

**BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM
MADHYA GUJARAT VIJ CO LIMITED
CORPORATE OFFICE, 5TH FLOOR SP VIDYUT BHAVAN,
RACECOURSE, VADODARA 390 007**

Subject	Consumer Grievances Complaint No.MG-I-22-2015.16
Complainant	M/s. Ohm Shiv Quarry, At village : Gothada, Post : Timba Road, Tal: Godhra, Dist : Panchmahals
Respondent	Shri S S Gandhi, Deputy Engineer, Godhra dn of MGVCL.
Date of hearing	03.07.2015 at Godhra, 17.07.2015 at Vadodara & on dated 31.07.2015 at Godhra

QUORUM	NAME
Chairperson	Shri P J Patel, Gandhinagar
Independent Member	Harsha S Chauhan, Vadodara
Technical Member	Shri A G Shah, MGVCL

The complaint dated 18.06.2015 regarding issue of wrong estimate for 11 KV 350 KVA connection.

On 03.07.2015 at Godhra, 17.07.2015 at Vadodara & on dated 31.07.2015 at Godhra, the case of the Complainant Grievance was heard before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum wherein Shri V.R. Kapoor, appeared on behalf of M/s. Ohm Shiv Quarry, whereas Shri S S Gandhi, Deputy Engineer, Godhra Division appeared as respondent on behalf of MGVCL before the Forum. Both the parties were heard.

The brief details of the case are as under:

1. M/s. Ohm Shiv Quarry is existing consumer having contract load of 100 KW (LTMD Tariff).
2. The complainant has asked additional load (HT Tariff).
3. The complainant has raised certain objections against the estimate issued for Registration charges, GETCO charges, Transmission cost, Dismantling charges, no need to use RSJ Poles and conversion of conductor size etc.,
4. At the time of first hearing dated 03.07.2015 at Godhra, the representative of complainant contended that he had asked some documents from MGVCL related to his complain which were not provided. It is required for proper representation of his case. The forum opine to provide it so asked MGVCL to arrange and to keep next hearing after delivery of said documents. Next hearing was kept on 17.07.2015 in which the representative was absent. The case was finally heard on 31.07.2015.

The representative of the complainant contended that they have applied for load extension to 375KVA 11KV HT power supply. Existing contract demand is 100 KW. The estimate issued by MGVCL was objected for the reasons written in the complaint. In support of his complaint contended that...

- a. As per his calculation, tail end VR is only 5.64. The MGVCL has considered it 8.23.
- b. The length of underground cable (180 meters) in the area of Railway Crossing is not considered for VR calculation.
- c. Diversity factor taken in calculation is wrong. It should be 2.1. MGVCL has considered it as 2.86.
- d. AAAC Rabbit & Dog conductor's current carrying capacity is 210 Amp and 255 Amp respectively.
- e. Regretted on the issue of MGVCL not giving all details related to the consumer for fair transparency.
- f. Other points as listed in their complaints dated 18.06.2015.
- g. Requested to look into and to revise the estimate.

The respondent Shri S. S. Gandhi, Deputy Engineer (MGVCL), Godhra, contended that there is nothing wrong in preparation of an estimate which is as per standard technical data, cost data and laid procedure in cases of HT consumers. In calculation, maximum current drawn in the feeder in last one year is being taken for load calculation which is 136 Amp in this case. The DP / CTPT structure is technically required to replace. The safety fencing surrounding to pole structure is for safety against any current leakages is standard practice and for any new/alteration the cost is being recovered from the applicant. Regarding use of RSJ poles for laying DOG conductor is as per technical requirements. Registration and GETCO charges are being recovered as per rules.

The Forum Members present at the hearing considered contention of both the parties and perused the records and observed that

1. M/s. Ohm Shiv Quarry bearing consumer number 19949/01118/3 having existing contract demand of 100 KW LTMD. Power supply fed from 11KV Timba Industrial feeder emanating from 66KV Timba sub-station.
2. Total 375 KVA load including existing contracted load applied on dated 24.04.2015. The revised load is falling under HT power supply.
3. On the same feeder M/s Bhuvneshwari Quarry has already applied for 500 KVA. It will draw additional load of about 25 Amp. To keep technical parameters within limits, about 3.83 KM length conductor was replaced to higher size DOG conductor. Its work is completed.

4. Additional load approximately 20 Amp will increase due to the complainants total load demand of 375 KVA.
5. Maximum 136 Amp load recorded on 12th January 2015 in existing feeder.
6. Total maximum load on the feeder will be $136+25+20=181$ Amp.
7. Based on above parameters, calculation checked for Diversity Factor & %HTVR confirmed as under.
 - a. Without proposed load of complainant and any modification of line is 2.23 and 7.74 respectively and with proposed load & without modification is 2.12 and 8.23 respectively. It is within permissible limit so based on these parameters, the forum is of the opinion that conversion of conductor size is not required.
 - b. The estimated load on the feeder is 181 Amp which is higher than the capacity of existing conductor (AAAC 55mmsq).
8. MGVCL has proposed conversion of existing 55mmsq to 100mmsq conductors for 1.430 KM length and subsequent calculations for its technical capacity found adequate.
9. The parameters DF (diversity factor), %HTVR & maximum loading will be 2.12, 7.43% & 182 Amp respectively in proposed modification of existing HT line are within permissible limits.
10. There should not be any compromise for safety so the applicant cannot be permitted to install equipment or fencing to the structure by their own. The cost of actual material used is being considered while finalization of bill and refunded/recovered accordingly.
11. Estimate given for HT line is tentative and to be adjusted at the time of final bill so grievance for quantity will be taken care of as per actual consumption of materials.
12. Underground XLPE conductor used for crossing of Railway line cannot be taken into account for calculation of %HTVR for being very small length and both end conductor size is smaller than that.
13. Only proportionate charges are being recovered in case of DTR and it becomes property of the utility (in this case DISCOM MGVCL) and responsible for its working throughout the tenure of existence of the consumer. So any refund related to it is not applicable.
14. Registration & GETCO charges are as per rules and GERC Notifications.

In view of the above discussions, the Forum is of the opinion that though the % HTVR is within limit, current loading is higher than technical requirement of existing conductor. It may also be presumed that if existing consumers use their

demand in full capacity/momentary overloading, the conductor may damage and create cause for an accident. Therefore, conversion of existing conductor to next higher size DOG conductor is required. Rest all other grievances are treated as resolved as per respondent's reply as above and the Forum agreed to that and given detail understanding to the representative of the complainant.

ORDER

The Forum directs complainant M/s. Ohm Shiv Quarry, At village: Gothada, Post: Timba Road, Tal: Godhra, Dist: Panchmahals that the main objection raised for proposed conversion for size of conductor is in order. The reply given by Madhya Gujarat Vij Co Limited for rest points is in line with the rules.

(A G Shah)
Technical Member

(Harsha S Chauhan)
Independent Member

(P J Patel)
Chairperson

PS :

If the complainant is not satisfied with the order of this Forum, the complainant may approach The Staff Officer, Office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission, Barrack No.3, Polytechnic Compound, Ambawadi, Ahmedabad 380 015 in accordance with Clause No.2.63 Chapter-2 of GERC Notification No.2 of 2011.

Procedure to make representations before Ombudsman***

1. Representation should be in writing duly signed by the complainant with his name and address.
2. Representation should be supported with affidavit.
3. True copy of order of Forum and original complaint made before Forum should be attached. Enclosed documents should be certified copies of the original documents.
4. The representation before Ombudsman should be submitted within 30 days from the date of order of Forum.
5. Copy of representation should be submitted at the office of Ombudsman. Copy of representation should be submitted to all respondents.
6. If the complainant is required to pay any amount according to the order of Forum, one-third of such amount should be deposited by complainant and proofs should be attached along with the representation.
7. The matter should not be pending before the competent Forum or any other court, tribunal, arbitrator or any other authority.
8. All representations should be with a sufficient cause, reasonable diligence causing the consumer prima facie loss and damages / inconvenience.
9. Representation may be submitted in English or Gujarati language

*** <http://www.gercin.org/docs/Cosumer%20Grievances/Procedure/Procedure.pdf>