

**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](http://www.mercindia.org.in) / [www.merc.gov.in](http://www.merc.gov.in)**

**Case No.32 of 2015**

**Date: 14 March, 2017**

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

**In the matter of**  
**Petition filed by M/s. M.R.Scion Agro under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and Regulation 22 of the MERC (CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations 2006 for non-compliance of Order dated 28 November, 2013 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF), Kolhapur in Consumer Complaint No.14/18/19/2013-14.**

M/s. M. R. Scion Agro .....Petitioner

V/S

- 1) Executive Engineer (Nodal Officer), MSEDCL, Vishrambag, Sangli.  
2) Executive Engineer, MSEDCL, Vishrambag, Sangli, (R-Division) .....Respondents

**Appearance:**

For the Petitioner: .....Shri.H.D.Khapre (Rep.)

For the Respondent: ...Shri. Nirav Shah (Advocate)

**Daily Order**

Heard the representative of the Petitioner & Advocate of the Respondent.

1. Advocate of MSEDCL stated that Writ Petition (WP No.2798/2015) filed by MSEDCL challenging the CGRF Order dated 28 November, 2013 is dismissed by Bombay High Court on 18 January, 2017. MSEDCL will comply with the Order of CGRF as per the prevailing practice provisions of MSEDCL.

2. To a query of the Commission regarding such compliance, Advocate of MSEDCL replied that it will refund only the cost of 11 kV line, which is around Rs.3.26 lakhs, as it has used only the line and not the transformer. MSEDCL will submit the detailed calculations within 3 days.
3. Representative of the Petitioner re-iterated its submissions and stated that MSEDCL has not yet complied with the CGRF Order, and is liable for action under Section 142 of Electricity Act, 2003. MSEDCL should also pay interest for the delay period, which should be recovered from the salary of the concerned officer/s.
4. The Commission asked why the CGRF Order was not complied with in the specified time, and even after the Writ Petition was dismissed. Advocate of MSEDCL stated that it will submit its justification for the delay.
5. The Commission directed that MSEDCL should have a meeting to discuss its calculations of the amount to be paid to Petitioner within 2 weeks and submit the report along with justification for delay in complying with the CGRF Order to the Commission within a week thereafter.

**The Case is reserved for Order.**

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

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