this, another independent test was conducted at the NABL-accredited TNPDC lab in October 2024, which confirmed that the meter was indeed registering double the actual power consumption.

7.9 The CGRF, considering the findings of the third-party challenge test, directed the revision of the bill from September 2023 to June 2024, allowing for a refund of excess charges and reimbursement of the challenge test fee. The respondent, however, maintains that the exact period from which the meter started malfunctioning could not be determined. The MRT reports from May and September 2023 had clearly stated that the meter was functioning correctly, and the appellant had not contested the initial CGRF decision from November 2023. Based on these reports and the CGRF order, the respondent asserts that the meter's abnormal readings must have started only from November 2023 and not earlier, as the appellant claims.

7.10 The respondent further contends that the appellant's request for bill revision from May 2023 is not justified, as there is no conclusive evidence that the meter was faulty before November 2023. Since the appellant did not appeal against the CGRF's earlier decision and the MRT reports confirmed the meter's accuracy until September 2023, there is no basis for granting additional bill adjustments for the three assessment periods of May, July, and August 2023. Moreover, the respondent highlights that the adjustment of Rs. 23,999, including the reimbursement of the challenge test fee, has already been credited to the service connection account as per the CGRF's directive.

7.11 In conclusion, the respondent argues that the petitioner's demand for additional bill revision beyond the period already granted is not supported by factual evidence and should be dismissed. The respondent maintains that the CGRF's decision was based on comprehensive testing reports from various agencies, and further compensation is neither justified nor feasible. Hence, the appeal should be rejected in the interest of fairness and proper regulatory compliance.

7.12 In this context, I am of the view that even though the MRT team downloaded data from the meter and verified it against the consumer ledger with its consumption recording, it was unable to determine from the above details whether the recording reflected the actual consumption of usage, as challenged by the appellant. Hence, the meter was again tested at the NABL lab in Guindy, and the test results revealed that

the meter was recording double the energy usage. Further, based on the NABL report, the CGRF directed the respondent to revise the bill from 09/2023 onwards.

7.13 The CGRF has merely accepted the MRT 09/2023 report and revised the bill from 09/2023 to 06/2024. However, the MRT 05/2023 report also indicated similar consumption readings. As the NABL report countered the MRT findings and confirmed that the meter was indeed recording twice the actual consumption, the NABL test results must be considered as the definitive fact in determining the meter's status. Furthermore, the CGRF's approach of revising the disputed billing period by considering only half of the assessed units is in line with the TNERC Regulations invoking supply code 11(7) and revise the bill as per 11(6) based on the NABL test results, which governs the methodology for computing defective period consumption averages. While I accept the CGRF's decision to grant the appellant relief for half of the consumption during the disputed billing period, the relief should rightfully extend from 05/2023 instead of 09/2023. Hence, the respondent is directed to revise the bill from 05/2023 and inform the appellant the amount to be refunded.

7.14 Another issue raised by the appellant is that his current consumption (CC) bills cannot be exhausted during his occupancy as her husband is retiring. In this case, as per regulations, the service connection is registered in the name of AE CPWD, who is the account holder, but the CC bill during the disputed period was paid by the appellant. This presents a complex situation regarding the refund request made by the appellant. The respondent is therefore asked to confirm whether it is possible to refund the revised bill amount from 05/2023, after adjusting two billing periods as per regulations, directly to the appellant if the account holder i.e. the AE / CPWD, authorize the same. The Respondent expressed that they may consider the above option.

7.15 In view of the above discussion and consideration agreed by the Respondent, the respondent is directed to consider reimbursement of the excess bill paid by the appellant from 05/2023 by revising the earlier CGRF order period from 09/2023 to 06/2024. The outstanding balance amount should be decided accordingly, as per the TNERC Supply Code Regulation 12.



## 8.0 Conclusion:

8.1 Based on the findings, the respondent is directed to recalculate the bills for the period from May 2023 to June 2024 and take necessary action for refund as discussed above.

8.2 With the above findings the A.P. No. 06 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. Tmt. C.Rukkumani,  
Block No.44/5, CPWD Quarters,  
Thirumangalam, Chennai – 600 040.

- By RPAD

2. The Executive Engineer/O&M/Anna Nagar,  
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/West,  
TNPDC,  
1100 A,H Block, 5th street, Ranganathan Garden,  
Anna Nagar, Chennai-600 040.

3. The Superintending Engineer,  
Chennai Electricity Distribution Circle/West,  
TNPDC,  
Thirumangalam 110/33/11 KV SS Complex,  
Anna nagar, Chennai - 600 040.

– By Email

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

– By Email

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

– By Email

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