

Date: 31/01/2014

In the matter of

Case No. 05/2013-14

Date:-

M/S. Pushpak Infracon Pvt. Ltd.  
Plot No.B 3-4, MIDC Lonand  
Tal.Khandala, Dist- Satara.

Complainant  
(Here in after referred As Consumer)

V/S

The Supdt.Engineer,  
Satarara Circle,  
MSEDCL, Satara.

Opponent  
(Here in after referred As Licensee)

**Quorum**

Chair person  
Member Secretary  
Member

Mr. S.D. Madake  
Mr. V.M.Bhattad  
Mr. Suryankant Pathak

- 1) M/S. Pushpak Infracon Pvt. Ltd. is a consumer of M.S.E.D.C.L.vide HT 203529024280 since 7<sup>th</sup> Aug.2012.
- 2) MSEDCL Satara Circle has sanctioned additional load of 4700KW & Contract Demand 2800 KVA totaling 5000 kW Connected load & 3000 KVA Contract Demand with condition that the transformer capacity should commensurate with Contract Demand & capacity of Transformer should not exceed 3600 KVA
- 3) The consumer in the present case made a grievance for not considering the application for giving sanction of transformer capacity to the extent of 7000 KVA.
- 4) Initially grievance was made before IGRC on 11.11.2013 requesting to consider for sanctioning of transformer capacity 7000 KVA. The application by consumer for sanction was not considered favorably by IGRC vide order dated 11.12.2013.

*G. J. J.*

*[Signature]*

*S. J.*

- 5) The consumer was dissatisfied by the order and therefore the said order is challenged before this forum as per Section 42(5) of the Electricity Act-2003.
- 6) M.S.E.D.C.L. filed say on 21.12.2013 and denied the allegations made in the complaint by consumer. It is submitted that 3600 KVA capacity transformer is technically sufficient for 3000 contract demand. The consumer has not justified necessity of 7000 KVA (2x3000 KVA + 1 x1000 KVA capacity. The M.S.E.D.C.L. submitted that higher the capacity of Transformer, it will create higher no load loss and the same occurring within transformer are increasing the M.S.E.D.C.L. system loss. It is averred that as per National Electricity Policy 2005, it is mandatory to reduce overall loss and use of energy efficient equipments.
- 7) The following points arise for our determination?
  - (1) Whether M.S.E.D.C.L. was justified in rejecting the application for installation of transformer as prayed by consumer?
  - (2) What order ?
- 8) Out findings are :
  - (1) In the negative
  - (2) As per final order

#### ORDER

- 9) Mrs. Suresh Sancheti argued for the consumer and Mr. R. B. Mane, E.E.(ADM), Satara Circle argued for the M.S.E.D.C.L. Admittedly, consumer was sanctioned load of 3000 KVA contract demand vide sanction letter bearing No.12226 dated 2.8.2013, there was a specific mention that transformer capacity should be to the extent of 3600 KVA. The consumer is of the view that the existing and required machinery set up is such that consumer requires installation of 2 transformer of 3000 KVA each and one transformer of 1000 KVA. Consumer contended that the request made for transformer has been not considered which resulted to wrongful loss and M.S.E.D.C.L. has no power to reject the application.
- 10) M.S.E.D.C.L. mainly relied on the National Electricity Policy 2005 stating that it

*G. Man*

*[Signature]*

*[Signature]*

