

Dated  
29.12.2005

**ORDER**

From the news appearing in Hindi Daily News paper the Prabhat Khabar dated 29.12.2005 (The relevant press clippings enclosed) it is believed that JSEB has increased the security amount for power supply to consumers and has also introduced "Tatkal Sewa" with a condition of special fee of Rs.300 for the same and that the consumers will have to supply meter and required materials for fixing of the meter. The aforesaid decisions have been taken without approval of the Commission and in contravention of the Act and Regulations framed by the Commission. JSEB has already been intimated by the Commission vide letter No.JSERC/01/507 dated 09.11.2005 and JSERC/01/545 dated 19.11.2005 that the enhancement of the charges recoverable from the consumers for Power Supply without approval of the Commission is in contravention of the Act and Regulations issued by the Commission but no reply against the same has been received from the JSEB.

The Board should clarify the position within 15 days.

Sd/-  
(P.C.Verma)  
Member (Tech)

Sd/-  
(Shakuntala Sinha)  
Member(L&A)

Sd/-  
(S.K.F. Kujur)  
Chairman





Dated  
24.01.2006

**ORDER**

In nut-shell the instant case is that the respondents Bharat Coking Coal India Ltd has entered into a Power Purchase Agreement with the petitioner M/s. DLF Power Co. Ltd for development, installation, operation and maintenance of a Coal Washery Rejects based Captive Power Plant at the Madhuband Coal Washery of the respondent Bharat Coking Coal Ltd on "build, own and operate" basis and for power supply to the respondent's (BCCL) Madhuband Washery point of power supply by the petitioner Ms DLF Power Co. Ltd. The respondents BCCL is to supply Coal Washery Rejects or in the event of Washery Rejects not being available, coal to the above Power Plant as per the terms and conditions of the aforesaid agreement and Ms. DLF Power Co. Ltd is to supply power from the above Power Plant to the BCCL as per the terms and conditions of the aforesaid agreement. The payment for the energy supplied by DLF Power Co. Ltd to BCCL has to be made by BCCL to DPCL as per the tariff envisaged in the agreement after the adjusting the cost of Rejects and/or cost of coal as per the aforesaid agreement.

The petitioner DPCL contended through their petition and pleadings that they had started supply of power to BCCL from their Power Plant at Madhuband Coal Washery from 19.06.2002 and has commissioned the subject Power Plant on 27.06.2002. That the respondents BCCL is not making any payment to DPCL for the Power

Supply to them from the aforesaid Captive Power Plant of the DPCL though about three (3) years have elapsed since the commencement of Power Supply and Commissioning of the subject Power Plant. DPCL further contended that the price of coal Washery Rejects chargeable by BCCL should be as per the aforesaid agreement. DPCL further contended that payment of the power supply should be made as per the terms and conditions of the aforesaid agreement and for that matter the Tariff payable to DPCL during 1<sup>st</sup> year after commissioning of the subject Power Plant @ Rs. 1.86 per Kwh as envisaged in the aforesaid agreement should be implemented and also interest charges should be payable by BCCL to DPCL on the pending payments as per the agreement. The DPCL has also contended that they should be compensated by BCCL for supply of fuel (coal wash reject) of poor quality than that envisaged in the agreement.

The respondent BCCL has refuted the claim of DPCL contending that subject Power Plant has been unreliable and it did not supply the Power as per agreement and that DPCL has not commissioned the subject Power Plant as per the schedule and terms and conditions of the aforesaid agreement and that DPCL has not got the Performance Guarantee Test conducted as per the aforesaid agreement. BCCL has further contended that they have supplied the coal Washery Rejects as per the terms and conditions of the aforesaid agreement rather the applicant DPCL has consumed coal reject at a very high rate than that envisaged in the agreement and therefore the applicant is liable to pay the market value for such additional coal

reject consumed above the normative quantity envisaged in the agreement for which the applicant DPCL is not agreeing and therefore their payments are not being finalized and thus interest charges on pending payments can not be attributed to the respondents BCCL.

In sum and substance this is a dispute between the Generator i.e. petitioner DPCL and the Consumer i.e. BCCL with respect to the Power Purchase Agreement entered into between them and implementation of Tariff as envisaged in the aforesaid Power Purchase Agreement. Under the Electricity Act, 2003 in general and under Section 86 read with Section 62 of Act the Commission neither has jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the dispute between generating company and consumer nor in the matter of determination of tariff in such cases. In view of the above in my opinion the instant petition is not maintainable and as such it is rejected.

(P.C.Verma)  
Member (Tech)

Dated  
24.01.2006

**ORDER**

In nut-shell the instant case is that the respondents Bharat Coking Coal India Ltd has entered into a Power Purchase Agreement with the petitioner M/s. DLF Power Co. Ltd for development, installation, operation and maintenance of a Coal Washery Rejects based Captive Power Plant at Madhuband Coal Washery of the respondent Bharat Coking Coal Ltd on "build, own and operate" basis and for power supply to the respondent's (BCCL) Madhuband Washery point of power supply by the petitioner Ms DLF Power Co. Ltd. The respondents BCCL is to supply Coal Washery Rejects or in the event of Washery Rejects not being available, coal to the above Power Plant as per the terms and conditions of the aforesaid agreement and Ms. DLF Power Co. Ltd is to supply power from the above Power Plant to the BCCL as per the terms and conditions of the aforesaid agreement. The payment for the energy supplied by DLF Power Co. Ltd to BCCL has to be made by BCCL to DPCL as per the tariff envisaged in the agreement after the adjusting the cost of Rejects and/or cost of coal as per the aforesaid agreement.

The petitioner DPCL contended through their petition and pleadings that they had started supply of power to BCCL from their Power Plant at Madhuband Coal Washery from 19.06.2002 and has commissioned the subject Power Plant on 27.06.2002. That the respondents BCCL is not making any payment to DPCL for the Power Supply to them from the aforesaid Captive Power Plant of the DPCL

though about three (3) years have elapsed since the commencement of Power Supply and Commissioning of the subject Power Plant.

Applicant DPCL further contended that there has been protracted delay in completion of the project due to reasons beyond the control of DPCL and not attributable to DPCL leading to escalation of cost over base capital cost stipulated in the aforesaid agreement on the following accounts-

- (A) Cost over run due to delay in completion of the project.
- (B) Additional investments for roads.
- (C) Additional investments in infrastructure for coal transportation.
- (D) Exchange rate variation compared to base exchange rate.
- (E) Additional investment for infrastructure like conveyer etc.

Applicant DPCL further contended that they have been requesting the respondents BCCL to fix the tariff for supply of power after expiry of 1 (One) year from the date of Commissioning (i.e. 20.06.2003 onwards) as per the aforesaid agreement and for that matter fix the capital cost of the subject Power Plant because the tariff for the power supplied after expiry of 1 (One) year from the Commissioning will inter-alia depend upon the capital cost also and that they have already submitted the details of capital cost certified by their Chartered Accountants/Auditors but tariff has not been fixed by the respondent BCCL and no payments are being made to the applicant for the power supplied by them.

The respondent BCCL has refuted the claim of DPCL contending that subject Power Plant has been unreliable and it did not supply the Power as per agreement and that DPCL has not commissioned the



subject Power Plant as per the schedule and terms and conditions of the aforesaid agreement and that DPCL has not got the Performance Guarantee Test conducted as per the aforesaid agreement. The respondents BCCL has further contended that they have been making several requests to the applicant DPCL to provide with respect to revised capital cost, documentary evidence in support of actual investments, the details of equipments installed along with the test certificate because these details are essentially required as per the aforesaid agreement for finalization of the revised capital cost.

In sum and substance this is a dispute between the Generator i.e. petitioner DPCL and the Consumer i.e. BCCL with respect to the Power Purchase Agreement entered into between them and implementation of Tariff as envisaged in the aforesaid Power Purchase Agreement. Under the Electricity Act, 2003 in general and under Section 86 read with Section 62 of Act the Commission neither has jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the dispute between generating company and consumer nor in the matter of determination of tariff in such cases. In view of the above in my opinion the instant petition is not maintainable and as such it is rejected.

(P.C.Verma)  
Member (Tech)

Dated 17.02.2006	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Order</b></p> <p>In short the case is that the petitioner Tata Steel Ltd (erstwhile TISCO) received power supply from DVC under Tripartite Agreement between the erstwhile BSEB, DVC and the petitioner company (TISCO) during period from 01.04.1991 to 31.03.2001 and according to this Tripartite Agreement the power supply by DVC to the petitioner company was treated as deemed supply of power by BSEB and DVC was to charge at BSEB Tariff from the petitioner and thereafter pay the differential amount of BSEB tariff and DVC tariff to BSEB. From 01.04.2001 onwards the petitioner company is receiving power supply from the respondent DVC under Bilateral Agreement entered between the petitioner (Tata Steel) and the respondent DVC.</p> <p>BSEB in terms of its tariff vide its circular dated 11.07.2000 fixed the rate of fuel surcharge for years 1996-97, 1987-98 and 1988-99 and accordingly respondent DVC raised supplementary bills of fuel surcharge pertaining to aforesaid years on 28.03.2001 amounting to Rs. 51.57 cores plus Rs 76.61 cores after discussing the matter with the petitioner in the meeting convened by DVC on 28.03.2001 and that in the said meeting it was decided that the aforesaid payments of supplementary fuel surcharge bills will be made in six installments without mention of any delay payment surcharge to be paid on the installments and that the decisions of the meeting were recorded in the minutes of the meeting which was signed by the officials of the respondents DVC and petitioner company. The petitioner company accordingly paid the aforesaid supplementary bill of fuel surcharge in six installments during 04.04.2001 to 22.08.2001. BSEB issued yet another circular dated 17.03.2001 fixing the rate of fuel for the year 2000-2001 and accordingly the respondent DVC raised another supplementary bill of fuel surcharge pertaining to the year 2000-2001 on 29.03.2001 amounting to Rs. 54.00 crores and that the petitioner company after receipt of the aforesaid supplementary bills of fuel surcharge wrote to respondent DVC to allow them to deposit the bill amount in six installments without any liability of delay payments surcharge and the respondent DVC granted permission to the petitioner to make the aforesaid</p>	
---------------------	---	--

payment in six installments vide their (DVC) letter dated 04.05.2001 and that the respondent DVC did not put any condition with respect to payment to delay payment surcharge on the said payment of installment in this letter and accordingly the petitioner made the payments of the aforesaid bill in six installments from 27.04.2001 and 25.09.2001. Further the respondent DVC raised bills of AMG charges for the year 2001-2002 in the month of May 2002 amounting to Rs. 14.75 crores and Rs.22.82 crores (total Rs. 37.57 crores) and again after receipt of this bill the petitioner vide its letter dated 18.05.2002 requested the Chief Engineer (Commercial) DVC to allow them to deposit the aforesaid bills in six installments without attracting any delay payment surcharge and in the meantime made payment of Rs. 14.75 crores on 25.05.2002 towards the aforesaid AMG bills and that the respondent DVC vide its Chief Engineer (Commercial) letter dated 10.06.2002 communicated its decision to allow the petitioners to deposit the aforesaid amount of AMG in six installments without attracting any delay payment surcharge. However before the due date of the payment of further installments respondent DVC vide its Chief Engineer (Commercial) (DVC) letter dated 25.06.2002 intimated the petitioners with reference to their (DVC) earlier letter dated 10.06.2002 that the petitioners request for payment of AMG bills in six installments as already allowed have been approved by DVC Board but DVC Board has not approved the waiver of the DPS as allowed vide the earlier letter dated 10.06.2002 for the installment payment and accordingly the petitioner will have to pay applicable DPS. On receipt of this letter dated 25.06.2002 of the respondent DVC that delay payment surcharge would be levied the petitioner made the entire payment of the balance amount of the aforesaid AMG bills within three days of the issuance of this letter. The respondent DVC raised on account of delay payment surcharge on the installment payment of aforesaid AMG bills amounting to Rs.77,60,785.00 (Seventy seven lacs sixty thousand seven hundred and eighty five) on 26.08.2002 and respondent DVC further raised bill dated 27.03.2003 amounting to Rs.9,87,12,485.00 only on account of delay payment surcharge on the earlier installments payment of the supplementary bills of fuel surcharge raised by DVC pursuant to aforesaid BSEB circular dated 11.07.2000 and dated 13.03.2001.

The aforesaid following two bills raised by the respondent DVC upon the petitioner Tata Steel Ltd on account of delay payment surcharge on the installment payments made earlier ie-

- 1 Bill dated 26.08.2002 amounting to Rs. 77,60,785.00 on account of installment payment of AMG bills.
- 2 Two bills dated 27.03.2003 total amounting to Rs. 9,87,12,485.00 on account of delay payment surcharge on installment payments of the supplementary bills of fuel surcharge;

is the bone of contention between the two parties i.e. The petitioner Tata Steel Ltd and the respondent DVC.

The petitioner has contended that the aforesaid bill amounting to Rs,77,60,785.00 raised on account of delay payment surcharge on the installments payment of AMG charges is illegal and not payable by the petitioner because the respondents (DVC) themselves consented and approved the installments for payment of the aforesaid AMG charges without delay payments surcharge communicated vide their letter dated 10.06.2002 which the respondents (DVC) letter revoked vide their letter dated 25.06.2002 which they (DVC) cannot legally do (revoke). The petitioner has further contended that the aforesaid bill amounting to Rs. 9,87,12,485 raised on account of delay payment surcharge on the installment payments of supplementary fuel surcharge bills is also illegal and not payable by the petitioner because the respondent (DVC) themselves consented and approved the payment of the supplementary fuel surcharge bills in installments without mentioning any condition for payment of DPS and that the respondents (DVC) have earlier already accepted the installments and have not objected to the non payment of DPS. The petitioner has further contended that though the aforesaid bills raised on account of delay payment surcharge on installments payment of AMG bills and supplementary fuel surcharge bills for the total amount of Rs. 10.65 crores are illegal and not payable by the petitioner; however the respondent DVC after giving notice has recovered and adjusted this amount in the month of July' 2004 from the regular monthly advance payment by the petitioner to the respondents towards supply of electricity by the respondents (DVC) in an illegal and arbitrary manner and further accordingly the

respondents have shown short fall in the regular payment by the petitioner for supply of electricity and respondents are charging delay payment surcharge on the short fall from Aug '2004 onwards which is again illegal and arbitrary.

The respondent DVC has contended that it (DVC) has raised, in view of the tripartite agreement, supplementary bills of arrear fuel surcharge in accordance with the BSEB circular and tariff and has accordingly issued bills dated 27.03.2003 amounting to Rs.9,87,12,485.00 upon the petitioner for Delay Payment Surcharge on account of installment payment of the aforesaid supplementary bills again in accordance with the BSEB Tariff and therefore these bills of Delay Payment Surcharge/Interest (DPS) are legal, justified and payable by the petitioner in view of the Tripartite Agreement entered into among the respondents DVC, petitioners Tata Steel Ltd. (formerly TISCO) and BSEB. The respondent has further contended that the said meeting was convened to reconcile the amount of the supplementary bills of arrear fuel surcharge and to discuss the mode of payment in installments and that though the respondent DVC has allowed the payment of aforesaid supplementary bills in installments however the respondents have never allowed this installment payment without any Delay Payments Surcharge/Interest; rather it was clearly stated on the bill that if payment is not made within 30 days delay payment surcharge will be chargeable as per agreement nor the respondents (DVC) has any authority to change or alter the Tariff of BSEB under which the delay payment surcharge bills has been raised. The respondents have further contended that the installments in payment of the supplementary arrear fuel surcharge bills was allowed because the petitioners showed difficulty in payment of entire amount in one shot and requested for installments in relaxation of Clause 22 of the Power Purchase Agreement where in it is provided that for non payment of outstanding dues for more than 60 days the line may be disconnected after due notice and that the said DPS bills were raised as per Clause 21(e) of the agreement and as per BSEB Tariff because they (DVC) have never relaxed the payment of DPS on the installment payment nor they have authority to do so. The respondent DVC has also contended that the bill dated 26.08.2002 amounting to Rs. 77,60,785.00 for the Delay Payment Surcharge/Interest on account of installment payment of AMG bill of the year 2001-2002 is also justified legal and payable by the

petitioners (Tata Steel Ltd.) because the same has been raised as per the Tariff and Clause 20 (e) of the Power Purchase Agreement. The respondent DVC has further contended that they (DVC) issued bills of AMG charges for the year 2001-2002 in the month of May 2002 amounting to Rs.14.75 crores and Rs. 22.82 crores (Total Rs. 37.57 crores) and that on the receipt of the these bills the petitioner Tata Steel Ltd. Vide its letter dated 18.05.2002 requested the respondent Chief Engineer (Commercial),DVC to allow them to deposit the aforesaid AMG bills in six installments without attracting any Delay Payment Surcharge and in the meantime made payment of one of the bills amounting to Rs. 14.75 crores on 25.05.2002. The respondents further contended that though respondent (DVC) Chief Engineer (Commercial) vide its letter dated 10.06.2002 communicated decision allowing the petitioner to deposit the amount of AMG bills in six installments without attracting any delay payment surcharge however later on before any further payments were made by the petitioner (Tata Steel Ltd.) after this decision dated 10.06.2002 the respondents (DVC) Chief Engineer (Commercial)vide its letter dated 25.06.2002 intimated the petitioner (Tate Steel Ltd.) that the payment of AMG bills in six installments as already allowed have been approved by DVC Board but DVC Board has not approve the waiver of DPS as allowed vide his earlier letter dated 10.06.2002 and accordingly the petitioner will have to pay applicable DPS on the installments payment of the aforesaid AMG bills. The respondents have further contended that since the DPS bill on the installment payment of AMG charges has been raised in accordance with the Tariff and Clause 20 (e) of the PPA and though the Chief Engineer (Commercial), DVC communicated to the petitioners that DPS will not be chargeable on the installment payment of AMG bills but before any further payment can be made by the petitioner (Tata Steel Ltd.)after this decision; the waiver of DPS was disapproved by DVC Board and was communicated to the petitioners vide respondents Chief Engineer (Commercial) (DVC) letter dated 25.06.2002 and therefore the earlier decision communicated by Chief Engineer (Commercial), DVC vide his letter dated 10.06.2002 that no DPS will be chargeable on the installments payment of AMG bills has no meaning and validity. The Respondents DVC further contended that the petitioner Tata Steel Ltd (formerly TISCO) according to Power Purchase Agreements, is a

bulk consumer of DVC and that the dispute raised by the petitioner being dispute between the DVC and the petitioner which is not a licensee is not maintainable in JSERC in view of the Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act.

The contention of the respondent DVC that the petitioner Tata Steel Ltd. (formerly TISCO) is not a licensee in view of the Power Purchase Agreements is not tenable because it is mentioned in the Power Purchase Agreements that the power was being purchased by TISCO for own use and resale and that TISCO was a sanction holder under Section 28 of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 for power supply to the consumers in specified areas in Jamshedpur and that it has been granted Distribution License under Section 14 of the Electricity Act, 2003 from 24.03.2004 onwards. In sum and substance this is dispute between the petitioner Tata Steel Ltd. (formerly TISCO) which is purchasing electricity from DVC and respondents DVC which is selling electricity to the petitioner regarding raising of bills for Delay Payment Surcharge/Interest by the respondent (DVC) upon the petitioner (Tata Steel Ltd.) for certain bills for electricity supply said to be not paid in full (in one shot) by the due date and instead paid in installments and / or part payment and realization of the aforesaid bills of the Delay Payment Surcharge/Interest by the respondents (DVC) on said nonpayment by the petitioner (Tata Steel Ltd.) from the advance payment by the petitioner of current bills of power supply (by way of adjustment) said to be in accordance with the agreements entered into between the two parties (the petitioners and respondent) and regarding interpretation and implementation of the agreements between the parties in this

regard. In my opinion since no matter in the instant petition is related to and/or falls under the purview of the enactments and/or provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 therefore I hold that this is not maintainable and as such may be rejected.

(P.C. Verma)

<p>Dated 20.02.2006</p>	<p>On perusal of the draft Tariff order prepared by TERI (with respect to Tariff petition filed by the Tata Steel) it is found that the relevant information/documents are not in record to examine prudence check of cost data but apart from that there are basic mistakes of principle and methodology as mention bellow-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. As per our regulations 14% return on equity is to be provided in ARR. Return on equity means pre tax income. However in the draft, apart from the 14% return on equity income tax has been provided in ARR which is against the norms and in contravention of our Regulations.</li><li>2. Above all the Tariff setting is not in accordance with the ARR rather it has been set arbitrarily at much higher Annual Revenue than the Annual Revenue Requirement which is in balatant violation of norms and principles and our Regulations.</li></ol> <p>As mentioned above the Tariff setting done by TERI in an arbitrary manner in violation of norms and principles and in contravention of our Regulations is a serious matter and in my opinion warrants action against them in this regard.</p> <p>Apart from the above there are following short comings which needs to be taken care of-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. CAPEX plan, though not directly related to the tariff setting, is an important part of the tariff order and it needs to be exercised in detail. All capital expenditure needs to be approved by the Commission before being implemented after examining whether it is necessary for the service of the consumers and that it is economically efficient otherwise the Commission may not allow the capitalization of the same in times to come. Therefore Detailed Project Report of all the planned capital expenditure including the details of physical work, Cost, Date of start, date of commissioning, funding and etc has to be submitted by the licensee which after being examined by the Commission shall be approved with modifications if needed. In the present case this being first tariff petition the details of the</li></ol>
-----------------------------	---



project report of the on going capital projects also will have to be submitted for their examination and approval.

2. Though it has been mentioned in the draft that power consumption of TISCO apart from their own Captive generation should be treated as power supply from the licensee under appropriate tariff but the same has not been taken into tariff setting on the ground that necessary data in this regard is not available. Necessary data in this regard can be available and it should be taken into account for fixation of tariff.
3. We do fix tariff for certain categories of consumers below the cost of supply for reasons of affordability. But why the tariff of utility category should be below the cost of supply? It should be suitably fixed as per cost of supply.

(P.C.Verma)  
Member (Tech)

Member (L)  
Chairman

S.No	Date of Proceeding	Proceedings with the signature of the Commission	Office action taken with date
	11.01.2007	<p data-bbox="656 275 902 306">Heard both parties.</p> <p data-bbox="561 327 1325 800">The petitioners Jharkhand Induction Furness Association has filed the instant petition alleging noncompliance of the order dated 27.11.2006 passed by the Commission in case No. 5 /2006-07 by the respondent Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB); alleging thereby that respondent JSEB has raised surcharge bills and pressing for the payment for the same which they (JSEB) cannot realized as per the Commission's above order dated 27.11.2006.</p> <p data-bbox="561 821 1325 1734">Respondent JSEB in their reply has categorically stated that they have not charged any interest or surcharge on the short charge bills of Load Factor Rebate. Learned Counsel for JSEB, Shri Rajesh Shankar further submitted and argued that Board has only issued supplementary electricity bills for the short charge for the period for which bills were issued with wrong application of Load Factor Rebate Clause of the Tariff by making correct application of the Load Factor Rebate Clause of the Tariff Order; which is strictly in accordance with the said order dated 27.11.2006 of the Commission and that JSEB has not charged any interest or surcharge on this supplementary bill for this period. He further argued that the only surcharge that Board is allowed to charge is Delay Payment Surcharge only and no any Delay Payment Surcharge has been charged in the said supplementary bill for short charge of Load Factor Rebate.</p> <p data-bbox="561 1755 1325 1955">The learned counsel of the petitioners M/s. Jharkhand Induction Furness Association, Shri Ajit Kumar submitted and argued that the said supplementary bill for short charge of Load Factor Rebate even if charged</p>	

	<p>without any Delay Payment Surcharge or interest; this being supplementary bill and as such additional bill is in itself a surcharge and hence the same is not chargeable in view of the order dated 27.11.2006 of the Commission. The argument of the Learned Counsel of the petitioners is not acceptable because the said supplementary electricity bill is as a matter of fact difference between the electricity bills charged with wrong application of Tariff (with respect to Load Factor Rebate) and electricity bills chargeable as per Tariff Order with correct application of Tariff (with respect to Load Factor Rebate) and as such this is not a surcharge. In any case the only surcharge which the respondent JSEB is allowed to charge is Delay Payment Surcharge only and the same has not been charged in the supplementary bills for the short charge for the period for which bills were issued with wrong application of Load Factor Rebate Clause of Tariff. The Learned Counsel of the petitioners have further argued that whatever cost of electricity and other expenses incurred in the past for making production had already been calculated on the product and sold out or passed to their customers who bought their product at the relevant time and that it will not possible for them to realize back the extra charges in case of any supplementary bill by the Respondent Board. This argument of the Learned Counsel of the petitioners is entirely mis-placed in view of the following fact:- (1) The Tariff order of the Commission has been duly notified in the official Gazette of the Govt. of Jharkhand and every consumer including the petitioners are suppose to know the Tariff and its applicability for them. (2) The price at which the petitioners sell out their products to their customers is depend on the prevalent price in the market and it is not a fact that they pass whatever cost of Electricity they incur on their product directly to their customers and realize it</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>from them. (3) The respondent JSEB is also doing business and has incurred the cost of inputs in the past. The Learned Counsel of the petitioners further, in course of his submission, referred to the provisions of Section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and Clause 11.11.2 of the Electricity Supply Code Regulation of the Commission. This is not an issue in question in the instant case but it goes without saying that the aforesaid provisions will hold good in its respective import, meaning and applicability.</p> <p>In view of the above Respondent JSEB has not committed any noncompliance or violation of the order dated 27.11.2006 passed by the Commission in case No.5/2006-07 as such the petition is rejected.</p>	
--	---	--

S.L. No.	Date of Proceeding	Proceedings with the signature of the Commission	Office action taken with date
		<p>1. M/s Shivam Iron and Steel company Ltd., Gridih as they have a petition for setting a side the letter No. 3497 dated 18.01.2006 issued by Chief Engineer (coml.) DVC (Respondents No.2) communicating that the rate of Fuel Cost Surcharge from Aprils 2006 to September 2006 has been claimed Fuel rate has been arrived at paise 85.74 per unit and provisionally claimed from October 2006 would be at the paise 87.74 per unit including the ad-hoc amount of 2paise per unit. The hearing was held on 02.03.2007 in which Mrs. Shila Prasad admitted on behalf of the petitioner and Sri M.S. Mittal, Sri S. Choudhry, Sri C.S. Singh, Sri K. Ranjan, advocate along with Sri S.K. Pal , Sri S.N. Singh Gupta, Sri K.K. Singh, Sri P.R. Bhagat on behalf of the DVC. The case was fixed for further hearing on 15.03.2007.</p> <p>2. The Petition was field by the petitioner fro grant of interim protection till next date of hearing on 06.03.2007. This petition was also fixed for hearing on the next date of hearing in the matter already fixed that is on 15.03.2007.</p> <p>3. The case was hear on 15.03.2007 in which Mrs. Shila Prasad, Advocate and appeared from the side of petitioner M/s Shivam Iron and Steel company Pvt. Ltd., Gridih and Sri S.B. Garodia Senior Advocate appeared from the side of DVC. Mr. M.S. Mittal, Advocate also appeared and</p>	

	<p>submitted that is not appearing in the case from the side of DVC and so his name may be title from the cost title of the case. Mr. Bajla, Learned Advocate, for the petitioner contended that DVC is not filling Distribution Tariff petition under the Commission for approval and on the other hand, is going on enhance Fuel Cost Surcharge without maintaining and transparency. A further submitted that DVC ..... Letter No 3497 dated 18.01.2007 communicating the petition, the rate of Fuel Cost Surchage from April 2006 to September 2006 that Fuel rate has been arrived at paise 85.74 per unit and that the provisional claimed from October 2006 would be at paise 87.74 per unit including on ad-hoc amount 2 paise per unit and has accordingly raised demand of Rs. 1,23,91,048.00 being the differences of the actual amount both for 9 months ending December 2006. He further argued that DVC cannot raise any bill enhancing Fuel Cost Surcharge without getting the same approved by the Commission the Learned Counsel for the Respondents DVC Mr. Garodia submitted that today is not ready but argued the case because reply has not been submitted from the side of DVC and requested that one short determined may be granted. He agreed that in the meantime in cohesive step for non payment of impugned amount will be taken from the side of DVC in view of the submission the case was</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>adjourned and fixed for hearing on 28.03.2007.</p> <p>8. The case was again taken up on 28.03.2007. Sri M.K.Bajla, Senior Advocate Mrs Shila Prasad and Sri N.K. Pasari, Advocate appeared on behalf of the petitioner. Sri S. Choudhry and Chandra Shekhar Singh, Advocate appeared on behalf of the Respondents and filed reply. Sri P.R. Bhagat, Sri B.N. Prasad and Sri Ajay of finally of DVC also appeared on behalf of the Respondents. Learned Counsel for the petitioner, Sri M.K. Bajla, submitted that a copy of the reply filed by Respondents DVC has been sent to him today only and there he requested for short adjournment to prepare himself to give reply on the points raised counter affidavit and to argue the matter. The Counsel for the hearing on 02.04.2007 with the observation that in the meantime, as agreed, the interim order in not any cohesive step by DVC against petitioner for the non payment of the impugned amount will continue.</p> <p>5. The case was taken up again for hearing on 02.04.2007 Mr. M.K. Bajla, Senior Advocate and Mrs. Shila Prasad, Advocate appeared on behalf of the petitioner and Sri. S.B. Bagria, Senior Advocate and S Choudhary, Advocate appeared on behalf of the Respondents. Sri Bagria Learned Counsel of the Respondents argued that the calculation of the Fuel Cost Surcharge is part of the Tariff of Generation in respect of which only the Central</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>Commission has jurisdiction and there he further argued the State Commission has not components and or jurisdiction in respect of or relating to the matter of Fuel Cost Surcharge. He contended that the State Commission has direction only in respect of determination of Distribution Tariff only for which the petition has already been filed by the DVC. He further argued that increase for Fuel Cost Surcharge made by the DVC is reasonable as it has been done on the basis of actual increase in the Cost of Fuel and other consumable use in Generation of Electricity and because even after increasing the Fuel Cost Surcharge DVC is charging such to the consumer that that charged by JSEB. Learned Counsel of DVC further argued that the Respondent DVC and petitioner consumer have entered into an agreement for supply of Electricity which is binding on the both of the party and according to which the petitioner should to for arbitration incase of any dispute in respect of coming to the Commission.</p> <p>6. Through there are argued and submission in the written reply, the course of the argument of Respondents DVC that calculation of Fuel Cost Surcharge is a part of the Tariff of Generation in respect of which only Central Commission has jurisdiction and that therefore State Commission has no contends or jurisdiction in respect or relating to the matter of Fuel Cost Surcharge and that the State Commission has</p>	
--	--	--



	<p>jurisdiction only with respect to the determination of the Distribution Tariff. Further there the contention is that the Respondents petitioner and Respondents DVC has entered into an agreement for the supply of Electricity and that themselves bounding on both the parties and that they have charged only in accordance with the Tariff schedule attach appointed with the agreement and which is part of the agreement. The Tariff or Generation has to be fixed by appropriate Commission under the provisions of Section 62 of electricity Act 2003 and it (Tariff for Generation)and it has to be for..... “Supply of Electricity by generating company to Distribution Licensee” only as explicitly provided under Section 62 1A. That is so it is clear beyond any doubt that Tariff or Generation has to be fixed for supply of Electricity by a generating company to a Distribution Licensee and not for supply to any consumer and further there is no question that the Tariff of Generation and for that matter Fuel Cost Surcharge of Tariff or Generation can be charged with respect to Electricity supply to a consumer. Any Tariff that is charged to the consumer including in Fuel Cost Surcharge if any is essentially the tariff retail sale of Electricity as provided in Section 62 1D and is essentially Tariff or Distribution and supply of Electricity which is to be determent by the State Commission only under Section 86</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>1A of Electricity Act.2003. In fact what they have actual charge has increased in Fuel Cost Surcharge is as per the schedule of their consumer Tariff that is retail Tariff that is Distribution Tariff which is also a part of the agreement between the petitioner and the Respondents DVC as has been admitted by the Respondent DVC and which has been fixed by the Respondents DVC themselves which they have no got approved by the Commission or they have not field a Tariff petition for which Distribution Tariff and got it approved and therefore the prayer of the petitioner is allowed and DVC is directed to not to raise bill of increase Fuel Cost Surcharge for the period from April 2006 to September 2006 at the enhance rate of 85.74 paise per unit and from October 2006 onwards at the enhance rate of 87.74 paise per unit till such time the Distribution of DVC is which determent by the Commission</p>	
--	--	--

S.L. No.	Date of Proceeding	Proceedings with the signature of the Commission	Office action taken with date
	01.11.2007	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORDER</u></p> <p>Mr. M.S. Mittal learned counsel appeared from the side of petitioner of case No. 11 &amp; 12 of 2007-08. Mrs. Shila Prasad learned counsel appeared from the side of petitioner of case No. 14/2007-08. Mr. Choudhry the learned counsel appeared from the side of respondent DVC. The learned counsels of the petitioners have submitted if a review petition has been filed by this Commission before the Appellate Tribunal is appeal No. 69/2007 a copy of that review petition may be given to the petitioners. The prayer is allowed.</p> <p>As all of three cases are of similar nature and similar issues are involved in it all have been tagged together for hearing. On the prayer of the learned counsels of both the sides, the cases are adjourned to 26.11.2007. Put up on the date fixed at 11:30 AM.</p> <p>Smt. Shakuntal Sinha      Sri P.C.Verma      Sri S.K.F.Kujur Member (Legal)              Member (Tech)      Hon'ble Chairman</p>	

S.L. No.	Date of Proceeding	Proceedings with the signature of the Commission	Office action taken with date
	27.11.2007	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORDER</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Both the parties are present through their respective Counsels. On their prayer put up on 21<sup>st</sup> December, 2007 at 11.30 A.M. for hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member (Legal)                  Member (Tech)                  Chairman</p>	

S.L. No.	Date of Proceeding	Proceedings with the signature of the Commission	Office action taken with date
----------	--------------------	--	-------------------------------

	07.01.2008	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORDER</u></p> <p>Case No. 11,12 and 14 of 2007-08 are put up for hearing.</p> <p>The order of Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (Appellate Jurisdiction) passed in Appeal No. 69 of 2007 dated the 20<sup>th</sup> December, 2007 has been received.</p> <p>Both the parties are present through their respective Counsels. On their prayer put up on 15<sup>th</sup> January, 2008 at 11.30 A.M. for hearing.</p> <p>Member (Legal) <span style="float: right;">Member (Tech)</span></p>	

S.N.	Date of proceeding	Proceeding with the signature of the Commission	Office action taken with date
	19.02.2008	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORDER</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>DETERMINATION OF TARIFF FOR</u> <u>RAJARAPPA AND GIDDI POWER PLANTS OF DLF</u> <u>POWER COMPANY LTD INCOMBENANCE TO THE</u> <u>ORDER OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT</u> <u>DATED 11.07.2007 IN CIVIL APPEAL NO.3109/2006</u></p> <p>As per the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 11.07.2008, the Commission has to determined the tariff of the Rajarappa and Giddi Power plants of M/s DLF Power Co. Ltd in terms of the Power Purchase Agreement (herein after called PPA) between M/s. DLF Power co. Ltd and CIL/CCL.</p> <p>The aforesaid PPA has explicit and clear provision for determination/revision of tariff from year to year after expiry of one year from the commissioning of respective power plant vide its Clause 1.18.</p> <p>The formula for determination/revision of tariff from year to year after expiry of one year from the date of commissioning has been given in Clause 1.18.2 which is quoted below-</p> <p>Quote "....."</p> <p>Unquote:</p> <p>It is clear from the above formula that determination/revision of tariff that the term <math>\Delta R</math> which is change in the percentage Annual Charge (0.185 or 18.5% at the time of agreement) above and below 0.185 ; shall be calculated as per Gazette of India notification No. 82 dated 23.01.1992 and Gazette of India notification dated 31.03.1992 and or any such notification for the commissioning of power plant . It further stipulated in PPA the said formula that if there is further change in CEA Govt. guidelines for Annual Charges and if the same is applicable to the.....operating power plant, further revision of tariff as per formula shall be admissible. Therefore in terms of PPA the terms <math>\Delta R</math> is to be calculated as change in percentage Annual Charge ( Annual Fixed Costs as per the percentage of total Capital Cost) from year to year and this percentage Annual Charge is to be calculated as per the guidelines for calculation of annual Charge notified by Govt. of India notification No. 82 dated 31.01.1992 and notification dated 31.03.1992 or any such notification issued from time to time in clause of the aforesaid notifications for guidelines for calculation of Annual Charges enforce applicable to the operating power</p>	

		<p>Plant for the year concerned for which tariff is to be determined. following notification have been issued for guidelines for calculation of Annual Charges in Clause of the said Govt. notification dated 31.03.1992 effective from the respective dates-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. CERC notifications dated 26.03.2001 effective from 01.04.2001.</li><li>2. CERC notification dated 26.03.2004 effective from 01.04.2004. Therefore accordingly the calculation of terms <math>\Delta R</math> in the formula for determination / revision of tariff in PPA has been calculated as per the Govt. notification No. 82 dated 23.01.1992 and dated 31.03.1992; and the same has been calculated as per CERC notifications dated 26.03.2001 wef. 01.04.2004 and the same has been calculated as per CERC notification 26.03.2004 wef.01.04.2004.</li></ol> <p>For the Lease Finance Capital its full lease rental has been taken as expenses in Annual Charge in lieu of interest charges and in lieu of depreciation as per Financial /Accounting norm and in line with the explanation provided in the said Govt. notification 30.03.1992 in its "Clause 2.6 explanation-II"; and the same added with the interest charges of the loan capital. And accordingly no depreciation has been charged for the part of Capital Cost Financed by Lease Financed. Depreciation has been charged for the total capital cost except for capital cost financed by lease financed by Lease Finance Assets as per the rates of depreciation vide the aforesaid notification.</p> <p>O&amp;M expenses has been taken as 205% of the capital cost for all the years as explicitly and clearly stipulated in the formula for determination / revision of tariff in the said Clause 1.18.2 of the PPA as quoted above and this has not been calculated as per the notification guidelines wherein there is provisions of escalation of O&amp;M expenses from year to year. PPA as its own Clause i.e. 1.18.4 for escalation of tariff on account of escalation of O&amp;M expenses and this escalation of tariff as per Clause 1.18.4 of PPA has been applied for determination/ revision of tariff.</p> <p>The tariff determination for Rajarappa and Giddi Power Plants of M/s. DLF power co. Ltd in different years is given below-</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member (Tech)</p>	

S.N.	Date of proceeding	Proceeding with the signature of the Commission	Office action taken with date
	19.02.2008		



# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission, Ranchi

(Case No. 03 of 2009)

M/s JMT Auto Limited (Foundry Division) .....Petitioner

**Versus**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & others ..... Respondents

<b>S.No</b>	<b>Date of Proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings with the signature of the Commission</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
5	21.05.2009	Both the parties appeared.  As prayed by both the parties, the case is adjourned for 11.07.2009 at 11.30 A.M.  Member (Tech)	



S.No	Date of Proceeding	Proceedings with the signature of the Commission	Office action taken with date
		<p data-bbox="662 275 1019 306">Both the parties are present.</p> <p data-bbox="662 348 748 380">Heard.</p> <p data-bbox="565 405 1284 600">The learned counsel for the petitioner did not clarify the issue of contract demand to the respondent. So, that the respondent cannot get consent to the arguments given by the learned counsel.</p> <p data-bbox="565 625 1284 764">The learned counsel for the petitioner demanded for a week of time to clearly workout the pointed issue against the respondent.</p> <p data-bbox="565 789 1284 873">Put up for next hearing would be held on 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2009 at 11:30 AM.</p>	

S.No	Date of Proceeding	Proceedings with the signature of the Commission	Office action taken with date
		<p data-bbox="662 275 1019 306">Both the parties are present.</p> <p data-bbox="565 348 1281 543">The learned counsel for the petitioner did not satisfy the issue of the problem to the Hon'ble Commission and the respondents pointwise accordingly.</p> <p data-bbox="565 569 1281 709">The learned counsel for the petitioner wanted time before the Commission to clarify the matter pointwise for a week of time.</p> <p data-bbox="662 730 1159 762">Put up on 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2009 at 11.30 AM.</p>	



# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS

Suo-Motu Case No. 21 of 2011

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
7	05.11.2011	<p>S/Shri Alok Sharan, Member (Finance) JSEB, Shri S.C. Mishra Chief Engineer and Nodal Officer and others officials of the JSEB were present. The officials of the JSEB requested for time for furnishing the names for filling the vacant posts. for constituting CGRF in remaining four divisions namely Dumka, Chibasa, Hazaribagh and Medninagar. JSEB was also reminded to send the name for Member (Finance) for Ranchi CGRF as well to fill the vacancy.</p> <p>The JSEB is given time to send the above information by 12.11.2011</p> <p>Post the matter for 12.11.2011 at 11.30 AM for further hearing.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p>Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p>Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS (Case No. 29/2011)

Jharkhand State Electricity Board ..... Petitioner

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
5	05.11.2011	<p>S/Shri Kumar Sundaram, Advocate and Vikash Kumar, Advocate, Mr. S.C. Mishra, Chief Engineer, JSEB are present on behalf of the petitioner.</p> <p>The learned lawyer pointed out that the senior lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar who is engaged to arguing this case is not feeling well today and requested for time to argue the case.</p> <p>Heard.</p> <p>Time granted</p> <p>Post this case on 26.11.2011 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS (Case No. 31/2011)

TATA STEEL LTD (TSL) ..... Petitioner

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
3	05.11.2011	<p>Shri M.S. Mittal, Advocate and Ms Anubhia Rawat Choudhary, Advocate appeared on behalf of the petitioner.</p> <p>Mr. Sharad Kumar, G.M TATA STEEL was also present during hearing.</p> <p>The petitioner was heard at length and arguments concluded. The petitioner lawyer requested for time to submit their submissions in writing by 12.11.2011.</p> <p>The petitioner request is granted and time given for written submissions by the petitioner by 12.11.2011.</p> <p>The case be put up on 19.11.2011 for orders.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS (DRAFT)

VINOD KUMAR ..... Vrs. Petitioner

Jharkhand State Electricity Board ..... Respondent

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
4	19.11.2011	<p>Shri Vinod Kumar Village Arsandey, Kanke, Ranchi and the petitioner Shri Purushotam Mahto and others of village Domandih, P.S. Silli, District Ranchi are present.</p> <p>Shri R.J.Singh, ESE, Ranchi, Shri Subhanker Jha, EEE, New Capital Division and Shri S.K. Kashyap EEE, Ranchi (E) on behalf of the Respondent.</p> <p>Shri R.J. Singh, the Electrical Superintending Engineer of the respondent-JSEB, Submitted a report to the commission on 19.11.2011 that the 80% work has been completed and remaining work of L.T. Extension will be provided to the consumers within a week.</p> <p>Shri R. J. Singh prays for complete the work and providing the electrical connection to all the applicants within 07.01.2012. Shri R.J.Singh, ESE, Ranchi has also demanded one month time to provide electric connections to the consumers of village –Domandih, P.S. Silli, District, Ranchi.</p> <p>Heard.</p> <p>The Commission fixed the date for both cases on 07.01.2012 for further hearing. The petitioners and the respondents are agreed.</p> <p>The case be put up on 07.01.2012 at 11.30 AM for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS (DRAFT)

Tata Steel Limited (TSL) .....

..... Distribution Licensee

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	10.12.2011	<p>The Commission directed its order dated 03.11.2011 to the Distribution Licensee-TSL to submit tariff petition for FY 2012-13 along with the audited Accounts The Commission allowed the Distribution Licensee-TSL to file the petition by 1<sup>st</sup> week of December, 2011. Meanwhile, The Commission got a written letter No.PBD/393/59/11 dated December 7, 2011 of General Manager (Power Services) of Distribution Licensee-TSL through Consultant of TSL</p> <p>Consultants have brought to its notification from MoP (letter No.:23/1/2008-R&amp;R (Vol-IV), dated 30<sup>th</sup> Nov, 2011 copy enclosed) where in Mop informed that all 1 MW &amp; above consumers are to be treated as open access and have to be kept out of the tariff determination purview.</p> <p>In view of the above ARR consultant' requested for further time of 60 days for rework the ARR petition to being it in line with the above notification and request the Hon'ble Commission to kindly consider the request and allowing us for filling the petition by 4<sup>th</sup> February, 2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the Distribution Licensee-TSL.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS

(Case No. 42 of 2011)

The Union of India, S.E. Railway, Ranchi ..... PETITIONER

**Vrs.**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... RESPONDENTS

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	10.12.2011	<p style="text-align: justify;">Shri Humayoon Rasheed, Advocate, L. Minz, Chief Law Assistant/SE.Rly, Ranchi, Shri Taslim Ahmad, ADEE/4/RNC S.E. Railway and Shri Umesh Prasad, SSE/EC/Ranchi S.E. Railway have presented on behalf of the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Shri Ajit Kumar, Advocate and Shri R.J.Singh, ESE Ranchi have attended on behalf of the Respondent JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">The Advocate on behalf of the petitioner has informed that the electric power supply from JSEB is quite irregular, inadequate and featured that frequent cut and break downs.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">Due to the above reason the Muri Railway settlement, maintenance and developmental works has been suffering great set back and obstruction and this has been indirectly affecting the local Railway system very adversely.</p> <p style="text-align: justify;">The Commission has directed the Respondents JSEB to submit the following information:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Name of the 33/11 KV Sub-station from where the supply is extended to the petitioner and length of the 11KV feeders from sub-station to petitioner's supply point.</li> <li>2. Connected load and date of release of supply to the petitioner.</li> <li>3. Whether the 11KV feeder is a dedicated feeder or not.</li> <li>4. Details of break downs/interruptions and reasons for</li> </ol>	

		<p>failure of supply, for the last three months ie from September 2011 to November 2011</p> <p>The Respondent JSEB has requested six weeks time for the submission of the above information.</p> <p>Time is granted.</p> <p>The Respondent JSEB is directed to file an affidavit with the above information on or before 16.01.2012 to the Commission.</p> <p>The petitioner is also directed to submit the following information to the Commission:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Details of connected load as per the agreement.</li><li>2. Details of interruptions from September 2011 to November 2011, if available with the petitioner.</li><li>3. Details of installed capacity of C.P.P. ie Hindalco Ltd and availability of surplus power from C.P.P.</li></ol> <p>Post this case on 21.01.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p>Issue notice to the Respondents JSEB and to the petitioner The Union of India, S.E. Railway, Ranchi.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member</p>	
--	--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS  
Suo-Motu Case No. 21 of 2011**

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
10	10.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Ajit Kumar, Advocate and Shri Kumar Sundaram, Advocate, Addl. Counsel presented on behalf of the JSEB. They have requested two weeks time for submission of details.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 24.12.2011 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 44 of 2011**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	10.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has given a public notice to obtain comments/suggestions from various Stake Holders on 19.12.2011 regarding approval of the modified draft HT agreement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In view of the Above the case is posted to 24.12.2011 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 43 of 2011**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	10.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has given a public notice to obtain comments/suggestions from various Stake Holders on 19.12.2011 regarding approval of the modified draft of power purchase agreement for synchronous operation of CPPs with JSEB system.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In view of the Above the case is posted to 24.12.2011 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p>	





**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS  
Suo-Motu Case No. 21 of 2011**

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
11	24.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Ajit Kumar, Advocate, Shri S.C. Mishra Chief Engineer (C&amp;R) JSEB and Shri Amar Nayak, Joint Secretary, JSEB are presented on behalf of the JSEB. Chairperson directed the concerned officer to provide information about the pending allegations, if any, in respect of Shri Jayant Prasad, Shri Raj Kumar Agrawal, Shri Suresh Jha and Shri Sanjeev Kumar all of the Accounts department</p> <p style="text-align: center;">After the receipt of this information, the names for the Consumers Grievance Redressal Forum will be finalized.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 07.01.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS

**Case No. 32 of 2011**

M/s. Riata India Company ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
03	24.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Ajit Kumar, Advocate and Shri S.C.Mishra Chief Engineer (C&amp;R) JSEB are presented on behalf of the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The petitioner Mr. Manoj Jay is presented points out that a sad incident has occurred in the family of his Advocate and as such she is not able to come today.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">A petition has also been filed to this effect. Manoj Jay requested for some times so that his counsel can appear and place his case.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Learned Lawyer for the JSEB pointed out that the petitioner is not paying the electricity bills which are monthly consumption of electricity bills. After discussion with the petitioner Manoj Jay it was agreed between parties that the monthly electricity bills including higher charge of the transformer will be regularly paid to the respondent JSEB subject to final out come of this proceeding.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 07.01.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the M/s Riata India and the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 46 of 2011**

M/s Ansuman Industries ..... Petitioner

**Vrs.**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board..... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	24.12.2011	<p>Mr. Anubhav Khetan present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Shri Ajit Kumar, Advocate, Shri Kumar Sundaram, Advocate, Addl. Counsel and Shri Prabhat, Advocate (Addl Counsel JSEB) are presented for the JSEB.</p> <p>After brief discussion with the two sides, it was agreed that the licensee JSEB will provide electricity connection to the petitioner on the existing network within 15 days.</p> <p>The petitioner shall not claim any compensation whatsoever.</p> <p>With these observations the petition of the petitioner is disposed of.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties concern.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 29 of 2011**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
7	24.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Ajit Kumar, Advocate, Shri Kumar Sundaram, Advocate, Addl. Counsel, Shri Prabhat Singh Advocate and Mr. S.C.Mishra Chief Engineer JSEB are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">It was argued on behalf of the petitioner that the issues raised in the review petition are such that they need detailed analysis and this can be possible when the next tariff petition is filed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The prayer of the petitioner that this petition be disposed of with the liberty to the petitioner to raise all these issues at the time of next tariff petition is granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The prayer of the petitioner is allowed with these observation this petition is disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 44 of 2011**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	24.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Ajit Kumar, Advocate and Shri Kumar Sundaram, Advocate, Addl. Counsel and Shri S.C. Mishra Chief Engineer JSEB are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has conducted Public Hearing for all of Stakeholders on 19.12.2011 at JSERC office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The draft H.T. Agreement was discussed in detail in this public hearing. The Commission is giving final touches to the said draft.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 07.01.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 43 of 2011**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	24.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Ajit Kumar, Advocate and Shri Kumar Sundaram, Advocate, Addl. Counsel and Shri S.C. Mishra Chief Engineer JSEB are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has conducted public hearing of all the Stakeholders on 19.12.2011 at JSERC office. In the light of the suggestions given by the Stakeholders, the Commission is finalizing the agreement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 23.01.2012 at 11.30 AM Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 18 of 2011**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
10	30.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Amar Nath Mishra, Electrical Superintending Engineer (APT), JSEB and Jugal Prasad, Electrical Superintending Engineer (Commercial &amp; Revenue), JSEB are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Jugal Prasad, ESE, JSEB prayed for time as their lawyer is not available due to unavoidable circumstances.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 21.01.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 26 of 2010**

M/s Jharkhand Small Industries Association ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Others ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
10	30.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Amar Nath Mishra, Electrical Superintending Engineer (APT), JSEB and Jugal Prasad, Electrical Superintending Engineer (Commercial &amp; Revenue), JSEB are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Jugal Prasad, ESE, JSEB prayed for time as their lawyer is not available due to unavoidable circumstances.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 21.01.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS  
Suo-Motu Case No. 12 of 2011**

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	30.12.2011	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Vinod Kumar Mishra, Dy. Secretary Energy Department and Shri N.K. Ojha, Electrical Executive Engineer (Trans), JSEB are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri N.K.Ojha, Electrical Executive Engineer, JSEB prayed for time as their lawyer is not available due to unavoidable circumstances.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 21.01.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS

### Case No. 36 of 2011

Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL) ..... Distribution Licensee

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	02.01.2012	<p>The Commission in its order dated 03.11.2011, allowed the licensee SAIL Bokaro filling the tariff petition for FY 2012-13 along with the audited Accounts till 31<sup>st</sup> Dec, 2011. The SAIL Bokaro again requested to the Commission by its letter reference No. TA/DGM(E)/2011-1073 dated 30.12.2011 intimated to the Commission that the tariff petition for the FY 2012-13 is under preparation and it will take atleast further 45 days time to finalize it before submission.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission grants further extension up to 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2012. The licensee SAIL Bokaro is hereby directed to file the Tariff Petition for the FY 2012-13 on or before 31.01.2012.</p> <p>Post this case on 02.02.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee SAIL Bokaro.</p> <p>Sd/- Member</p> <p>Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS

**Case No. 32 of 2011**

M/s. Riata India Company ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
04	07.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Sunil Kumar Thakur, ESE/Supply Circle, Chas and Rahul Kumar, Advocate are present on behalf of the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The petitioner Mr. Manoj Jay and A.K. Sahani, Advocate are present on behalf of the Petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Licensee JSEB informed that the LTIS connection of the consumer has already been converted into HTS connection and an agreement has been entered into by the two sides to this effect. The JSEB has pointed out that the consumer is supposed to provide a separate transformer at his cost for which three months time was given but he has not done as yet.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The JSEB has also pointed out that monthly electricity bills are also not paid by the consumer. On the other hand, the consumer points out that voltage is very poor and he is not able to run his Unit properly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Taking the things as they are, after discussion with the two sides, the Licensee JSEB is directed to provide a copy of the agreement to the consumer and also to ensure proper voltage.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The consumer is directed to procure its transformer in the next three months and ensure the electricity bills are regularly paid.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">With these observations, the matter is disposed off.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the M/s Riata India and the licensee JSEB.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> <div style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</div> <div style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</div> </div>	

--	--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 47 of 2011**

M/s Hindustan Malleables & Forging Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	07.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Rajesh Kumar Jha, Advocate and Shri Prashant Kumar Singh are presented for DVC.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri N.K.Pasari, Advocate is present on behalf of the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Rajesh Kumar Jha has requested to the Commission for extension of time for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 28.01.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS  
Case No. 44 of 2011**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	07.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The Model HT Agreement has been finalized by the Commission in consultation with all these Stakeholders. The finalized version which is on record is approved by the Commission.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of the said Agreement document be sent to the Licensee for their use.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/ Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 28 of 2011

Vinod Kumar & Purushotam Mahto & Ors. .... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
05	07.01.2012	<p>Shri Raghu Nath Mahto and others are present for the petitioner. Shri R.J.Singh ESE, Ranchi and other Officials of the JSEB are present.</p> <p>The villagers pointed out that in their Domnadih village no work is going on for electrification. On the other hand the Officials of the JSEB told that villagers are not co-operating.</p> <p>After discussion with both the sides, the Officials of the Licensee have been directed to visit the village in question on 13.01.2012 between 12:00 to 1:00 PM. The villagers are directed to be present on the date and time and co-operate with the Officials.</p> <p>Put up this case on 28.01.2012 at 11.30 AM to monitor the progress of the electrification of the villagers in question.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 26 of 2011

Ramesh Sahu ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
07	07.01.2012	<p>Mr. Ashok Kumar, Chief Engineer and Mr. R.J.Singh, Electrical Superintending Engineer are present for the Licensee JSEB. The details regarding over loaded transformer and repaired transformers have been provided. Total No. of 1701 failed transformers have been corrected and sent to the field in the month of August, September and October 2011. They also informed that in thirteen (13) Circles, total number of 1672 transformers are over loaded. Obviously, the Licensee JSEB has to work out a time frame in which these over loaded transformers have to be augmented / to provide additional transformers. The earlier is done the better it is. Delay will cause problem in over-loaded transformers and thereby causing interruption of supply of electricity. It is on continuing process.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No need to keep this proceeding pending. The Licensee is directed to work out a mechanism in which the burnt and defective transformers are repaired and replaced in time frame. The over loaded transformers are also augmented</p>	



	<p>or additional transformers are provided to take care of over loading problem on the existing transformers. This exercise should also be worked out in such a way that at regular intervals the Board is aware which of these transformers are to be augmented or additional transformers provided. With these observations the proceeding is disposed off.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p>Sd/- Member</p> <p>Sd/- Chairperson</p>	
--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING  
Suo-Motu Case No. 21 of 2011**

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
12	07.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The Licensee JSEB has informed that all the officials of the five Consumer Grievance Redressal Forums have been notified.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Since the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum's vacancies have been filled up, no further action will be required in this proceeding.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Hence, closed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 43 of 2011**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	17.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 23.01.2012 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As per the Govt. orders the 23.01.2012 is a public holiday. Hence, the Case has been posted to 11.02.2012 at 11.30 AM at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 28 of 2011**

Vinod Kumar & Purushotam Mahto & Ors. .... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
06	17.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 28.01.2012 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As per the Govt. orders the 28.01.2012 is a public holiday. Hence, the Case has been posted to 11.02.2012 at 11.30 AM at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 47 of 2011**

M/s Hindustan Malleables & Forging Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	17.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 28.01.2012 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As per the Govt. orders the 28.01.2012 is a public holiday. Hence, the Case has been posted to 11.02.2012 at 11.30 AM at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 26 of 2010**

M/s Jharkhand Small Industries Association ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Others ..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
11	21.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Amar Nath Mishra, Electrical Superintending Engineer (APT), JSEB, Shri Jugal Prasad Electrical Superintending Engineer (Commercial &amp; Revenue), JSEB, Deepak Kumar, Electrical Executive Engineer, Rajesh Shankar, Advocate and Abhay Prasad, Advocate are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Vijay Kumar Gupta prayed for three weeks time as their senior lawyer is not available due to unavoidable circumstances.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 25.02.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 41 of 2011**

Dhananjay Shukla ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board. .... Respondent

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
05	21.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Kumar Sundaram, Addl. Counsel, JSEB, G.B. Rao, Rajesh Shankar Advocate S.C. JSEB and Abhay Kumar Singh, Advocate Addl. Counsel, JSEB are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In respect of electrification in Village Khairant, Block-Lesliganj, District-Palamau, Sri R.J.Singh, Electrical Superintending Engineer, Ranchi said that necessary steps are being taken by the licensee-JSEB but the consumer is not ready for release of supply. The electric connection will be provided after the completion of the premises of the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">None present for the petitioner nor any information. Since the petitioner is not pursuing the petition, it is dismissed in default.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 42 of 2011**

The Union of India, S.E. Railway, Ranchi ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors ..... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	21.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Kumar Sundaram, Advocate, Addl. Counsel and Shri R.J.Singh, Electrical Superintending Engineer, Ranchi are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Humayoon Rasheed, Advocate, Sri L. Minz, Chief Law Assistant, South Eastern Railway, Ranchi, Shri R.P. Sharma, Jt. President Corp. Affairs. Hindalco Ind. Ltd., Shri Udayan Sarkar, Dy. General Manager (Accounts) Hindalco Ind. Ltd, Umesh Prasad, and Taslim Ahmad, ADEE/G/RNC, S.E. Railway are present on behalf of the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The licensee JSEB was to file a reply to the petition of the South Eastern Railway, Ranchi Division but orally requested for 15 days time</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 11.02.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 48 of 2011**

Tata Steel Limited (TSL) .....

Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	21.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Sharad Kumar, General Manager (Power Services), Jamshedpur, Mr. Arvind Kumar Sinha, Chief, Tata Steel and Mr. K.C. Jha are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up for order on 11.02.2012.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	21.01.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate, Addl. Counsel, JSEB, Mr. Rajesh Shankar, Advocate S.C., JSEB, Mr. Abhay Prakash, Advocate Addl. Counsel, JSEB and Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Electrical Executive Engineer (C&amp;R), JSEB are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Deepak Sinha, Advocate and Santosh Kumar Singh are present for petitioner</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The petitioner asked for time as their senior counsel was not available today. After consultation with both the parties time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 25.02.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 41 of 2011**

Dhananjay Sharma ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board. .... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
06	09.02.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Hiranand Pathak, from village Khairant, Block-Lesliganj, District- Palamau for the petitioner has given a request letter dated 08.02.2012 to the Commission to reopen the case as the petitioner could not get information about hearing on 21.01.2012</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Commission allows to reopen the case and fix for further hearing will be on 17.03.2012 at 11.30AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 28 of 2011**

Purushotam Mahto & Ors. .... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	11.02.2012	<p>Shri S.K. Kashyap, EEE Ranchi (East) JSEB, Shri R.J. Singh, ESE, Ranchi and Shri S.C. Mishra, Chief Engineer (C&amp;R), JSEB are present for the licensee JSEB.</p> <p>Shri Raghu Nath Mahto is present for the villagers.</p> <p>The licensee JSEB has pointed out that 80% work is over and need about 10 -15 days to complete the work.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put up this case on 25.02.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 42 of 2011**

The Union of India, S.E. Railway, Ranchi ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors ..... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	11.02.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri S.K. Kashyap, EEE, Ranchi (East) JSEB ,Shri R.J.Singh, Electrical Superintending Engineer, Ranchi, Shri S.C. Mishra, Chief Engineer (C&amp;R) and Shri Umesh Prasad are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Humayoon Rasheed, Advocate, Sri Taslim Ahmad, ADEE/G/RNC, S.E. Railway, Shri Umesh Prasad,SSE/EC/RNC South Eastern Railway and Shri A.K. Hemrom, Sr D.E.E./G/RNC, Railway are present on behalf of the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Railway has requested time to point out law under which they have filed this petition.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 25.02.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 47 of 2011**

M/s Hindustan Malleables & Forging Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation & Ors ..... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	11.02.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Rajesh Kumar Jha, Advocate, DVC, Sri Prashant Kumar Singh, Advocate DVC Sri S.Beck, JDP, DVC, Ranchi, Sri Abhijit Chanda S.E. (E), Comml. DVC, Kolkata and Sri Anand Kumar Dhanuka, Asstt. Law Officer, DVC are present for DVC.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">None present for the petitioner when the case was called. Later on Advocate Arvind Kumar Ranjan appeared and filed a petition on behalf of the petitioner's lawyer seeking time on health grounds.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 10.03.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">It is made clear that the petitioner is given time as a last opportunity.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 35 of 2011

M/s Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Generator

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
04	11.02.2012	<p>The Commission by its order dated 29.12.2011 had directed the Generator-Jharkhand State Electricity Board (hereinafter referred to as “Generator-JSEB”) to file the MYT Business Plan and MYT tariff petition along with the Audited Accounts and consolidated compliance report of the direction issued in Tariff Order for FY 2011-12 by 15<sup>th</sup> February,2012.</p> <p>In compliance, the Generator-JSEB has submitted Business Plan and MYT Tariff Petition and Audit Report for Financial Year 2005-06 and 2006-07 for Generation function of JSEB vide letter No.214 dated 10.02.2012 and letter No. 200 dated 06.02.2012. The Generator-JSEB has not submitted Audited Report for previous FY 2007-08 to 2010-11.</p> <p>Perused the petition.</p> <p>Let a copy of the Business Plan and MYT Tariff Petition and Audited Account 2005-06 and 2006-07 be sent to the consultant of the Commission for scrutiny and report. Put up on receipt of the report of the Consult for further order.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="margin-left: 200px;">Chairperson</span></p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 09 of 2011

Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) ..... Petitioner

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
07	14.02.2012	<p>The Commission by its order dated 19.01.2012 had directed all the licensees of the Jharkhand State to submit their ARR to the Commission, as per the JSERC (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Distribution Tariff) Regulations, 2010 and the licensee DVC had directed to submit ARR for the Financial Year 2012-13 on or before 28.02.2012.</p> <p>In compliance, the licensee DVC has already submitted the Petition for distribution of retail supply of electricity for the FY 2006-09 and 2009-11 and 2011-14 before the Commission on 05.09.2011 without fees for fixation of retail tariff. The Commission directed the licensee DVC to pay the requisite fees for admitting the ARR submitted on 05.09.2011.</p> <p>In compliance, the licensee DVC has submitted Rs.10 lacs as fee for submission of Tariff Petition for determination of Distribution &amp; Retail Tariff for FY 2012-13 vide DD No. 381039 dated 06.02.2012.</p> <p>Perused the petition.</p> <p>Let a copy of the Tariff Petition be sent to the consultant of the Commission for scrutiny and report. Put up on receipt of the report of the Consultant for further order.</p> <p style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	



# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 28 of 2011

Purushotam Mahto & Ors. .... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
08	25.02.2012	<p>Shri S.K. Kashyap, EEE Ranchi (East) JSEB, Shri Umesh Prasad Assistant Electrical Engineer (C&amp;R), Ranchi Circle, Ranchi are present for the licensee JSEB.</p> <p>Shri Raghu Nath Mahto, Sri Nitai Mahto and Ravindra Nath Mahto are present for the villagers.</p> <p>The villagers pointed out that no progress taken place in electrification of their villages. The officials of the JSEB pointed out that the work is being executed by NESCL, a branch of the NTPC looking after the electrification of the said village under the RGGVY scheme.</p> <p>It was also pointed out that Mr. K.K. Gupta is project incharge.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission directs Mr.K.K.Gupta to inform the Commission about the progress in electrification of the village in question either through his representative or appearing in person at the next date of hearing.</p> <p>Put up this case on 24.03.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 42 of 2011**

The Union of India, S.E. Railway, Ranchi ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors ..... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	25.02.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Ajit Kumar, Advocate, Shri Kumar Sundaram, Advocate, Shri S.K. Kashyap, EEE, Ranchi (East) JSEB , and Shri Umesh Prasad are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Sri Taslim Ahmad, AEE/G/RNC, S.E. Railway, Shri Umesh Prasad,SSE/EC/RNC South Eastern Railway and Shri Sudhir Kumar, Advocate and Ranjit Kumar Singh, Advocate are present on behalf of the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard both the side.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Ajit Kumar requested the Commission for one week's time to submit the Counter Affidavit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 10.03.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 18 of 2011

Jharkhand State Electricity Board ..... Petitioners

With

Case No. 26/2010

Jharkhand Small Industries Association ..... Petitioners

**Vrs.**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors ..... Respondent

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
12	25.02.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Rajesh Shankar, Advocate S.C. JSEB, Shri Deepak Kumar Electrical Executive Engineer/APT and Shri Anand Kaushik, Assistant Electrical Engineer/APT are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard the Licensee-JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Non present from the other side.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Since the two cases namely 26/2010 and 18/2011 pertains to the amendments in the Electric Supply Code. The proposed amendments has to be put on websight for public comments and suggestions and then a public hearing is to be organized. Commission's office is directed to put the notice on the website for comments and suggestions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Commission also directs the office to organize the public hearing thereafter.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this record on 12<sup>th</sup> May, 2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 20px;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Sd/- Member</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Sd/- Chairperson</p> </div> </div>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 43 of 2011**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	10.03.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Licensee-JSEB has filed a petition before the Commission for the approval of the draft Agreement for utilization/supply of surplus capacity of Captive Power Plants and for connectivity/synchronization for the purpose with the grid system of Licensee-JSEB</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 47 of 2011**

M/s Hindustan Malleables & Forging Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation & Ors ..... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	10.03.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri N.K Pasari, Advocate and Ranjana Mukherjee, Advocate are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Anand Kumar Dhanuka, Asstt, Law Officer, DVC, Kolkata, Shri Sumitra Baroi, Advocate and Shri Subhasish Ghosh, Superintending Engineer (E), DVC, Comml. Dept, Kolkata are present for the DVC.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Superintending Engineer, DVC, during the course of hearing, disclosed that the petitioner has deposited necessary supervision charges for execution of the erection of line works by the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The petitioner is directed to ensure the completion of work of their part, so that the DVC can release the service connection.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">With the agreement of the two sides, the matter is posted for 31.03.2012 at 11.30 AM to monitor the progress of works.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	10.03.2012	<p>Mr. Deepak Sinha, Advocate and Santosh Kumar Singh are present for M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited.</p> <p>Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate, Addl. Counsel, JSEB is present for JSEB.</p> <p>JSEB has requested for time to file a counter affidavit which they were supposed to file today.</p> <p>Since Mr. Ajit Kumar, Senior Advocate of the JSEB is stated to be indisposed today and requested for time.</p> <p>Time is granted.</p> <p>Put up this case on 17.03.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 42 of 2011**

The Union of India, S.E. Railway, Ranchi ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors ..... Respondent

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
06	10.03.2012	<p>Mr. Gaurav Kumar AEE/S/ Tatisilwai and Mr.Kumar Sundaram are present for JSEB.</p> <p>Shri Taslim Ahmad, AEE/G/RNC, S.E. Railway, Shri Umesh Prasad,SSE/EC/RNC South Eastern Railway and Shri Sudhir Kumar, Advocate and Ranjit Kumar Singh, Advocate are present for the South Eastern Railway.</p> <p>The JSEB is not able to file their counter affidavit which they were to do today. The Learned Lawyer on their behalf the JSEB submitted that Mr. Ajit Kumar, Senior Advocate is not feeling well today, as such, they have not been able to finalize the counter affidavit and requested for time.</p> <p>In consultation with the two sides, time is granted.</p> <p>Put up this case on 17.03.2012 at 11.30 AM with the direction to the JSEB to serve a copy of the counter affidavit on the other side also on or before 16<sup>th</sup> March, 2012.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

**Case No. 03 of 2012**

Damodar Valley Corporation & others ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
M/s. Shivam Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	10.03.2012	<p>Mr. Anand Kumar Dhanuka, Asstt. Law officer ,DVC, Kolata, Sri Soumitra Baroi, Advocate and Subhasish Ghosh S.E. (E), DVC, Comml. Dept., Kolkata are present for the DVC.</p> <p>Mr. N.K.Pasari, Advocate and Ranjana Mukherjee, Advocate are present for the respondents.</p> <p>Heard the two sides.</p> <p>On behalf of the DVC, it was stated that they have completed technical feasibility survey and the report there of has been made available to the respondent for depositing the cost of survey which they have not done.</p> <p>DVC says that once the technical feasibility survey cost is deposited, then they will take further steps to erect a separate line for the respondent.</p> <p>The Learned Lawyer pointed out that he will ask his client to deposit the required amount and DVC under took to complete the job once they receive the required amount.</p> <p>Both the sides were directed to compete their side of the job.</p> <p>In consultation with the two sides the matter posted on 31.03.2012 at 11.30 AM for further hearing.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



--	--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	17.03.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar and additional Counsel Mr. Kumar Sundaram present for the Licensee- JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Deepak Sinha, Advocate and Santosh Kumar Singh Executive are present for the Petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard the two sides. Both sides prays one week time to arrive at a settlement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 24.03.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

**Case No. 42 of 2011**

The Union of India, S.E. Railway, Ranchi ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors ..... Respondent

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
07	17.03.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr Ajit Kumar Learned Senior Counsel, JSEB, Mr. .Kumar Sundaram Additional Counsel and Mr. S.K.Kashyap, EEE/S/ Ranchi (East) are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Taslim Ahmad, AEE/G/RNC, S.E. Railway, Mr. Umesh Prasad, SSE/EC/RNC South Eastern Railway and Mr. Sudhir Kumar, Rly. Advocate are present for the South Eastern Railway.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard both the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Learned Lawyer for the Licensee-JSEB assures that the field officers of the Licensee will be directed to ensure continuous and quality power to the consumers. The Learned Lawyer for the Railways says that only plea is that the Licensee must ensure continue quality power.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">We direct the Licensee-JSEB to depute a team of officials to go to the consumers, talk to the officers their and understand their problems and quickly work out solutions to ensure continue and quality power. Failing which the petitioner would be free to seek other remedies.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">These observations the petition is disposed off.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

--	--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 41 of 2011**

Dhananjay Sharma ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board. .... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	17.03.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Ajit Kumar, Sr. Counsel and Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Additional Counsel present for the Licensee-JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Learned Lawyer request for time to check up the physical progress on electrification of village, Khairant, Block- Lesliganj, District- Palamau.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 07.04.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 02 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	24.03.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Ajit Kumar, Sr. Counsel and Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Additional Counsel, JSEB present for the Licensee-JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Sr. Advocate and Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate are present on behalf of the M/s Usha Martin Ltd.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Learned Lawyer Mr. M.S.Mital has requested one week time for filing counter affidavit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 31.03.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
06	24.03.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar and additional Counsel Mr. Kumar Sundaram present for the Licensee- JSEB.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Deepak Sinha, Advocate, Shri Ram Pravesh Agrawal, Director Rishi Cement co. Ltd and Santosh Kumar Singh Executive are present for the Petitioner.</p> <p>Heard the two sides. The parties have failed to arrive at a settlement.</p> <p>The JSEB requested for time to file counter-the affidavit.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put up this case on 21.04.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 28 of 2011**

Purushotam Mahto & Ors. .... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
09	24.03.2012	<p>Shri Ajit Kumar, Sr. Advocate, Shri S.K. Kashyap, EEE Ranchi (East) JSEB, Shri Umesh Prasad Assistant Electrical Engineer (C&amp;R), Ranchi Circle, Sri Sanjay Kumar AEE/S&amp;D HQ. Ranchi-4, Sri D.K.Mishra, Manager, NESCL, Sri O.P.Kushwaha, Sr. Engineer, NESCL, Ranchi are present for the licensee JSEB.</p> <p>Shri Raghu Nath Mahto, is present for the villagers.</p> <p>Shri D.K.Mishra said that 80% work is over and remaining 20% works will be completed up to 28.04.2012.</p> <p>The JSEB has requested for time.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put up this case on 28.04.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING Suo-Motu Case No. 12 of 2011

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
	24.03.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Shri Ajit Kuamr and Additional Counsel Shri Kumar Sundaram, officials of the JSEB and Shri Vinod Kumar Mishra, Dy. Secretary Energy Department Govt. of Jharkhand are present.</p> <p>Mr. Mishra, Dy. Secretary informed that a meeting was held at the level of Chief Secretary and discussed ways and means to clear the electricity bills of various Govt. Deptts. It was decided in the meeting that the JSEB will serve bills on all the Govt. offices (consumers) and each such consumer will pay the actual bill regularly. If the departments need additional funds for clearance of pending bills, Govt. would provide such funds. In this background, the JSEB has to ensure timely service of bills including the pending and recover the same.</p> <p>Shri Ajit Kumar, Learned Counsel sought time for furnishing consolidated position on all the issues being monitored in this proceedings, specially with reference to the order dated 21<sup>st</sup> January, 2012.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Also separate the papers regarding Mr. Gaya Shukla, Chief Engineer (Transmission) for initiating a proceeding under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and open a separate record.</p> <p>Put up this case on 21.04.2012 at 11.30 AM Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p>Sd/- Member</p> <p>Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 04 of 2012

M/s Damodar Valley Corporation ..... Petitioner

And

Licensee & Consumers of DVC in the State of Jharkhand..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	26.03.2012	<p>M/s Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC), Kolkata had submitted a draft Power Purchase Agreement vide letter No.-comml / Agreement_JHARKHAND/4338 dt 13.05.2011 for approval of the Commission. In response to their letter, the Commission directed the DVC vide letter No.JSERC/120/DVC/165 dated 30<sup>th</sup> May 2011 to host the draft Power Purchase Agreement on their website for public comments / suggestions. Also, the DVC was directed to conduct a public hearing with all the Stakeholders i.e. licensees/consumers for their comments/suggestions.</p> <p>Accordingly, the draft Power Purchase Agreement was hosted on DVC website on 23.06.2011 for comments / suggestions of all the stakeholders of DVC located in the State of Jharkhand. Also a meeting with the stakeholders of DVC was organized on 16.07.2011 at the Auditorium of Administrative Building, DVC Mython, Jharkhand. 36 representatives of the stakeholders attended and offered their remarks/suggestions. Further, the DVC also conducted another consumer meet on 24.01.2012 at 10.30 hrs at Chanakya BNR Hotel, Ranchi for comments/suggestions. 25 representatives of stakeholders attended the consumer meet and offered their remarks.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">After incorporating the public remarks and suggestions</p>	

	<p>M/s Damodar Valley Corporation, Kolkata has filed a petition in respect of Power Purchase Agreement between DVC and licensee and consumers in the State of Jharkhand for approval of the Commission. The Petition is duly supported by the affidavit and the petitioner deposited the requisite fees. DVC corporation was directed to send representatives for discussion on above draft agreement on 24.03.2012 to the Commission.</p> <p>Since the DVC-the Petitioner has discussed the draft Agreements under consideration with all the stakeholders, the Commission does not want to repeat the exercise of consultation again.</p> <p>The representatives of DVC Sri Subhashish. Ghosh, Superintending Engineer, DVC and B.N.Prasad, Dy. Chief Engineer (Commercial), DVC, Kolkata had attended and discussed with the Commission on 24.03.2012 regarding the above draft Power Purchase Agreement.</p> <p>The Commission suggests certain amendments in the draft agreements. Send the suggested amendments to DVC for incorporation in the final version of the Agreements.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	
--	---	--

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 03 of 2012

Damodar Valley Corporation & others ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
M/s. Shivam Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
03	31.03.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Advocate Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh, Mr. Abhijit Chanda S.E. (E), Comml., DVC, Kolkata, Mr. S.Beck, Joint Director of Personnel, DVC, Ranchi and Mr. Anand Kumar Dhanuka, Asstt. Law officer ,DVC, Kolkata,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. N.K. Pasari present for the opposite party.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The petitioner DVC has filed supplementary affidavit. Keep it on record. Heard the two sides.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">From the arguments, it transpires that the opposite party has not yet deposited the required amount for preliminary survey which they were directed to do in the earlier order of 10.03.2012. As such the DVC has not carried out the preliminary survey. The opposite party is again directed to deposit the said amount so that the petitioner DVC can carry out the preliminary survey. The learned lawyer for the DVC points out that the petitioner would take four weeks to complete the survey from the date of deposit of the money.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In view of this, put up on 05.05.2012 at 11.30 AM for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

--	--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 02 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	31.03.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Additional Counsel, JSEB present for the Licensee-JSEB.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. M.S. Mittal, and Learned Lawyer Ms. Shilpi John, are present for the opposite party.</p> <p>Rejoinders have been filed by the petitioner to the counter affidavit filed by the respondents on 24.03.2012. Keep it on record.</p> <p>The Learned Lawyer for the petitioner sought time to study the rejoinder.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put up this case on 09.04.2012 at 4.00 PM</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 47 of 2011**

M/s Hindustan Malleables & Forging Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation & Ors ..... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
06	31.03.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. N.K Pasari present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh, Shri Abhijit Chanda, S.E. (E), Comm., DVC, Kolkata, Shri S.Beck, Joint Director of Personnel and Shri Anand Kumar Dhanuka, Asstt, Law Officer, DVC, Kolkata, are present for the DVC.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Supplementary counter affidavit on behalf of the DVC has been filed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Keep this on record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The petitioner, it seems, has not completed the work on his part and sought time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up on 28.04.2012 at 11.30 AM for further hearing</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 41 of 2011

Dhananjay Sharma ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board. .... Respondent

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
08	07.04.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram and Mr. Dharmdeo Ram, EEE, Daltonganj are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Dhananjay Shukla, Bharat Swabhiman Trust, Patanjali Yog Samiti, Palamu is present for the petitioner.</p> <p>The JSEB has informed that 39 electric poles have been sent to the village in question and other material is being organized by the G.M. Medininagar. The field officers feel that they will complete the work till May 2012.</p> <p>The petitioner points out that the consumers deposited the money long back in 2002 and till date villagers of the petitioner have not been given connections. The petitioner also pointed out that atleast one transformer of 200 KVA is needed in their villages.</p> <p>The field officers have to ensure that the load of the village is kept in mind in installing the transformer otherwise the system will not work. If there is problem of procuring 200 KVA transformers, then two transformers of 100 KVA each be ensured in that villages.</p> <p>Put up this case on 16.06.2012 at 11.30 AM for further hearing.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



--	--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 02 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	09.04.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Prabhat Kumar Singh Additional Counsel, JSEB present for the Licensee-JSEB.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. M.S. Mittal, and Learned Lawyer Ms. Shilpi John, are present for the opposite party.</p> <p>Mr. Prabhat Kumar Singh has informed that Mr. Ajit Kumar, Senior Advocate for JSEB has gone out of station and pray for extension of time. With the consent of both the parties time granted.</p> <p>Put up this case on 13.04.2012 at 4.00 PM</p> <p>It is last opportunity for JSEB as the time is granted on their request.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING  
Suo-Motu Case No. 12 of 2011**

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
	19.04.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The Case had been posted on 21.04.2012 at 11.30 AM for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In the mean time the Chairperson, JSERC is out of station. Hence, the Case has been posted to 24.04.2012 at 4.00 PM at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	19.04.2012	<p>The Case had been posted on 21.04.2012 at 11.30 AM for further hearing.</p> <p>In the mean time the Chairperson, JSERC is out of station. Hence, the Case has been posted to 24.04.2012 at 4.00 PM at JSERC Office.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
08	24.04.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar and Additional Counsel Mr. Kumar Sundaram present for the Licensee- JSEB.</p> <p>Shri Ram Pravesh Agrawal, Director Rishi Cement co. Ltd and Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh, Executive are present for the Petitioner.</p> <p>A counter affidavit on behalf of the respondents 1 to 4 has been filed. The petitioner wants time to respond to the counter affidavit.</p> <p>During the course of hearing, it is pointed out by the respondents that as per the orders of the Hon'ble Ombudsman the liability of the consumer comes to Rs. 2 crores 60 lacks. The petitioner wanted the calculation chart for this amount. Similarly, the respondents also wanted calculation of the petitioner who is claiming that as per his calculation. JSEB has to return Rs. 53 lacks. After hearing, both parties were directed to share their respective calculations.</p> <p>Put up this case on 05.05.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	





**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 47 of 2011**

M/s Hindustan Malleables & Forging Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation & Ors ..... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	28.04.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh, Shri P. Jena, Law Officer and Mr. Anand Kumar Dhanuka, Assistant Law Officer, DVC, Kolkata, are present for the DVC.</p> <p>The Law Officer of the DVC informed the Commission that the petitioner has completed as part of the work and the DVC is supplying continuously and quality power to the petitioner.</p> <p>In view of this, no need to proceed further in this case.</p> <p>With these observations, the petition is disposed of.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 28 of 2011**

Purushotam Mahto & Ors. .... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
10	28.04.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr.Kumar Sundaram, Shri S.K. Kashyap, EEE Ranchi (East) JSEB, Sri D.K.Mishra, Manager, NESCL, Sri O.P.Kushwaha, Sr. Engineer, NESCL, Ranchi are present for the licensee JSEB.</p> <p>None present for the villager's side.</p> <p>Shri S.K.Kashyap, EEE(S), Ranchi East said that the work is completed.</p> <p>In view of this, no need to proceed further in this case.</p> <p>With these observations, the petition is disposed of.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 06 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	05.05.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer for the petitioner Mr. Ajit Kumar and Chief Engineer (Commercial &amp; Revenue), JSEB HQr is also present on behalf of the licensee JSEB. After brief discussion the petitioner has sought permission to draw the clarificatory petition. The petitioner is allow to withdraw the petition.</p> <p>The petition is disposed of as withdrawn with the liberty to file another appropriate petition.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
09	05.05.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar, Mr Sartaj Quraisi, AEE (C&amp;R) and Kumar Sundaram, Advocate are present for the licensee JSEB. Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh and Learned Lawyer Mr. Anil Choudhary appeared for the petitioner and filed Vakalatnama on 05.05.2012. He also pointed out that the counter affidavit filed by the respondents needs a response from their side and sought time.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put up this case on 18.05.2012 at 04.30 PM</p> <p>Both parties are directed to bring their calculations ready which will be handed over to one another in the Commission during the course of hearing itself.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 03 of 2012**

Damodar Valley Corporation & others ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
M/s. Shivam Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	05.05.2012	<p>Learned Advocate Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh is present for the DVC, and Mr. Anand Kumar Dhanuka, Asstt. Law officer ,DVC, Kolkata also present for the DVC.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. N.K. Pasari present for the opposite party.</p> <p>DVC, the petitioner says that the respondent has not deposited the necessary amount as directed by the Commission earlier.</p> <p>Mr Pasari seeks time for seven days as he has to check with his client whether the amount for the preliminary survey has been deposited or not.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put the case on 18.05.2012 at 04.30 PM.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 05 of 2012**

Tata Steel Limited (TSL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	05.05.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The case is fixed up for today i.e. 05.05.2012 at 11.30. From the record it transpires that the licensee concerned has not been communicated the date fixed for hearing and such they are not able to come.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this record on 18.05.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The office is directed to inform the petitioner about the next date of hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/ Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 18 of 2011

Jharkhand State Electricity Board ..... Petitioners

With

Case No. 26/2010

Jharkhand Small Industries Association ..... Petitioners

**Vrs.**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors ..... Respondent

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
13	05.05.2012	<p>From the two records i.e. 26/2010 and 18/2011 that these two petitions pertain to certain amendments carried out in the JSERC (Electric Supply Code) Regulation, 2005.</p> <p>It has been ordered earlier that a public hearing is to be organized to know the views of all the stakeholders which is not yet done. Tariff fixation of all licencees is in the progress and it will be difficult to find time for a public hearing in May, 2012. The Commission feels that the said two petitions be put on Commission's website for inviting comments/suggestions from the stakeholders giving 30 days notice.</p> <p>In view of this, Secretary-In-Charge should ensure that these two petitions are loaded in the website and an advertisement in the leading newspapers is carried out inviting comments/suggestions giving 30 days notice.</p> <p>On the expiry of 30 days notice public hearing will be fixed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="margin-left: 200px;">Chairperson</span></p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
10	18.05.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar, Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate and Mr Sartaj Quraisi, AEE (C&amp;R) are present for the licensee JSEB.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Sanjay Kumar Prasad and Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh, Executive are present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Sanjay Kumar Prasad requested for time due to his senior Advocate Mr. Anil Choudhary is going out side of Ranchi on that date.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put up this case on 16.06.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p>Both parties are directed to bring their calculations ready which will be handed over to one another in the Commission during the course of hearing itself.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 03 of 2012**

Damodar Valley Corporation & others ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
M/s. Shivam Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	18.05.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Advocate Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh and Mr. Subhashish Gosh Superintending Engineer (E) DVC/Commercial Department are present for the DVC, Kolkata.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. N.K. Pasari, Mr. A.K. Rajan and Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, Advocate are present for the opposite party.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">This is very small matter pending since 11.02.2012. The parties are directed to argue the matter on the next date on merits for final disposal as the respondent has failed to deposit the amount for the preliminary survey and does not seem to be interested in doing so.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 14.07.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 05 of 2012**

Tata Steel Limited (TSL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	18.05.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Since the petitioner has already filed Tariff Petition for the Financial Year 2013, FPPPA component for the period from December 2011 to March 2012 will be taken care of in the Tariff Order.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">With these observations, the petition is desposed off.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 07 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	18.05.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Since the petitioner has already filed Tariff Petition for the Financial Year 2013, FPPPA component for the period from December 2011 to March 2012 will be taken care of in the Tariff Order.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">With these observations, the petition is desposed off.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 03 of 2012**

Damodar Valley Corporation & others ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
M/s. Shivam Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
06	14.07.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Advocate Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh and Mr. Rajib Goswami Superintending Engineer /Commercial Department, DVC, Kolkata are present for the DVC, Kolkata.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. N.K. Pasari, present for the opposite party.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard both the sides.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The parties are directed to argue the matter on the next date on merits for final disposal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Both the parties are requested for time grant.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 25.08.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 11 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	21.07.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">None present for the petitioner. Issued notice to the JSEB the petitioner as to why the petition should not dismiss in default.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 18.08.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the Petitioner JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 12 of 2012**

Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	21.07.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Aveek Chatterjee, Senior Manager, Regulation Eastern Region, Shri Satish Kumar, Sr. Manager-Accounts, Shri Ashok Kumar Lodh, AGM, Shri Tarun Negi, Executive Shri Anirban Das Asst. Manager and Shubhayu Sanyal, Executive are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Chatterjee presented the case in respect of the Review Petition under consideration. During the course of hearing, petitioner was directed to submitted line diagram showing the position of the water meter and the flow channels of intake water to the powerhouse units No. 1,2,3,4 and 5.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(2) Monthly water consumption for the period under consideration and the corresponding power generation of the aforesaid generating units. And (3) Readings of the water-meters showing consumption of water by the aforesaid generating units.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The petitioner is directed to furnish aforesaid information within three weeks.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 18.08.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the Petitioner Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 01 of 2012

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
13	28.07.2012	<p>Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate Additional Counsel JSEB and Mr Sartaj Quraisi, AEE (C&amp;R) are present for the Respondent.</p> <p>Mr. Biren Poddar, Advocate, Mr. Anil Choudhary, Advocate, Piyush Poddar, Advocate and Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh, Executive are present for the petitioner.</p> <p>The petitioner has work out the details of the amount payable to JSEB / Refundable from JSEB and also month-wise details which are placed on record. One set of these documents was handed over by the petitioner to the respondent. The respondent also filed a photo copy of an orders of the Hon'ble High Court, Jharkhand judgment in M/s Rishi Cement Co. Ltd Vrs. Jharkhand State Electricity Board &amp; Others. A copy was also handed over to the petitioner.</p> <p>Both sides suggested that they will give a mutually agreed name of a Chartered Accountant to work out the details of payable / Refundable amount on the basis of the judgment of the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum/Ombudsman and papers filed by the respective parities.</p> <p>Put up this case on 04.08.2012 at 11.30 AM Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p>Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

--	--	--	--

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 01 of 2012

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
14	04.08.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate Additional Counsel JSEB is present for the Respondent.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Biren Poddar, Advocate, Mr. Anil Choudhary, Advocate, Piyush Poddar, Advocate and Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh, Executive are present for the petitioner.</p> <p>The petitioner has filled a petition naming four Chartered Accountants for working out the amount on the basis of judgment of the Ombudsman. The respondent requested for time for consideration of names suggests by the petitioner.</p> <p>Time granted. The respondent will submit their views on names given by the petitioner or suggest their own names by 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2012 and inform the petitioner as well. The petitioner will file their counter affidavit by 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2012.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up for hearing on 25.08.2012 at 11.30 AM Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engineering)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 15 of 2012**

Jamshedpur Utilities & Services Co. Ltd (JUSCO) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	04.08.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Vijay Prakash Singh, Dy. G.M. and Mr. K.C. Jha, F.C. are present for the petitioner and also argued the case for the review the petition.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up for further order on 25.08.2012 Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engineering)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 14 of 2012**

Tenughat Vidyut Nigam Limited (TVNL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	04.08.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. S.R. Sinmgh, EEE (OS), Mr. M.K. Prasad, D.A. and Mr. N. Sinha, Advocate (Fin) are present for the petitioner. The presented the case on review petition. If the review petition is allowed the financial burden comes on JSEB and as such the Jharkhand State Electricity Board is impleaded as a party. Notice to JSEB to join the proceedings and file their response if any by the 25.08.2012.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up for further order on 25.08.2012 Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engineering)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 16 of 2012**

Tata Steel Limited (TSL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	04.08.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Ajay Kumar, Head, LDC &amp; Power Management and Mr. K.C. Jhar, FC are present for the petitioner. They made their submissions on the review petition.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Since, TSL sells power to JUSCO, the later company becomes a necessary party. Issue Notice to JUSCO for their version on the revision petition.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up for on 25.08.2012 Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engineering)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS Suo-Motu Case No. 12 of 2011

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
	07.07.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr.Ajit Kumar, Advocate Sr.S.C.Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate, Mr. Pranay Kumar, Advocate Mr. A.N. Mishra, ESE, Chas, Mr. U.S. Roy, ESE/EC/Ranchi, Mr. Ashok Kumar, C.E. (S&amp;D), Mr. R.N. Sharma, ESE, Hazaribagh, Mr. S.C. Mishra, C.E.(C&amp;R), Mr. M.M.P. Tripathi, Energy Department, Mr. C.L.Roy, ESE/R-APDRP, Mr. R.N.Singh, ESE/Tr, Mr. Ajay Kumar, EEE/Tr, and Mr. S.P.Singh, G.M./R-APDRP are present.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Some information relating to Data Centre and DTR Metering and interruption in power supply of Dhanbad, Chas, Ranchi, Gumla, Deoghar, Dumka, Sahibganj, Hazaribagh and Garwa have been filled. Data Centre and DTR Metering are the activities which are related to establishing Energy Audit System. Energy Audit is a very important programme for the licensee because, through this programme the licensees will be able to know how much is the technical loss and how much is the commercial loss. The programme is much behind the scheduled. The licensee-JSEB is directed to monitor the programme on priority so that it is complete at the earliest.</p>	

Regarding interruption in power supply, the Commission has already vide its order dated 24.04.2012 directed the licensee to inform the Commission of their plan to ensure continuous quality power but no such plan has been filed. Moreover, the licensee must analyse the causes of frequent interruption and take remedial measure so that the continuous flow of power is maintained. No compliance of other issues have been filed which is a serious matter.

The learned lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar prayed that the licensee be permitted to file compliance on next date on two issues only so that they come prepared. He added that the officials are not able to respond to all the issues under consideration at a time. The prayed of the learned lawyer is allowed. He suggests that the Govt. pending dues and distribution transformers be taken up in the next date of hearing. The Commission agrees. Let the licensee file updated position on these two issues.

Put up for the next hearing on 04.08.2012 at 11.30 AM

Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-  
Chairperson

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS Suo-Motu Case No. 12 of 2011

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
	04.08.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Addl. Counsel, JSEB, Mr. R.J.Singh, G.M. Ranchi, Mr. Pranay Kumar, Advocate Mr. A.N. Mishra, ESE, Chas, Mr. U.S. Roy, ESE/EC/Ranchi, Mr. Ashok Kumar, C.E. (S&amp;D), Mr. R.N. Sharma, ESE, Hazaribagh, Mr. B.M.Sarkar, EEE (C&amp;R), Mr. C.L.Roy, ESE/R-APDRP, Mr. R.N.Singh, ESE/Tr, Mr. Ajay Kumar, EEE/Tr, and Mr. S.P.Singh, G.M./R-APDRP are present.</p> <p>The licensee-JSEB has furnished information on inspection of distribution transformers and pending dues towards various government departments. From the report filed by the licensee-JSEB, it seems that various circle officers have inspected 623 transformers. It is also reported that 342 additional distribution transformers have been installed and capacity of 101 transformers have been augmented to meet the additional load. There are around 25 thousand transformers in the distribution system of the JSEB. If this is the pace of inspection of transformers by the field functionaries, to check all the transformers they will take years. Obviously, the field</p>	

functionaries have to speed up the inspection of the transformers and the JSEB management may consider the fixing up the targets of such inspections. If the transformers are not in order, it is difficult to supply power to consumers. Secondly, the Commission feels that whatever the deficiencies are noticed during the course of inspection, the same must be attended to within 10-15 days.

Regarding pending dues with various government departments, the licensee has stated that they have served arrears bills on the all concerned departments. The information shows that about Rs. 508 crores dues are pending against various government departments. The licensee-JSEB should take up the matter with the Energy Department and the Chief Secretary to realize all the pending dues, as was decided in a meeting held at the level of Chief Secretary.

Learned lawyer for the licensee-JSEB submitted that they will be submitting compliance report on the remaining issues on the next date of hearing.

Put up for the next hearing on 15.09.2012 at 11.30 AM

Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-  
Member (E)

Sd/-  
Chairperson

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 41 of 2011

Dhananjay Shukla ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board. .... Respondent

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
10	11.08.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Kumar Sundaram, Addl. Counsel, JSEB and Mr. Nitish Kumar Sinha, AEE, Daltonganj (Rural) are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">None present on behalf of the petitioner.</p> <p>A petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner, stating that the work has not been completed as yet. The Licensee-JSEB pointed out that the work is in progress and it is taking time because of non availability of necessary materials. The villagers have deposited money many times back, but they have not yet been provided connection. The Commission feels that it is a serious matter.</p> <p>The Licensee-JSEB is duty bound to give connection after accepting the necessary charges from the consumers. However, taking into consideration that there are certain constraints in completing the work, one month time is granted. Member (Tech &amp; Distribution) is directed to arrange the required materials in next 15-20 days, so that the field functionaries can complete the work in time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up for the next hearing on 15.09.2012 at 11.30 AM Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS

### Case No. 12 of 2012

Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL) ..... Petitioner

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
03	18.08.2012	<p>Shri Aveek Chatterjee, Senior Manager, Regulation Eastern Region, Shri Ashok Kumar Lodh, AGM, and Shubhayu Sanyal, Executive are present for the petitioner.</p> <p>The petitioner is heard.</p> <p>During the course of hearing, it transpired that the petitioner has submitted a line diagram of raw water circuit which shows one common meter for the total drawl of raw water for unit Nos. 1,2,3,4 &amp; 5 and apportionment of drawl of raw water of each unit has been work out on the basis of gross generation of each unit. The Commission believes that it will be better if a separate water meter is installed for unit 2 &amp; 3 to know the exact consumption of raw water.</p> <p>The petitioner agrees to examine the technical feasibility and get back to the Commission. During the course of hearing, the Commission made it clear that the Commission agrees, in principles, the expenditure incurred towards drawl of raw water for unit No. 2 &amp; 3 and will be allowed subject to the firming of figures of drawl of raw water.</p> <p>Put up the case on 22.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the Petitioner Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

--	--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 07 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	18.08.2012	<p>The record is put up today for final order.</p> <p>The petition pertains to FPPPA for 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter i.e. from October, 2011 to December, 2011 and another petition has been filed by the petitioner for the last quarter also i.e. January, 2012 to March, 2012 for allowance of FPPPA in another proceeding case No. 11 of 2012.</p> <p>The Tariff Order for the FY 2012-13 has been issued considering the FPPPA of the above two quarters and as such these two petitions are disposed off.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the Petitioner JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 01 of 2012

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
15	25.08.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Rahul Kumr, Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate Additional Counsel JSEB and Mr. Sartaj Quraisi are present for the Respondent.</p> <p>Mr. Biren Poddar, Advocate, Mr. Anil Choudhary, Advocate, Piyush Poddar, Advocate and Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh, Executive are present for the petitioner.</p> <p>On behalf of the JSEB an affidavit has been filled suggesting the name of the Chartered Accountant. Shri Rajesh Srivastava &amp; Co. Chartered Accountant, Kamayani, H.No. 143/2, Balihar Road, Opposite Doon Public School, Morabadi, Rancho. The petitioner has earlier given names of four Chartered Accountants. After discussion, both sides agreed that Shri Rajesh Srivastava &amp; Co. named by the JSEB and Ghose &amp; Pandey Chartered Accountants, Main Road, Ramgarh one of the four Chartered Accountant named by the petitioner be asked to work out the figures in the light of the order of the CGRF and order dated 30.09.2011 passed in appeal No. EOJ/03/2011 of the Ombudsman and submit their findings to the Commission by 29<sup>th</sup> September, 2012. The petitioner made a submission that he would pay in advance rupees six lacs for one month and whatever current bill will be there, will be adjusted and always Rs. six lacs will be with the licensee-JSEB in advance if electric connection is restored.</p>	

		<p>The learned lawyer of the licensee-JSEB requested time of 15 days to consider the proposal.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>The licensee-JSEB will respond to the above proposal by 14<sup>th</sup> of September under intimation to the petitioner.</p> <p>Put up this case on 29.09.2012 at 11.30 AM Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Chairperson</p>	
--	--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 03 of 2012**

Damodar Valley Corporation & others ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
M/s. Shivam Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	25.08.2012	<p>Learned Advocate Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh present for the DVC, Kolkata.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. N.K. Pasari and Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh are present for the opposite party.</p> <p>None present for the DVC. The respondent is present. DVC is the petitioner. Another opportunity to appear pursuant to their petition is given to DVC. If they failed to appear on the next date, their petition will be dismissed in default.</p> <p>Put up the case on 22.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 17 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	01.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate, Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate and Mr. B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB is present for the opposite party.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The opposite party JSEB has pointed out that they have filed LPA before the Hon'ble High Court and as such they be granted time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The opposite party JSEB is directed to file a petition in this behalf and also clarify whether stay has been granted by Hon'ble High Court on their petition.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 15.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 18 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	01.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate, Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate and Mr. B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB is present for the opposite party.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The opposite party JSEB prayed for time to file counter affidavit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 15.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	01.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate, Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate and Mr. B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB is present for the opposite party.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The opposite party JSEB prayed for time to file counter affidavit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 15.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING (Case No. 22 of 2012)

Jharkhand State Electricity Board ..... Licensee

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
01	07.09.2012	<p>The Commission is aware that the supply of electricity of late is erratic in the State as a whole and Ranchi town in particular. For almost last 3-4 days, every newspapers is carrying news to this effect. The news items pointed out that the defective transformers are not replaced in time, the electricity supply is tripping too often, conductors are stolen and the people are agitating against poor or no power supply. The Commission takes suo-muto cognizance of all these ie erratic or no supply of power, theft of conductors and non replacement of defective transformers in time.</p> <p>Issue notice to the licensee-JSEB as to why proceeding be not initiated on the aforesaid issue against them</p> <p>The licensee-JSEB is directed to file its reply within 15 days of the receipt of the notice.</p> <p>Put up on 22.09.2012 at 11.30 AM. Let a copy of this order be sent to the licensee-JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

--	--	--	--



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING  
(Case No. 13 of 2012)**

M/s Manikaran Power Trading Limited ..... Petitioner  
3/A, Aastha, 460, Bypass, Kolkata-700107

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	13.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The Petitioner- M/s Manikaran Power Trading Limited have requested vide letter No.55/2012 dated 13.09.2012 to postpone the public hearing on their petition for issuance of License for distribution of electricity in Ranchi district, which has been slated on 15.09.2012. Since the public notice for public hearing has already been pruslised in the press and all the concerned have been informed, it is difficult to postpone the public hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Moreover, the Commission has to dispose off the petition within the time frame stipulated in the JSERC (Distribution License Conditions) Regulations, 2005.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In view of the above, the petition for postponement of the public hearing is rejected.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Inform the petitioner accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 17 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	01.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Piyush Poddar, Advocate &amp; Mr. B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Rahul Kumar, Standing Counsel. are present for the opposite party.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The opposite party JSEB has pointed out that they have filed LPA before the Hon'ble High Court and requested one week time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The opposite party JSEB is directed to file a petition in this behalf and also clarify whether stay has been granted by Hon'ble High Court on their petition.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 15.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member (Engg.)</p>	Chairperson

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 41 of 2011**

Dhananjay Shukla ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board. .... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
11	15.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Shri Kumar Sundaram, Addl. Counsel, JSEB, Rahul Kumar, Standing Counsel and Mr. Nitish Kumar Sinha, AEE, Daltonganj (Rural) are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Dhananjay Shukla is present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shri Shukla has demanding three phase line for the use of motor pump for irrigation, which will solve the problem of the farmers. But JSEB has not completed the work for three phase line in that area.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Nitish Kumar Sinha, AEE, Daltongaj pointed out shortage of material for not completing the work. He requested one month's time for completion of work</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up for the next hearing on 13.10.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 17 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	01.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate, Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate, Mr. N.K. Patodia, Usha Martin and Mr. B.K. Singh are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Rahul Kumar, Standing Counsel. are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The opposite party JSEB has pointed out that they have filed LPA before the Hon'ble High Court and requested one week time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Licensee-JSEB is directed to file a petition in this behalf and also clarify whether stay has been granted by Hon'ble High Court on their petition.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 22.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
03	15.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Piyush Poddar, Advocate, Mr. N.K.Patodia, Usha Martin &amp; Mr. B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Rahul Kumar, Standing Counsel. are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The learned lawyer for the respondent requested for short adjournment for filing their reply.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 29.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
03	15.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Piyush Poddar, Advocate, Mr. N.K.Patodia, Usha Martin &amp; Mr. B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Rahul Kumar, Standing Counsel. are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The learned lawyer for the respondent requested for short adjournment for filing their reply.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 29.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 17 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	15.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate, Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate, Mr. N.K.Patodia, Usha Martin and Mr. B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate (Standing Counsel) are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The JSEB has requested for a short time to file the counter affidavit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Requested allowed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 22.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS  
Suo-Motu Case No. 12 of 2011**

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
	15.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned lawyer, Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Addl. Counsel, JSEB , Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate, Standing Counsel, Mr. Pranay Kumar Sinha, Advocate, JSEB, Shri Ashok Kumar, Chief Engineer (S&amp;D), JSEB, Mr. B.M.Sarkar, EEE (C&amp;R) , JSEB, Mr. S.P.Singh, G.M. (R-APDRP), Mr. C.L.Roy, ESE, (R-APDRP), Mr. U.S. Roy , ESE/TC/Ranchi, and Mr. Shakeel Ahmed, ESE/Trans are present for JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The JSEB has filed information on the remaining issues. Heard the Learned Lawyer for the licensee-JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Order reserved.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 18 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
03	15.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate, Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate, Mr. N.K.Patodia, Usha Martin and Mr. B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate (Standing Counsel) are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The leaned lawyer for the respondent requested short adjournment for final reply.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Requested allowed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 22.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

**Case No. 03 of 2012**

Damodar Valley Corporation & others ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
M/s. Shivam Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
08	22.09.2012	<p>Learned Advocate Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh and Mr. S.Ghosh are present for the DVC, Kolkata.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. N.K. Pasari present for the opposite party.</p> <p>Argument heard.</p> <p>The Learned Lawyer for the DVC argued that the respondent M/s. Shivam Iron &amp; Steel Co. Ltd. has to deposit the preliminary survey charges first then only the petitioner DVC can consider on the petition for the respondent. On the other hand the learned lawyer for the petitioner argued that there is no provision of preliminary survey charges and as such DVC can not compel the respondent to incur expenditure which is do not sanctioned by law.</p> <p>Section 45 of the Electricity Act, 2003 provides about the charges a distribution licensee can charge from a consumer but in this section preliminary survey charges does not find place. Section 46 of the Act speaks about the powers of State Commission to make regulations authorizing distribution licensee to charge from a petitioner requiring supply of electricity in pursuant of Section 43. Chapter three (3) of JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2005 framed by the Commission speaks about the recovery of charges. Regulations 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 speaks about various charges but not about preliminary survey charges.</p>	

In view of the aforesaid legal position, the Commission is of the opinion that the petitioner DVC is not entitled to ask for preliminary survey charges and hence their plea is rejected.

The Commission again clarifies that it is duty of the licensee to give electrical connection to the consumers and if new lines and other infrastructure has to be created in that case the licensee can ask for more time from the Commission. Of course, the charges incurred in supplying electricity to the consumer because of laying of electricity line or other infrastructure can be charged to the consumer.

Sd/-  
Member (E)

Sd/-  
Chairperson

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 17 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
04	22.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate, Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate, Mr. N.K.Patodia, Usha Martin and Mr. B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate (Standing Counsel) are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The JSEB has requested for one week's time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Requested allowed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 28.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 17 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
05	28.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate and Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The learned lawyer for the appellant pointed out that the issue under consideration has been resolved through an order of the Hon'ble High Court, Ranchi. He promised to provide a copy of the order.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case for final orders on 13.10.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 18 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
04	22.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate, Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate, Mr. N.K.Patodia, Usha Martin and Mr. B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate (Standing Counsel) are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal said that the similar case is pending before the Hon'ble High Court for judgment and requested the Commission to wait.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 28.09.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 18 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	28.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate and Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB is present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rejoinder has been filed on behalf of the M/s Usha Martin Limited.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The learned lawyer for the respondent pointed out that senior lawyer was not able to come today because of some emergency and as such time be granted. Last time also time was granted to JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let it be the last opportunity to JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 13.10.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 01 of 2012

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
16	29.09.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Biren Poddar, Advocate, Mr. Anil Choudhary, Advocate, Mr. Piyush Poddar, Advocate and Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh are present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel), JSEB, Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate and Mr. S.C. Mishra, Chief Engineer (C&amp;R), JSEB are present for the respondent.</p> <p>M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited on last date had offered to pay in advance of Rs. 6 (six) lacs for re-connection besides the current bill and the respondent JSEB was supposed to give their view on that. JSEB asked for Rs. 15 (fifteen) lacs as an advance instead of the offer of Rs. 6 (six) lacs. After consultation with the two sides, it has been agreed that the petitioner will pay Rs. 10 (ten) lacs as advance, on payment of Rs. 5 (five) lacs as advance connection will be restored to the petitioner and after 45 days of the date of re-connection another 5(five) lacs as advance will be paid to the JSEB. In other words, in all Rs. 10 (ten) lacs, in two installments of Rs.</p>	



5 (five) lacs cash will be paid by the petitioner to JSEB. Of course, the current monthly bill will be paid as per law by the petitioner.

Since the two Chartered Accountants firm are working out the figures in light of the order dated 11.04.2011 in case No. 05/2010 of CGRF and order dated 30.09.2011 passed in appeal No. EOJ-03-2011 of the Ombudsman, both sides asked for time.

Time allowed.

Put up this case on 03.11.2012 at 11.30 AM

Sd/-  
Chairperson

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 21 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	29.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB, Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate (Standing Counsel), Mr. S.C. Mishra, Chief Engineer (C&amp;R), JSEB and Ritesh Yadav, Consultant are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The petitioner pray for time for filing an interim petition in continuation of the original petition and requested for time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 13.10.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 20 of 2012**

M/s Khalari Cements Limited..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC)..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	29.09.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. N.K.Pasasri, Advocate and Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, Advocate are present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh, Advocate is present for DVC.</p> <p>The respondent DVC requested for time for filing a reply to the petitioner of the petition.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put up the case on 03.11.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	29.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Biren Poddar, Advocate and Mr. Piyush Poddar, advocate are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB, Rahul Kumar, Standing Counsel. and Mr. S.C.Mishra, Chief Engineer (C&amp;R), JSEB are present for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The respondent JSEB has filled a petition for time to file a reply.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 13.10.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 15 of 2012**

Jamshedpur Utilities & Services Co. Ltd. (JUSCO)                      .....                      Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	29.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The record is today put up for order. Because of pre-occupation with the scheduled FOIR meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> October, 2012 in Ranchi, in which Chairperson and Members of all State Commissions are coming, the order is not ready.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up for order on 12.10.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 14 of 2012**

Tenughat Vidyut Nigam Limited (TVNL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	29.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The record is today put up for order. Because of pre-occupation with the scheduled FOIR meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> October, 2012 in Ranchi, in which Chairperson and Members of all State Commissions are coming, the order is not ready.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up for order on 12.10.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 16 of 2012**

Tata Steel Limited (TSL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	29.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The record is today put up for order. Because of pre-occupation with the scheduled FOIR meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> October, 2012 in Ranchi, in which Chairperson and Members of all State Commissions are coming, the order is not ready.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up for order on 12.10.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING  
(Case No. 22 of 2012)**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board ..... Licensee

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	22.09.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The licensee-JSEB through a letter has informed that the problem of burning of transformers of the town has been taken care of and now the power supply is normal. Taking into consideration the reply of the licensee and having noticed considerably improvement in the supply of power, this proceeding is dropped.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING (Case No. 23 of 2012)

M/s Krishana Fuels..... Petitioner  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
02	13.10.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. M.S.Mittal, Senior Advocate, Mr. Nitin Pasari, advocate and Mrs. Shilpi John, Advocate are present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel, JSEB) and Mr. Ashok Kumar Sinha, EEE/S/Chaibasa are present for the respondents.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer for the petitioner argued that the licensee-JSEB, the respondent in this case has misinterpreted the tariff order as well as the agreement executed between the petitioner and the respondent; and that is the reason the petitioner has filed the petition in this Commission. The learned lawyer also argued that there is apprehension of arrest of the petitioner in a proceeding pending before the Certificate Officer and as such stay of the proceeding of the Certificate Court till the next date be granted. The respondent has not filed the reply though one month has passed. The Learned Lawyer for the petitioner also points out that according to agreement and tariff order, the JSEB, the respondent if at all, is</p>	

entitled to receive some dues is around 3,50,000/-(three lakhs fifty thousand).

After hearing two sides, we feel that the petitioner should deposit Rs. 3,50,000/- (three lakhs fifty thousand) within a week from today. The respondent will file the reply to the petition by 26<sup>th</sup> October, 2012 and also serve a copy to the petitioner.

Put up this case on 03.11.2012 at 11.30 AM.

Till then the proceedings of the Certificate Court is stayed.

Member (Engg.)

Chairperson

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 21 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	13.10.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB is present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The interim petition is filed on behalf of the petitioner. The Learned Lawyer requested for time to argue the review petition.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 03.11.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
05	13.10.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Piyush Poddar, Advocate, Mr. B.K.Singh, Usha Martin and Mr. N.K.Patodia, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB, is present for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Learned Lawyer for the respondent JSEB is requested for short adjournment to the argue the case.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 29.10.2012 at 4.30 PM. for arguments. It is clarified that this is the last opportunity given to JSEB to argue the case failing which the proceeding will be here exparte.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 18 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
06	13.10.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate and Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate, Mr. B.K. Singh and Mr. N.K.Patodia, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB is present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard two sides.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Both sides agreed that the petitioner under consideration be disposed of in the light of order of the Hon'ble High Court of Jharkhand at Ranchi pronounced in WP(C)No. 1091 of 2006, M/s Perfect Electric Concern Ltd. Vrs. Jharkhand State Electricity Board &amp; ors. The petition is disposed accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The interest will be payable at RBI rate with effect from 10.06.2003. The respondent JSEB will calculate the interest accordingly and either adjust that amount in future energy bills or refund the access amount to the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 17 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
06	13.10.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate and Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate, Mr. N.K.Patodia, Usha Martin and Mr. B.K.Singh are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB is present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The learned lawyer for the respondent requested for short adjournment as their senior lawyer is out of station for urgent work. The respondent has also filed a petition to this effect.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 29.10.2012 at 4.30 PM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 17 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	29.10.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr. M.S. Mittal, Senior Advocate, Ms. Shilpi John, Advocate, Mr. N.K.Patodia and Mr. B.K.Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate Sr. Standing Counsel, JSEB, Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Mr. Navin Kumar, Advocate are present for the respondent.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Heard the arguments of the two sides.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Judgment reserved.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
06	29.10.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Birendra Poddar, Advocate, Piyush Poddar, Advocate, Mr. B.K.Singh, Usha Martin and Mr. N.K.Patodia, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate, Sr. Standing Counsel, JSEB, Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB, and Mr. Navin Kumar, Advocate, Addl. Counsel, JSEB are present for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Both the sides have requested for short adjournment.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Request allowed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 24.11.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 20 of 2012**

M/s Khalari Cements Limited..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC)..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	03.11.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, Advocate is present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh, Advocate is present for DVC.</p> <p>Counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the respondent DVC. The petitioner has asked for time to file a reply to the counter affidavit of DVC.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put up the case on 24.11.2012 at 04.30 P.M.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 21 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	03.11.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate Sr. Standing Counsel, JSEB, Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB, Mr. Sartaj Quraisi, AEE (C&amp;R) Electric Supply Circle, Hazaribagh and Mr. Praveen Akhauri, Advocate (Standing Counsel, JSEB) are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Learned Lawyer for the petitioner has requested for some time to argue the case.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 24.11.2012 at 04.30 PM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 24 of 2012**

M/s Laxmi Business & Cement Co. (P) Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	03.11.2012.	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, Advocate is present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate Sr. Standing Counsel, JSEB, Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB , Mr. Sartaj Quraishi, AEE (C&amp;R) Electric Supply Circle, Hazaribagh and Mr. Praveen Akhauri, Advocate (Standing Counsel, JSEB) are present for the respondent.</p> <p>Counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent- JSEB the petitioner has requested for time to file a reply to the counter affidavit of the respondent and requested for adjournment.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted till on 18.01.2013 at 04.30 PM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 25 of 2012**

M/s Laxmi Ispat Udyog ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	03.11.2012.	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, Advocate is present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate Sr. Standing Counsel, JSEB, Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB , Mr. Sartaj Quraisi, AEE (C&amp;R) Electric Supply Circle, Hazaribagh and Mr. Praveen Akhauri, Advocate (Standing Counsel, JSEB) are present for the respondent.</p> <p>Counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent- JSEB the petitioner has requested for time to file a reply to the counter affidavit of the respondent and requested for adjournment.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted till on 18.01.2013 at 04.30 PM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING  
(Case No. 23 of 2012)**

M/s Krishana Fuels..... Petitioner

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	03.11.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mrs. Shilpi John, Advocate is present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate (Sr. Standing Counsel) Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel, JSEB), Mr. Praveen Akhauri, Advocate, Standing Counsel, JSEB and Mr. Ashok Kumar Sinha, EEE/S/ Chaibasa are present for the respondents.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer of the petitioner asked for two weeks time as their senior counsel is out of station for some urgent work. The petitioner also requested for stay of the certificate proceeding till the next date. The respondent dose not have any objection.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>The stay is extended against the proceeding of the Certificate Court is extended till next date.</p> <p>Put up this case on 18.01.2013 at 04.30 PM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (Engg.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
17	03.11.2012	<p>Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh is present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate, Sr. Standing Counsel, Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel), JSEB, Mr. Sartaj Quraishi, AEE (C&amp;R) Electric Supply Circle, Hazaribagh and Mr. Praveen Akhauri, Advocate (Standing Counsel, JSEB) are present for the respondents.</p> <p>A petition is filed on behalf of M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited asked for an adjournment as their lawyer is out of Station for some urgent work.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 12.12.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 41 of 2011**

Dhananjay Shukla ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board. .... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
12	13.10.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Addl. Counsel, JSEB, Mr. Pankaj Kumar, JEE, Daltonganj are present for JSEB.</p> <p>Shri Dhananjay Shukla is present for the petitioner.</p> <p>Shri Shukla said that the three-phase line has not been completed by the given one month is period. Mr. Pankaj Kumar requested to allow 15 to 20 days for the completion of the three-phase line. JSEB was asked to file an affidavit in this regard to complete the three-phase line within one month is time.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put up for the next hearing on 01.12.2012 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 15 of 2012**

Jamshedpur Utilities & Services Co. Ltd. (JUSCO) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	12.10.2012	Due to pre-occupation the order is not ready. Put up on 06.11.2012 for orders  Member (E) <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 15 of 2012**

Jamshedpur Utilities & Services Co. Ltd. (JUSCO)                      .....                      Petitioner

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
06	06.11.2012	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>ORDER</u></b></p> <p>The petitioner, Jamshedpur Utilities and Services Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the petitioner or JUSCO) has filed a review petition Under Section 94 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 36 of Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations 2011. The review petition has been filed against the tariff order for FY 2012-13 dated 15.06.2012 on the following two counts:-</p> <p><b>A. NON INCLUSION OF SURCHARGE ON ELECTRICITY DUTY.</b></p> <p><b>B. ASSESSABLE INCOME FOR COMPUTATION OF INCOME TAX FOR FY 2010-11.</b></p> <p>The petitioner was heard at length and the case was fixed for orders. Because of pre-occupation with certain other urgent matters, the order could not be passed earlier.</p> <p>Coming to the issues raised for review, as mentioned</p>	

earlier, only two issues have been raised which we will discuss one by one in the following paragraphs:-

**A. NON INCLUSION OF SURCHARGE ON ELECTRICITY DUTY:-**

The petitioner has submitted that for the FY 2010-11 surcharge on electricity duty amounting to Rs. 36.48 lakh has been paid by it and was included under the Power Purchase Cost in its Audited Accounts on the advice of the statutory Auditor. The petitioner explained that earlier surcharge on electricity duty was a part of the A&G expenses. Since, the surcharge of electricity duty has not been allowed under the Power Purchase Cost which has been duly paid, the petitioner prays that this expenditure for the FY 2010-11 be allowed. The petitioner has filed proof of payment as well.

Let us have a look at Para 5.28 of the tariff order of the petitioner for the FY 2012-13 which is reproduced below:

*5.28 Further, as the petitioner has not submitted details of Electricity Duty separately, the Commission has not approved any amount under this head for FY 2010-11. Also Electricity Duty for power sector has been discontinued by State Government with effect from July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011; thus no liability would arise in future under this head.*

A perusal of the aforesaid para makes it clear that the petitioner has not submitted the details of the surcharge of electricity duty separately and as such it was not approved by

the Commission.

Now the petitioner explains that on the advice of the auditor they had included the surcharge on electricity duty in the Power Purchase Cost and not under the A&G expenses.

Be as it may, from the tariff order, it is clear that the surcharge on electricity duty for the FY 2010-11 was not allowed by the Commission for want of details. Since, now the petitioner has filed the proof of payment of surcharge on electricity duty, the Commission allows the same which comes to Rs. 36.48 lakhs. The petitioner is directed to reflect this amount in its ARR while filing the next tariff petition.

**B. ASSESSABLE INCOME FOR COMPUTATION OF INCOME TAX FOR THE FY 2010-11:**

The petitioner has submitted that it is a Public Limited Company registered under the Companies Act, 1956 and maintains the accounts as per the Company Law. The petitioner submitted that the Audited Accounts for JUSCO as a whole for the FY 2010-11 had negative profit before tax and based on which the Commission has not considered any income tax liability for the Power Business Division of the petitioner for the FY 2010-11. The petitioner submitted that the assessable income for computation of income tax is based on the provisions of the Income Tax Act and not on the basis of Company Law Accounts. According to the petitioner, it has assessable income for income tax purposes for the FY 2010-11

which works out to Rs. 6.30 crores. The petitioner pointed out that it has paid already Rs. 9.30 crores as income tax for its whole business for the FY 2010-11. The petitioner claims that Power Business Division is liable for income tax and the share of the Power Business Division comes to Rs. 1.87 for the period under reference.

Here it is relevant to refer to the tariff order for the petitioner for the FY 2012-13 in which the income tax liability of the petitioner has been considered. Para 5.68 of the aforesaid tariff order is reproduce below:-

*5.68 The Commission in previous Tariff Order had approved normative income tax for the petitioner for FY 2009-10 as the audited accounts for the whole business of JUSCO for FY 2009-10 showed a positive Profit Before Tax (PBT). However in FY 2010-11, the audited accounts of the whole business of JUSCO for FY 2010-11 show a negative profit Before Tax (PBT) for the company. Thus the Commission is of the view that as the whole business of JUSCO has a negative PBT, there is no assessable income for computation of Income Tax during FY 2010-11. accordingly for FY 2010-11, the Commission has not considered any income tax for the Petitioner as there is no income tax liability ascertained for whole business of JUSCO. However, in case any income tax is actually paid by the Petitioner pertaining to FY 2010-11 in future years, the*

*Commission would allow as per the actual amount based on the supporting documents submitted by the Petitioner for the same.*

A perusal of the aforesaid Para shows that at the time of issuing tariff order for the FY 2012-13, the Commission had come to the conclusion that there is no income tax liability of the petitioner for the FY 2010-11.

But the petitioner, as stated earlier, claims that it has Assessable Income for the aforesaid financial year and the share of the Power Business Division as income tax comes to Rs. 1.87 crores.

Let us examine the information submitted by the petitioner.

A perusal of the information submitted by the petitioner shows that an amount of Rs. 34.11 crores has been added back in the FY 2010-11 as “Unpaid provisions”. This unpaid provisions include leave salary, bonus, gratuity and superannuation fund. The petitioner claims that the amount of Rs. 34.11 crores which was to be paid for the said liabilities in FY 2010-11 could not be paid in that year and as such, has been added back in the FY 2010-11. The petitioner has not explained or clarified as to when there were provision for payment of the liabilities under consideration for the FY 2010-11, why these were not paid in that year. Secondly, if these were not paid in that year, then according to Accounting

Principles, these should have been carried forward to the next financial year i.e. 2011-12 instead of adding back in the year 2010-11. The Commission is not convinced about the methodology adopted by the petitioner and there is no logical explanation from the petitioner on adding back the amount of Rs. 34.11 crores in the year 2010-11. Had this amount been paid in FY 2010-11, the petitioner would have got a negative income of Rs.3.19 crores for the income tax purposes.

Another Rs. 13.61 crores has also been added back to the book losses in the FY 2010-11 by the petitioner. This amount relates to unpaid amount of other items under section 28 to 44 DA including warranty provision, provision for loss under AS-7 and provisions for IDT and LD. Since these items do not pertain to the Power Business Division specifically, these cannot be considered while allocating income tax liability of the regulated business of the petitioner.

In view of the aforesaid discussion, the Commission finds no reason for approving normative income tax for the FY 2010-11 for the regulated business of the petitioner and rejects the plea of the petitioner on this count.

The petition is accordingly disposed of.

Sd/-  
Member (E)

Sd/-  
Chairperson

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 16 of 2012**

Tata Steel Ltd. (TSL) ..... Petitioner

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
06	09.11.2012	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>ORDER</u></b></p> <p>The petitioner, Tata Steel Limited, Jamshedpur has filed a review petition under Section 94 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 36 of the Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations 2011 for review of JSERC Tariff Order for the petitioner for FY 2012-13 dated 15<sup>th</sup> June, 2012 on the following three counts:-</p> <p><b>A. RPO OBLIGATION FOR FY 2011-12.</b></p> <p><b>B. ASSESSABLE INCOME FOR COMPUTATION OF INCOME TAX FOR FY 2010-11.</b></p> <p><b>C. CARRYING COST OF REVENUE GAP FOR FY 2010-11.</b></p> <p>The petitioner was heard.</p> <p>Since the issue of RPO Obligation is related to M/s. JUSCO, another distributions licensee as well, they were also noticed who joined the proceedings.</p> <p>Let us discuss the issues raised in the review petition under consideration.</p>	



**A. RPO OBLIGATION FOR FY 2011-12:-**

The petitioner has submitted that the Commission while calculating Renewable Purchase Obligations for FY 2011-12 in the tariff order for the FY 2012-13 has erred by taking energy input as per Tariff Order for FY 2011-12 rather than considering revised approved energy input for the FY 2011-12 in ARR. The petitioner has pointed out that total power purchase of the Tata Steel Ltd includes purchase of power for their JUSCO licenced area as well. It is pointed out by the petitioner that the TSL and JUSCO have separate licenced areas and thus have separate RPO Obligations. According to the petitioner, there is duplicacy in the RPO obligations because of the methodology adopted by the Commission. The petitioner requested that the Commission should consider the net input energy for Tata Steel Ltd. by the reducing energy purchased for JUSCO.

From the Tariff Order for the petitioner for FY 2012-13, it transpires that the Commission has taken total energy requirements of the petitioner including the power sold to JUSCO. It is also clear from the JUSCO Tariff Order that on the power purchased by JUSCO from TSL, the Commission has again worked out RPO on that power. The Commission feels that there is duplication in RPO obligation calculations and to that extent the plea of the petitioner is correct.

Now the question is whether the power sold to JUSCO by Tata Steel Ltd should be reduced from the power requirement of the petitioner and then RPO obligation worked out or alternatively the power purchased by JUSCO from TSL be exempted from the RPO obligations.

Here, it would be relevant to refer to the definition of obligated entity. Regulation A2 Clause 2.1(j) of the JSERC(Renewable Purchase Obligation and its Compliance) Regulation 2010 defines obligated entity is under:

***“Obligated entity” Means the distribution licensee, consumer owning the captive power plants and open access consumer in the state of Jharkhand, who have to mandatorily fulfil renewable purchase obligation under these Regulations.***

It is an admitted fact that the petitioner TSL is a Distribution Licensee and as such on obligated entity.

Regulations 5.1 mandates that the minimum percentage of Renewable Purchase Obligation as specified in Clause 5.2 of these Regulations shall be applicable to all Distribution Licensees in the State.....

Regulation 5.2 of the aforesaid Regulation says that every obligated entity shall purchase electricity (in Kwh) from Renewable Energy Sources. It prescribes the minimum percentage of the total consumption of its consumers including T&D losses during a year.

A simple reading of the aforesaid Regulation 5.1 and 5.2 makes it clear that the petitioner has been mandate under these Regulations to purchase Renewable Energy on the total consumption of its consumers including T&D losses during a year. Obviously, the power sold to JUSCO by the TSL is included in the total energy requirements of the petitioner and as such Renewable Energy Obligation will apply on the total energy consumed by the petitioner. So, in view of this, simply because some power has been sold to JUSCO, the RPO Obligation of the petitioner will be reduced is not the correct interpretation of the relevant regulation. The Commission feels that the total energy consumed by the petitioner including that sold to JUSCO has been rightly taken into consideration while calculating the RPO requirements for the petitioner and as such, the plea of the petitioner on this count is rejected.

As stated earlier, the Commission agrees that there is an element of duplication in RPO obligation calculations of the TSL vis-a-vis the JUSCO and this has to be corrected. In Commission's view, the power purchased by the JUSCO from the Petitioner TSL should be exempted from the RPO obligation, because that power has already been accounted for in the energy consumption of the petitioner. So the petitioner as well as the JUSCO, while filing the next tariff petition, will keep this aspect in mind and correct their ARR accordingly.

**B. ASSESSABLE INCOME FOR COMPUTATION OF INCOME TAX FOR FY 2010-11:**

The petitioner has pointed out that the profit before tax of Power Business Division is negative due to uncovered revenue gap of Rs. 16.39 crores for FY 2010-11 as approved by the Commission. It has been added that if the gap had been approved in the same year to be recovered, the revenue would have been higher and would have resulted in positive PBT for its power business. The petitioner adds that computation of tax should be done on regulatory profits rather than comparing with book profits. It is also submitted that if the final revenue gap for the FY 2010-11 is allowed to be recovered in the FY 2012-13, the profits to that extent will go up and resultant tax liability will also go up. The petitioner points out that it would not be able to recover this tax component in FY 2012-13 as the tariff regulation 2010 would allow return on equity directly grossed up by tax rate for the subsequent year. In view of this, petitioner has prayed that income amounting to Rs. 5.67 crores to be allowed for the FY 2010-11.

Let us examine the averments and submissions of the petitioner. First of all, we refer to the tariff order for the petitioner for FY 2012-13 to which the petitioner has also referred too. On page 36 of the said tariff order under the income tax, the petitioner's submissions and the Commission's analysis is given which is reproduced:-

***Income Tax***

***Petitioner's Submission***

***5.59 The petitioner submitted that it has calculated income tax in accordance with the methodology adopted by the Commission in its previous Tariff Orders. The corporate tax rate has been taken as 33.22% for FY 2010-11 and the income tax has been proposed at Rs.5.84 Cr.***

***Commission's Analysis:***

***5.60 During the technical validation and analysis of the Audited Accounts for FY 2010-11 for both Tata Steel and its Power Business Division for assessing the actual tax paid by the Company during FY 2010-11, the Commission observed that even though the Profit Before Tax (PBT) of Tata Steel is positive, the PBT for the Power Business Division is negative. In such a case, the Commission finds no merit in allocating the Income tax liability of Tata Steel, to the Power Business Division during FY 2010-11. Accordingly, the Commission has not allowed any income tax for FY 2010-11 to the Petitioner.***

A perusal of the analysis done by the Commission at the time of preparation of the tariff order shows that the Power Business Division of the petitioner had negative PBT for the FY 2010-11 and as such no provisions was made for the income tax.

The petitioner submits that the PBT is negative for its

regulated business due to approved revenue gap by the Commission for the FY 2010-11 of Rs. 16.39 crores. It is also stated that if this gap had been allowed to be recovered during the FY 2011-12, the petitioner's Power Business Division would have a regulatory profit before tax of Rs. 11.27 crores for FY 2011-12 and accordingly the tax liability for FY 2010-11 would be Rs. 5.67 crores.

As per the tariff order of the petitioner for FY 2012-13 the revenue gap comes to Rs. 16.39 crores. The FY 2010-11 has been finally tried up after receipt of the Audited Accounts in the Tariff Order for the FY 2012-13. Only the Audited Accounts can give a true picture of accounts. Since in the Tariff Order for FY 2012-13, there is a revenue gap, in Commission's view no income tax liability arises. Moreover, the petitioner's plea is based on preemption and cannot be accepted. The Commission is guided by the regulatory accounts. And as has been analysed in 11 paragraphs of the Tariff Order, which has been reproduced earlier, the Commission feels that PBT for Power Business Division for the FY 2010-11 is negative. Therefore, the plea to allow PBT is rejected.

**C. CARRYING COST OF REVENUE GAP FOR FY 2010-11.**

The tariff order for the FY 2010-11 of the petitioner issued by the Commission shows a revenue surplus of Rs. 24.24 crores. The tariff order for the FY 2011-12 also shows

the surplus of Rs. 57.23 crores for the FY 2011-12. The surpluses are carried forward to the FY 2012-13 to be adjusted against likely revenue gap. Tariff was not reduced in the FY 2010-11 and 2011-12 despite the surpluses because the Commission was waiting for Audited Accounts. When Audited Accounts have come for the FY 2010-11, final true up has been done. The tariff order of the petitioner for FY 2011-12 shows a surplus of Rs. 57.23 crores for the FY 2011-12. Tariff order of the petitioner for the FY 2010-11 shows surplus of Rs. 24.24 crores. Whatever overall revenue gap was found by the Commission as per the tariff order for the FY 2012-13 has been made up through increase in tariff. No regulatory assets were created by the Commission in the FY 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2012-13 and as such the question of allowing carrying cost does arise. The plea for allowing carrying cost is also rejected.

The review petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-  
Member (E)

Sd/-  
Chairperson

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 16 of 2012**

Tata Steel Ltd. (TSL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	12.10.2012	Due to pre-occupation the order is not ready. Put up on 09.11.2012 for orders.  Member (E) <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 12 of 2012**

Tata Power Company Ltd. (TPCL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	22.09.2012	Due to pre-occupation the order is not ready. Order is reserved.  Sd/- Member (E)	Sd/- Chairperson

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 09 of 2011**

Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
11	22.11.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The Provisional Tariff Order for the Petitioner –DVC on Annual Revenue Requirement and Determination of Retail Tariffs for Jharkhand Area for the Financial Year 2012-13 has been prepared and signed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let the aforesaid tariff order be issued and uploaded on the website of the Commission as well as a copy of the same be sent to the Petitioner-DVC. Further, sufficient number of copies of the Tariff Order of the DVC be got printed and sent to all the SERCs and CERC.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	24.11.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Biren Poddar, Advocate, Ms. Darshana Poddar Mishra, Advocate, Mr. B.K.Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB, Mr. S.C. Mirshar, Chief Engineer (C&amp;R), JSEB, Mr. Praveen Kumar, Advocate, Addl. Counsel, JSEB, Mr. Umesh Prasad, Mr. Rakesh Sinha and Mr. S.K. Kashyap, EEE/S/Ranchi are present for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram has requested for short adjournment because of their Senior Advocate is out of station.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 08.12.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member (E) <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 20 of 2012**

M/s Khalari Cements Limited..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC)..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	24.11.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, Advocate is present for the petitioner-M/s Khalari Cements Limited.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh is present for the respondent-DVC.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The petitioner has filed time petition for short adjournment</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 22.12.2012 at 11.30 A.M.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member (E) <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 21 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
05	24.11.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB, is present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Learned Lawyer for the petitioner has requested for time because of their Senior Advocate is out of Station.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 22.12.2012 at 11.30 A.M.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member (E) <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS  
Suo-Motu Case No. 12 of 2011**

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
	29.11.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">The final order in this suo-moto proceeding has been passed separately and kept in the record. Let the order be uploaded on the website of the Commission. Also sent a copy of the order to the JSEB-the licensee.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 28 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	01.12.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Praveen Akhauri, Advocate (Standing Counsel), JSEB, Mr.Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB, Mr. Jugal Prasad, ESE/ Comml &amp; Rev., JSEB, Ranchi , Mr. Mukul Kumar, AEE (Comml.), JSEB, Mr. Pankaj Kumar Goinka, Mr. Nitish Kumar Singh, AEE, Daltonganj (Rural) are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Learned Lawyer for the petitioner requested one month's time to argue the matter.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Time granted.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 23.02.2013 at 11.30 A.M.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 41 of 2011

Dhananjay Shukla ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board. .... Respondent

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
13	01.12.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Praveen Akhauri, Advocate (Standing Counsel), JSEB, Mr.Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB, Mr. Jugal Prasad, ESE/ Comml &amp; Rev., JSEB, Ranchi , Mr. Mukul Kumar, AEE (Comml.), JSEB, Mr. Pankaj Kumar Goinka, Mr. Nitish Kumar Singh, AEE, Daltonganj (Rural) are present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mr. Dhananjay Shukla for the petitioner has submitted a request letter before the Commission for not being present today because he is out of State for personal work.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer for the JSEB has submitted an affidavit for the completion of three phase line for agricultural connections in the village of Khairant, Lesliganj.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">One month time given for cross check on the matter.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 23.02.2013 at 11.30 A.M.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
08	08.12.2012	<p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Piyush Poddar, Advocate is present for the petitioner-M/s Usha Martin Limited.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB is present for the respondents-JSEB.</p> <p>Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram has informed that the issue is under process and requested for short adjournment.</p> <p>Time granted.</p> <p>Put up the case on 22.12.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 29 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Licensee

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	08.12.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Mr. Jugal Prasad, ESE/Comml.&amp; Rev. is present for the Petitioner-JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As per the report received from the JSEB the matter is posted for orders on 12.12.2012 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDING

### Case No. 01 of 2012

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
18	12.12.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Biren Poddar Ms.Darshana Poddar Mirshra and Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh, Executive are present for the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel), JSEB, Mr. Sartaj Quraisi, AEE (C&amp;R) Electric Supply Circle, Hazaribagh are present for the respondents.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer for the petitioner through a petition filed in the Commission has reported that as per direction, the petitioner has deposited a sum of Rs. 5 lakh on 8<sup>th</sup> Dec, 2012. The Learned Lawyer for the licensee-JSEB pointed out in writing that the JSEB officials went to reconnect the connection of the petitioner but the petitioner pointed out that his premises are under renovation and asked for some time for reconnection.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In view of this, the Commission feels that once the premises are ready for reconnection, the petitioner will approach the concerned officials of the JSEB to get the work</p>	

done.

Meanwhile, the two Chartered Accountants are also expected to complete the calculations of dues/no dues in compliance of the implementation of the CGRF/Ombudsman orders.

Put up this case on 23.02.2013 at 11.30 AM

Sd/-  
Member (E)

Sd/-  
Chairperson

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 29 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Licensee

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	12.12.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Kumar Sundaram, Advocate (Addl. Counsel) JSEB and Mr. Jugal Prasad, ESE/Comml.&amp; Rev. are present on behalf of the Licencee-JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Commission is glad to note that the strike called of at the direction of the Hon'ble Jharkhand High Cout, Ranchi and power was restored.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Now the power supply is normal. The Commission feels that the Licencee-JSEB will take all remedial measures so that such incidents are not repeated in future.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">With this, the proceeding is disposed of.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Member (E)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sd/- Chairperson</p>	

# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi

## FORM OF PROCEEDINGS

### Case No. 18 of 2011

Jharkhand State Electricity Board ..... Petitioners

**With**

### Case No. 26 of 2010

M/s Jharkhand Small Industries Association ..... Petitioners

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Others ..... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
14	14. 12.2012	<p>The record is put up today.</p> <p>It seems the record got misplaced after 05.05.2012. Last order sheet shows that 30 days notice was published in the newspapers inviting comments/suggestions. No comments /suggestions have come.</p> <p>A perusal of the petition says that the JSIA is seeking some amendments in Electric Supply Code. Similarly in Case No. 18 of 2011, JSEB is also seeking some other amendments in the Electricity Supply Code. The work of comprehensive revision of the JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations is already on. Two meetings of the State Advisory Committee have considered the new draft Regulations.</p> <p>Now the public hearing will take place. These two petitions should also be considered at the time of public hearing so that the issues raised in the two case record i.e. Case No. 18 of 2011 and Case No. 26 of 2010 are also taken into consideration.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up this case on 17.03.2013 at 11.30 AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Member <span style="float: right;">Chairperson</span></p>	

--	--	--	--

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
09	22.12.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Bireen Poddar, Advocate, Mr. Piyush Poddar, Advocate, Mr. N.K. Patodia, Usha Martin and B.K. Singh, Usha Martin are present for the petitioner-M/s Usha Martin Limited.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Praveen Akhauri, Advocate (Standing. Counsel) JSEB is present for the respondents-JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Praveen Akhauri has submitted a letter and the letter is recorded. Due to lack of Quoram, the case has been adjourned to 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2013. The parties may be informed accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 23.03.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member (E)</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 21 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors.        .....        .....        Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
06	22.12.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Praveen Akhauri, Advocate (Standing. Counsel) JSEB, is present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of Quoram, the case has been adjourned to 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2013. The parties may be informed accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 02.03.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 20 of 2012**

M/s Khalari Cements Limited..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC)..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	22.12.2012	<p style="text-align: center;">Learned Lawyer Mr. Praveen Akhauri, Advocate (Standing. Counsel) JSEB, is present for the JSEB.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of Quoram, the case has been adjourned to 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2013. The parties may be informed accordingly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 02.03.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 24 of 2012**

M/s. Lazxmi Business & Cement Co. (P) Limited..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	02.01.2013	<p>The Commission has posted the Case on 18.01.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p>As per the Govt. orders the 18.01.2013 is a Public Holiday and also due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 16.02.2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p>Put up the case on 16.02.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 23 of 2012**

M/s Krishana Fuesl ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
04	02.01.2013.	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 18.01.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As per the Govt. orders the 18.01.2013 is a Public Holiday and also due to lack of quorum, the case has been adjourned to 16.02.2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 16.02.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 25 of 2012**

M/s Laxmi Ispat Udyog ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

Sl.No.	Date of proceeding	Proceedings of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
03	02.01.2013.	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 18.01.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As per the Govt. orders the 18.01.2013 is a Public Holiday and also due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 16.02.2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 16.02.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/ Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 24 of 2012**

M/s. Lazxmi Business & Cement Co. (P) Limited..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	02.02.2013	<p>The Commission has posted the Case on 16.02.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p>Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjorned to 16.03.2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p>Put up the case on 16.03.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 23 of 2012**

M/s Krishana Fuesl ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	02.02.2013.	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 16.02.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 16.03.2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 16.03.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 25 of 2012**

M/s Laxmi Ispat Udyog ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	02.02.2013.	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 16.02.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 16.03.2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 16.03.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 30 of 2012**

M/s Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	21.02.2013.	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 23.02.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 30.03.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 28 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	21.02.2013.	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 23.02.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 30.03.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 41 of 2011**

Dhananjay Shukla ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board. .... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
14	21.02.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 23.02.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 30.03.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
19	21.02.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 23.02.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 30.03.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 21 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors.       .....       .....       Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	21.02.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 02.03.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 6<sup>th</sup> April, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 06.04.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 20 of 2012**

M/s Khalari Cements Limited..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC)..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
06	21.02.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 02.03.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 6<sup>th</sup> April, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 06.04.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 34 of 2012**

Tata Steel Limited (TSL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	21.02.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 02.03.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 6<sup>th</sup> April, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 06.04.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors .....Respdents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
11	21.03.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 13.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As per the Govt. orders the 13.04.2013 is a public holiday. Hence, the Case has been posted to 27.04.2013 at 11.30 A.M at JSERC Office</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 27.04.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 25 of 2012**

M/s Laxmi Ispat Udyog ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors .....Respdents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
06.	21.03.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 13.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As per the Govt. orders the 13.04.2013 is a public holiday. Hence, the Case has been posted to 27.04.2013 at 11.30 A.M at JSERC Office</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 27.04.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 23 of 2012**

M/s Krishna Fuel ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07.	21.03.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 13.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As per the Govt. orders the 13.04.2013 is a public holiday. Hence, the Case has been posted to 27.04.2013 at 11.30 A.M at JSERC Office</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 27.04.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 24 of 2012**

M/s Laxmi Business & Cement Co. (P) Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
06.	21.03.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 13.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As per the Govt. orders the 13.04.2013 is a public holiday. Hence, the Case has been posted to 27.04.2013 at 11.30 A.M at JSERC Office</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 27.04.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 20 of 2012**

M/s Khalari Cements Limited..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07.	04.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 06.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 27.04.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 21 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
08.	04.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 06.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 27.04.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Case No. 34 of 2012**

Tata Steel Limited (TSL) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03.	04.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 06.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 27.04.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 41 of 2011**

Dhananjay Shukla..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board..... Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
16	15.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 20.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 11.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
21	15.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 20.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quorum, the case has been adjourned to 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 11.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 28 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05.	15.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 20.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 11.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 30 of 2012**

M/s Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) ..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	15.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 20.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 11.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
12	22.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 27.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjorned to 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 17.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 20 of 2012**

M/s Khalari Cements Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
08	22.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 27.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 17.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 21 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors.

.....

Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
09	22.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 27.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 17.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING  
Case No. 23 of 2012**

M/s Krishna Fuel ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
08	22.04.2013	<p>The Commission has posted the Case on 27.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p>Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p>Put up the case on 17.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 25 of 2012**

M/s Laxmi Ispat Udyog

.....

Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. ....

Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	22.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 27.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quorum, the case has been adjourned to 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 17.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 24 of 2012**

M/s Laxmi Business & Cement Co. (P) Ltd. .... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
07	22.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 27.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 17.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 34 of 2012**

Tata Steel Limited (TSL)

.... ..

Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
04	22.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 27.04.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 17.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 41 of 2011**

Dhananjay Shukla

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board

.... ..

Petitioner

.... ..Respondent

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
17	06.05.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 11.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quorum, the case has been adjourned to 08<sup>th</sup> June , 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 08.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 30 of 2012**

M/s Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC)

.....

Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	06.05.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 11.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 08<sup>th</sup> June , 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 08.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 28 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board (JSEB)

.....

Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
06	06.05.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 11.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 08<sup>th</sup> June , 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 08.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 01 of 2012**

M/s Rishi Cement Company Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
22	06.05.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 11.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjorned to 08<sup>th</sup> June , 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 08.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 04 of 2013**

Tata Steel Limited

..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	15.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 20<sup>th</sup> April,2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjorned to 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 11.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 05 of 2013**

Sri Ram Steels ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
02	27.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 27<sup>th</sup> April,2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjorned to 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 17.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 04 of 2013**

Tata Steel Limited (TSL)

..... Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	27.04.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 11<sup>h</sup> May ,2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 29<sup>th</sup> May, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 29.05.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	



**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 19 of 2012**

M/s Usha Martin Limited ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
13	13.05.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 17.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 14.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 20 of 2012**

M/s Khalari Cements Limited ..... Petitioner

Vrs.

Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
09	13.05.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 17.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 15<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 15.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 21 of 2012**

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors.

.....

Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
10	13.05.2013	<p>The Commission has posted the Case on 17.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p>Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 15<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p>Put up the case on 15.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING  
Case No. 23 of 2012**

M/s Krishna Fuel

.....

Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. ....

Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
09	13.05.2013	<p>The Commission has posted the Case on 17.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p>Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p>Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p>Put up the case on 14.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 25 of 2012**

M/s Laxmi Ispat Udyog

.....

Petitioner

Vrs.

Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. ....

Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
08	13.05.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 17.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 14.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 24 of 2012**

M/s Laxmi Business & Cement Co. (P) Ltd. .... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors. .... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
08	13.05.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 17.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 14.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 34 of 2012**

Tata Steel Limited (TSL)

.... ..

Petitioner

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
05	13.05.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 17.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 15<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 15.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	

**Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission  
Ranchi**

**FORM OF PROCEEDING**

**Case No. 05 of 2013**

Sri Ram Steels ..... Petitioner  
Vrs.  
Jharkhand State Electricity Board & Ors ..... Respondents

<b>Sl.No.</b>	<b>Date of proceeding</b>	<b>Proceedings of the Commission with signature</b>	<b>Office action taken with date</b>
1	2	3	4
03	13.05.2013	<p style="text-align: center;">The Commission has posted the Case on 17.05.2013 for further hearing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Due to lack of quoram, the case has been adjourned to 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 at JSERC Office.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Let a copy of this order be sent to the parties.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Put up the case on 14.06.2013 at 11.30 AM.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Sd/- Member (E)</p>	