

MINUTES OF MEETING

OF THE

MUMBAI DISTRIBUTION NETWORK ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (M-DNAC)

Date :- 31 January 2025 at 14.30 Hrs.

Venue :- Site Visit - M/s. Speco Infrastructure Ltd. – 2 Nos. RMC plants – Kurla Bail Bazar, Kurla (W), Mumbai 400070.

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. Kiran Patil — AEML-D
Shri. Amit Patil — AEML-D
Shri. Sameer Govind — AEML-D

Shri Rajesh Rajgurav — TPC-D
Shri Harsh Chougule — TPC-D
Smt Tejaswita Paradkar — TPC-D
Smt Vaishnavi Jaiswal — TPC-D

Discussions held:-

1. AEML-D had received the power supply applications from M/s. Speco Infrastructure Ltd. for its 2 Nos. RMC plants at Kurla Bail Bazar, Kurla (W), Mumbai 400070. The load requirement of the applicant consumer is 170 kW and 190 kW. AEML-D assessed the MD as 211 kVA and 188 kVA in accordance with the MD estimation guidelines issued by the Commission. AEML-D stated that its CSS is located within the applicant consumer's premise, however, the existing capacity of the Substation is 400 kVA which needs to be upgraded in order serve to the consumer's load requirement. Accordingly, AEML-D assessed its own network position and communicated to TPC-D on 8 January 2025 (with a copy marked to MDNAC) that the upgradation of existing CSS would be required to supply the consumer and hence the proposal comes under level (3) and above as per the Commission's Order in Case No. 182 of 2014.
2. AEML-D, in its letter, further claimed that HT and LT network of TPC-D is at a distance of more than 700 Meters and 1 km respectively from the site (route distance) whereas AEML-D's 11 kV network is available inside the plot due to presence of

existing CSS. AEML-D 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 licensees.

3. In response, TPC-D, vide its letter dated 16 January 2025, informed that its HT (11 kV) network is available at 650 Meters from the proposed consumer premises and it will also require LT CSS (Level 3 connection) to serve the applicant consumer) . It further 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*”.

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

- i. The Committee carried out a site visit on 31 January 2025 in the presence of the representatives of AEML-D and TPC-D to verify the claims of the Licensees regarding the existence of their distribution mains near the applicant’s premises.
- ii. The Committee notes that AEML-D’s 11 kV network is available inside the applicant’s premises as its 11/0.433 kV Substation with 400kV Oil type transformer is inside the premise of the applicant consumer. Further, presently power supply to the applicant’s premise is being provided by AEML-D by laying LT service cables, meaning thereby its HT as well as LT network is available inside the applicant’s premise.
- iii. TPC-D has claimed that its HT (11 kV) network is available at 650 mtrs. from the applicant’s premises. 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 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 in present case, AEML-D’s distribution mains is available inside the applicant’s location as the consumer is being supplied by AEML-D through its LT mains. Thus, AEML-D’s distribution mains is available 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 is inside the applicant's premises.
- vii. Considering the aforesaid facts and considering the relative network spread of both the Licensees, the Committee is of the opinion that the the applications received from M/s. Speco Infrastructure Ltd. for its 2 Nos. RMC plants at Kurla Bail Bazar, Kurla (W), Mumbai 400070, fall under scenario 53(a) as per Case No. 182 of 2014.

5. In view of the above, the Committee has decided to confirm that the applications of M/s. Speco Infrastructure Ltd. for power supply to its 2 Nos. of RMC plants located at Kurla Bail Bazar, Kurla (W), Mumbai 400070, fall 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)