



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 25.06.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.24826 of 2005

and

W.P.M.P.Nos.27187 & 32394 of 2005

C.Viswanathan

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Chief Engineer
Tamilnadu Electricity Board (Commercial)
Chennai-2

2.The Deputy Inspector General Vigilance
Anti Energy Theft
Tamilnadu Electricity Board
Chenna-2

3.The Superintending Engineer
Tamilnadu Electricity Board
Villupuram

4.The Assistant Executive Engineer
Tamilnadu Electricity Board
Panrothu 607 106

5.The Inspector of Assessment
Tamilnadu Electricity Board
Kadampuliyur

... 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 in connection with the proceedings issued in Ka.No. Ue.Se.Po./Nagaram/Panrotti/Ko.Kattu/590 dated 20.07.2005 by the 4th respondent and quash the same and consequently to direct the 5th respondent to return the amount paid by the petitioner Rs.50,000/-.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Ilaavaludhi

For Respondents : Mr.M.Varunkumar



O R D E R

The petitioner filed this Writ Petition, to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records in connection with the proceedings issued in Ka.No. Ue.Se.Po./Nagaram/Panrotti/Ko.Kattu/ 590 dated 20.07.2005 by the 4th respondent and quash the same and consequently to direct the 5th respondent to return the amount paid by the petitioner Rs.50,000/-.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the matter related to the theft of electricity. During the course of the inspection by the respondent board, they found the petitioner has committed theft of electricity and the 3rd respondent assessed the value of extra levy liable to be paid by the petitioner to the Board as per Section 135 of Indian Electricity Act 2003 and the regulations contained in Tamil Nadu Electricity Supply Code 2004. Accordingly, an impugned order was passed on 20.07.2005 directing the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.1,96,000/- towards extra levy along with BPSC 1.5% till the date of payment. The petitioner approached this Court and at the time of admission, this Court passed an interim stay of the order with the condition to pay the sum of Rs.75,000/-. Accordingly, the petitioner deposited the said amount on 26.09.2005. Hence, the balance amount of Rs.1,20,000/- is liable to be paid by the petitioner as on 20.07.2005. Subsequently, the Division Bench of this court has passed an order in similar writ petitions to proceed with the civil liability. Hence, the petitioner may be permitted to deposit the remaining amount without any BPSC charges and penalty and requests this Court to grant some reasonable time to deposit the same.

4.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



WEB COPY

repealed Act reads as follows:

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):

Highest High Tension tariff rate for maximum demand x 4.

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.."



WEB COPY

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.

5.In view of the above decision held by the Division Bench of this Court in batch cases, this Court is inclined to direct the petitioner to pay the amount as demanded in the impugned notice dated 20.07.2005 after adjusting the amount already paid if any without BPSC and penalty within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6.With the above direction, this writ petition stands disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Insp Cell)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kas

To

1.The Chief Engineer
Tamilnadu Electricity Board (Commercial)
Chennai-2

2.The Deputy Inspector General Vigilance
Anti Energy Theft
Tamilnadu Electricity Board
Chenna-2



3.The Superintending Engineer
Tamilnadu Electricity Board
Villupuram

4.The Assistant Executive Engineer
Tamilnadu Electricity Board
Panrottu 607 106

5.The Inspector of Assessment
Tamilnadu Electricity Board
Kadampuliyur

+1cc to Mr.Varun Kumar, Advocate, S.R.No. 53285
+1cc to Mr.S.Ilamvaludhi, Advocate, S.R.No. 51965

W.P.No.24826 of 2005
and
W.P.M.P.Nos.27187
& 32394 of 2005

RSV(CO)
GN(07/08/2019)