# Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission Ranchi <br> Form of Proceedings 

## Case No. 38 of 2023

Steel Authority of India Ltd. $\qquad$ Petitioner
Versus
Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) .......... ............... ........... Respondent

## CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMITAV KR.GUPTA, CHAIRPERSON HON'BLE MR. MAHENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (LAW) HON'BLE MR. ATUL KUMAR, MEMBER (TECH)

For the Petitioner : Mr. Indrajit Sinha and Mr. Saket Upadhyay Advocates.
For the Respondent: Mr. A.K.Mehta, Advocate.

| Sl.No | Date of <br> Proceeding | Proceeding of the Commission with signature <br> Office <br> action <br> taken <br> with <br> date |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6. | 02.04 .2024 | Mr. Indrajit Sinha, learned counsel has appeared for the <br> petitioner. <br> Mr. A.K. Mehta, learned counsel has appeared on behalf of <br> the respondent-DVC. <br> Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that due to <br> inadvertence, there is delay of 43 days in filing the review petition <br> and prayed for condonation of delay. <br> Learned counsel for the respondent submitted that there is <br> no satisfactory explanation for the delay and prays to dismiss the <br> petition in limine. <br> In view of the reasons assigned in the petition the delay |  |


|  |  | review petition is filed on limited question for pointing out the apparent error on record. It is stressed that although corrigendum issued by the Hon'ble Commission was brought on record as annexure in the rejoinder affidavit but it was not considered and discussed in the impugned order dated 12.06.2023. It is canvassed that clause 4.5 of JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015 is an enabling provision and it does not act as a bar for voltage rebate. <br> Both the parties have concluded their arguments. <br> Heard. <br> Order is reserved. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

