IN THE JHARKHAND STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION AT RANCHI

Case No. 10 of 2026

Tata Motors Ltd. .... Petitioner

Versus

Tata Steel Ltd. (TSL) (Distribution Licensee)... Respondent

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

For the Petitioner : Mr. Navin Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent : Mr. Saket Upadhyay, Advocate

ORDER

Date – 04th August, 2026

1. The Petitioner – Tata Motors Ltd. has filed the instant petition under clause 4.7 of the JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015 seeking approval for supply of power at 33kV for contract demand up to 60,000 kVA and permission to avail supply at a voltage level other than the standard classification.

2. The Prayers of the Petitioner are as under: -
   (a) Pass suitable order for approval of supply of power at 33kV for contract demand up to 60,000 kVA in terms of the provisions contained under clause 4.7 of the Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2015, notwithstanding the standard voltage classification.
   (b) Allow sourcing of power up to 60,000 kVA from Renewable Energy source through the Interstate Transmission System (ISTS) and wheeling through distribution network of Tata Steel Limited licensee's network to the petitioner's drawl point.
   (c) Condone any inadvertent omissions/errors/shortcomings and permit Tata Motors Limited to add/change/modify/alter this filing and make further submissions as may be required at a future date.

Submission made on behalf of the Petitioner

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner Company is one of India's oldest and leading automobile

manufacturers engaged in the manufacture of a diverse range of commercial vehicles. It was submitted that the Company's Commercial Vehicles Division is engaged in the design, manufacture and marketing of a comprehensive portfolio of products, including small commercial vehicles, pick-up trucks, light commercial vehicles, medium and heavy commercial trucks, and buses. It was further submitted that the Petitioner also manufactures critical powertrain components, including engines, axles, transmissions and other aggregates, catering to its commercial vehicle product portfolio.

4. Power supply of this manufacturing facility is presently being availed form Tata Steel ltd. (TSL), Power Distribution Licensee.

5. The current contract demand is 40,000 kVA as detailed below:

S. No.	**Business Partner No.**	**Contract Demand (kVA)**	**Source Substation**
1	10065332	30,000	33kV Tata Power Substation
2	10065333	10,000	33kV BPRS Substation
	Total	**40,000**	

6. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner's existing power requirement is predominantly met through the sanctioned contract demand of 40,000 kVA availed from TSL, the Distribution Licensee. It has been further submitted that the balance of the Petitioner's electricity requirement is met through captive solar generation and Diesel Generator (DG) sets installed at its premises.

7. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that, with a view to advancing its sustainability objectives under the RE100 Initiative, the Petitioner proposes to meet its electricity requirement, to the maximum feasible extent, through Renewable Energy (RE) sourced from its proposed captive generating plant located at Bijapur, Karnataka, as well as from other eligible Renewable Energy sources through the Open Access mechanism. It has been further submitted that the proposed green power is intended to be transmitted through the Inter-State Transmission System (ISTS) and thereafter wheeled through the distribution network of Tata Steel Limited**,** the Distribution Licensee, up to the Petitioner's drawal point, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, and the regulations framed thereunder.

8. To cater to the said power requirement, it is proposed to enhance the

Contract Demand from 40,000 KVA to a consolidated Contract Demand upto 60,000 kVA at a new interconnection point in BPRS Substation.

9. The learned counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that reference may be made to **Clause 4.3 of the Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015**, which prescribes the general classification of consumers and the corresponding system of supply applicable to each category of consumer.

Category	System of Supply
High Tension	
Contracted load exceeding 100 kVA and up to 1500 kVA	3 Phase at 6.6 kV / 11 kV / 22 kV
Contracted load exceeding 1500 kVA up to 10000 kVA	3 Phase at 22 kV/ 33 kV
Contracted load exceeding 10000 kVA and up to 20,000	3 Phase at 33 kV
Extra High Tension	
Contracted load exceeding 20,000 kVA	3 Phase at 66 kV/ 110 kV/ 132 kV/ 220 kV

10. The Regulation prescribes 132kV voltage for supply of power above 20000 KVA contracted demand.

11. However, clause 4.7 of the Regulation provides that; 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 clauses 4.3 and 4.3 of these Regulations, subject to the Commission's approval.

12. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner's existing Contract Demand of 30,000 kVA, pertaining to Business Partner No. 10065332 and being supplied at the 33 kV voltage level, constitutes a legacy arrangement that has continued since prior to the notification and coming into force of the Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015. It was submitted that the said arrangement has remained in operation notwithstanding the subsequent enforcement of the aforesaid Regulations.

13. The learned counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that, at the time when such electrical connections were originally sanctioned, the respective distribution licensees were governed by their prevailing standards and practices for determining the applicable voltage of supply. It was further submitted that, in several cases, the classification of consumers and the

corresponding voltage of supply were prescribed under the relevant orders issued by the respective licensees.

14. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner has sought the Commission's permission to continue availing electricity supply at the 33 kV voltage level for the proposed Contract Demand of up to 60,000 kVA**.** It was submitted that the existing 33 kV supply arrangement constitutes the only technically feasible option, having regard to the Petitioner's existing switchgear and distribution infrastructure. It was further submitted that migration to the 132/33 kV voltage level would necessitate the establishment of a new 132/33 kV receiving substation, entail substantial additional capital expenditure, require acquisition or availability of additional land, and involve prolonged shutdown of the Petitioner's existing facilities, thereby adversely affecting its operations.

15. The Petitioner has requested the TSL Distribution Licensee to provide the proposed supply from the 400 kV BPRS Substation, routed through existing 33 kV substations. The existing 33 kV network infrastructure will be suitably augmented to meet the requirements of the proposed Contract Demand based on approval of the Commission.

16. Notwithstanding the availing of Open Access for renewable energy, the Petitioner shall continue to avail supply from the Distribution Licensee, and a Contract Demand upto 60000 KVA shall remain contracted with the Licensee.

17. Petitioner further submits that they are ready to pay any other applicable charges (either effective now or become effective in future) for availing electricity at a lower voltage than what is identified in the Regulations.

18. In view of the above, the Petitioner has approached the Commission seeking approval for deviation from the standard voltage classification.

Replies of the Respondent

19. Learned counsel for the respondent submitted that Petitioner - Tata Motors Limited, is one of the consumers of the Respondent who is currently enjoying the facilities manufacturing units, wherein the contract demand of 40,000 kVA, which is met through Respondent's sub-stations.

20. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondent submitted that the Respondent is filing the present reply in respect of the material facts and

issues arising for determination in the instant Petition, insofar as the same have been specifically raised and contested by the Petitioner. It was further submitted that all statements, averments and allegations contained in the Petition, save and except those specifically admitted herein, are denied. The Respondent further reserved its right to file additional submissions and to furnish a specific response to any averment or contention raised in the Petition, as may be considered necessary or as may be directed by the Commission during the course of the proceedings.

21. That in reply to statements made in paragraph-6 of the Petition, the Respondent submits that as per the existing arrangement whereby two contract demands (i.e., 30,000 kVA & 10,000 kVA) were fed from two sub-stations to the Petitioner. However, it is clarified that the Petitioner cannot be provided with supply at multiple locations (as aforesaid) under a single contract of supply of upto 60000 KVA Contract Demand.

    That in furtherance, the answering Respondent states that the prevailing 30,000 kVA contract demand from 33 kV Tata Power Substation and 10,000 KVA from BPRS shall be stopped, when the new 60,000 KVA contract demand comes in service, and the entire contract demand as requested upto 60,000 kVA will be fed from BPRS Substation as per the prayer made by the Petitioner.

22. That in reply to statements made in paragraph-13 of the Petition under reply, the Respondent submits that the requirements of the Petitioner may be considered, if the Petitioner is not allowed to avail voltage subsidy for continuing to serve with supply at 33 kV voltage level for the proposed contract demand upto 60,000 kVA. It may be noted that the Petitioner has approached the Commission to safeguard its interest and expenditure by continuing to avail supply at 33 kV voltage level. It is thereby imperative that the Petitioner cannot seek to avail voltage rebate, once the instant approval is granted.

23. That in reply to statements made in paragraph-14 of the Petition, the Respondent states and submits that approvals for the feeders at the same place shall be given as the exceptional case. Any expenditure incurred by the Respondent must be reimbursed by the Petitioner.

24. That in reply to statements made in paragraph-15 of the Petition, the Respondent raises no averments. However, it may be noted that, grant of Open Access in favour of the Petitioner may result in increase of power

purchase cost of the Distribution Licensee.

25. That in reply to statements made in paragraph-16 to the Petition, respondents submits that the Hon'ble Commission may consider any adverse effect on the power purchase cost of the answering Respondent and thus provide any remedial mitigating steps, which may be borne by the Petitioner as suggested by the Petitioner in the paragraph under reply.

26. That in response to the Prayer made by the Petitioner, the Respondent states and submit that it may only be allowed if certain conditions as illustrated above by the Respondent are kindly taken into consideration by the Commission. The Respondent states that the Commission may take note of the circumstances in which the instant approval is being considered and this may not be cited as a precedent for any further approvals.

Commission's Observation and findings

1. The Commission has carefully considered the submissions made by the parties and has meticulously perused the pleadings, documents, and all other materials available on record. The Commission's observations and findings are as follows:

2. It is further observed that clause 4.7 of the JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulation, 2015 provides 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 clauses 4.3 and 4.3 of these Regulations, subject to the Commission's approval.* "

3. The Commission observes that the Respondent has not raised any objection, in principle, to the proposal advanced by the Petitioner. The Respondent has submitted that the proposed Contract Demand of up to 60,000 kVA is capable of being catered to from the BPRS Substation, subject to the augmentation of the existing distribution network and strict compliance with the applicable Rules, Regulations, and other statutory requirements in force. The Respondent has further contended that, in the event supply is extended at a voltage lower than that prescribed under the applicable Regulations, the Petitioner shall not be entitled to claim any voltage rebate, concession, or any other consequential benefit on such account. It has also been submitted that the entire cost towards augmentation, strengthening, and development of the requisite electrical infrastructure undertaken by the Distribution Licensee for extending such supply shall be borne exclusively by the Petitioner.

4. The Commission takes note of the fact that the existing arrangement for supply of a portion of the Petitioner's load at 33 kV was established prior to the coming into force of the JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015**,** and has remained operational over a substantial period without interruption. The issue under consideration is, therefore, not one of permitting a new voltage level contrary to the prevailing regulatory framework, but rather of examining the Petitioner's request for continuation of supply at the existing voltage level with an enhanced Contract Demand, subject to the Respondent undertaking the necessary augmentation and strengthening of the distribution system in accordance with the applicable laws and Regulations.

5. The Commission finds that the proposed arrangement is supported by the Distribution Licensee from a technical feasibility perspective and that the approval sought is based on the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, including the existing network configuration and the Petitioner's requirement to source renewable energy through Open Access.

6. At the same time, the Commission is of the considered view that the relaxation granted from the prescribed voltage classification shall not operate so as to confer any unintended or unwarranted commercial advantage upon the Petitioner. Accordingly, the Petitioner shall not be entitled to claim or avail any High Voltage Supply Rebate, voltage-related concession, incentive, or any other consequential benefit that would otherwise accrue under the applicable tariff framework by virtue of the prescribed voltage classification. The Commission further directs that the entire expenditure towards augmentation, strengthening and upgradation of the distribution network, including the creation of dedicated electrical infrastructure, if any, necessitated exclusively for meeting the enhanced Contract Demand of the Petitioner, shall be borne solely by the Petitioner in accordance with the provisions of the applicable Act, Rules, Regulations, and the governing Supply Code.

7. The Commission also clarifies that the approval granted herein is based on the specific facts and circumstances of the present case and shall not be construed as a precedent for similar requests by other consumers. Every such request shall be examined independently on its own merits, technical feasibility and system requirements.

ORDER

8. Accordingly, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the submissions advanced by the parties, and the findings recorded hereinabove, the Commission, in exercise of the powers vested in it under Clause 4.7 of the JSERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2015, hereby permits the continuance of power supply to the Petitioner at the 33 kV voltage level with an enhanced Contract Demand of up to 60,000 kVA, subject to the following conditions, which shall be binding upon the parties:

(a) The entire sanctioned Contract Demand up to 60,000 kVA shall be catered through the network arrangement proposed by the Respondent-Licensee and in accordance with the technical scheme approved by the Licensee.

(b) All expenditure relating to dedicated infrastructure, network augmentation and associated facilities required exclusively for serving the Petitioner's enhanced load shall be borne by the Petitioner in accordance with applicable Regulations.

(c) The Petitioner shall not be entitled to claim any High Voltage Supply Rebate, voltage-related concession or any other benefit arising out of the approved voltage classification, unless specifically permitted under future orders of the Commission.

(d) That all the safety and protection measures to be taken care of by both the parties while implementation of the above. The respondent may allow H.T. connection service to the petitioner at supply voltage of 33kV with a contract demand of 60000 kVA after ensuring proper arrangement of metering, billing and network system protection.

(e) The Petitioner and the Respondent shall comply with all applicable provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, the JSERC Regulations, Open Access Regulations and other directions issued by the Commission from time to time.

With the above observations and directions, the Petition is allowed and stands disposed of.

Sd/-	Sd/-
Member (L)	Chairperson