



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.12.2021

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.Nos.18788 and 18789 of 2010
and

M.P.Nos.1, 2 of 2010 and M.P.Nos.1, 2 of 2010

R.R.D.Tex (Unit of Best Corporation Ltd.,)
HT SC.No.271,
SF.No.607, Suriyanallur Village,
Vengipalayam Post,
Dharapuram - 638 703 rep by its
Manager P.Muthukrishnan

...Petitioner
(in W.P.No.18788 of 2010)

Best Cotton Mills,
HT SC.No.129,
Pollachi Road, Dharapuram,
Tirupur District,
Rep. by its Manager
P.Muthukrishnan

...Petitioner
(in W.P.No.18789 of 2010)

Vs.

1.Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
Rep. by its Secretary
19-A,Rukmini Lakshmipathy Salai,
(Marshall's Road), Egmore, Chennai-600 008

2.The Chairman
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
144, Anna Salai, Chennai-600 002.

3.Superintending Engineer
Udumalpet Electricity Distribution Circle,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Udumalpet.

... R1 to R3
(in both W.Ps)

4.The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electricity Distribution



Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Kundadam, Dharapuram.

.... 4th respondent
in W.P.No.18788 of 2010

5.4.The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electricity Distribution
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Dharapuram West, Dharapuram.

.... 4th respondent
in W.P.No.18789 of 2010

Prayer in W.P.No.18788 of 2010 : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in his Bill No.271 dated 31.07.2010 in so far as it relates to levy of excess charges for the alleged excess consumption, quash the same as illegal, against the orders passed in M.P.No.42 of 2008 and Suo moto proceeding No.1 of 2009 by the 1st respondent and consequently forbear the 3rd respondent from raising any demand without taking into consideration the wind energy generation and the quota fixed thereon.

Prayer in W.P.No.18789 of 2010 : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in his Bill No.129 dated 31.07.2010 in so far as it relates to levy of excess charges for the alleged excess consumption, quash the same as illegal, against the orders passed in M.P.No.42 of 2008 and Suo moto proceeding No.1 of 2009 by the 1st respondent and consequently forbear the 3rd respondent from raising any demand without taking into consideration the wind energy generation and the quota fixed thereon.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.P.Parthasarathy
(in both W.Ps)

For R1 : No Appearance
(in both W.Ps)

For R1 to R4 : Mr.L.Jai Venkatesh
[For TANGEDCO]
(in both W.Ps)

COMMON ORDER

The facts and circumstances narrated by the petitioners in the present writ petitions are similar to that of the issues considered and decided by the Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory



Commission in D.R.P.No.41 of 2014 dated 13.02.2015. Thus the issues are not more res integra and the petitioners are entitled to get the benefits pursuant to the orders passed by the Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission. Further, the 1st order passed by the Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission in M.P.Nos.6 of 2010, 9 of 2010 and 17 of 2010 and D.R.P.No.9 of 2010 dated 07.09.2010 and paragraph 4.4 provides findings of the Commission which reads as under:

"4.4 The consumer is at present permitted to utilise power from captive sources. The present order would enable a consumer to purchase power from third party sources as well. Procurement of power by a consumer through Open Access is protected by the Electricity Act, 2003. The role of the licensee is limited to that of a carrier. Procurement through Open Access will be treated as an additionality. The ceiling, upto which a consumer can utilise power including the TNEB quota demand, captive power and third party purchase would be the sanctioned demand. In such a situation, there would be no need for advance declaration by the consumer of procurement of captive power as stipulated in SMP.No.1 of 2009 or procurement of third party power as stipulated in the Interim Order dated 17.08.2010. As the TNEB had allowed procurement of power upto the sanctioned demand in their communication dated 17.07.2009 "procedure for allowing third party sale/purchase under intra state open access", there should be no difficulty in allowing the consumer to procure power upto the sanctioned demand."

2.Considering the above proposition, the Regulatory Commission subsequently passed an order in D.R.P.No.41 of 2014 and the relevant portion of the order stands extracted here under

"5. Findings of the Commission:-

5.1.The prayer of the Petitioner is to rectify the defect and error in the order dated 25-02-2013 passed by the Commission in R.A.No.4 of 2013 by directing that the date of effect of the order dated 07-09-2010 will apply to all consumers with sanctioned demand of 500 KW and above from 30-12-2008 and to all consumers with sanctioned demand of 250 KW and above from 17-07-2009 and consequently direct the Respondents to refund to the HT consumers accordingly.

5.2.Against the prayer of the petitioner the



WEB COPY

argument put forth by the respondent is that the TNEB's Memo's dated 30-12-2008 and 17-07-2009 have permitted open access only for the third party power purchasers. In this connection, Section 42(2), 42(3), 42(4) is reproduced below:

Section 42. (Duties of distribution licensee and open access):

(2) The State Commission shall introduce open access in such phases and subject to such conditions, (including the cross subsidies, and other operational constraints) as may be specified within one year of the appointed date by it and in specifying the extent of open access in successive phases and in determining the charges for wheeling, it shall have due regard to all relevant factors including such cross subsidies, and other operational constraints:

Provided that 1[such open access shall be allowed on payment of a surcharge] in addition to the charges for wheeling as may be determined by the State Commission:

Provided further that such surcharge shall be utilised to meet the requirements of current level of cross subsidy within the area of supply of the distribution licensee :

Provided also that such surcharge and cross subsidies shall be progressively reduced 2[***] in the manner as may be specified by the State Commission:

Provided also that such surcharge shall not be leviable in case open access is provided to a person who has established a captive generating plant for carrying the electricity to the destination of his own use:

3[Provided also that the State Commission shall, not later than five years from the date of commencement of the Electricity (Amendment) Act, 2003, by regulations, provide such open access to all consumers who require a supply of electricity where the maximum power to be made available at any time exceeds one megawatt.]

(3) Where any person, whose premises are situated within the area of supply of a distribution licensee, (not being a local authority engaged in the business of distribution of electricity before the appointed date) requires a supply of electricity from a generating company or any



WEB COPY

2009.

(iii) In the order dated 07-09-2010, the State Commission after taking note of the memo dated 17-07-2009 from the Chairman, TNEB directed the TNEB to act in accordance with its own stand. Thus, the State Commission has erred in deciding the date of effect of its order to 17-08-2010.

(iv) The procurement of power through open access from third party is protected under the Electricity Act, 2003 and the State Commission could not restrict the operation of its order effective from 17-08-2010 as the same has to be made effective from the date when third party purchase through open access was permitted by the Electricity Board.

In the above order, the words "the State Commission could not restrict the operation of its order effective from 17-08-2010 as the same has to be made effective from the date when third party purchase through open access was permitted by the Electricity Board" are very significant. In line with the APTEL's Order, the Commission in its Order dated 25-02-2013 in R.A.No.4 of 2013 directed that the date of effect of the Commission's Order dated 07-09-2010 in M.P.No.6 of 2010, M.P.No.9 of 2010 and M.P.No.17 of 2010 and D.R.P.No.9 of 2010 shall be 17-07-2009. In this Order, the Commission took into account only one date i.e. 17-07-2009 the date on which the TANGEDCO permitted open access to HT consumers with sanctioned demand of 250 kW and above. However, as rightly pointed out by the petitioner, the TANGEDCO permitted third party power purchase for the consumers with sanctioned demand of 500 kW and above with effect from 30-12-2008 and for the consumers with sanctioned demand of 250 kW and above with effect from 17-07-2009. These are two different dates on which the TNEB permitted open access for HT consumers with different sanctioned demand limits. The Commission accepts that the effective dates of Commission's Order in R.A.No.4 of 2013 should have been 17-07-2009 for the consumers with sanctioned demand of 250 kW and above, and 30-12-2008 for the consumers with sanctioned demand of 500 kW and above. Accordingly, in line with the direction of the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity, the



WEB COPY

Commission hereby directs that the date of effect of the order dated 07-09-2010 of the Commission in M.P.No.6 of 2010, M.P.No.9 of 2010 and M.P.No.17 of 2010 and D.R.P.No.9 of 2010 shall be 17-07-2009 for the consumers with sanctioned demand of 250 kW and above, and 30-12-2008 for the consumers with sanctioned demand of 500 kW and above. To that extent the Commission's Order dated 25-02-2013 in R.A.No.4 of 2013 has been modified. The other part of the Commission's Order dated 25-02-2013 in R.A.No.4 of 2013 holds good. Consequently, TANGEDCO is directed to effect refund to the HT consumers accordingly. This exercise shall be done within the period of two months from the date of the issue of this order.

6. Appeal:-

An appeal against this order shall lie before the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity under section 111 of the Electricity Act, 2003 within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order by the aggrieved person."

3. In view of the proposition considered and laid down, the present writ petitions are also require consideration. Accordingly, the impugned orders passed by the third respondent in proceedings dated 30.06.2010 are quashed and the respondents are directed to comply with the directions issued by the Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission in the subject matter.

4. With these directions, these writ petitions stand allowed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS-VI)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

Cse/Jeni

To

1. The Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission,
19-A, Rukmini Lakshmi Pathy Salai,
(Marshall's Road), Egmore, Chennai-600 008



2.The Chairman
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
144, Anna Salai, Chennai-600 002.

3.Superintending Engineer
Udumalpet Electricity Distribution Circle,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Udumalpet.

4.The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electricity Distribution
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Kundadam, Dharapuram.

5.The Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electricity Distribution
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Dharapuram West, Dharapuram.

+2cc to Mr.R.S.Pandiyaraj, Advocate SR.No.66968

W.P.Nos.18788 and
18789 of 2010

GJ(CO)
GN(04/01/2022)