

**ODISHA ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
BIDYUT NIYAMAK BHAWAN,
UNIT – VIII, BHUBANESWAR – 751 012**

*** **

**Present : Shri S.P Nanda, Chairperson
Shri B.K. Misra, Member
Shri S.P.Swain, Member**

Case No. 35/ 2013

M/s. Sonthalia Rice MillPetitioner

Vrs.

CEO, CESU and anotherRespondents

In the matter of: Application u/S. 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-implementation of Order dated 19.01.2013 of the OERC passed in Case no.75 of 2012 and order dated 07.09.2011 of the GRF, Bhubaneswar passed in C.C.Case No. 62/2011.

**For the Petitioner: Shri S. K. Biswal, Prop. M/s Sonthalia Rice Mill,
Shri A. K. Sahani, the authorized representative**

For the Respondents: Shri S. C. Dash, Advocate

Date of hearing: 26.07.2013

Date of order:12.11.2013

ORDER

1. The factual matrix of the case is that the Petitioner had filed a case in this Commission due to non-implementation of GRF Order by the Distribution Utility called CESU. The Commission directed the respondent CESU to implement the GRF Order by completing the extension work of 11 KV Naharkanta – Baliana Feeder upto Bhingarpur within one month in Case No. 75/2012.
2. When the respondent CESU did not take any initiative to carry out the above direction of the Commission, the present Petition has been filed under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003. When the instant proceeding was underway in the Commission we made an interim order on 29.07.2013 as follows:

In view of the above submissions made by the petitioner and the respondent a fact finding team comprising of official of OERC, CESU may visit the spot for getting the first-hand information about the configuration of the supply line and suggest the remedial measures within 7 days. During the visit of the above team the representative of the petitioner should also be present.

3. As per the above direction of the Commission a fact Finding Team was constituted consisting of OERC, CESU official including the representative of the Petitioner. The fact finding Team visited the premises of the consumer and also surveyed allied electricity feeding network of the consumer on 08.08.2013. The Fact Finding Team has also submitted its report in the meantime.
4. As per the Report of the Fact Finding Team the Rice Mill of the Petitioner is availing power supply from Phulnakhara 33/11 KV sub-station of CESU through Phulnakhara – Baliana 11 KV feeder. Since the Phulnakhara-Baliana feeder is around 35 kms. long the consumer suffers from perennial low voltage problem. The fact finding team have suggested the following measures to alleviate the voltage problem of the consumer. They are as follows:
 - (a) The nearest primary sub-station of the consumer is at Naharkanta situated at a distance of 12 kms. The sub-station transformer capacity is of 5 MVA and it is loaded to its optimum capacity. The sub-station is having two 11 KV feeders one among them is Naharkanta-Baliana feeder.
 - (b) The rice mill of the petitioner can very well be fed from this Naharkanta-Baliana feeder by extending it upto Bhingarpur where the rice mill is situated. As the Naharkanta sub-station is fully loaded it can be augmented with another 3 MVA transformer. The existing conductor of the Naharkanta – Baliana feeder which will be extended upto Bhingarpur should be replaced by RECON conductor of 80 mm sq. size so that the voltage Regulation shall reach (-) 8.6% which is nearer to the standard prescribed by OERC which is $\pm 6\%$ in the present case. This extension is possible by erection of a new line approximately of one kilometre along the river embankment between Baliana and Bhingarpur.
 - (c) The voltage Regulation shall improve further after the erection of proposed 33/ 11 KV sub-station at Bhingarpur by CESU under Capex Plan.
5. After perusal of the report submitted by the Fact Finding Team at length we direct the respondent CESU to implement the suggestion of the Fact Finding Team at para 4 (a) and (b) above as a short term measure within two months and simultaneously expedite the completion of 33/11 KV substation at Bhingarpur under Capex Plan. It appears that none of the technical staff of the utility has applied his mind to find out a solution to the

problem rather have been sitting pretty over it. We note with anguish that had the CESU been little bit sensitive to the cause of the petitioner it would have redressed the grievance of the consumer on its own without entering into litigation. If due to any reason CESU is unable to complete this work within two months they may seek extension of time from the Commission citing its justification.

6. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Sd/-
(S. P. Swain)
Member

Sd/-
(B. K. Misra)
Member

Sd/-
(S. P. Nanda)
Chairperson