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. 2 of 2016

<u>Dated</u>: 15 March, 2016

CORAM: Shri Azeez M. Khan, Member Shri. Deepak Lad, Member

In the matter of Petition for punishment under Section 146 of Electricity Act 2003, for non-compliance of Order dated 16 September, 2015 passed by CGRF, Amravati Zone, Akola in complaint No. 67 of 2009.

M/s. Gujarat Ambuja Exports Limited.		Petitioner
V/s.		
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Lt	td. (MSEDCL)	Respondent
Representative for the Petitioner:	Shri. B. I	K. Chitlange
Representative for the Respondent:	Shri. G. V. Mahajan	

Daily Order

Heard the Representatives of the Petitioner and the Respondent. Representative of Petitioner submitted that MSEDCL issued arbitrary bill including ASC charges for the month of September 2009. Petitioner approached CGRF Akola against the arbitrary bill. CGRF issued an Order on 1 February, 2010 and quashed the demand of Rs. 51, 94, 693.87/- raised by MSEDCL. MSEDCL filed a Writ Petition challenging the CGRF Order. Bombay High Court vide its Judgment dated 31 March, 2015 remanded the matter to CGRF Akola for fresh adjudication. CGRF Akola issued a fresh Order on 16 September, 2015 and revised the benchmark consumption month as January, 2006. Petitioner further submitted that MSEDCL has issued the revised bill considering the benchmark consumption of 393465 units. However there is some disagreement on calculation of the revised bill, which the Petitioner has communicated to MSEDCL.

MSEDCL Representative submitted that it has complied with the CGRF Order and given effect in his bill for the month of January 2016. The calculation of the Petitioner has also been forwarded to its IT Department for further consideration. MSEDCL is ready to discuss the calculation with the Petitioner and revise it accordingly if necessary. The Petitioner agreed to discuss the matter as suggested by the MSEDCL Representative.

The Commission directed MSEDCL to file a report, with a copy to the Petitioner, within a month after discussion with the Petitioner and co ordination with IT Department.

Depending on the submission of the parties, the Commission will decide the further course of action in this Case.

Sd/ (Deepak Lad) Member Sd/-(Azeez M. Khan) Member