

Sub: In the matter of petition for review of supply affording charges on connected load under Section 45(3)(b) and 46 of the Electricity Act, 2003 in case of LT consumer under MPERC (Recovery of expenses and other charges for providing electric line or plant used for the purpose of giving supply) (Revision-I) Regulations, 2009

ORDER

(Date of hearing: 7th January, 2014)

(Date of order: 3rd February, 2014)

Electricity Consumers Society, - Petitioner
C/o All India Manufacturers Association,
(M.P.State Board)
Industrial Estate, Pologround,
Indore- 452015

M.P. Pashchim Kshetra Vidyut Vitaran Co. Ltd., - Respondent
GPH Compound, Pologround ,
Indore- 452015

Shri R.C. Somani, Consultant and Shri R.S. Goyal, Consultant appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

2. The petitioner, Electricity Consumers Society has filed this petition seeking review of supply affording charges on connected load under Section 45(3)(b) and 46 of the Electricity Act, 2003 in case of LT consumer under MPERC (Recovery of expenses and other charges for providing electric line or plant used for the purpose of giving supply) (Revision-I) Regulations, 2009.

3. The petitioner has stated that:

(i) Electricity Consumers Society is a registered society, a recognized NGO by MPERC and sponsored by six Industries Associations in Indore and Dewas.

(ii) The Commission issued tariff order for FY 2013-14 on dated 23.03.2013 in which the connected load ceiling in case of demand based LT industrial tariff has been removed. The rationale behind this was explained in the chapter on 'Retail Tariff Design'.

(iii) The Commission notified the Electricity Supply Code, 2013 on dated 30.08.2013. It was made clear that up to contract demand of 112 kW, there

Sub: In the matter of petition for review of supply affording charges on connected load under Section 45(3)(b) and 46 of the Electricity Act, 2003 in case of LT consumer under MPERC (Recovery of expenses and other charges for providing electric line or plant used for the purpose of giving supply) (Revision-I) Regulations, 2009

shall be no ceiling on connected load in case of consumer opting for LT demand based tariff subject to payment of supply affording charges based on connected load. But the will of the Commission did not fulfilled with such provisions.

- (iv) The licensee is not put to any loss even if there is an increase in the connected load if the maximum demand recorded is within the contract demand.
- (v) After removal of ceiling on connected load, the consumers are responsible to control their contract demand and the LT consumers are to be treated at par with HT consumers.
- (vi) In its petition, the petitioner has prayed the Commission to consider the following submissions:
 - (a) Supply affording charges to be recovered on the basis of contract demand only.
 - (b) To give directions to the Discoms not to prepare the cases where the recorded MD is within the parameter of tariff order under section 126.
 - (c) Suitable modifications may be done in MPERC (Recovery of expenses and other charges for providing electric line or plant used for the purpose of giving supply) (Revision-I) Regulations, 2009 and the Electricity Supply Code, 2013 as under:

“Demand based tariff for LT:
150 HP (112 kW) contract demand with no ceiling on connected load subject to the payment of supply affording charges based on contract demand.”

4. The case was listed for motion hearing on 07.01.2014. During the hearing, the petitioner, by and large, reiterated what has been stated in the petition. The Commission enquired from the petitioner regarding the rationale behind the request

Sub:In the matter of petition for review of supply affording charges on connected load under Section 45(3)(b) and 46 of the Electricity Act, 2003 in case of LT consumer under MPERC (Recovery of expenses and other charges for providing electric line or plant used for the purpose of giving supply) (Revision-I) Regulations, 2009

of the petitioner. The petitioner could not reply adequately and agreed to withdraw the petition.

5. Having heard the petitioner and considering the written submissions made, the Commission decides to dismiss the petition as withdrawn.

Ordered accordingly.

(Alok Gupta)
Member

(A.B.Bajpai)
Member

(Rakesh Sahni)
Chairman