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

Present : Shri S. P. Nanda, Chairperson
Shri S. P.Swain, Member
Shri A. K. Das, Member

Case No. 49/2014

GRIDCO ..... Petitioner
Vrs.
M/s Shalivahan Green Energy Ltd. ..... Respondents

In the matter of: An application u/S. 94 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 70 of OERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 for review of the order dated 01.03.2014 passed in Case No. 16/2013.

AND

Case No. 53/2014

GRIDCO Ltd. ..... Petitioner
Vrs.
M/s Shalivahan Green Energy Ltd. & others ..... Respondents

In the matter of: An application u/S. 94 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 70 of OERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 for review of the order dated 11.03.2014 passed in Case No. 93/2013.

For Petitioners: Ms. Dipti Satapathy, MGR(F), PP,GRIDCO, Shri S. K. Sahoo, DGM(F),GRIDCO, Shri G. S. Panigrahi, DGM(Law),GRIDCO, Shri U. N. Mishra, CGM(PP), GRIDCO Ltd.

For Respondents: Shri R.P.Mohapatra, the authorized representative of M/s. Shalivahan Green Energy Ltd.
Ms. Niharika Pattnayak, ALO, DoE, GoO .
Ms. Sujata Dash, Verifier, OREDA,
Shri P. K. Dash, CGM(Comm.), CESU
No body is present on behalf of WESCO, NESCO & SOUTHCO.

O R D E R

Date of Hearing: 26.09.2014 **Date of Order: 30.09.2014**

The petitioner M/s. GRIDCO Ltd. has filed both the cases seeking review of the order dated 01.03.2014 passed in Case No.16/2013 in Case No.49 of 2014 and order dated 11.03.2014 passed in Case No.93 of 2013 in present Case No. 53/2014.

2. Both the cases are clubbed together and taken up for analogous hearing on condonation of delay in filing of the above review petitions as well as on question of admission as both are similar in nature and the parties are also same.

3. Heard the petitioner in both the cases on condonation of delay in filing of the above review applications at length. During hearing the petitioner in both the cases could not explain each and every day's delay in filing of the above review applications satisfactorily.

4. There was 73 days and 84 days delay in filing the review application in Case No.49 of 2014 in Case No.53 of 2014 respectively. These are sheer negligence on the part of the Petitioner in making the delay and also as the petitioner has not furnished the details for explaining the delay in filing of both the review applications for review of the above orders dated01.03.2014 & 11.03.2014 of the Commission passed in Case Nos. 16 & 93 of 2013 respectively, both the review applications are dismissed as delay is not condoned.

5. Accordingly, both the cases are disposed of.

Sd/-	**Sd/-**	**Sd/-**
(A .K. Das)	**(S. P. Swain)**	**(S. P. Nanda)**
Member	**Member**	**Chairperson**