## Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.'s Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum Nagpur Urban Zone, Nagpur

## Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/065/2008

Applicant	: M/s. Chinteshwar Steel Pvt. Ltd., At 226, Central Avenue, Lakadganj Nagpur.
Non–applicant	: MSEDCL represented by the Executive Engineer, Division No. I, NUZ, Nagpur.
Quorum Present	: 1) Shri S.F. Lanjewar Executive Engineer & Member Secretary, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Nagpur Urban Zone, Nagpur.
	2) Smt. Gouri Chandrayan, Member, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Nagpur Urban Zone,

- -

Nagpur.

## ORDER (Passed on 15.02.2009)

The present grievance application has been filed on 17.12.2008 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 here-in-after referred-to-as the said Regulations.

The grievance of the applicant is in respect of uninterrupted supply to the applicant, refund of undue charges paid by the applicant & compensation towards direct loss to the tune of Rs. 20005133/.

The applicant, before coming to this Forum, had approached the Cell under the said Regulations by filing his complaint dated 05.09.2008 on the same subject-matter of the present grievance.

The matter was heard on 27.01.2009.

The applicant's case was presented before this Forum by his nominated representative one Shri R.B. Goenka while the case of the non-applicant Company was presented by the Executive Engineer, (Adm), & Assistant Engineer Smt. Parihar, Nagpur Rural Circle, MSEDCL, Nagpur.

The applicant has sought relief's in the following points.

- 1) To direct the MSEDCL to give uninterrupted supply to the applicant as per load shedding proto-cal decided by the Commission for industrial.
- 2) To direct the MSEDCL to refund undue charges paid by the applicant for receiving supply which is over and above the guidelines of Supply Code Regulations.
- 3) To direct the MSEDCL to provide direct loss compensation to the applicant to the tune of Rs.2,00,5,133/- which is due to frequent power cutes and negligent approach of MSEDCL.

In addition to this, the applicant had put-up some facts regarding the case.

1) The consumer applied for sanction of load 1500 KVA on dated 17.01.2005.

The MSEDCL sanctioned the estimate of Rs. 21,11,244/- & issued a demand note of 15% supervision charges of Rs. 24,000/- under ORC scheme & he paid as per the details.

In this estimate re-conducting of conductor and other material is included for construction of line and he complete the work under the supervision of Dy. E.E. and he submitted the work completion certificate with details material which he utilized the inspection of IEI is also carried out.

The consumer were facing regularly power interruptions problem due to which he has to bear the heavy loss to his industry, the applicant say was that his industry is iron industry and continuous process industry due to which he cannot the frequent power interruption.

He submitted the DIC certificate for the support. The applicant also replied that he was continuous follow-up & contact to MSEDCL Engineers & authorities and brought to notice the interruption problem in written as well as verbal.

The non-applicant in his written statement vide his letter No. SE/NRC/NGP/Tech/CGRF/507 dated 23.01.2009 is submitted this reply to cross the points raised by applicant in his application.

The consumer is having a connected load of 1500 KVA but he did not applied for continuous load for which he did not submitted 9-A & 9 –B form and not mentioned this is a continuous process industry. The noting is must for continuous process industry. Due to which the application is treated as non-continuous category of supply. The estimate was framed from 11 KV Kamptee Rural feeder from 220 KV Kanhan Sub-Station. The work of reconducting of existing conductor of 10 KM length upto the point of supply of the applicant was required, to be carried out for this work the consumer was given consent and paid Rs.24,000/- as a 15% supervision charges.

The applicant had also carried out the work and he informed the same to MSEDCL.

The said work for composite / mixed feeder in Kamptee Rural feeder which is feeding 6 nos. villages of 24 Nos. Dist. Transformers which is feeding other L & F, Commercial & Agricultural consumers. They have also submitted a single line diagram where the different locations of above transformer and location of M/s. Chinteshwar Steel Industries is shown. The industry is located at the farthest end of the feeder.

The feeder is started from 220 KV Kanhan Sub-Station and it almost ends to M/s. Chinteshwar Steel Industries and having a route length of 21.06 Km.

As the feeder is a mixed consumer feeder hence the load shedding proto-cal has to follow as per Commission Proto-cal. Hence, the load shedding to this protocal is bound.

In addition to this feeder is a complete Rural feeder and lengthy feeder, hence the tripping breakdown, shutdown and other electrical maintenance work has to do, for the above work if industry does not get the supply for that the MSEDCL is not liable for compensation as After hearing both the parties, and documents submitted by both of them.

The following findings are;

- 1) If the consumer wants the express feeder (dedicated feeder), the consumer has to pay the full amount of charges.
- 2) The charges paid by consumer earlier that amount should be deducted from the total amount.
- 3) The MSEDCL has to pay more attention and do proper maintenance of line so that the frequent interruption and breakdown can be avoided so that the loss to industry will not occur.

This Forum is giving an order of no compensation.

The applicant's grievance application stands disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-Sd/-(S.F.Lanjewar)(Smt. Gauri Chandrayan)Member-SecretaryMEMBERCONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUMMAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CO LTD'sNAGPUR URBAN ZONE, NAGPUR.