

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

**Date: 8 September, 2020**

**CORAM: I. M. Bohari, Member**  
**Mukesh Khullar, Member**

**Case No. 177 of 2020 and MA No 50 of 2020**

**Petition filed by Orange Maha Wind Energy Pvt. Ltd seeking Review of the Order dated 11 July 2020 in Case No. 100 of 2020 under Section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 85 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004.**

M/s. Orange Maha Wind Energy Pvt. Ltd.	: Petitioner
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd.	: Respondent No.1
Maharashtra State Load Despatch Centre	: Respondent No.2
Maharashtra Energy Development Agency	: Respondent No.3

**Appearance:**

M/s. Orange Maha Wind Energy Pvt. Ltd.	: Shri. Sakya Choudhari (Adv.)
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd	: Shri. Harinder Toor (Adv.)
Maharashtra State Load Despatch Centre.	: Shri. P.S. Sharma (Rep)
Maharashtra Energy Development Agency	: Dr. Shri J V Torne (Rep.)
	: Shri. Manoj Pise (Rep.)

**Daily Order**

Heard the Advocates/ Representatives of the Petitioners and Respondents.

1. Advocate of the Petitioner requested the Commission to grant 3-4 days' time to file its reply on the submission received from the Respondents and list the matter thereafter. To the query of the Commission regarding the request made by the Petitioner for urgent hearing in the matter as per the observation made by the APTEL in Appeal no 127 of 2020, the Petitioner stated that unless it examines the documents referred by MEDA in its reply, matter cannot

be pleaded in entirety.

2. Advocate of MSEDCL stated that MSEDCL is ready to continue with the hearing but has no objection in granting few days for Petitioner to submit the reply. MSEDCL stated that the Petitioner should restrict itself to the limited domain of the review Petition. Petitioner cannot keep adding new documents and still invoke the review jurisdiction.
3. The Representative of MEDA stated that the documents such as joint inspection report and letter of Panchayat Samithi Tasgaon which the Petitioner was referring and has sought from MEDA are already available with the Petitioner, rather it was submitted by Petitioner itself to MEDA. Hence MEDA need not be required to provide these documents afresh to the Petitioner. MEDA informed the Commission that they are ready for the hearing and will limit their arguments to the submissions made in the reply.
4. The Commission categorically brought to the notice of the Petitioner that though the Commission listed the matter for urgent hearing as per the request made by the Petitioner, it is requesting for another date of hearing so that Sr Counsel appointed for pleading the matter will be available. In the interim it can file its rejoinder to the replies of the Respondents. Petitioner also indicated that it will not have any problem if the matter gets listed after 2-3 weeks. However, Petitioner requested for the earliest possible date within the existing hearing schedules of the Commission. At the request of the Petitioner, the Commission adjourns the hearing.

**Next date of hearing will be intimated by the Secretariat of the Commission.**

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

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