

MINUTES OF MEETING

OF THE

MUMBAI DISTRIBUTION NETWORK ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (M-DNAC)

Date :- 31 January 2025 at 11.30 Hrs.

Venue :- Site Visit - M/s. Dynamix Contractors & Builders Pvt. Ltd., CTS No. 845, Pt. Village Malad, Nr. Swapnalok Towers, Goregaon E, Mumbai 400063.

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

Licensee's representatives:
Shri. Vivek Mishra — AEML-D
Shri. Sanjay Dhumal — AEML-D
Shri. Jitendra Patil — AEML-D

Shri Swapnil Rao — TPC-D
Shri Harsh Chougule — TPC-D
Shri Tushar Rahatal — TPC-D
Shri Rahul Chavan — TPC-D

Discussions held:-

1. AEML-D had received the power supply application from M/s. Dynamix Contractors and Builders Pvt. Ltd., CTS No. 845, Pt. Village Malad, Nr. Swapnalok Towers, Goregaon E, Mumbai 400063 for total load requirement of 6517 kW. AEML-D estimated the Maximum Demand as 1392 kW in accordance with the MD estimation guidelines issued by the Commission. Accordingly, AEML-D assessed its own network position and communicated to TPC-D on 8 January 2025 (with a copy marked to the M-DNAC) that it will require Consumer Substation (CSS) to supply the consumer and hence the proposal comes under level (3). AEML-D further claimed that HT and LT network of TPC-D is at a distance of more than 500 Meters from the site (route distance) whereas AEML-D's 11 kV network is available on the road right in front of the applicant's premises (barely 5 Meters). AEML-D further stated that in view of the decisions already provided by the M-DNAC dated 4 September 2020 and 9 June 2021 and earlier decisions in this regard, the location is required to be considered under Scenario 53 (a), basis the network spread of the two licences.

2. In response, TPC-D, vide its letter dated 16 January 2025, informed MDNAC that its HT (11 kV) network is available at 670 Meters and the applicant consumer can be served by TPC-D after installation of CSS i.e. Level 3 by extending its HT distribution mains from 670 mtr. TPC-D stated that the present application falls under Scenario 53 (d) which deals with a situation where “*either or both Licensees are ‘present’ but neither ‘completely covers’ the area*”.

3. M-DNAC Committee’s observations and decision:-

- i. The Committee carried out a site visit on 31 January 2025 in presence of the representatives of AEML-D and TPC-D to verify the claims of the Licensees regarding existence of their distribution mains nearby the applicant’s premise.
- ii. The Committee noted that AEML-D’s 11 kV network is available on the road right in front of the applicant’s premise at about 5 mtr. The Committee further observed that its 11/0.433 kV Substation exists in the adjacent premise. Further, presently the power supply for construction purpose has been provided by AEML-D to the applicant’s premise by laying LT cable and by installation of LT pillar inside the applicant’s premise, meaning thereby its HT as well as LT network is available just near/inside the applicant’s premise.
- iii. TPC-D has claimed that its LT and HT network is available at 670 mtrs. from the applicant’s premise. During the site visit, same has been verified by the Committee.
- iv. TPC-D, in its letter dated 16 January 2025, stated that it is TPC-D’s understanding that the present application falls under scenario 53(d) which deals with a situation where “*either or both licensees are present*” but neither “*completely covers the area*”. The Committee notes that presently the power supply for construction purpose has been provided by AEML-D to the applicant’s premise by laying LT cable, meaning thereby its HT as well as LT network is available near/inside the applicant’s premise. Thus, AEML-D’s distribution mains is available just near/inside the applicant’s location and completely covers the location. Hence, the said location does not fall under scenario 53(d) which deals with a situation where “*either or both licensees are present*” but neither “*completely covers the area*”. Hence, TPC-D’s claim for scenario 53(d) is not correct.
- v. As per the Order in Case No. 182 of 2014, scenario 53(a) comprises areas or locations which are completely covered by one Licensee since it has its distribution mains there, but Licensee B does not. The relevant abstract of Case No. 182 of 2014 is reproduced as below:

“136.1 Scenario 53 (a) comprises areas or locations which are completely covered by one Licensee *since it has its distribution mains there but Licensee B does not.*”

- vi. In the present case, AEML-D's distribution mains are just on the wall boundary of the applicant's premise, and it can extend the 11kV distribution mains without availing of any local authority permission.
- vii. Considering the aforesaid facts and considering the relative network spread of both the Licensees, the Committee is of the opinion that the application received from M/s. Dynamix Contractors & Builders Pvt. Ltd., CTS No. 845, Pt. Village Malad, Nr. Swapnalok Towers, Goregaon E, Mumbai 400063, falls under scenario 53(a) as per Case No. 182 of 2014.

4. In view of the above, the Committee has decided to confirm that the application of M/s. Dynamix Contractors & Builders Pvt. Ltd. for power supply to their building located at the location, CTS No. 845, Pt. Village Malad, Nr. Swapnalok Towers, Goregaon (East), Mumbai 400063, falls under scenario 53(a) and this criterion is satisfied by AEML-D.

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

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

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

Sd/-
Dr. Prafulla Varhade,
Chairman (Commission's Officer)