## 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. 63 and 64 of 2015

Dated: 20 September, 2016

For the Respondents:

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

Shri Deepak Lad, Member

In the matter of

Petition filed by Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. (MSETCL) under Rule 3 (3) of the Maharashtra Electricity Works of Licensees Rules, 2012 for seeking stay and to quash the Order dated 5 March,2015 passed by the District Collector, Nanded.

(Case No. 63 of 2015)

## In the matter of

Petition filed by Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. (MSETCL) under Rule 3 (3) of the Maharashtra Electricity Works of Licensees Rules, 2012 for seeking stay and to quash the Order dated 5 March,2015 passed by the District Collector, Nanded.

(Case No. 64 of 2015)

Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd.	Petitioner
V/s	
Shri Vikram Shivaji Mungal and 12 others.	
Shri Nandkumar Bhagwanrao Bhosale and 8 others.	Respondents
<u>Appearance</u>	
For Petitioner:	Adv. Abhijeet Joshi Shri Dhananjay Deshmukh

Adv. Pavan Uttarwar

## **Daily Order**

The Commission heard both Cases together as the issues are similar. The Commission heard Representatives of the Petitioner and Advocate of the Respondents.

The Petitioners have challenged the Orders passed by District Collector, Nanded. The Petitioner reiterated the submissions made in the Petitions. It stated that, at the time of erection of towers in the year 1990, MSETCL had paid compensation to the erstwhile owners of the land. Stringing of second circuit of transmission line was carried out in February, 2013.

The Petitioners stated that District Collector, Nanded, in his Order at paragraph 5, has wrongly mentioned that the Petitioner is ready to give compensation to the Respondents. The Petitioner has not made any admission or statement agreeing to pay compensation to the Respondents. It further stated that the Petitioner could not get hold of the expected documents regarding receipts of earlier compensation paid and land ownership documents from the authorities and was hence unable to file these additional submissions. The Petitioner sought one months' time for filing additional submissions/ Rejoinder, which is granted by the Commission.

The Advocate for the Respondents stated that the revision Petition is not maintainable as the grounds of revision are not made out by the Petitioner. He stated that the District Collector is empowered with discretion to grant full compensation for the loss of land owners.

The Secretariat of the Commission will inform the further date of hearing.

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