

MAHARASHTRA ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

World Trade Centre, Centre No.1, 13th Floor, Cuffe Parade, Mumbai - 400 005

Tel. No. 022 22163964/65/69 – Fax 022 22163976

E-mail mercindia@mercindia.org.in

Website: www.mercindia.org.in

Case No. 93 of 2010

In the matter of

Application of Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited for withdrawal of load shedding of Divisions A, B, C, D groups of Other Region area

**Shri V.P. Raja, Chairman Shri
Vijay L. Sonavane, Member**

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co Ltd.

Registered office:

Prakashgad, Bandra (East),

Mumbai 400 051

.....Applicant

ORDER

Dated: 20th October, 2011

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co Ltd. (MSEDCL) submitted a petition on December 2, 2011, dated December 1, 2010 for withdrawal of load shedding of Divisions A, B, C, D groups of Other Region area.

2. MSEDCL submitted that due to the extended rainy season the power demand was reduced drastically and MSEDCL had switched over to Scenario III from Scenario IV of load shedding protocol from November 21, 2010. Further, even though Scenario III was implemented, MSEDCL was withdrawing the load shedding almost daily for all groups in sequence. Moreover, the balance water available for Koyna Hydro Generation was considerably higher compared to the previous year and power was available in market at reasonable rates compared to previous year. Considering this power scenario, MSEDCL had planned to withdraw Load Shedding of A,B,C,D groups of Other Region area by procuring additional power of 200 MW, round the clock, from January 2011 to June 2011

and 200 MW during peak hours from March 2011 to June 2011. MSEDCL proposed that Load Shedding for E & F group divisions of Other Region area, Agricultural dominated region, Ag LM Scheme and Industries be implemented as per existing Load Shedding schedule. When the loss level of divisions of E & F group was reduced to the level of divisions of D group or less than D group, the same facility was proposed to be extended to them also. For mixed Ag feeder, when Agricultural and Gaothan feeders are separated, the facility of withdrawal of load shedding was proposed to be extended to Separated Gaothan feeders depending upon their respective loss level group A,B,C or D. There were 83 divisions covered under A, B, C and D groups of Other Region area.

3. The prayers set out in MSEDCL's petition were as under:

“.....

- a) *To Withdraw the load shedding of Divisions of ABCD groups of other Region area*
- b) *As and when loss level of divisions of E& F group is reduced to D group or less than D group , the same facility will be extended to them also.*
- c) *For mixed Ag feeder , when Agricultural and Gaothan feeders are separated , the facility of withdrawal of load shedding will be extended to Separated Gaothan feeders depending upon their respective loss level group A,B,C D*
- d) *The performance of the divisions is quarterly reviewed and the DCL groups A to F are decided accordingly. The facility of withdrawal of load shedding to A,B,C,D groups will be given accordingly.*
- e) *The Hon'ble commission may please condone any errors/omission and opportunity be given to rectify the same and permit MSEDCL to submit additional Data, if required.“*

4. A hearing was held on January 5, 2011, along with a hearing in the matter of Case 76 of 2010, wherein MSEDCL had sought to continue Zero Load Shedding in the Headquarters of Revenue Divisions in MSEDCL Licence Area for one year from 1st December 2010.

5. Shri Pratap Hogade, President, Maharashtra Veej Grahak Sangathana (MVGS), wrote a letter to the Commission on December 20, 2010, submitting a rejoinder in the Case. The Commission scheduled a hearing on January 5, 2011, to hear intervention applications filed in Cases 76, 93, and 94 of 2010 by Shri Pratap Hogade, MVGS.

6. During the hearing, Dr. Ashok Pendse, and Dr. S. L. Patil (of Thane Belapur Industries Association), Consumer Representatives, were present. Dr. Pendse drew attention of the Commission to MSEDCL's petition in the present Case, wherein MSEDCL proposed to withdraw load shedding of Divisions A, B, C, D groups of Other Region area by procuring 200 MW of additional power round the clock and another 200 MW during peak hours, with no proposal for recovery of any Reliability Charge. Therefore, Dr. Pendse submitted that MSEDCL's approach in the present Case was different from Case 76 of 2010, where MSEDCL had proposed to levy Reliability Charges for withdrawal of load shedding in certain areas. The Commission directed MSEDCL to respond with rationale to the observation made by Dr. Pendse.
7. However, the Commission received a letter from MSEDCL on January 4, 2011, informing the Commission that it had decided not to pursue the proposal of withdrawal of load shedding of A, B, C, D groups of Other Region area and accordingly requested the Commission to adjourn the hearing in Case 93 of 2010 scheduled on January 5, 2011.
8. During the hearing on January 5, 2011, MSEDCL reiterated its submission that it was no longer pursuing the proposal of withdrawal of load shedding of A, B, C, D groups of Other Region area and requested the Commission to adjourn the hearing in Case 93 of 2010.
9. Shri. Pratap Hogade vide his letter dated December 20, 2010 and during the hearing of January 5, 2011 submitted that MVGS supported the proposal of MSEDCL for withdrawal of load shedding in Case No. 93 of 2010 and 94 of 2010. However, Shri. Hogade objected on the assumption adopted by MSEDCL. MSEDCL has assumed only 8 hours of supply for Single Phasing and Separate Gaothan Feeder schemes, which he observed was not complying to the Commission's Order dated February 20, 2007 in Case No. 78 of 2006. The Commission in the said Order had directed that there should be 10 hours of supply for the Single Phasing and Separate Gaothan Feeders. Shri. Hogade submitted an objection that was multiplicity of proceedings as the Order in Case No. 81 of 2010 was pending. It was also submitted that the Commission should look in depth into the demand for electricity and how the availability of electricity is decided. In conclusion, Shri Hogade submitted that the Commission shall not dismiss the Case, suo-moto. Further, MVGS, vide its letter dated December 25, 2010, had submitted its intervention application in the present Case.
10. MVGS essentially submitted that MSEDCL's petition was discretionary and against the protocol fixed by the Commission. According to the protocol MSEDCL could have volunteered to reduce the load shedding opting for Option 2 or Option 1 of the protocol. On January 12, 2011, the Commission received a letter from Thane Belapur Industries Association, Consumer Representative, in support of the rejoinder submitted by MVGS. In the meantime the Commission decided to hear the matter again on April 11, 2011 and accordingly intimated MSEDCL and Consumer Representatives for the same through its Notice dated March 31, 2011.

11. On April 4, 2011, the Commission received a submission from MSEDCL, under affidavit, essentially submitting that there was no further necessity of hearing of the original petition submitted for withdrawal of load shedding in A, B, C, D groups of Other Region area as MSEDCL planned for complete withdrawal of load shedding by procuring short-term power and UI power from Central Grid whenever frequency profile was better and through load relief from Load Management Schemes. Accordingly, MSEDCL submitted that complete load shedding was withdrawn except the load shedding to Agriculture Load Management Schemes and weekly staggering day to industrial consumers. However, due to transmission and local distribution network constraints, the load shedding of 2.00 to 5.45 hours in Other Region and 8.30 to 11.00 hours in Agriculture dominated areas were implemented in Dhule, Babhaleshwar and Solapur and some part of Marathwada region of about 400 to 500 MW.

There were further details in the submission depicting load reliefs obtained under Load Management Schemes and load shedding schedules followed as per Circular 33 dated November 21, 2010. MSEDCL submitted that it was planning to withdraw the ZLS model from July 2011 as power purchase agreements were finalised up to June 2011. It stated that it had further planned to withdraw load shedding from ZLS area (Revenue Headquarters) also. However, MSEDCL submitted that it was in the process of withdrawing load shedding on trial basis by procuring short term power but it was not a commitment.

12. During the hearing of April 11, 2011, the Commission enquired the reasons for MSEDCL not to shift to Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 of Principles and Proctocols of Load Shedding (PPLS), if the demand-supply gap was less. The Commission also enquired whether there was system constraints for implementing PPLS. However, MSEDCL has not provided any justification for the same, except reiterating that it intended to withdraw its petition in Case 93 of 2010 for withdrawal of load shedding in A, B, C, D groups of Other Region area.
13. In regard to the observations of Shri Hogade, mentioned in para 9, it may be noted that the Commission had issued its order in Case 81 of 2010 on May 9, 2011. Also, the order in Case 94 of 2010 was passed by the Commission on August 23, 2011.
14. Admittedly, MSEDCL has withdrawn / cancelled its proposal for withdrawal of load shedding in the areas of A, B, C, D groups in Other Region. Hence, none of the prayers made in the present petition survive. Accordingly, the petition of MSEDCL in Case No. 93 of 2010 stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(Vijay L. Sonavane)
Member

Sd/-
(V.P. Raja)
Chairman