

**Before the  
MAHARASHTRA ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
World Trade Centre, Centre No.1, 13th Floor, Cuffe Parade, Mumbai 400005  
Tel. 022 22163964/65/69 Fax 22163976  
Email: mercindia@merc.gov.in  
Website: www.mercindia.org.in/www.merc.gov.in**

**Case No. 213 of 2014**

**In the matter of**

**Petition filed by M/s Shree Balaji Builder and Developers under Sections 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of Order dated 19 July, 2014 passed by CGRF, Bhandup (Case No. 541, 542, 543 of 2014)**

**Dated: 27 October, 2015**

**CORAM: Shri Azeez M. Khan, Member**

**Shri Deepak Lad, Member**

M/s Shree Balaji Builder and Developers

... Petitioner

V/s

Superintending Engineer, MSEDCL Thane Urban Circle.

... Respondent

**Appearance**

Representative for the Petitioner:

1. Deepak A. Mohite  
2. B. R. Mantri

Advocate / Representative for the Respondents:

Adv. Ashish Singh  
Shri K. D. Humane

**Daily Order**

The Parties were informed of the Commission's decision to constitute a two Member bench to hear and decide this Case.

Heard the Representative of Petitioner Shri. Deepak Mohite and Advocate of the Respondent.

The Commission asked the Petitioner to clarify his stand on withdrawal of affidavit filed by his Representative Shri. B. R. Mantri as the Commission is in receipt of letter informing that Shri. B. R. Mantri had not been authorized for withdrawal. The Petitioner informed that Shri.

B. R. Mantri has no role to play henceforth in this Petition and the Petitioner intends to proceed ahead in the matter.

The Petitioner reiterated its submission in the Petition that it has not received full payment as per CGRF Order.

Advocate of the Respondent submitted that it has complied with the CGRF Order and the Petitioner has been paid as per the said Order. If the Petitioner is not satisfied he may approach the office of his client for getting his doubts cleared. Advocate of the Respondent further submitted that the Petitioner has not made any claims whatsoever since the passing of said Order.

The Commission opined that the Commission's role is limited to the compliance of the CGRF Order. Apparently, in this case there has been compliance to the Order of CGRF by the Respondent. The Petitioner may obtain clarification regarding the computation of dues/ payments by MSEDCL.

The Parties agreed to mutually discuss the issues.

**Case is reserved for Order.**

**Sd/-  
(Deepak Lad)  
Member**

**Sd/-  
(Azeez M. Khan)  
Member**