

**MADHYA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION, BHOPAL**

**Sub :-** In the matter petition against the new tariff determined by the Commission against the Petition No. 5/2010 filed by the MP Paschim K VVC Ltd. – Petition filed by Shri Kishor Deepak Kodwani thereon.

**ORDER**

**(Date of hearing 28.12.2010)**

**Date of order 07.01.2011**

**Shri Kishor Deepak Kodwani, Sarvodya Nagar, Indore - Petitioner**

Shri Kishor Deepak Kodwani, Petitioner appeared before the Commission.

2. Since the petition was filed after the period of allowed to file review petition was over, the petitioner, therefore, requested for condonation of delay. The Commission considered the request of the petitioner and decided to hold the motion hearing in the matter. Accordingly, the hearing was scheduled on 28/12/2010.

3. The petitioner filed the subject petition before the Commission in the matter of rationalization of tariff fixed for different Water Works Schemes operated by Indore Municipal Corporation. It is stated in the petition that Indore Municipal Corporation has different points of electricity connections based on the location of the connections. The rates which are being charged to different connections of Water Supply Schemes are different. The tariff as charged by the Distribution Company on various Water Supply Schemes of Indore is very high. The petitioner requested that the tariff for electricity connections for the purpose of Water Works Schemes should be minimum. This tariff should also be free from fixed charges, load factor additional charges, meter rent etc. The electricity cess should not be billed on the Public Water Works connections and also the delayed payment surcharge should not be imposed. The petitioner also submitted that the aforementioned issues had already been referred to the Commission during the course of the deliberations on the petition filed by the West Discom for determination of Distribution and Retail Supply Tariff for the year 2010-11. The petitioner requested that the advantage of load factor incentive should also to be given to the Public Water Works Schemes i.e. tariff category HV 5.

**Sub :- In the matter petition against the new tariff determined by the Commission against the Petition No. 5/2010 filed by the MP Paschim K VVC Ltd. – Petition filed by Shri Kishor Deepak Kodwani thereon.**

4. During the course of the hearing on 28/12/2010 the petitioner submitted before the Commission that the issue of deciding the tariff for Water Supply Connection of Indore Municipal Corporation had already been presented before the Commission during the course of the hearing held in the matter of fixation of retail supply tariff for the year 2010-11 but the Commission did not consider the request while determining the tariff. The petitioner further submitted that the connections of Indore Municipal Corporation used for Water Supply are presently working at almost 100% load factor. For this category (HV-5) of consumers there is no provision of less energy charges if the load factor is more than 50% nor is the load factor incentive allowed. The petitioner further submitted that for Water Supply Connection the Commission may consider the minimum tariff. The petitioner stated that the energy charges for HV-5 are very high as compared to tariff for other categories.

5. The Commission heard the submission made by the petitioner The Commission expressed the view that it is not proper to compare only the energy charges as the tariff comprises of fixed charges, and energy charges besides other charges, if any. The commission also brought to the notice of petitioner that tariff for H.T. water works is around 95% of average cost of supply and for L.T. water works connections only 90%. Thus the effective rates are lower as compared to other categories. The Commission observed that the arguments taken by the petitioner do not warrant a review. The Commission however stated that the Distribution Companies have already filed their petitions for determination of Retail Supply Tariff Order for the year 2011-12, and the petitioner would have an opportunity to file his objections/comments/suggestions on the tariff petitions of the Distribution Companies when the public notice is issued in the newspapers in the near future.

6. The Commission therefore, rejected the petition and decided to close the case.

7. Ordered accordingly.

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

**(K.K. Garg)**  
**Member (Engineering)**

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