

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. 352 of 2018

Dated: 16 January, 2019

Coram: Anand B. Kulkarni, Chairman
I. M. Bohari, Member
Mukesh Khullar, Member

**Case filed by Marigold Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd. seeking review of the Commission's
Order dated 22.11.2018 in Case No. 210 of 2018.**

M/s. Marigold Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd. (MPPL) : Petitioner

Vs

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

Appearance

For the Petitioner : Shri. Chandrasen B. Chandwad
: Smt. Shivabai C. Chandwad

For the Respondent : Shri Amsiddha P. Huvale (Rep.)

DAILY ORDER

1. Petitioner reiterated its submission and stated that:

- a) The CGRF, Baramati had ordered on six different issues by considering various grievances of MPPL. However, in the impugned Order, there is no clear direction from the Commission regarding compliance of CGRF Order in its entirety.
- b) MSEDCL in its reply dated 03.10.2018 had stated that alternate connection under Clause 2.2.7 is not technically feasible, while on other hand on 09.10.2018, MSEDCL sanctioned the connection under Clause 2.2.7. It is not clear as to why MSEDCL had to change its stand from technical non-feasible to technical feasible connection for better quality of power supply.

- c) Petitioner submitted that it has obtained information under RTI, that Manegaon feeder is making 24 Hours Electricity Supply from its feeders. However Petitioner is getting 13-15 Hours supply from existing Bopale Feeder.
- d) During the proceeding, MPPL submitted additional facts which are of confidential nature and according to the MPPL these facts will prove that supply position of Manegaon feeder is much more reliable than the existing Bopale feeder and hence requested the Commission that an enquiry should be initiated in this regard.
2. Representative of MSEDCL stated that, the instant Review Petition is not maintainable as there are no grounds adduced, hence it is liable to be rejected. The Commission had addressed all the issues in the Order dated 22 November, 2018 in Case No. 210 of 2018 and given a reasoned Order.
3. In these circumstances, the Commission is of the view that MPPL has raised serious issues that are contrary to the position taken by MSEDCL in the case, as regards supply status of Manegaon feeder. It is not clear as to why it was informed to the commission by the local officers of MSEDCL that it was technical not feasible to give better quality of power supply from Manegaon feeder or from any other feeder to the Petitioner. The Commission feels that an enquiry is warranted to verify the facts and a review of various communications to petitioner from the local office of MSEDCL. The Commission directs Regional Director, Pune of MSEDCL to look into the entire matter including the following issues and submit a report to the Commission within a month:
- a) To verify the availability/reliability of power supply at Manegaon and existing Bopale feeder.
- b) To check whether the Manegaon and Bopale Feeder are under the same load shedding protocol.
- c) Reason for the contrary position taken by local area officials of MSEDCL as to the technical feasibility of reliable power supply to the premises of Petitioner.

The Case is adjourned till the completion of enquiry and receipt of enquiry report from Regional Director, MSEDCL Pune.

Sd/-
(Mukesh Khullar)
Member

Sd/-
(I. M. Bohari)
Member

Sd/-
(Anand B. Kulkarni)
Chairperson