

**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. 35 of 2019**

**Date: 11 April 2019**

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

**Petition filed by Pegasus Properties Pvt. Ltd seeking review of the Commission's Order dated 18.01.2019 passed in Case No. 351 of 2018 regarding refund of amounts incurred by the Petitioner towards establishing 220 kV EHV Transmission Lines and substation.**

1) Pegasus Properties Pvt. Ltd., Pune .....Petitioner

V/s.

1) Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. .... Respondent  
2) Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd. .... Impleaded Party

**Appearance:**

For the Petitioner : Ms. Pratiti Rungta (Adv.)

For the Respondent No.1 : Shri. Jitendra Pathade (Adv.)

For the Impleaded Party : Shri. Rahul Sinha (Adv.)

**Daily Order**

Heard the Advocates of the Petitioner, Respondent and Impleaded Party.

1. Advocate of the Petitioner stated that it has filed the review Petition on the following grounds:

a) Impugned Order has rejected the claim of the Petitioner as an afterthought and is in fact contrary to earlier undertakings of the Petitioner.

- b) Impugned Order has not considered the fact that the erected substation is in the area of Maharashtra Industrial Development Corporation (MIDC) and could have been taken on depreciated cost to utilize for future demand of electricity as mentioned in its letter dated 10 April 2018 addressed to MSETCL.
2. Advocate of Petitioner during hearing said that owing to Metro and other industrial development happening in the area, higher demand is envisaged. Therefore, instead of creating new infrastructure afresh, facilities constructed by Petitioners could be availed for catering to the higher demand.
  3. Advocate of MSETCL stated that it has constructed the 220 kV substation and line as per the request of MSEDCL. It is the responsibility of MSEDCL to provide supply to all the consumers at appropriate voltage as per the provisions of the MERC Supply Code.
  4. Advocate of the MSEDCL stated that he has received a copy of the Petition on 10.4.2019 and filed its preliminary reply to the Petition. It sought time to file its detailed reply. The Commission directs MSEDCL to file reply within a week with a copy to the parties.
  5. The Commission notes that MIDC (IT Division) vide letter dated 9 June 2008, had provided the commencement certificate to the Petitioner for construction of its residential buildings. As the substation constructed by Petitioner is in MIDC area, the Commission directs MSETCL to write a letter to MIDC and obtain upcoming load details in the vicinity of the 220 kV substation.
  6. The Commission directs Petitioner to implead MIDC as a party to the Case and serve the copy of its Petition on MIDC immediately.

**List the matter for hearing on 24 April, 2019 at 10.00 AM.**

**Sd/-**  
**(Mukesh Khullar)**  
**Member**

**Sd/-**  
**(I. M. Bohari)**  
**Member**

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