

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

Date :- 16 May 2025 at 12.00 Hrs.
Venue :- Through Video Conferencing.
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)

Discussion held:-

1. AEML-D had received the power supply application on 28 April 2025 from “Kalpataru Properties Pvt. Ltd., JVLR, Jogeshwari (E), Mumbai 400060” for total load requirement of 5707 kW. AEML-D estimated the Maximum Demand (**MD**) as 2063 kVA in accordance with the MD estimation guidelines issued by the Commission. Accordingly, AEML-D assessed its own network position and communicated to TPC-D by email on 30 April 2025 (with a copy marked to the M-DNAC) that the proposal might fall under Scenario 53 (D). AEML-D further stated that in order to connect the said consumer, AEML-D would be required to install CSS (Level 3 connection) and hence would be required to follow the procedure laid down by the Commission in terms of Para 6 of Annexure C of its Order dated 12 June 2017.
2. In response, TPC-D, vide its email on 5 May 2025, informed AEML-D (with a copy marked to M-DNAC) that its HT and LT network is available at 700 Mtr from the applicant’s premise and it will be in a position to connect the applicant by commissioning a CSS in the plot (Level 3 connection).
3. Subsequently, AEML-D vide its email on 6 May 2025 to M-DNAC (with a copy marked to TPC-D) claimed that the present application falls under Scenario 53 (A) as AEML-D’s network is available right in front of the plot (a distance of Max. 5 Mtr.) against the network of TPC-D available at 700 Mtr.
4. **M-DNAC Committee’s observations and decision:-**
 - i. The Committee carried out a site visit on 16 May 2025 in presence of the representatives of AEML-D (Shri. Vivek Mishra, Shri. Amber Pandey and Smt. Ashwini Wagh) and TPC-D (Shri Niranjan C. V., Shri. Vikas Koul and Shri Harsh

Chougule) to verify the claims of the Licensees regarding existence of their distribution mains nearby the applicant's premises.

- ii. The Committee notes that AEML-D's 11 kV network is available right in front of applicant's premises as its 11 kV cable (emanating from 33/11 kV Sarvodaya Receiving Station (RSS)) is passing by the premise at about 5 Mtr and requires approx. 120 meters cable laying from existing cable to metering point inside the consumer's premise. AEML-D claimed that load on its 11 kV feeder is approximately about 45%. 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 in the close vicinity of the applicant's premise.
- iii. TPC-D has claimed that its HT (11 kV) network is available at 700 Mtr. from the applicant's premises. During the site visit, same has been verified by the Committee.
- iv. TPC-D, vide its email on 5 May 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 is available just 5 meters away from the applicant's location and 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 HT mains is just 5 meters away from the applicant's premise (on the road).
- 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 Kalpataru Properties Pvt. Ltd., JVL R, Jogeshwari (E), Mumbai 400060, 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 Kalpataru Properties Pvt. Ltd., JVLR, Jogeshwari (E), Mumbai 400060, 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)