

**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. 60 of 2016

Dated: 22 September, 2016

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

In the matter of
Petition filed by Shri Dilip Bhikaji Dete under Rule 13 (2) Maharashtra Works of Licensees Rules 2012 & Work of Licensees Rules 2006 & sec 67 of EA 2003 for not giving expected compensation and for granting of enhanced compensation for erecting Electricity Tower in his agricultural land.

Shri Dilip Bhikaji DetePetitioner

V/s.

Maharashtra Eastern Grid Power Transmission Co. Ltd (Akola and Gujarat).....Respondents

Appearance

Representative for Petitioner: Shri Sudhakar .S. Dalvi (Adv.)

Representative for Respondents: Ms Rishika Rajadhyaksha (Adv.)

Daily Order

Heard the Advocates for the Petitioner and Respondents

1. The Petitioner stated that he had 200 Mango and 250 Papaya trees in his agricultural and his family livelihood depends on farm income. He further stated that the Respondent had brought material for construction of Transmission line on his farm and damaged the crops/trees. Respondent has paid Rs 4,76,000, which is only part of the total compensation due as per the valuation by the Taluka Agricultural Officer. Petitioner further stated that representatives of the Respondent were not answering his phone calls since 2014 for paying balance compensation.
2. The Respondent stated that it had filed its detailed Reply on 21 September, 2016, and requested to postpone the hearing to further date. The Reply was provided to the Petitioner at the hearing. The Commission did not find it appropriate to postpone the hearing as the Respondent has now belatedly filed its Reply and the convenience of the Petitioner, who is a farmer residing in Buldhana District, also has to be

considered. The Commission also noted that the hearing notice was issued on 18 August, 2016 and the Reply filed by the Respondent just one day before the hearing.

3. The Petitioner sought 2 weeks' time for filing its Rejoinder to the Reply served by the Respondent at the hearing. The Commission allows 2 weeks to the Petitioner to do so, with copy to the Respondent.
4. After the hearing, the Respondent, vide its letter dated 22 September, 2016 stated that the Commission proceeded to hear the arguments of the Petitioner and closed the hearing without considering the request made by Advocate to be heard on any other short date. Further the Respondent also stated that it will suffer grave and irreparable loss and requested to be heard and represented on merits.
5. The Commission has recorded its decision taken at the hearing. However, the Respondent may file any additional submission within a week with a copy to the Petitioner.

Case is reserved for the Order

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

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