

**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. 92 of 2017**

**Date:12 September 2017**

**CORAM: Shri. Anand B. Kulkarni, Chairperson  
Shri. Azeez M. Khan, Member  
Shri. Deepak Lad, Member**

**In the matter of**

**Petition of Shrinivas Engg. Auto Components Pvt. Ltd. regarding violation by  
MSEDCL of Regulation 5.3 of the Standards of Performance Regulations, 2014 in the  
matter of quality of supply and system of supply**

M/s. Shrinivas Engineering Auto Components Pvt.Ltd. (SEAC) ... Petitioner

V/s

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd. (MSEDCL) ... Respondent

**Appearance:**

For the Petitioner: ...Shri. B. R. Mantri (Rep.)  
For the Respondent: ...Shri.Ashish Singh (Adv.)

**And**

**Case No. 99 of 2017**

**In the matter of**

**Petition of Guardian Castings and 11 others for levying Wheeling Charges applicable to  
consumers connected on 33 kV Line introduced in MYT Order dated 3.11.2016 in Case  
No. 48 of 2016 instead of the Wheeling Charges applicable to consumers on 22 kV Line**

Petitioners:

- 1) M/s. Guardian Castings Pvt. Ltd
- 2) M/s. Surya Ferrous Alloys Pvt. Ltd.
- 3) M/s. New Steel Trading Pvt. Ltd.

- 4) M/s. Shivkrupa Steel & Alloys Pvt. Ltd.
- 5) M/s. Jay Jagdamba Profile Engineering Products .Ltd
- 6) M/s. Solo Metals Pvt. Ltd.
- 7) M/s. Bholaram Metal Industries Pvt.Ltd.
- 8) M/s. Alok Ingots (Mumbai) Pvt. Ltd.
- 9) M/s. Sun Metallics & Alloys Pvt. Ltd.
- 10) M/s. Thane Steels Pvt. Ltd.
- 11) M/s. Balbir Alloys Pvt. Ltd.
- 12) M/s. Jaideep Metallics & Alloys Pvt. Ltd.

V/s

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd. (MSEDCL) ..... Respondent

Appearance:

|   |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner:                     | ...Shri. Vijay Agrawal (Adv.) |
| For the Respondent:                     | ...Shri.Ashish Singh (Adv.)   |
| For Intervention Applicant              | ...Shri.Ajit Patil            |
| For Authorised Consumer Representative: | ...Dr. Ashok Pendse (TBIA)    |

**Daily Order**

1. The Commission noted that the basic issues involved in Case Nos. 92 and 99 of 2017 are similar, and hence decided to hear them together. The Commission also stated that Case No. 99 of 2017 had been partly heard by a 2-Member Bench. The Chairperson had assumed office since then on 9.8.2017, and Case No. 92 of 2017 had been partly heard by a Bench including him and the other two Members. The Commission proposed to proceed in both matters before a 3-Member Bench of the full Commission and to take on record the earlier proceedings in Case No. 99 of 2017, to which the Parties agreed. The Commission heard the Representative/Advocates of the Petitioners in both Cases and of MSEDCL accordingly
2. In Case No. 92 of 2017, SEAC (the Petitioner) stated that, following the Daily Order of the last hearing held on 22.8.2017, no submission had been received from MSEDCL, nor had it submitted its Reply to the Petition. MSEDCL stated that it had filed its Reply to the Petitions on the similar issue in Case No. 99 of 2017, and would serve it on SEAC also.
3. The Petitioners in Case No. 99 of 2017 reiterated the submissions in their Petitions, and stated as follows:
  - a. The Petitioners are to be supplied at the voltage level matching their demand in accordance with the SoP Regulations, 2014.

- b. In its Reply, MSEDCL had admitted that there is no 33 kV network in the areas where the Petitioners are located. It has also admitted that the difference in Wheeling Charge applicable to 22 kV and 33 kV network is substantial.
      - c. It also appears from MSEDCL's Reply that the 33 kV network still needs to be developed for the Petitioners in accordance with their level of power demand.
      - d. MSEDCL is also of the view that an appropriate mechanism needs to be developed for the Wheeling Charge to be applied in such cases.
4. The Commission observed that, as recorded in the Daily Order of the last hearing, MSEDCL was expected to provide a comprehensive response to the issues involved in the Petitions and submit its proposal with regard to the Wheeling Charges to be levied in circumstances where it does not have a network of the appropriate voltage level and cannot develop it in the near future. Instead, MSEDCL has made no concrete suggestion and left it entirely to the Commission. Notwithstanding the provision in the SoP Regulations, 2014, the Commission is of the view that laying a totally new infrastructure of the appropriate voltage in all areas where it is not presently available will require considerable time and very large capital expenditure. On the other hand, its absence also has consequences in terms of higher Wheeling Charges for consumers who are connected at lower voltages than is required under the Regulations. Moreover, this issue also has another aspect of losses and voltage surcharge. Hence, the Commission directed MSEDCL to evaluate these issues and come up with a viable and specific proposal, which may include a formulation for the Wheeling Charges to be applied where it is not possible to develop a 33 kV network.
5. M/s Century Rayon, represented by Shri Ajit Patil, requested the Commission to allow it to intervene in this matter. The Commission stated that it may first file its Application, with a copy to the Parties, for consideration.
6. The Commission directed MSEDCL to file the required details within 2 weeks, with copy to the Petitioners in both Cases and the Consumer Representatives.

**The next date of hearing will be communicated by the Secretariat of the Commission.**

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

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

**Sd/-  
(Anand B. Kulkarni)  
Chairperson**