

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

Date :- 13 June 2025 at 10.30 Hrs.

Venue :- Site Visit - Fortune Town Planners LLP, Common CTS no.15, Daftary Rd. Fortune Plaza, Opp. Eastern Plaza, Malad (E), Mumbai 400097.

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. Harsh Chougule — TPC-D
Shri. Rahul Chavan — TPC-D
Shri. Tushar Rohatal — TPC-D

Discussions held:-

1. AEML-D had received the power supply application from Fortune Town Planners LLP, Common CTS no.15, Daftary Rd. Fortune Plaza, Opp. Eastern Plaza, Malad (E), Mumbai 400097. The load requirement of the applicant consumer (for its entire commercial building) is 5707 kW. AEML-D assessed the MD as 846 kVA in accordance with the MD estimation guidelines issued by the Commission. In order to serve the load requirement of consumer, AEML-D assessed its own network position and communicated to M-DNAC on 4 June 2025 (with a copy marked to TPC-D) that AEML-D would require a new 11/0.4 kVA CSS in the consumer's premise to supply power 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 about 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 premise (barely 5 Meters). AEML-D stated that in view of the decisions already provided by the M-DNAC, the location may be considered under Scenario 53 (a), basis the network spread of the two licensees.

3. In response, TPC-D, vide its letter dated 11 June 2025, informed that its HT (11 kV) and LT network is available at 450 Meters from the proposed consumer's premise 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 13 June 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 notes that AEML-D's 11 kV network is available on the road right in front of the premise of the applicant consumer. Further, presently temporary 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 at the applicant's premise.
- iii. TPC-D has claimed that its HT (11 kV) network is available at 450 Meters from the applicant's premise. During the site visit, same has been verified by the Committee.
- iv. TPC-D, in its letter dated 11 June 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 in present case, AEML-D's distribution mains are available at the applicant's location as the temporary power supply (100 kW) to the consumer is being supplied by AEML-D through its LT mains. Thus, AEML-D's distribution mains are available at the applicant's location and completely cover 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 present at the applicant's premise. The Committee has observed a similar situation in the recent case of Kalpataru Properties Pvt. Ltd., JVLR, Jogeshwari (E), Mumbai where AEML-D's distribution HT mains were just 5 Meters away from the applicant's premise (on the road) whereas TPC-D's HT (11 kV) network was

available at 700 Meters and concluded on 16 May 2025 that the said site falls under scenario 53(a) as per Case No. 182 of 2014.

- vii. Considering the aforesaid facts and considering the relative network spread of both the Licensees, the Committee is of the opinion that the the application received from Fortune Town Planners LLP, Common CTS no. 15, Daftary Rd. Fortune Plaza, Opp. Eastern Plaza, Malad (E), Mumbai 400097, falls 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 application of Fortune Town Planners LLP, Common CTS no. 15, Daftary Rd. Fortune Plaza, Opp. Eastern Plaza, Malad (E), Mumbai 400097, 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)