

Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission, Ranchi
Form of Proceedings
Case No. 01 of 2012

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited. Petitioner
 Versus
 Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors Respondents

For the petitioner : Mr. Deepak Singh, Advocate
 For the Respondents : Mr. Navin Kumar & Mr. Amit Sinha, Advocates

Sl.No	Date of Proceeding	Proceeding of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
04	17.05.2016	<p>An application has been filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking an order for appointment of a local independent agency in place of PwC, who was appointed by order dated 24.7.2014 to carry out the evaluation of billing statement.</p> <p>It has been submitted that even after lapse of long time PwC, who was appointed for the specific work, has not submitted its report.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that PwC is stationed at New Delhi and they are facing difficulty in approaching them. The matter has also been delayed inordinately.</p> <p>He further submitted that they will propose three names/agencies to the respondents within 10 days for selecting one out of them.</p> <p>Mr. Navin Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submitted that they have no objection in changing the agency and they may select one of the names/agencies or furnish other names for</p>	

consideration/selection by the Commission, if the names proposed are not found acceptable.

Learned counsel for the petitioner thereafter submitted that they were given temporary supply of electricity for testing and maintenance of equipments etc. on payment of security deposit, as the unit of the petitioner is shut down since a long time. But before the completion of maintenance works, their supply has been arbitrarily disconnected on 18.2.2016 which requires immediate restoration of electricity line for testing the equipment and other maintenance work.

Mr. Navin Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the connection was given temporarily for testing of equipments and maintenance work, as directed by this Commission in June 2014. The petitioner got sufficient time for the same. There is no valid ground for restoration of the supply. However, he will seek instructions regarding the same and file a reply, if so required.

Learned counsel for both the parties pray for six weeks time for the said purposes and further hearing.

Prayer is allowed.

Put up on 19.07.2016 at 2.30 PM.

Sd/-
Member (E)

Sd/-
Chairperson