

**BEFORE THE TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY
COMMISSION**

11th September 2007

PRESENT :

Thiru S. Kabilan - **Chairman**

Thiru B. Jeyaraman - **Member**

And

Thiru R. Rajupandi - **Member**

M.P.No. 10 of 2007

Chief Electrical Distribution Engineer
Office of the Chief Electrical Engineer
Southern Railway, 7th floor, NGO Annex
Park Town, Chennai – 600 003. Petitioner

Vs

The Chairman
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
NPKRR Maligai, No.800, Anna Salai
Chennai – 600 002.
Respondent

The above petition viz M.P.No.10 of 2007 came up for hearing before the Commission on the 11th September 2007, the Commission upon perusing the petition and the counter affidavit and all records connected with the case and upon hearing the arguments of both side, the Commission passes the following

ORDER

1. Prayer of the petitioner

The prayer of the petitioner is to direct the respondent board (TNEB) to implement and comply with the order of this Commission dated 2.4.2007 in M.P.No.5 of 2006 and M.P.No.16 of 2006.

2. Contentions of the petitioner

At paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 of the petition, the petitioner has stated as follows

“Hon’ble Commission after hearing the arguments has ordered the following in M.P.No.5 of 2006 on 02.04.2007.

- i. The respondent board is directed to defer the implementation of the modified software system in the energy meters of the petitioner (Southern Railway) for a period of three years.
- ii. Till the restoration of the old system the respondent board is directed not to allow any incentive nor levy any penalty.
- iii. TNEB shall revert to the old system of blocking the leading VAR to unity early.

The respondent board (TNEB) has not honoured and complied with the above orders of the Commission”.

3. Contentions of the Respondent Board

At paragraph 3 of the counter affidavit of the respondent board, it has been stated as follows

“This respondent has examined the order and after obtaining approval from the competent authority, the said order of the Hon’ble Commission has been fully implemented. (copy of circular dt.31.07.2007 issued is enclosed) In the process some delay has occasioned in implementing the said order, which is neither wilful nor wanton.”

4. Arguments of the Petitioner

The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the respondent board have not yet implemented the orders of this Commission dated 2.4.2007

passed in M.P.No.5 of 2006 in certain energy meters provided in Traction Substations.

Conclusion

The respondent board is directed to implement the order dated 2nd April 2007 passed in M.P.No. 5 of 2006 in toto within thirty days from the date of receipt of this order.

With the above directions, M.P.No. 10 of 2007 is finally disposed of. There would be no costs.

(R. RAJUPANDI)
Member

(B.JEYARAMAN)
Member

(S.KABILAN)
Chairman

