

MINUTES OF MEETING
OF THE
MUMBAI DISTRIBUTION NETWORK ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (M-DNAC)

Date :- 5 September, 2019 at 16.00 Hrs.

Venue :- MERC, 12th Floor Conference Hall

Present :- Shri. Dineshchandra Saboo, Member (External)
Shri. Prafulla Varhade, Member (Commission's Officer)
Shri. Dilip Dumbre, Member (Ombudsman's Officer)
Shri. Rakesh Guhagarkar, Member Convener, (Commission's Officer)

Discussions held

1. Mumbai Distribution Network Assessment Committee (M-DNAC) received a letter dated 1 August, 2019 from **AEML-D** seeking confirmation for going ahead with providing supply in response to application received from **Jagdev Mhatre, New Uttan, Gorai Rd, Bhayandar (W)** for supply of 145 kW –LT-II Commercial category claiming that the location belongs to scenario 53(a) as per the Commission's Order in Case No. 182 of 2014. AEML-D stated that its LT Network is covered in the vicinity of the location but it cannot cater to the requirement of the applicant and thus required extension of 11kV cable from nearest substation for commissioning of the 11/0.433 kV substation. AEML-D's 11kV mains is located about 850 mtr. from the proposed substation location. Also, TPC-D's LT network is located outside of 9.2 km and HT network outside 6.1 km from the concerned location of the applicant. AEML-D submitted a map indicating the consumers' location, AEML-D's and TPC-D's nearby network spread.
2. TPC-D, vide its letter dated 21 August, 2019 disputed on AEML-D's scenario classification and stated that the applicant can be supplied electricity only after extending / augmenting its distribution mains and not by merely laying a service line. Hence the said applicant is not completely covered by AEML-D. Further, TPC-D's Distribution Network is also in the vicinity. Since both TPC-D and AEML-D require to install a new substation or augment the existing substation, a said applicant falls under 53 (d) scenario.
3. TPC-D further stated that the Order dated 4 February, 2019 in Case No. 345 of 2018 is not applicable to the present case since the case of Case No. 345 of 2018 (M/s. Medinee Niketan) was a re-development case and thus permitted under Scenario 53 (a). However, present case is not re-development case and thus would fall under Scenario 53 (d).

4. The Committee observed that although TPC-D stated that its network is also in vicinity, it did not deny the AEML-D's submission that TPC-D's network is 6 to 9 km away. Accordingly, during meeting held on 5 September, 2019, TPC-D was requested to clarify the same. During the meeting, TPC-D admitted that its nearby network is at least 6 km away from the proposed consumers' location.
5. The Committee notes that in its Order dated 4 February, 2019 in Case No. 345 of 2018, the Commission has already acknowledged that there could be level 3 and above applications in scenario 53(a). Hence, there is no merit in the TPC-D's contention that a said consumer falls under 53 (d) scenario just because AEML-D would require to install a new substation to supply to the consumer. Further, the Committee does not agree with the contention of TPC-D that the ruling in Case no. 345 of 2018 would only applicable to re-development cases since no such segregation is made in that Order.
6. AEML-D has confirmed that it has its LT network nearby which cannot cater the applicant's load and hence new substation is required which is level 3 of the scenario of 53(a).
7. Further, although, distance is not the criteria for scenario classification as per the Commission's Order, TPC-C's claim that the location falls under scenario 53(d) doesn't have merit considering the network spread of both the Licensees in present case.
8. Therefore, the Committee is of the opinion that the location of Applicant Jagdev Mhatre, New Uttan, Gorai Rd, Bhayandar (W) for supply of 145 kW falls under scenario 53(a) as per Case No. 182 of 2014.
9. In view of the above, the Committee has decided to confirm for releasing power supply connection to Applicant (Jagdev Mhatre, New Uttan, Gorai Rd, Bhayandar (W)) which falls under scenario 53(a) and this criteria is satisfied by AEML-D.

Sd/-
Shri. Dineshchandra Saboo,
Member (External)

Sd/-
Shri Prafulla Varhade,
Member (Commission's Officer)

Sd/-
Shri. Dilip Dumbre,
Member (Ombudsman's Officer)

Sd/-
Shri. Rakesh Guhagarkar,
Member Convener (Commission's Officer)