

**IN THE JHARKHAND STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION AT  
RANCHI**  
**Case No. 41 of 2025**  
**&**  
**I.A. No. 01 of 2025**

M/S Chanduka Hi-Tech Steel Pvt. Limited.....Petitioner  
Versus  
Jharkhand Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and Ors. .... Respondents

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

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ajit Kumar, Sr. Advocate & Mr. Dhananjay Kr. Pathak, Advocate  
For the Respondents : Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Mr. Mayank Deep & Ms. Shambhavi Singh, Advocates.

**Date – 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2026**

1. The instant petition has been filed by the Petitioner- M/S Chanduka Hi-Tech Steel Pvt. Limited, seeking enforcement of the clause 8.2.3 of the JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015 by the Respondent-JBVNL.
2. The Petitioner in its petition has made following prayers:
  - i. To direct the Respondents to immediately and forthwith grant single point supply to the Petitioner under HTSS tariff at 33KV with a contract demand of 4500 KVA for running its integrated steel industry, in terms of the specific provision stipulated under clause 8.2.3 of the Supply Code Regulation 2015.
  - ii. To direct the Respondents not to insist the Petitioner for taking two separate connections and installation of two separate meters for running its integrated steel units considering the settled provision of single point of supply in one industry as also stipulated under supply code regulation and accordingly amend the load sanction order issued by the Respondents.
  - iii. For passing such order or orders, as the Commission may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

**Submission of the Petitioner**

3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner is a Private Limited Company and has established an integrated steel industry at 6<sup>th</sup> Phase, Industrial area, Adityapur, Jamshedpur. Subsequently, the Petitioner took an electrical connection of 600KVA under HTS tariff bearing consumer No, HJAP-172 for running a rolling mill unit.
4. The Petitioner submitted that considering the competition in the steel industry and finding single rolling mill not economically feasible, the Petitioner dismantled its rolling mill and established an integrated unit of induction furnace as well as rolling mill, having a setup/system of continuous process of manufacturing of hot billets and thereafter angle, flat, bar and rode. Subsequent to establishment of its integrated industrial unit, the Petitioner applied for enhancement of its load from 600KVA to 4500KVA at 33KV supply for running its integrated steel unit in duly prescribed form and also deposited the required fee. All the formalities for application for connection were completed in January, 2024.
5. The Petitioner submitted that the application for sanction and extension of load from 600 KVA to 4500 KVA at 33KV supply voltage under HTSS tariff was

processed by General Manager (Revenue) vide memo no. 578 dated 03.09.2024. Subsequently, the General Manager -cum- Chief Engineer, Jamshedpur vide letter dated 11.09.2024 while sanctioning the load, observed for installation of two separate meters, ignoring the provisions of the regulation.

6. Further, the Petitioner submitted that the Respondents prepared an estimate for extension of 33KV line to the Petitioner and directed to deposit the supervision charge vide letter dated 17.05.2025. The Petitioner complied with all the directives. The Petitioner also submitted the required security deposit of Rs. 4,07,55,000/- (four crore seven lacs and fifty five thousands only).
7. The Petitioner submitted that after installation of all the required electrical elements and obtaining test certificate, the Petitioner informed the Respondent vide letter dated 30.08.2025 about completion of work and requested to energize the power connection of 4500 KVA at 33KV supply voltage to its industrial unit. However, the Respondent made the issue to take two separate power connections and install two separate meters.
8. The Petitioner submitted that after raising objection to the contention of the Respondents, the matter again reached to Nigam Head Quarter. The General Manager (Revenue) vide letter dated 24.09.2025 directed the GM-cum -CE, Jamshedpur to ensure segregation of load of induction furnace and its auxiliary in HTSS tariff, holding the same be deemed as a separate entity and further ordered that the load of the plant shall also be treated as separate unit in HTSS tariff, directing the Petitioner to apply for fresh connection under HTS tariff.
9. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the instance of the Respondents to take two separate connections and install two separate meters in a single industrial unit is against the settled provision of single point supply in any premises as also stipulated under clause 8.2.3 of Supply Code Regulation. Clause 8.2.3 deals with the point of supply and in no uncertain terms it stipulates that power supply can be given in a single point in the premises and its reads as follows: -

**Point of Supply**

**8.2.3** *Subject to clause 5.4 of these Regulations, supply shall normally be given at a single point in the premises at the incoming terminals of switchgear installed by the consumer. The point of supply shall be determined by the Distribution Licensee such that meters and other equipment are always accessible to the Distribution Licensee for inspection without infringing upon the consumer's privacy. All HT & EHT consumers shall provide independent entry to the meter or metering cubical. However, in special cases, the Distribution Licensee may agree to give supply at more than one-point in the consumer's installation on account of the physical layout of the installation and the requirements of the consumer.*

10. The Petitioner submitted that the tariff order 2025-26 for the Respondents issued by the Commission also stipulates about point of supply and it reads as under: -

**Point of Supply**

*The Power supply shall normally be provided at a single point for the entire premises. In certain categories like coal mines power may be supplied at more than one point on the request of consumer subject to technical feasibility. But in such cases metering and billing shall be done separately for each point.*

11. The Petitioner submitted that from the aforesaid provisions it would be amply clear that the Commission also mandates and recognizes single point supply as

standard. There is no separate provision in the regulation or tariff for installation of different meters in a single industrial unit.

12. The Petitioner further submitted that since inception the Respondents had provided single point HTSS connection to the industries having induction furnace with rolling mill and to the best of the knowledge of the Petitioner in all the neighboring states like Bihar, West Bengal & Orissa where integrated steel plants are established, the distribution licensee has provided single point supply and billing through single meter. The supply code regulation of the concerned states also provides for single point supply as has been provided in the Supply Code Regulation issued by this Commission. Furthermore, the Respondents while going beyond the provisions of regulation and the tariff issued by the Commission have sanctioned the extension of load putting a condition for installation of two separate meter in a single industrial premises. Because of the unreasonable condition put by the Respondents even after completing all the necessary formalities including deposit of security deposit, the power could not be energized in the Petitioner's unit.
13. The Petitioner also submitted that they have established the unit with a huge investment by taking financial assistance from Financial institution and thus obligated to pay monthly interest on the same. The industry is in ready to run position, but due to the pre-conditions of double metering put by the Respondents, the Petitioner's establishment is without power. Upon energization of power the Petitioner's unit is going to generate direct and indirect employment of approx. 500 people. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances the Petitioner sought immediate intervention of the Commission.

#### **Submission of the Respondent**

14. The Learned Counsel for the Respondent submitted that the Petitioner M/s Chanduka Hi-Tech Steels Pvt. Ltd., applied for enhancement of its load from 600 KVA at 11 KV to 4500 KVA at 33 KV under the HTSS tariff as part of its integrated steel unit expansion at Adityapur Industrial Area. The application and all required formalities were completed, including the deposit of necessary fees and security money, and obtaining statutory clearance from the Electrical Inspector. The sanction for extension of load was granted by the competent authorities, and terms and conditions for supply were communicated to the Petitioner. These terms included technical and safety requirements in accordance with the Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2015.
15. The Respondent further submitted that the action of the Respondent regarding double metering was not arbitrary, but was strictly as per the JSERC Electricity Supply Code Regulations. This was further supported by internal office orders and communication from the General Manager Revenue, specifically Letter No. 754 dated 24.09.2025, which directed for segregation and metering as required by the said regulations. It was notable that GM-cum-CE, ESA, Jamshedpur upon inspection of the site had observed that since there were two separate transformers each, it reinforced the rationale behind implementing separate metering for each tariff category within the premises.
16. The Respondent submitted that Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission (JSERC) Electricity Supply Code, clause 9.1.8, explicitly provides that if supply is provided by the Distribution Licensee to different categories of consumers in the same premises, separate meters shall be installed for measurement of energy for each such category. This regulatory requirement ensures accurate accounting and billing for different categories and prevents any misuse or cross-utilization of energy across categories. This action substantiates the Revenue Division's position that technical tariff-wise separation, along with independent metering, is essential and in accordance with JSERC's regulations, Clause 9.1.8. The regulatory framework requires

distinct treatment of loads categorized as HTSS and HTS, both in terms of supply arrangement and metering, thus protecting the integrity of the distribution system and ensuring fair revenue realization.

17. Furthermore, it was submitted by the Respondent that by issuance of sanction letter of load extension of 600 KVA to 4500 KVA, at clause 2 it is specifically mentioned that:

*"the contract demand of induction furnace (HTSS) shall be based on the total capacity of the induction/arc furnace and the equipment as per manufacturer technical specification in light of Para 2.2.2.1 of audit objection for FY 2016-2017 under the heading 'Failure to segregate the load as per service category'. For both tariffs HTS and HTSS, two separate meters to be installed by the Petitioner. It must be ensured that the load of induction furnace and its auxiliary shall be in HTSS tariff"*

18. The Respondent submitted that the Petitioner had submitted details of load bifurcation for HTSS and HTS before the Electrical Superintendent Engineer via letter dated 04.09.2025. According to the submission, the load breakdown is as follows:

- **HTSS Tariff**

Induction Furnace - 4000 KW;

- **HTS Tariff**

- Furnace Auxiliary Load-150 KVA (Crane Pump House);
- CCM Plant-200 KVA (Water Pump House, withdrawal stands);
- Rolling Mill-700 KVA (including Chattal Motor, pinch roll machine, rotary shearing machine, and stand motor gear box)

19. It was further pointed out by the Respondent that in addition to the main request for single point supply under HTSS tariff, it is on record that the applicant, M/s Chanduka Hi-Tech Steels Pvt. Ltd., subsequently applied for a separate connection of 1,550 KVA under HTS tariff (single shift, 33 KV) through the online portal. This application was duly processed and sanctioned-vide Letter No. 1304 dated 22.10.2025 issued by the General Manager cum Chief Engineer, Electric supply Area (ESA), Jamshedpur. The sanction of a separate connection clearly demonstrates that the applicant was fully aware of and complied with the regulatory requirement for electrical segregation of different categories of loads, as stipulated by the JSERC Supply Code. The approval and processing of this connection reinforce the rationale behind implementing separate Metering for each tariff category within the premises.

20. Furthermore, it was submitted by Respondents that the Distribution licensee has acted in good faith and in strict adherence to the JSERC Regulations and tariff orders applicable to the present case. The requirement for installation of separate meters for different categorized loads within the same premises is a legal and regulatory necessity and not a discretionary decision. There is neither procedural lapse nor violation of any regulatory provision by the Respondent. The directive for double metering is in interest of commercial prudence, regulatory compliance, and safeguarding revenue. The Petitioner's request for a single point supply does not consider the regulatory mandate for metering multiple tariff categories.

***After hearing both parties at length, the Commission reserved its order on 13.11.2025. Subsequently, on 24.11.2025, the Petitioner, M/s Chanduka Hi-Tech Steel Pvt. Limited, filed an Interlocutory Application supported by an affidavit, seeking further hearing of the matter in view***

*of the disclosure of certain vital and material facts. The Petitioner gave the reference of another integrated steel manufacturing unit at Dhanbad namely M/S Renuka Ispat Pvt. Ltd., which is also an industry of similar kind as that of Petitioner and where JBVNL is supplying power at single point.*

*The Petitioner submitted that the aforementioned integrated steel unit at Dhanbad is engaged in manufacturing of steel through melt iron which is manufactured in its furnace in a continuous process, the petitioner has also setup the manufacturing process for manufacture of steel. Hence, both the units are identical in all respects and engaged in the same nature of production. The respondents may not supply power to one unit through single point of while giving supply with single metering and discriminatory treatment to the Petitioner, compel it to take supply through two meter which will adversely affect the load factor of the petitioner resulting into poor load factor and same shall debar the petitioner to get load factor rebate.*

*Over which the Respondent objected the claim of the Petitioner and reiterated that single point supply cannot be provided to the Petitioner under regulatory norms.*

#### **Commission Observation and Findings**

21. The Commission considered the submission made by the parties and perused the materials available on records.
22. The Commission observed that the Petitioner relied upon Clause 8.2.3 of the JSERC Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2015, which stipulates that

#### ***Point of Supply***

***8.2.3 Subject to clause 5.4 of these Regulations, supply shall normally be given at a single point in the premises at the incoming terminals of switchgear installed by the consumer. The point of supply shall be determined by the Distribution Licensee such that meters and other equipment are always accessible to the Distribution Licensee for inspection without infringing upon the consumer's privacy. All HT & EHT consumers shall provide independent entry to the meter or metering cubical. However, in special cases, the Distribution Licensee may agree to give supply at more than one-point in the consumer's installation on account of the physical layout of the installation and the requirements of the consumer.***

However, the Respondent relied on Clause 9.1.8 of the JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015 read as under;

*"If supply is provided by the Distribution Licensee to different categories of consumers in the same premises, separate meter(s) shall be installed for measurement of energy for each such category."*

23. It is further observed by the Commission that the Petitioner's integrated plant, which includes Induction furnace and Rolling mills, fall under different category of Tariff as specified in the Tariff orders of the Commission. With regard to the issue of *load bifurcation*, the Commission observes that the Petitioner, through its communication dated 04.09.2025, submitted before the Electrical Superintendent Engineer, JBVNL that the 'auxiliary loads' associated with the induction furnace had been categorized under the HTS tariff category. However, subsequently, through a letter dated 24.09.2025 issued by the General Manager (Revenue) to the GM-cum-Chief Engineer, ESA, Jamshedpur, it was directed that the load of the induction furnace along with all its 'auxiliary components' shall be classified under the HTSS tariff category.

In this regard, the Commission places reliance on its relevant Tariff Orders, wherein the applicability of the HT Service categories has been clearly stipulated as follows:

## **HT Services**

### **Applicability:**

All the consumers drawing power at voltage level at 6.6 kV and above except Domestic-HT consumers and HT- Institutional Consumers. High Tension Special Service (HTSS): This tariff schedule shall apply to all consumers who have a contracted demand of 300 KVA and more for induction/arc Furnace. **In case of induction/arc furnace consumers (applicable for existing and new consumers), the contract demand shall be based on the total capacity of the induction/arc furnace and the equipment as per manufacturer technical specification** and not on the basis of measurement. This tariff schedule will not apply to casting units having induction furnace of melting capacity of 500 Kg or below.

From the Tariff order it is obvious that the contract demand for HTSS is calculated based on the **total furnace capacity plus auxiliary equipment capacity** (as per manufacturer specs). Accordingly, the segregation under different tariff category will be as follows:

- **InductionFurnace and its auxiliary** –under the HTSS tariff category
  - **Other Load** –under the HTS tariff category
24. This is further reinforced by the fact that currently there are two separate transformers each supplying different segment of the load of the Petitioner.
25. During the course of rehearing, the Petitioner brought on record certain new facts, wherein reference was made to another integrated steel manufacturing unit located at Dhanbad, namely M/s Renuka Ispat Pvt. Ltd. The Petitioner submitted that the said unit is of a similar nature and engaged in identical manufacturing processes, and that JBVNL is allegedly supplying power to it through a single-point connection. The Commission has examined the submission and is of the considered view that the applicable regulatory framework does not permit grant of single-point supply in such cases. Accordingly, the Respondent-Licensee is directed to enquire into the supply arrangement of the aforesaid unit and ensure conformity with the prevailing Supply Code and Tariff provisions.
26. In view of the above, the Commission finds no justification to allow the Petitioner's request for a single-point supply under the HTSS tariff, as such an arrangement would violate clause 9.1.8 of the JSERC Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2015, disregarding tariff categorization principles, and would lead to inappropriate cross-application of tariff slabs.

In the result, it is ordered as;

### **ORDER**

27. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the prayers of the Petitioner are disallowed for getting single point supply by the Respondent under HTSS tariff. The Petitioner is allowed to receive supply through two separate points, with separate meters, corresponding to the HTSS and HTS tariff categories, in compliance with clause 9.1.8 of the JSERC Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2015.
28. With the aforesaid observations and direction, the petition along with I.A. is hereby disposed off.

Sd/-

Member (T)

Sd/-

Member (L)

Sd/-

Chairperson