

IN THE JHARKHAND STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

AT RANCHI

Case No. 06 of 2025

M/s Priya Stone Mines..... Petitioner

Versus

Jharkhand Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited & Ors..... Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVNEET KUMAR (CHAIRPERSON)
HON'BLE MR. MAHENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (LAW)
HON'BLE MR. ATUL KUMAR, MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rishabh Kaushal, Advocate

For the Respondent : Mr. Manoj Kumar, Sr. Standing Counsel and Mr. Abhijeet
Suman, Advocate.

Date – 30th January, 2026

1. The Petitioner M/s Priya Stone Mines has filed the instant petition under clause 4.7 of the (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015 seeking necessary approval to allow the Petitioner to get fresh electrical connection on total contract demand of 700 KVA applied under H.T.S. category at supply voltage of 33 KV from Respondent- Jharkhand Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited (JBVNL).
2. The prayers of the Petitioner are as under:
 - i. For availing fresh electrical connection from Respondent JBVNL on total contract demand of 700 KVA applied under HTS category at supply voltage of 33 KV.
 - ii. For grant of any other relief or reliefs for the Petitioner is entitled under the facts and circumstances of the instant case.

The factual matrix of the case as submitted by the parties may be appreciated in the following manner:

Submission of the Petitioner

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner's unit is beneficial for local community by & large as this is a labour intensive work and which in turn is generating manifold employment in directly and which will lead to overall economic development of rural areas and in absence of quality power connection, the Petitioner company will be unable to function properly and which will result into lower production of the items.

4. It was submitted that after doing all the necessary statutory requirements like mining lease agreement, environment clearance, CTE, CTO, the Petitioner applied online for getting fresh Electrical Connection on the official website of JBVNL for the contract demand of 700 KVA at 33 KV line and the expected date of issuance of fresh Electrical Connection was 12.02.2025 but the same was rejected by the JBVNL. In this regard an upto date status was uploaded on the official website of JBVNL showing application no. NC37952317 HT rejected on the ground that consumer applied load is eligible for less than 33 KV connection as per the JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015.
5. Learned Counsel submitted that in absence of the high quality power voltage connection, the Petitioner company will face acute problem and its production will suffer a lot and the Petitioner submitted that it will day by day increase its activities and after successful project implementation the contract demand will certainly increase in 1 or 2 years upto 1500 KVA or more.
6. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the project site of the Petitioner company is located in the village of Gumla District having problems of regular quality Electric Supply and since the work of the Petitioner company is highly specialized and technical therefore the company needs uninterrupted power for doing production at plant in climate control conditions and any interruption in power supply will seriously damage the entire plant.
7. Learned Counsel pointed out that the 33 KV line of JBVNL is crossing near to the gate of the proposed project of the Petitioner company and therefore no extra capital investment requires to be made by JBVNL and even the Petitioner company is ready to bear the installation cost for providing power under 33 KV and shall not claim Higher Voltage Rebate from the Respondent JBNVL.
8. Learned Counsel submitted that in the facts of the above said facts, the Respondent JBVNL might not have any difficulty in allowing new HT service connection to the Petitioner at supply voltage of 33 kV for having contract demand of 700 KVA, since 33 KV line is passing in front of the present site of the Petitioner company and within a year or two, the load of the Petitioner company certainly rise beyond the 1500 KVA.

Submission of the Respondent

9. Learned Counsel for the Respondent submitted that the Petitioner has applied for the new service connection of 700 KVA load on 33 KV voltage supply, whereas as per the JSERC Supply Code 2015 regulations, clause 4.3, the lower ceiling for availing the power supply on 33 KV line is 1501 KVA load.

10. Learned Counsel for the Respondent apprised that the present applied load is feasible on 11 kV supply as per the clause 4.3 of the JSERC Supply Code 2015 regulations, whereas in future if the load is increased to a ceiling of 1501 KVA or above, the same will be feasible on 33 KV supply voltage. It was also submitted that the 33 KV feeder line namely 33 KV Chainpur Feeder from Gumla Grid is passing near to the proposed site. If supply on the 33 KV permitted by the Hon'ble Commission, then the required expenditure for energization through the noted 33 KV supply will have to be borne by the Petitioner.
11. Learned Counsel submitted that the Petitioner's proposed connection is approx. 105 Km away from the PSS and the voltage drop is greater than 10% on that point and it is not feasible to give supply on 33 KV line namely 33 KV Chainpur Feeder from Gumla Grid. Further, a grid at Chainpur is under construction, after completion of the Grid at Chainpur, voltage drop will be improved.
12. Learned Counsel in its conclusion submitted that the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief (s) as per existing clause of the Hon'ble JSERC Supply Code Regulations, 2015 and the present case is fit to be dismissed.

Commission Observation and Findings

13. The Commission considered the submission made by the parties and perused the materials available on records.
14. Clause 4.7 of the JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015 reads as under;

“4.7 The Distribution Licensee may, depending upon the technical conditions of the distribution system, give supply at a voltage and phase other than the classification of supply in clause 4.3 of these Regulations, subject to the Commission's approval.”
15. The Commission observed that the Petitioner applied for getting fresh Electrical Connection on the official website of JBVNL for the contract demand of 700 KVA at 33 KV line under HTS category, citing that they require high quality power voltage connection, otherwise the Petitioner's Stone Chips mining company will face acute problem and its production will suffer a lot. The Respondent JBVNL replied that the said connection is not feasible in terms of clause 4.3 of the JSERC Supply Code 2015 regulations, as the lower ceiling for availing the power supply on 33 KV line is 1501 KVA load, whereas Petitioner company has contracted load of 700 KVA only.
16. Further, the Commission also noted that the Petitioner's proposed connection is approx. 105 Km away from the nearest PSS and the voltage drop is greater than

10% at that point and it is not feasible to give supply on 33 KV line namely 33 KV Chainpur Feeder from Gumla Grid.

17. The Commission perused the technical feasibility report and found that the Petitioner is currently connected with the 11 KV feeder named Jairagi from the 33/11 KV Jaigari PSS. The total distance of the premises from the PSS Jaigari is 8KM and voltage regulation of the feeder is 9.2%. Further, the Petitioner on the basis of apprehension only is praying for to be connected in the 33 KV line.

In the result, it is ordered as;

ORDER

18. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the prayers of the Petitioner for availing fresh connection from Respondent, JBVNL, on the connected load of 700 KVA under HTS category at supply voltage of 33 KV is hereby rejected.
19. The Petitioner shall remain connected at the 11 KV line with the current contracted demand of 700 KVA. It is hereby clarified that if the Petitioner in future increases its contracted demand to ceiling of 1501 KVA then may avail 33 KV line connectivity. Further, in any case, if the Petitioner faces the frequent interruption/restriction in power supply at 11 KV voltage or any other power quality issue, the Petitioner is at the liberty to approach the appropriate authority for relief (s).
20. Accordingly, the Petition stands disposed off with aforesaid observations.

Sd/-

Member (T)

Sd/-

Member (L)

Sd/-

Chairperson