



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.07.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.25610 of 2004
and
W.M.P.No.31117 of 2004

Vimla Devi

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
Rep. by its Chairman
800, Anna Salai
Chennai 600 002

2.The Executive Engineer
Operations & Maintenance
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
No.6, Lafend Street
Chintadripet, Anna Salai
Chennai 600 002

3.The Asst. Executive Engineer
Operations & Maintenance
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
Chintadripet, Anna Salai
Chennai 600 002

... Respondents

Prayer: The writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the second respondent herein in proceedings No.EE/O&M/AS/AR/CAUP/F/TOE/D.No.1825/04 dated 28.08.2004 relating to the service connection No.195:26:14 at door No.2, Venkatroyan Lane, NSC Bhose Road, Chennai 600 003, quash the same and direct the respondents to forthwith return the sum of Rs.1.80,000/- collected from the petitioner in respect of the aforesaid service connection in 25.08.2004.

For Petitioner : Mrs.A.L.Ganthimathi

For Respondents : Mr.P.R.Dhilipkumar



O R D E R

The petitioner filed this Writ Petition, to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the second respondent herein in proceedings No.EE/O&M/AS/AR/CAUP/F/TOE/D. No.1825/04 dated 28.08.2004 relating to the service connection No.195:26:14 at door No.2, Venkatroyan Lane, NSC Bhose Road, Chennai 600 003, quash the same and direct the respondents to forthwith return the sum of Rs.1.80,000/- collected from the petitioner in respect of the aforesaid service connection in 25.08.2004.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the matter related to the theft of electricity. At the time of identifying the theft, the authorities initiated proceedings under Section 135 of the Act and proceeded with the civil liability by imposing penalty and in the mean time, the Respondent Board also registered a criminal case. The petitioner paid the compounding fee of Rs.1,80,000/-. Thereafter impugned demand notice was issued to pay Rs.2,16,262/- as extra levy payable by the petitioner and the petitioner was permitted to pay the same in ten monthly instalments. Subsequently, the Division Bench of this court has passed an order in similar writ petitions to proceed with the civil liability. Hence, the counsel on instructions would submit that the petitioner may be permitted to deposit the remaining amount without any BPSC charges and penal interest and requests this Court to grant some reasonable time to deposit the same.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the respondent Board admitted the fact that the petitioner has paid some portion of the amount and this court may pass appropriate orders.

5.The said issue has been squarely covered by the decision of the Division Bench of this Court in batch of cases in W.A.Nos.1808, 1811 of 2009, W.P.Nos.29882 of 2004 and 3013 of 2014 and W.P.No.(MD) Nos.2360 and 2361 of 2008, as follows:

28.It was also stated that Section 185 of the Act, 2003 cannot come to the rescue of the Electricity Board, as the action has been initiated only after the Act, 2003 came into existence and no proceedings initiated under the Old provisions / Repealed Act cannot be continued. Further, the Board cannot initiate proceedings under Clause 8.01 and 8.02 of the Terms and Conditions of Supply of Electricity (Electricity Supply Act 1948) with regard to theft of energy, as those clauses are no longer in vague as on the date of initiation of proceedings, the Old Act got



repealed and the Act 2003 had came into force. Clause 8.01 and 8.02 of the Terms and Conditions of Supply of Electricity (Electricity Supply Act 1948) in the repealed Act reads as follows:

WEB COPY

8.00 Theft of Energy and Extra Levy:

8.01 Any consumer who dishonestly abstracts or uses energy shall be deemed to have committed theft within the meaning of Indian Electricity Act, 1910 as amended by the Tamil Nadu Government and the Indian Penal Code and the existence of artificial means for such abstractions shall be prima facie evidence of such dishonest abstraction. Illegal restoration of supply to a disconnected service connection will fail under this category.

8.02 Extra levy for theft of energy by tampering of meters / meter seals will be made at the rates given below:

- (a) for a period of twelve months; or
- (b) for a period from the date of prior inspection if any by the APTS or MRT wing to the date of detection; or
- (c) for a period from the date of replacement of meter to the date of detection; or
- (d) for a period from the date of service connection to the date of detection whichever period of the above is less.

For other cases of theft of energy, the extra levy will be made for a period of twelve months or from the date of service connection to the date of detection whichever period is less at the same rates given below:

(i) For Energy:

(a) Low Tension Service Connection : Highest Low Tension tariff rate x3: The charges arrived at will be rounded off to the next higher rupees.

(b) High Tension Service Connection:

Highest High Tension Tariff rate x 4 the charges arrived at will be rounded off to the next higher rupee

(ii) For maximum demand: (In High Tension Service Connection):



WEB COPY

Highest High Tension tariff rate for maximum demand x4

Extra levy for illegal restoration of supply to a disconnected service connection will be made for a period of twelve months, immediately preceding the date of detection of the violation or for the period from the date of disconnection of the service connection to the date of detection of the illegal restoration, whichever period is less, at the rates given above..”

29.The above submission made by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners cannot be accepted, because once there is a saving clause provided under the New Act, then there is no impediment or bar for the Department to proceed under the Old Act in the absence of proof that it is inconsistent with the provisions of the Act, 2003. More so, quoting a wrong provision of the Act will not entitle a wrong doer to escape from the clutches of law, especially when Section 126 of the Act, 2003 extends power to the Department / Board / Authorities to ensure that the electricity consumed unauthorisedly is calculated and necessary charges are paid by the defaulter. In the decision, Hitech Mineral Industries (P) Ltd., Salem V.TNERC, Chennai, reported in 2010 (3) MLJ 697, it is inter alia, observed that the persons who steal energy or use energy unauthorisedly have to be punished.

6.In view of the decision held by the Division Bench of this Court and also considering that the petitioner has accepted the Provisional Assessment Order and they have also paid substantial amount to the tune of Rs.1,80,000/- and agreed to pay the remaining amount without BPSC and penal interest, this Court is inclined to direct the petitioner to deposit the entire due after adjusting the amount already paid by him within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7.With the above direction, this writ petition stands disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS III)

//True Copy//

kas

Sub Assistant Registrar



To

1.The Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
Rep. by its Chairman
800, Anna Salai
Chennai 600 002

2.The Executive Engineer
Operations & Maintenance
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
No.6, Lafend Street
Chintadripet, Anna Salai
Chennai 600 002

3.The Asst. Executive Engineer
Operations & Maintenance
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
Chintadripet, Anna Salai
Chennai 600 002

+1 cc to Mrs.AL.Gandhimathi, Advocate, S.R.No.56701

+1 cc to Mr.P.R.Dhilipkumar, Advocate, S.R.No.56655

W.P.No.25610 of 2004
and
W.M.P.No.31117 of 2004

EV(CO)
SSM(07/08/2019)