

**MADHYA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION, BHOPAL**

**Sub: (i) Petition under Section 86 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for the execution of the order dt. 06.09.2023 passed by MPERC in P-16/2023 and initiation of proceedings/ appropriate action under Section 142 read with Section 149 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and conduct of business Regulation 2016 of MPERC against the Respondents for non-compliance of the order dt. 06.09.2023 passed by the Commission in P-16/2023 (P. No. 60/2023)**

**(ii) Review Petition against Hon'ble Commission order dated 06.09.2023 in petition no. 16/2023 filed under section 45, 61, 62, 86 (1) (a) section 181 of the Act (P.No. 72/2023)**

**DAILY ORDER**

(Hearing through Video Conferencing)

**Date of Hearing: 04.01.2024**

**Date of Order:04.01.2024**

**1. M/s. Birla Corporation Ltd, Unit: Satna Cement Works : Petitioner** } **P.No.**  
**V/s** } **60/2023**  
**(i) MP Poorv Kshetra Vidyut Vitran Co. Ltd.** }  
**(ii) MP State Load Despatch Centre (MPSLDC), Jabalpur : Respondent** }

**1. MP Poorv Kshetra Vidyut Vitran Co. Ltd. : Petitioner** } **P.No.**  
**V/s** } **72/2023**  
**(i) M/s. Birla Corporation Ltd, Unit: Satna Cement Works** }  
**(ii) MP State Load Despatch Centre (MPSLDC), Jabalpur : Respondent** }

(i) Shri Ajay Porwal, appeared on behalf of Petitioner in P. No. 60/2023 and as Respondent in P.No.72/2023.

(ii) Shri Prakash Upadhyay, advocate appeared on behalf of Petitioner in P.No.72/2023 and as Respondent in P.No. 60/2023.

(iii) Shri Anurag Mishra, GM appeared on behalf of the respondent No. 2 in P. No. 60/2023 and P.No.72/2023.

2. At the hearing held on 04.01.2024, the following is observed:

**(a) P. No. 60/2023**

(i) Respondent No. 1 (East Discom) has filed reply through mail on 03.01.2024.

(ii) Respondent No. 2 (MPSLDC) sought adjournment upto 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2024 to file reply.

**(b) P.No.72/2023**

(i) Respondent No. 1 (M/s. Birla Corporation Ltd.) has filed reply.

(ii) Respondent No. 2 (MPSLDC) sought adjournment upto 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2024 to file reply.

3. Time adjournment upto 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2024 was granted to MPSLDC to file reply in both the cases. Petitioners may file rejoinder within seven days, thereafter in both the cases.
4. At the hearing it is also noted that the timeline fixed by the Commission is not being followed by the parties. It is therefore pointed out that timelines given by the Commission are sacrosanct and are to be complied with. In case of genuine difficulty in meeting the timelines given by the Commission, parties are expected to file application with reasons as to why the timeline given by the Commission can not be complied and further extension of time is required.  
Listed for arguments on the **23<sup>rd</sup> January, 2024.**

**(Prashant Chaturvedi)**  
**Member**

**(Gopal Srivastava)**  
**Member (Law)**

**(S. P. S. Parihar)**  
**Chairman**