

**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](mailto: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. 98 of 2016**

**Date: 16 May, 2017**

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

**In the matter of**  
**Petition of M/s Harman Finochem Limited under Sections 142 & 146 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for Non-Compliance of CGRF, Aurangabad's Order dated 20 May, 2016.**

M/s Harman Finochem Ltd. (HFL) . . . .Petitioner

V/s.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited (MSEDCL) . . . .Respondent

Appearance:

For the Petitioner: . . . .Mr.Kulwinder Singh

For the Respondent: . . . .Mr.Kiran Gaikwad (Adv)

For the Authorized Consumer Representative: . . . .Dr.Ashok Pendse (TBIA)

**Daily Order**

Heard the Representative of the Petitioner and Advocate of MSEDCL.

1. Advocate of MSEDCL stated that it has challenged the CGRF's Order dated 20 May, 2016 before the High Court of Judicature at Bombay, Bench at Aurangabad in WP No. 9470 of 2016, and the next hearing is scheduled on 21 June, 2017.
2. The Commission noted that, at its last hearing on 2 May, 2017, the High Court ruled the following:  
*"Mr. Shah, learned Counsel for respondent states that statement made by him, on 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 to this Court that no coercive steps would be taken by him against the petitioner would continue till 21<sup>st</sup> June, 2017".*
3. To a query of the Commission, the Representative of the Petitioner submitted his

interpretation of the High Court's interim Order, namely that there is no stay to the CGRF's Order, but could not explain what are the coercive steps in this context not to be taken against the Petitioner according to the High Court's Interim Order.

4. Representative of the Petitioner sought time to file its Rejoinder.
5. The Commission asked the Advocate of MSEDCL what its course of action would be if the proceedings in the High Court are further extended. There was no reply to this.
6. As the matter is in effect subject to stay by the High Court, the Commission closed the Case with liberty to the Petitioner file a fresh Petition subsequent to the further order or outcome the matter in the High Court.

**The Case is reserved for Order.**

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

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