



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.58 of 2015

Thiru A. Paulraj,
S/o. G. Anthonysamy,
No.120, Sripudukuppam,
Srimushnam Post,
Cuddalore District.

.....Appellant
(Rep by Thiru R. Srinivasalu, Advocate on 13.10.15 &
Thiru. V.N. Prasad, Advocate on 27.11.15)

Vs

The Executive Engineer / O & M,
Chidambaram,
Cuddalore Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
Anandeeswarar Koil Street,
Chidambaram-608 001.

.....Respondent
(Rep by Thiru S. Balasubramanian,
Executive Engineer/Chidambaram).

Date of hearing : 13.10.2015 & 27.11.2015

Date of Order : 19 .2.2016

The petition dated 14.7.2015 filed by Thiru A. Paulraj, S/o. Anthonysamy, Sripudukuppam was registered as appeal petition No.58 of 2015. The above appeal petition came up for hearing before the Electricity Ombudsman on 13.10.2015 & 27.11.2015. Upon perusing the appeal petition, Counter Affidavit 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 remove the new electric post erected near the teak wood tree and erect it in the corner of the road.
- (ii) to order compensation for cutting the branch of the 35 years old teak wood tree and for damaging the fence.

2. Brief history of the case:

- 2.1. Near the Appellant's land, a new pole was erected for fixing a street light as per the request of the Executive Officer of the Panchayat. While erecting pole for the above street light, the branches of the teak wood tree were cut to facilitate the erection of street light.
- 2.2. The Appellant has paid a sum of Rs.6160/- towards shifting of the pole which was erected in the Appellant's land. The pole was shifted outside the land of the Appellant. But the line is crossing the Appellant's land.
- 2.3. The Appellant prayed compensation for cutting the teak wood tree and also prayed for shifting the new street light pole to a new location so that further cutting of the teak wood tree could be avoided in future and to avoid crossing of line through his land.
- 2.4. The CGRF, Cuddalore EDC has ordered that the pole and line could be shifted only on DCW basis and the payment of compensation towards cutting the tree is beyond their purview.
- 2.5. Aggrieved by the order of the CGRF, the Appellant filed this appeal petition before the Electricity Ombudsman.

3. Orders of the CGRF:

The CGRF, Cuddalore EDC has issued its orders on 6/2015. The relevant para of the order is extracted below : -

‘செயல் அலுவலர் ஸ்ரீமுஷ்ணம் பேரூராட்சி அவர்கள் கோரி மதிப்பீட்டு தொகை செலுத்தியதன்படியே பொது பாதையிலேயே மின் பாதை மாற்றியமைக்கப்பட்டது என எதிர் மனுதாரர் தெரிவித்துள்ளதையும் மனுதாரர் அவரது இடத்தில் செல்லும் மின் பாதையை மாற்றியமைக்க உரிய மதிப்பீட்டு தொகை 19.5.2015 அன்று செலுத்தி எதிர் மனுதாரரால் அந்த பணி முடிக்கப்பட்டுள்ளதென்பதையும் இம்மன்றம் கருத்தில் கொள்கிறது.

மனுதாரர் மதிப்பீட்டு தொகையை செலுத்தி தனது நிலத்தில் உள்ள மின் பாதையை மாற்றியமைத்துள்ளார். ஆகையால் மின் பாதையை மாற்றியமைக்க மதிப்பீட்டு தொகையைச் செலுத்தினால் எதிர் மனுதாரரால் அப்பணி செய்யப்படுமென மனுதாரர் அறிவித்துள்ளதை இம்மன்றம் கருத்தில் கொள்கிறது. தமிழ்நாடு மின்சார ஒழுங்குமுறை ஆணையத்தின் மின் வழங்கல் விதி தொகுப்பின் படி ‘The cost of shifting service / line structure and equipment shall be borne by the consumer. The consumer shall pay the estimate cost of shifting in advance in full. The shifting work will be taken up only after the payment is made.’ என்றே உள்ளதால்.

தமிழ்நாடு மின்சார ஒழுங்குமுறை ஆணையத்தின் மின் வழங்கல் விதி படி மனுதாரர் மின் கம்பம் மற்றும் மின் பாதையை மாற்ற பங்களிப்பு வைப்பு தொகையின் கீழ் மதிப்பீட்டு தொகை செலுத்தினால் மட்டுமே மனுதாரர் கோரும் பணிகளை எதிர் மனுதாரரால் செய்து கொடுக்க இயலும் என இம்மன்றம் முடிவு செய்கிறது.

மனுதாரர், மரங்களை வெட்டியதற்காக எதிர் மனுதாரரிடம் இழப்பீடு கோருவது குறித்து விசாரிப்பது மன்றத்தின் வரையறைக்குள் இல்லாததால், மின் உரிமதாரர் இது குறித்து விசாரணை செய்து நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கலாம் என்ற நிலையில் மன்றம் இது குறித்து எதுவும் பதிவு செய்ய இயலாத நிலையில் உள்ளது.

தமிழ்நாடு மின்சார ஒழுங்குமுறை ஆணையத்தின் விதிகள்படி பாதுகாப்பான மின்சாரம் வழங்கிட ஏதுவாக மனுதாரருக்கு அறிவிப்பு அளிக்கும்படி எதிர் மனுதாரரை இம்மன்றம் அறிவுறுத்துகின்றது.

மனுதாரர் உரிய மதிப்பீட்டு தொகையை செலுத்திடவும், எதிர் மனுதாரர் மனுதாரர் கோரும் பணிகளை செய்து முடிக்க வேண்டுமெனவும் இம்மன்றம் வழிகாட்டுகிறது.’

4. Contentions of the Appellant:

4.1. On 18.5.2015, Thiru S. Balasubramanian, Public Information Officer and Assistant Engineer, Sreemushnam have inspected his garden. At that time the grievance about the cutting of teak wood tree and the wrong erection of a pole and the line was also informed to them. It was assured that while shifting the old

pole which was erected in the middle of the garden on DCW basis, the newly erected pole nearer to the teak wood tree and the line will also be shifted.

- 4.2. The cost of shifting was estimated as Rs.6150/- and the same was paid by his elder brother. As the CGRF meeting was scheduled on 20.5.2015, they have been advised to give a letter making that their grievance was redressed so as to avoid attending the CGRF meeting. But it was replied that they do not have any inconvenience in attending the meeting.
- 4.3. On 19.5.2015, the pole which was erected in the center of their land was removed and a new pole was erected outside their land and the line was drawn from the above pole to the pole which was erected near the teak wood tree.
- 4.4. The request for shifting the pole erected near the teak wood tree to the corner of the road was not taken and it was informed that they could do the above work only.
- 4.5. In the CGRF meeting, Thiru S. Balasubramanian/EE/TNEB and AE / TNEB argued that for shifting the pole which was erected near the teak wood tree also they have to pay the estimate charges.
- 4.6. The CGRF members Thiru M. Jothilingam, Advocate and Thiru Rajendran, NGO have observed that the pole erected by TNEB shall be shifted to the corner of the road at TNEB's cost.

5. Contentions of the Respondent

- 5.1. As the Appellant has filed a petition for shifting a pole which was erected in the middle of the garden to outside the garden, it was done under DCW after getting proper approval and the work was completed on 19.5.2015.
- 5.2. Now, the Appellant has requested for shifting a pole which was erected outside the garden and available in the public road to a corner of the road.

- 5.3. In the CGRF Order, it was ordered that shifting of the pole now available in the cement road could be done only if the petitioner paid the estimate cost under DCW as per regulation 5(6)(1) of the Supply Code.
- 5.4. No teak wood tree was cut as informed by the Appellant. The branches which are hindrance to the electric line which was drawn along the cement road alone were removed. A photo copy was submitted before the Chairman & Member in the CGRF meeting conducted at Cuddalore.

6. Hearing held by the Electricity Ombudsman:

- 6.1. In order to enable the Appellant and the Respondent, to put forth their arguments in person, a hearing was conducted before the Electricity Ombudsman on 13.10.2015 & 27.11.2015.
- 6.2. Thiru R. Srinivasalu, Advocate has attended the hearing on 13.10.2015 and Thiru. V.N. Prasad, Advocate has attended the hearing on 27.11.2015 on behalf of the Appellant and putforth their arguments.
- 6.3. Thiru S. Balasubramaniam, EE / O & M, Chidambaram, the Respondent herein has attended the hearing and putforth his arguments on both the days.

7. Arguments put forth by the Appellant's representatives on the hearing dates :

- 7.1. The learned Advocate reiterated the contents of the appeal petition.
- 7.2. The learned Advocate argued that the Appellant would have erected the line on the other side of the road instead of the existing location while erecting the street light.
- 7.3. The street light pole was erected near to his teak wood tree by cutting almost all branches. The future growth of the tree is also affected by the line.

- 7.4. The street light pole erected is hindrance to the entry of their land. Had it been erected in some other location, the lines crossing the land would have also been avoided. Shifting of pole inside the land was done to avoid crossing of line for future uses. But the very purpose was defeated as the line is still crossing the land.
- 7.5. The learned Advocate furnished his written argument also. The arguments that are not covered in the appeal petition are furnished below:-
- (i) The appellant submits that in November 2014, suddenly, the Shrimushnam Electricity Department officials erected new electric pole at the cross section inside of the garden of his property. Further, when the appellant shocked to find that the said officials of the EB has cut down fully a big 35 years old TEAK tree which was located inside the garden of the appellant's property. The value of the said teak tree would be worth about Rs.50000/-.
 - (ii) Immediately, the appellant gave complaint on 20.11.2014 to Asst Executive Engineer, Shreemushnam regarding the above said illegal erection of pole and cutting down the appellant's teak tree. But the appellant was told by the said officer that only on the instruction of Mr.Chinnappan, Panchayat President, the new pole was erected in the appellant's property. The act of officials was done without even giving any prior intimation to the appellant
 - (iii) He gave police complaint on 21.1.2014 against the officials of the EB department and also against the Panchayat President unauthorizedly cutting down the appellant's teak tree in the property. They have illegally trespassed in to the appellant's property and spoiled the tree. It is submitted that based on the complaint, the EB officials had promised with the appellant that instead of giving compensation for cutting down the teak tree, they agreed to remove the old pole

and newly erected pole from the existing location and would erect the same nearer to the public road.

- (iv) After one week, when he approaches the EB officials, he was requested to pay Rs.7300/- by the EB officials for removing the poles from his property towards cost. Though appellant made protest and requested the officials to adjust the said sum from compensation amount for illegal cutting down of his teak tree, the officials told appellant to claim against the said Chinnappan separately regarding the compensation. It shows that they have shifted their burden of liability to the Panchayat President. The officials cannot justify their wrong doing by shifting their liability. The appellant was driven from pillar to post to get his remedy but still not recovered.
- (v) After full fledged enquiry, the CGRF has given finding that though the respondent has admitted their action of cutting down the teak tree, the appellant was not entitled to claim compensation from the said Forum. The Forum did not consider the bonafide claim of the appellant while deciding the compensation.
- (vi) The Lower forum has not even considered the further request of removing the existing pole erected on the corner of appellant's property and shift it to public place. But the lower forum has directed the appellant to pay the costs for doing such shifting without even consider the unlawful act done by the EB officials.
- (vii) The appellant submits that the respondent has originally made promise with the appellant that they would remove the electric poles from the appellant's property and asked the appellant to pay the cost for which the appellant has also paid. But they went back their promise by removing the electric pole from the appellant's property and erected again on the corner of the appellant's property. All these have been done by the respondent without even giving prior notice to

the appellant herein. The appellant humbly submit that the respondent has not obtained prior permission from the appellant who is the land owner in whose land the respondents have erected poles , which is violation of Section 12(2) of the Indian Electricity Act 1910 which reads as follows:-

(2) Nothing contained in sub-section(1) shall be deemed to authorize or empower a licensee, without the consent of the local authority or of the (owner or occupier) concerned, as the case may be, to lay down or place any electric supply line, or other work in, through or against any building or on, over or under any land not dedicated to public use whereon, wherever or whereunder any electric supply or work has not already been lawfully laid down or placed by such licensee.

- (viii) So as per Section 12 of the Indian Electricity Act 12 (2) of Act, 1910, it is mandatory on the part of the appellants to get prior permission from the owner of the land before erecting the electric poles in his land for the purpose of providing electric supply to the public which has not been done so in this case.
 - (ix) The CGRF has made ineffective attempt that it does not have jurisdiction to decide the compensation for the teak trees cut by the respondent unlawfully.
 - (x) The appellant is having right over the property and his constitutional right is protected under Article 300-A of Constitution of India.
- 7.6. On 27.11.2015, the Appellant's representative argued that the proposal given by the Respondent is not acceptable to him. He argued that instead of erecting two additional poles, the work could be completed by erecting one additional pole only which is cost effective. He gave a sketch also for the above deviation.

7.7. He also informed that there will not be any objection on the above route and if any objection is raised by anybody he will arrange to get the concurrence.

8. Arguments put forth by the Respondent on the hearing dates :

8.1. Thiru S. Balasubramanian, Executive Engineer, Chidambaram EDC reiterated the contents of his counter.

8.2. He argued that the street light pole was erected as requested by the Panchayat Board for erecting a street light. The pole was erected only on the public cement road.

8.3. He also argued that there are objection from the village people to shift the street light pole from the existing location. Hence, he argued that way leave has also to be arranged by the Appellant besides paying the cost of the estimate charges for shifting the line.

8.4. The EE also argued that the Appellant has paid the charges for shifting a pole from his land to other location and the same was done. The sanctioned estimate did not include the cost for changing of the street light post and the line crossing their land. Hence, he argued that the shifting work executed is confirming to the sanctioned estimate only.

8.5. Regarding cutting of teak wood tree, the EE argued that the branches which are hindrance to the electric line which was drawn on the public road alone have been removed i.e. the branches which have crossed the boundry of the Appellant and are hindrance to the line alone were removed.

8.6. The EE argued the following on 27.11.2015.

(i) The line passing through the land of the Appellant could be shifted by providing 2 poles one at location (opposite side of the road) (A) and

another at location (B). He has furnished the sketch also. But the estimate charges have to be paid by the Appellant. The EE also informed that for shifting the line in the above route, concurrence of the nearby people have been obtained.

- (ii) Regarding the proposal of the Appellant, the EE agreed to consider the proposal of the Appellant if the Appellant is willing to arrange for the way leave and pay the estimate charges.

9. Written arguments of the Appellant furnished in letter dated 25.1.2016.

- 9.1. We have furnished the application for shifting the line as per our drawing to AE / Sreemushnam on 30.11.2015.
- 9.2. But, the Respondents are requesting concurrence for payment of estimate charges for erection of two poles which is not as per the direction given on 27.11.2015.
- 9.3. The Appellant also informed that the Respondent have orally informed that if any objection was received for shifting the line as per their sketch, then the amount paid will not be refunded to them.
- 9.4. The Appellant prayed that the shifting work may be ordered to be done as per the sketch.

10. Written arguments of the Respondent :

- 10.1. The Respondent has furnished the following in letter dt. 23.10.15.
 - (i) In order to shift the pole erected in the public cement road in front of the Appellant's land, the site was inspected on 15.10.15. To erect the pole on the eastern corner of the opposite side of the road, the owner of the land Thiru.

James Manohar is objecting. He gave a letter also stating that it will be a disturbance while building a house in the above site.

- (ii) To erect the pole in the northern side of the Appellant's land on the cement road at the corner and to erect a stay, the owner of the land Thiru. A. Irudayasamy of Pudukuppam has objected stating that the erection of stay will be hindrance for the movement of his tractor and Bullock cart. Thiru. Irudayasamy has also given a letter. Hence, the line could not shifted as above also.

10.2. The Respondent has furnished the following in letter dt. 8.1.2016.

- (i) The Appellant has furnished an application (on 4.12.2015) for shifting line with a sketch. But the Appellant has not furnished an undertaking to arrange for way leave for their proposal as agreed by them on 27.11.2015.
- (ii) Hence, the Appellant was requested to furnish an undertaking on 7.12.2015. But, the Appellant has refused to give an undertaking. As there was objection in the said route the line could be shifted only if the way leave is arranged by the Appellant and agreed to pay the estimate charges.

11. Findings of the Electricity Ombudsman:

I have heard the arguments of both sides. On a careful consideration of the arguments putforth by both the parties the findings are issued on prayer wise. The prayers are given below:-

Prayer 1 To remove the electric post erected near the teak wood tree and erect it in the corner of the road.

Prayer 2 To order compensation for cutting the branches of the 35 years old teak wood tree and for damaging the fence.

12. Findings on the first prayer:

- 12.1. The Appellant prayed to remove the electric post erected near the teak wood tree and erect it in the corner of the road. The Appellant argued that the concurrence of the owner was not obtained for erecting a pole citing section 12(2) of the Indian Electricity Act 1910.
- 12.2. The Appellant argued that the above pole was erected in front of their land without their concurrence.
- 12.3. The Respondent has informed that while shifting the pole erected inside their land under DCW, the pole erected near the teak wood tree will also be shifted. But, while executing the work, the pole erected inside the land alone shifted outside the land but the line is still passing through the land and the pole erected outside their land near the teak wood tree was not shifted as promised.
- 12.4. The Appellant argued that the shifting work could be done by erecting a single pole alone as shown in their sketch, whereas the licensee is proposing erection of two poles which is not cost effective.
- 12.5. The licensee may execute the work as per the Appellant's sketch by collecting the required estimate charges alone without insisting the way leave.
- 12.6. The Respondent argued that the work of shifting of the pole erected inside the Appellant's land was executed as per the sanctioned estimate only. The estimate for shifting the pole which is erected outside the land of the Appellant is not covered in the above said estimate and hence not shifted.
- 12.7. The Respondent also informed that they are willing to shift the pole and the line passing through the Appellant's land if they are agreeable to pay the estimate charges and arrange for way leave for the alternate route of the line.
- 12.8. The Respondent also argued that Thiru A. Irudayasamy and Thiru James Manohar have given objection letters to erect stay/pole in their land and hence

argued that there was objection for the alternative route suggested by the Appellant.

12.9. The Respondent also furnished a proposal along with a sketch to shift the pole and argued that if the Appellant agrees to pay the estimate charges, the shifting will be done as per their proposal and they have already got concurrence from the neighbours for the said route.

12.10. Alternatively, the Respondents have also argued that if the Appellant is arranging way leave and agreeing to pay the estimate charges, the licensee is ready to execute the work as per the sketch furnished by the Appellant.

12.11. Regarding the contention of the Appellant that the Respondent have not got the concurrence for erecting a pole in his land, it is to be noted that the pole to be shifted is erected in a public road for erection of a street light based on the request of the local body. Hence, I am of the view that the prior permission of the Appellant is not required to erect the said pole.

12.12. As this is shifting of a line, I would like to refer Regulation 5 (6) of the Supply Code which is extracted below:-

(6)²¹ Service / line, structure and equipments shifting charge :

(1) The cost of shifting service / line, Structure and equipments shall be borne by the consumer. The consumer shall pay the estimated cost of shifting in advance in full. The copy of the estimate shall be given to the consumer. The shifting work will be taken up only after the payment is made. The estimate will cover the following:

(i) Materials dismantled in the old site and reusable shall be used in the new site as far as possible.

(ii) 10% of the present value of the dismantled and reusable materials towards charge for dismantling and charges for loading, unloading, transport to the new site/store.

(iii) Cost of the new materials required for the shifting work.

(iv) Add 5% of the cost of new materials towards loading, unloading and transport to new site.

(v) Add 10% of the present value of all the materials to be erected in the new site towards erection charges.

(vi) 5% of the present value of retrievable scrap materials towards transport charges.

(vii) Due credit shall be given to the consumer /applicant as below but however limited to the total estimated cost of new work:

(a) Book value /written down value subject to a minimum of 20% of the cost of retrievable and reusable materials but not used in the new site.

(b) Scrap value on the retrievable but not reusable materials at not less than 10% of its original value.

(viii) After completion of the work a revised estimate shall be prepared with a copy to the consumer based on the actual cost of materials, loading, unloading, transport and erection charges. If the original estimate cost is more than the revised estimate, the balance shall be refunded to the applicant/consumer within 3 months. If the original estimate cost is less than the revised estimate, the difference shall be collected from the applicant/consumer.

(2) Temporary dismantling and re-erection or shifting of a service connection within the same premises necessitated due to remodeling of premises will be carried out on payment of the required charges for the same.

(3) Shifting of an existing service connection involving change in door number or sub-door number or survey field number, shall be considered as a new service connection only.

No shifting of an existing service connection is permissible unless all arrears in the service connection are paid, if so demanded by the Licensee.

12.13. On a careful reading of the above regulation, it is noted that the cost of shifting a line shall be borne by the consumer and has to be paid in advance before starting the work. The above regulation also gives the details of components which are to be included in the said estimate.

12.14. Further, for shifting of a line, we have to examine the following also:

(i) *The technical feasibility of shifting the line.*

(ii) *Whether it meets the requirement of Right of way.*

12.15. In the case on hand, the Respondent has argued that the nearby owners of land viz. Thiru A. Irudayasamy and Thiru James Manohar are objecting the erection of pole and line in their land / front of their land. They have also enclosed copies of

the letters submitted by the said parties in support of their arguments. Hence there is an issue of Right of Way in the route proposed by the Appellant. However, the Respondent is not arguing that the route proposed by the Appellant is not technically feasible. They also agree to execute the work on DCW basis if the Appellant is willing to arrange for the way leave (Right of way) in the route proposed by the Appellant.

12.16. It is to be noted that the existing pole is only in the public road and not in the Appellant's land. It was erected for provision of street light as per the request of the concerned Panchayat.

12.17. As per the Regulation 5 (6) of the Supply Code, the shifting of line / structure / equipment could be done only if the consumer bears the shifting cost. Further the right of way and Technical feasibility are also essential for shifting of a line.

12.18. As the Appellant is seeking shifting of a pole erected in a public road, in front of his land, I am of the view that the Appellant has to arrange for Right of Way (way leave) for the proposed shifting of pole & line and bear the estimate cost of such shifting of line as per Regulation 5 (6) of the Tamil Nadu Electricity Supply Code.

12.19. With regard to the apprehension of the Appellant that if objections are received for the route as suggested by them, then the entire amount paid will not be refunded to them. In this regard, I would inform that if the work was stopped due to objection, then, the expenditure incurred by the licensee on the said work will be deducted from the amount paid and the balance alone will be refunded.

13. Findings on the second prayer:

13.1. The Appellant prayed to order compensation for cutting the branches of the 35 years old teak wood tree and damaging the fence.

- 13.2. The Appellant argued that the Respondent has cut the branches of the teak wood tree while erecting a pole for the street light in front of their land and also damaged the fence and hence requested for necessary compensation.
- 13.3. The Respondent argued that for erecting a pole for provision of a street light, the branches of the tree that are hindrance to the line and cross the boundry of the Appellant alone were cut.
- 13.4. The CGRF in its order has remarked that the above prayer is outside the purview of the Forum.
- 13.5. In this connection, I would like to refer Regulation 7 (11) of the Regulations for CGRF and EO. The same is extracted below:-
- '7 (11) In respect of grievances on non implementation of standards of performance of licensee on consumer service specified by the Commission under section 57(1) of the Electricity Act 2003, if the forum finds that there was default of the licensee, it shall only hold that the consumer is entitled to the compensation and shall state that, the consumer if agreed, can accept the compensation prescribed by the Commission in the relevant Regulations'*
- 13.6. On a careful reading of the said Regulation 7 (11) of the Regulations of CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman, it is noted that in respect of grievances on non implementation of the standards of performance of licensee on consumer services specified by the Commission under Section 57 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003 alone CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman can hold that the consumer is entitled for compensation.
- 13.7. As there is no provision to order compensation other than the one discussed in previous para, I am of the view that the Electricity Ombudsman cannot issue any order on the above prayer, as it is outside the purview of the forum and Electricity Ombudsman.

14. Conclusion:

- 14.1. In view of the findings in Prayer I, furnished in para 12, the Appellant's request for shifting of the line and pole could be done only if the Appellant is willing to bear the entire cost of the estimate for shifting the line and arrange for the required Right of Way.
- 14.2. The prayer for award of compensation for cutting the branches of the teak wood tree is not considered as it is outside the purview of the CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman as per my findings in para 13.
- 14.3. With the above findings, the A.P.No.58 of 2015 is finally disposed of by the Electricity Ombudsman. No costs.

(A. Dharmaraj)
Electricity Ombudsman

To

1) Thiru A. Paulraj,
S/o. G. Anthonysamy,
No.120, Sripudukuppam,
Srimushnam Post,
Cuddalore District.

2) The Executive Engineer / O & M,
Chidambaram,
Cuddalore Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
Anandeeswarar Koil Street,
Chidambaram-608 001.

3) The Superintending Engineer,
Cuddalore Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
230 KV Auto SS Complex,
Capper Hills, Cuddalore – 4.

4) The Chairman,
(Superintending Engineer),
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
Cuddalore Electricity Distribution Circle,
TANGEDCO,
230 KV Auto SS Complex, Capper Hills, Cuddalore – 4.

4) The Chairman & Managing Director,
TANGEDCO,
NPKR Maaligai,
144, Anna Salai,
Chennai – 600 002.

5) The Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
No.19A, Rukmini Lakshmiipathy Salai,
Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.

6) The Assistant Director (Computer) - **FOR HOSTING IN THE TNEO WEBSITE PLEASE**
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
No.19-A, Rukmini Lakshmiipathy Salai,
Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.