

**MADHYA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION, BHOPAL**

**Sub : In the matter of permitting 14 MVA load at 33 KV to Bhilai Jaypee Cement Ltd. located at Birhauili, Dist. Satna (MP).**

**Petition No. 96 of 2010**

**ORDER**

**(Date of hearing : 25<sup>th</sup> January, 2011)**

**(Date of order : 25<sup>th</sup> January, 2011)**

M/s Bhilai Jaypee Cement Ltd.,  
Village, Birhauili,  
Teh : Raghuraj Nagar, Dist. Satna (MP) - Petitioner

V/s

M.P.Poorv Kshetra Vidyut Vitaran Co. Ltd.,  
Jabalpur. - Respondent No. 1

M.P.Power Transmission Co. Ltd.  
Shakti Bhawan, Jabalpur. - Respondent No. 2

Shri H.Christopher, Vice President and Shri Jayant Kumar, S.R.Officer appeared on behalf of Petitioner.

Shri P.K.Singh, CE (Com.) and Shri S.K.Okhade, EE appeared on behalf of Respondent No. 1.

Shri M.K.Mittal, EE (PS) and Shri S.P.Sharma, EE (EHT Const.) appeared on behalf of Respondent No.2.

2. The petition is in the matter of extension of time for temporary arrangement permitting 14 MVA load at 33 KV to the Petitioner. The Petitioner has filed the present petition under Clause 3.4 of MP Electricity Supply Code, 2004.

3. The Petitioner, in his petition, has submitted that they had executed supplementary agreement dated 06.10.2009 for availing supply of 10 MVA at 33 KV w.e.f. 15.12.2009. Subsequently, an application for availing additional 4 MVA power was made by the Petitioner. As power above 10 MVA cannot be supplied at 33 KV, it was necessary to avail the same at 132 KV in accordance with the MP Electricity Supply Code, 2004. The supply arrangements at 132 KV were finalized and all formalities in this connection were completed. The construction of 220/132 KV Substation at Kotar and connecting 132 KV line was expected to take about six months from the date of sanction. The Petitioner, therefore, requested the Commission that the company may be allowed to avail 14 MVA supply at 33 KV.

**( Cont. to next page )**

**Sub : In the matter of permitting 14 MVA load at 33 KV to Bhilai Jaypee Cement Ltd. located at Birhauli, Dist. Satna (MP).**

4. The Commission in its Order dated 11.01.2010 had observed as under :

*“In view of para 9 above, the Commission allows the respondent No. 1 to supply additional 4 MVA power (total 14 MVA) at 33 KV as a temporary arrangement for a period not exceeding six months, subject to compliance of necessary requirements such as signing of agreement, etc. The Petitioner shall also pay charges at temporary tariff for 4 MVA supply as per tariff order. Further, all the parties shall put in their best efforts to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is created within six months so that the Petitioner could switch to 132 KV from 33 KV.”*

5. The Commission vide its Order dated 19.07.2010 in Petition 26 of 2010 extended the period for supply of additional 4 MVA power (total 14 MVA) at 33 KV as temporary arrangement for a further period of six months i.e upto 13<sup>th</sup> January, 2011 by passing the following Order :

*“The Commission, after hearing the Petitioner and the Respondents, has observed that Respondent No.2 has not brought out full facts and has, by and large, been evasive in his replies. The Commission has directed that the Respondent No. 2 should inform the Commission regarding outcome of the Hon’ble High Court’s decision in the hearing to be held on 13<sup>th</sup> July, 2010 and based on the Court’s verdict submit the time by which 132 KV supply can be given to the Petitioner. The Commission further directed the Respondent No. 1 to supply additional 4 MVA power (total 14 MVA) at 33 KV as a temporary arrangement for further period of six months subject to completion of necessary formalities by the Petitioner.”*

6. As stated in the petition, Petitioner has taken all steps to avail 132 KV supply. It however, appears that there will be further delay from the side of Respondents No. 2 MPPTCL. The Petitioner has therefore submitted that the Commission may kindly call the parties concerned and assess the realistic situation and consider extension of the period of continuing supply at 33 KV to the Petitioner. The case was listed for motion hearing on 12.01.2011.

7. During the motion hearing, the representative of the Petitioner made a submission that they have taken all the steps to avail supply at 132 KV but there is delay on the part of Respondent No. 2 to lay 132 KV line. He has further submitted that the period of temporary supply, as approved by the Commission, shall expire on 13.01.2011. He has also requested to extend the temporary power supply for further period.

8. The Commission admitted the petition and directed Respondent No.1 to continue supply of additional 4 MVA power (total 14 MVA) at 33 KV as a temporary arrangement on the same terms and conditions as hitherto till the disposal of this petition. The Commission further directed

**( Cont. to next page )**

**Sub : In the matter of permitting 14 MVA load at 33 KV to Bhilai Jaypee Cement Ltd. located at Birhauli, Dist. Satna (MP).**

to issue notices to the Respondents to submit their replies. The case was listed for hearing on 25.01.2011.

9. During the hearing, the Petitioner submitted that their substation is ready but 132 KV line is under construction. As there is Right of Way problem which will take some time to resolve the issue, he has requested to extend the period of temporary connection till completion of laying of 132 KV line.

10. During the hearing, the Commission enquired regarding the time required for completion of above work. The representative of Respondent No. 2 stated that in 10 locations, Right of Way of problem exists and efforts to sort out this problem are being made in right earnest. He has submitted that the above work shall be completed within six months.

11. On hearing the Petitioner and the Respondents, the Commission allows Respondent No.1 to supply additional 4 MVA power (total 14 MVA) at 33 KV as a temporary arrangement for a further period of six months w.e.f. 13.01.2011 or till charging of 132 KV line, whichever is earlier, on the same terms and conditions. The Commission further directed that all parties should put in their best efforts so that the Petitioner could switch over to 132 KV from 33 KV at the earliest.

12. With the above directions, the Petition No. 96 of 2010 stands disposed of.

Ordered accordingly,

**(C.S.Sharma)**  
**Member (Eco.)**

**(K.K.Garg)**  
**Member (Engg.)**

**(Rakesh Sahni)**  
**Chairman**