

**Sub : In the matter of application under Section 94(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003  
for review of order dated 19.02.2013 passed by the Commission**

**ORDER**

**(Date of hearing: 24<sup>th</sup> May,2016)**

**(Date of order: 30<sup>th</sup> May,2016)**

M.P. Poorv Kshetra Vidyut Vitaran Co. Ltd., - Petitioner  
Shakti Bhawan, Rampur,  
Jabalpur- 482 008

M/s Orient Paper Mill (OPM), - Respondent  
Amlai, through  
M/s Orient Paper and Industry Limited,  
P.O. Amlai Paper Mill,  
District Shahdol (M.P.)

Shri Prakash Upadhyay, Advocate and Smt. S. Dixit, DGM appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

2. The petitioner, M.P. Poorv Kshetra Vidyut Vitaran Co. Ltd., Jabalpur has filed this petition for review of order dated 19.02.2013 passed by the Commission in petition no.76/2012. The case was listed for motion hearing on 26.04.2016.

3. During the motion hearing on 26.04.2016, the petitioner restated the contents of the petition. The Commission observed that the petition was filed after a considerable delay of 1064 days without giving detailed justification in the application for condonation of delay. The petitioner sought time to submit date wise chronological events which lead to such delay. The Commission allowed time up to 16.05.2016 for submission of the same. The petitioner filed a written submission on 19.05.2016. The next date of motion hearing was fixed for 24.05.2016. On 24.05.2016, the petitioner informed that due to typographical error in para 4 of the aforesaid written submission, the date mentioned as 05.03.2015 may be read as 05.03.2013.

4. During the motion hearing on 24.05.2016, the petitioner restated the contents of the written submission and filed a copy of the judgments passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in cases related to condonation of delay. The Commission enquired from the petitioner regarding

**Sub : In the matter of application under Section 94(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003  
for review of order dated 19.02.2013 passed by the Commission**

reasons of delay during the period from 19.03.2013 to 27.04.2015. The petitioner could not reply adequately.

5. Having heard the petitioner and on considering the written submission, the Commission has noted that the petitioner could not produce any document which can substantiate the cause of delay as sufficient. The Commission is of the view that the petitioner, being a commercial organization, should have acted promptly to safeguard its interest. The Commission, therefore, does not find any sufficient ground on which this petition is allowed for hearing and is dismissed at the Admission stage itself.

Ordered accordingly.

**(Alok Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(A.B.Bajpai)**  
**Member**

**(Dr. Dev Raj Birdi)**  
**Chairman**