

MADHYA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION, BHOPAL

Sub : In the matter of extension of period of reduced contract demand of 3600 KVA in place of 5000 KVA at 132 KV, under clause 3.4 of the MP Electricity Supply Code, 2004 (Fourteenth Amendment).

Petition No. 34/2012

ORDER

(Date of hearing 28th May, 2012)

(Date of order 28th May, 2012)

M/s Parasrampur International,
Plot No. 423-432,
Industrial Area Sector No. III,
Pithampur Distt. Dhar (MP).

- Petitioner

V/s

M.P.Paschim Kshetra Vidyut Vitaran Co. Ltd.
GPH Compound, Pologround,
Indore (MP)

- Respondent

Shri A.N.Pandey, Elec. Advisor appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

2. The petitioner has filed this petition in the matter of extension of period of contract demand of 3600 KVA in place of 5000 KVA at 132 KV under Clause 3.4 of the MP Electricity Supply Code, 2004 (Fourteenth Amendment).

3. Earlier the petitioner had filed a petition (Petition No. 56/2011) seeking reduction in contract demand of 5000 KVA to 3600 KVA at 132 KV for a period of 6 months. After considering the precarious financial condition of the petitioner's company, the Commission vide order dated 20.10.2011 granted the approval based on petitioner's submission that they will revert back to contract demand of 5000 KVA after this period. Consequently, a third HT supplementary agreement was executed between the parties on 21.11.2011 for a period of six months reduction being effective from 20.10.2011. The agreement period has expired on 19.04.2012.

4. The petitioner has submitted that the financial condition of its company has slightly improved but it is still critical and hence the petitioner has requested extension of the period of reduced contract demand for further 6 months i.e. upto 19.10.2012.

(cont. to next page)

Sub : In the matter of extension of period of reduced contract demand of 3600 KVA in place of 5000 KVA at 132 KV, under clause 3.4 of the MP Electricity Supply Code, 2004 (Fourteenth Amendment).

The petitioner is also ready to pay the supply affording charges as per norms. They have further stated that out of allowed 6 months, they could avail reduction for 4½ months only because of outage of their transformer.

5. The case was listed for motion hearing on 28.05.2012.

6. During the motion hearing on 28.05.2012, the Commission enquired from the petitioner regarding the basis of maintainability of the petition. The representative of the petitioner could not reply satisfactorily and requested that the period of reduced contract demand be extended for further six months.

7. On hearing the petitioner, the Commission is of the view that the petitioner could not establish the maintainability of the petition and therefore petition cannot be admitted.

8. In view of the above, the Petition No. 34/2012 is dismissed.

Ordered accordingly,

sd/-
(C.S.Sharma)
Member

sd/-
(Rakesh Sahni)
Chairman