

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
www.mercindia.org.in / www.merc.gov.in

Case No. 7, 8, 10,11,12,13 & 25 of 2015

Date: 29 October, 2015

CORAM: Shri. Azeez M. Khan, Member

Shri. Deepak Lad, Member

In the Matters of

- 1) **Petition of M/s Samrudh Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd. under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against MSEDCL for not allowing option to exercise choice between continuous and non-continuous type of supply to the Petitioner connected on express feeder in Case No. 7 of 2015,**
- 2) **Petition of M/s Manan Cotysn Pvt. Ltd. under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against MSEDCL for not allowing option to exercise choice between continuous and non-continuous type of supply to the Petitioner connected on express feeder in Case No. 8 of 2015,**
- 3) **Petition filed by M/s Aarti Drugs Ltd for allowing option to exercise choice between continuous and non-continuous type of supply by consumer connected on express feeder by MSEDCL in Case No. 10 of 2015,**
- 4) **Petition filed by M/s Everest Kanto Cylinder Ltd for allowing option to exercise choice between continuous and non-continuous type of supply by consumer connected on express feeder by MSEDCL in Case No. 11 of 2015,**
- 5) **Petition filed by M/s Aarti Drugs Ltd for allowing option to exercise choice between continuous and non-continuous type of supply by consumer connected on express feeder by MSEDCL in Case No. 12 of 2015,**
- 6) **Petition filed by M/s Aarti Drugs Ltd for allowing option to exercise choice between continuous and non-continuous type of supply by consumer connected on express feeder by MSEDCL in Case No. 13 of 2015,**
- 7) **Petition filed by M/s Dicitex Home Furnishing Pvt. Ltd. under Section 142 of EA 2003 to direct MSEDCL for allowing option to exercise choice between**

**continuous and non-continuous type of supply by Consumer connected on
express feeder in Case No. 25 of 2015.Petitioners**

Vs

**Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. (MSEDCL)
.....Respondent**

Present during the hearing:

For all the Petitioners : Shri. Subir Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondent : Ms. Deepa Chawan, Advocate

Daily Order

The Parties were informed of the Commission's decision to constitute a two Member Bench to hear and decide the Cases. As the matter is identical, the Commission has clubbed all the seven Cases for hearing together, to which the parties agreed.

Heard the Advocate of the Petitioners and the Respondent.

The Advocate for the Petitioners submitted that they had applied to MSEDCL for change of Tariff category from continuous to non-continuous supply. However, MSEDCL neither replied nor took any action on their applications.

The Commission asked the Petitioners as to why they have not approached CGRF for their grievance. The Commission also enquired as to whether they have applied for such change of Tariff category from continuous to non-continuous supply under the recent Tariff Order.

The Commission directed the Petitioners to submit Rejoinder, within a week.

The Case is reserved for Order.

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

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