

9

**MEGHALAYA STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
**New Admn. Building, Left Wing, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor**  
**LOWER LACHUMIERE: SHILLONG – 793001.**

.....  
F.NO.MSERC/MePDCL/RP/14-15/2014/142,

Dated, the 10.09.2014

From: The Secretary,  
MSERC, Shillong.

To: ✓ The Director,  
MePDCL, Lumjingshai, Shillong.

Sub: **Commission's Order dated 09.09.2014.**

Dear Sir,

Enclosed please find a certified true copy of the Commission Order dated 09.09.2014.

Kindly acknowledge receipt.

Encl: as above.

Yours faithfully,



( J B Poon )  
Secretary

Meghalaya State Electricity Regulatory Commission

**BEFORE THE MEGHALAYA STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

In the matter of:

Petition for Review/Modification of Tariff Order dated 12.04.2014 under section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and regulation 21 of MSERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2007 and regulation 22 of MSERC (Terms and Conditions of Determination of Tariff) Regulations, 2011.

And

In the matter of:

Meghalaya Power Distribution Corporation Limited, Lumjingshai, Shillong, Meghalaya.

**CORAM**

**Shri Anand Kumar, Chairman**

**Date of Order: 09.09.2014**

**ORDER**

Petitioner MePDCL vide their petition dated 10.06.2014, prayed for modification/ review of the Tariff (Distribution) order for FY 2014-15 passed by the Commission on 12.04.2014. MePDCL has sought to invoke section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and regulation 21 of the MSERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2007 & also regulation 22 of MSERC (Terms and Conditions for Determination of Tariff) Regulations, 2011 in filing the petition.

2. The grounds seeking the review are that Commission approved the ARR at Rs.618.87 crores as against Rs.859.56 crores proposed in the tariff petition dated 16.12.2013, that the average cost of supply has been assessed at Rs.5.38/unit against the proposed Rs.8.26/unit. On the various items of expenditure also, such as employee costs, R&M expenses, Administration and General Expenses, depreciation, interest on loan capital, interest on working capital, return on equity and other items, petitioner MePDCL pleaded that Commission review the same since they fell short of what it had proposed.

