



WEB COPY

WP No. 31182 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE P.T. ASHA

**WP No. 31182 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.34925 and 34927 of 2025**

E.Kalaiyaran
S/o.S.Elumalai, No.3/52, Pillaiyar Kovil Street,
Naraiyur Village And Post, Kilpennathur Taluk,
Thiruvannamalai District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Superintendent Engineer,
TANGEDCO, Vengikkal, Thiruvannamalai,
Thiruvannamalai District.
2. The Executive Engineer,
Operation and Maintenance (East),
TANGEDCO, Thiruvannamalai,
Thiruvannamalai District.
3. The Assistant Executive Engineer
Operation and Maintenance, TANGEDCO,
Rajanthangal, Thiruvannamalai District.
4. The Junior Engineer
Operation and Maintenance, TANGEDCO,
Vettavalam-Sorathur, Thiruvannamalai
District.

..Respondent(s)



PRAYER: Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the impugned order of the 3rd respondent dated 11.10.2023 in க.ஆ.எண்.உ.செ.பொ/இ & ப /இராஜ / கோ.மிதி / அ.எண்.190/ 2023-24 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to restore the petitioner's Service No.315-006-1287 within a time bound manner.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.D.Senthilkumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.Swami Subramanian, Standing Counsel

ORDER

The above writ petition has been filed to call for the records relating to the impugned order of the 3rd respondent dated 11.10.2023 in க.ஆ.எண்.உ.செ.பொ/இ & ப /இராஜ / கோ.மிதி / அ.எண்.190/ 2023-24 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to restore the petitioner's Service No.315-006-1287 within a time bound manner.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that in the year 2016, he had availed for an Agricultural (Floriculture) Service Connection from the TANGEDCO. He was assigned service connection bearing Service No.315-006-1287. However, while giving the service connection, he was



informed by the officials that the meter was not available and the 4th respondents and his subordinates assured that as soon as the meter was received by them, they will install it in the petitioner's place. The petitioner would submit that he and his father had approached the respondents 3 and 4 several times and requested to install the meter. However, the respondents 3 and 4 except for orally assuring that they would install meter, had not complied with their assurance. The petitioner, without using the service connection, was paying minimum charges to the respondents in order to retain the service connection.

3. The petitioner would further submit that on 29.09.2022, he had sent a requisition letter to the 4th respondent requesting him to install the meter to his service connection. Though the letter was received by the 3rd respondent he had neither replied to the same nor installed the meter. Once again, a similar letter was addressed to the 2nd respondent which also received the same treatment. Once again, a representation dated 28.11.2022 was sent to the 4th respondent setting out the entire facts and requesting him to install the meter. This request was also not given effect to.



4. The petitioner would submit that the wireman who had come to the property had demanded a sum of Rs.5,000/- as directed by the 4th respondent, which was refused by the petitioner. Therefore, to harass the petitioner, a complaint had been filed by the 4th respondent before Vettavalam Police Station stating that the meter was stolen by the petitioner. Thereafter, on 27.09.2023, the petitioner had sent a detailed representation to the respondents in this regard and on 11.10.2023, the 3rd respondent had issued the impugned order contending that the petitioner had committed energy theft and he was directed to pay Rs.2,00,400/- towards the damages.

5. Challenging the same, the petitioner is before this Court.

6. The petitioner would submit that he had also challenged the false case forged against him by filing a criminal original petition in CrI.O.P.No.28363 of 2023 before this Court and had sought the anticipatory bail. The anticipatory bail was granted on condition that the petitioner should deposit a sum of Rs.50,000/- to the credit of Crime No.381 of 2023 which sum was also deposited by the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner would seek to quash the impugned order.



7. The 3rd respondent has filed a counter affidavit, in which, it was stated that on 23.11.2016, the writ petitioner had obtained energy service connection in S.C.No.315-006-1287 for Agricultural Allied Activities (Floriculture) under Tariff IIIA1 with three phase and electric meter bearing S.No.16418835. This meter was installed in S.No.105/5A, Naraiyur Village, Kilpennathur Taluk, Tiruvannamalai District. The petitioner had also acknowledged the installation of the electric meter by signing the meter test report. After the installation of the meter, the petitioner was utilising the service connection and paying the monthly energy bill.

8. It is the contention of the respondent that on 06.09.2022, during the inspection, the authorities discovered that the electric meter was not available in the premises and immediately, a police complaint dated 19.09.2022 was preferred before the Vettavalam Police Station, Thiruvannamalai. The inspection conducted thereafter revealed that the writ petitioner indulged in the theft of the electricity.

9. The respondent had preferred a police complaint on 26.09.2023 on the file of the Vettavalam Police Station against the theft of



electricity and meter and CSR.No.432/2023 was obtained. That apart, the equipments used for theft of electricity was also handed over to the police authorities. Thereafter, CSR was converted to FIR in Cr.No.381/2023.

Thereafter, the petitioner's father was served with a parvai mahazar and working sheet dated 11.10.2023 demanding a sum of Rs.2,00,400/-. The petitioner's father refused to sign the mahazar and threatened the officials who had gone to his premises. The respondents would state that the writ petitioner and his father had indulged in theft of electricity by directly hooking to the electricity line going through the transformer, all of which, was discovered when the officials had visited the site in question and they had also observed that the electric meter installed was stolen. Immediately, a police complaint was lodged and the representations given by the petitioner was only after the date of finding that the meter was stolen and not at any point earlier.

10. Heard the rival submissions and perused the materials on record.

11. The petitioner had submitted the online payment with reference to S.No.315-006-1287. A perusal of the said payment status



would show that the petitioner was not only assigned consumption charges but the meter has been installed bearing S.No.16418835. Further, in the counter affidavit, the 3rd respondent have clearly stated that the petitioner has also signed the meter test report at the time of meter installation. Therefore, the contention of the petitioner that the meter was not installed in his premises appears to be a false statement.

12. The petitioner, in his affidavit filed in support of the petition, had clearly stated that he and his father has been making representations to the respondents to install the meter. However, none of the correspondence from the year 2016 when the meter was installed upto 2022 has been filed into this Court. It is only in the year 2022, when the respondent had visited the site and discovered the theft of electricity meter and taken action and filed the criminal case against the petitioner, that the petitioner had sent the representations. This is nothing but, an afterthought and an attempt to create evidence in favour of the petitioner. Further, it is highly improbable for a consumer to have kept quiet all these years without the electric meter being installed and by paying the very low consumption charges. The impugned order rejecting the request of the petitioner is, therefore, in order and I do not see any reasons to interfere with the same.



Accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed. Consequently,
connected miscellaneous petitions stand closed. No costs.

09-02-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

ssa

To

1.The Superintendent Engineer,
TANGEDCO, Vengikkal, Thiruvannamalai,
Thiruvannamalai District.

2.The Executive Engineer,
Operation and Maintenance (East),
TANGEDCO, Thiruvannamalai,
Thiruvannamalai District.

3.The Assistant Executive Engineer
Operation and Maintenance,
TANGEDCO, Rajanthangal,
Thiruvannamalai District.

4.The Junior Engineer
Operation and Maintenance,
TANGEDCO, Vettavalam-Sorathur,
Thiruvannamalai District.



WEB COPY

WP No. 31182 of 2



P.T.ASHA, J.

ssa

WP No. 31182 of 2025

09-02-2026