

**KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 003**

PRESENT: Shri. C. Balakrishnan, Chairman
Shri. C. Abdulla, Member

November 25, 2005

Petition No. DP-21	Dy. No.	M/S. Koyenco Steels Pvt Ltd	Petitioner
		M/S. KinfraExport Promotion Industrial Parks Ltd, Cochin	Respondent

ORDER

1. Background:

a. Petitioner

The petitioner is a Company incorporated under the Indian Companies Act 1956 and is a Regd. Manufacturing unit for Steel Products. When they planned their construction activities, in the Export Promotion Industrial Park at Kakkanad, Cochin, M/s. KINFRA agreed to provide power from their 110/11 KV Substation set up in the Park. The Petitioner set up an Industrial unit for the manufacture of iron rods and bars and the total requirement of power was assessed at 6300 KVA. When the application for Power Allocation was raised by the Petitioner, the Licensee, (M/s. KEPIP) agreed to provide power in two stages.

Power Allocation of 4600 KVA was issued by the Licensee during 8/2004. Accordingly, the petitioner received power through two Nos. 11KV feeders and under two consumer Nos. 110 & 111. The Consumer No. 110 was allotted for a HT Power Intensive Load of 4250 KVA & the Consumer No. 111, for a HT Industrial Load of 350KVA. The power supply to Consumer No. 110 (4250KVA) is taken from the 11 KV Panel in the Sub-station and is fed through a 3x300 sq.mm 11KV XLPE cable of 100 Mts.length. The power supply to Cons. No. 111 (350KVA) is taken from the RMU erected adjacent to the Petitioner's Compound wall through a 3 x 185 sq. mm XLPE cable of 25 mtrs length. The RMU is connected to the 11KV panel at KINFRA Substation through a 3-x240 sq.mm 11KV XLPE cable. The Petitioner received Power Supply during November 2004 and commissioned the Melting Plant. The balance power supply of 1400KVA was to be availed of after completion of the Re-rolling Mill.

The Petitioner has complained that they have completed the erection of the Re-rolling Mill, but denied of additional power supply of 1400 KVA under Consumer No.111, so that the total power against this Consumer No. would be 1750 KVA as originally requested for. It is further informed that the Licensee (M/S. KEPIP) has refused to give Allocation for additional Power, for want of the clarification to be obtained from the SERC in the light of the provisions of Supply Code 2005 issued by the Commission. The Petitioner has represented that the newly completed Rolling Mill can be operated only if the additional power allocation of 1400KVA requested for in respect of Consumer No.111 is also granted. The Petitioner's contention is that even with this additional load of 1400 KVA, the Contract Demand for the Power through the feeder supplying Consumer No.111 will be well within the limit of 3000 KVA stipulated in the Supply Code 2005, framed by the Commission. It is also stated that the Honourable Commission, published the Supply Code, effective from 2/3/2005. Hence the Petitioner has stated that the restrictions with regard to Contract Demand as per the Supply Code cannot be made applicable to the Additional Load of 1400KVA now requested to be catered at the supply voltage level of 11KV.

The Petitioner had approached the Honourable High court with Writ Petition No. 23456 of 2005(P), which was disposed of by Judgement dated 17/10/2005, wherein the Court required the Commission to take a decision in the matter within a period of one month from the date of receipt of the application from the Petitioner. And hence a combined hearing of the Petitioner and the Respondent is arranged this day.

b. Licensee

M/S. KEPIP (Kinfra Export Promotion Industrial Parks Ltd) is a fully developed Industrial Park in Kakkanad in Ernakulam District set up with financial assistance from Govt. of India. KEPIP has also been declared as a licensee for the supply of power in the Park area, vide the G. O. (P) No.18/2003/PD dated 8/5/2003 and is distributing power to all Industrial Units set up in the Park. Just like the other Licensees within the state, KEPIP is also governed by the Regulations framed by the SERC. The Petitioner approached KEPIP on 19th April 2004 for supply of power to their Industrial unit with a request for availing 4600KVA by June 2004 and additional 1700 KVA after three months, the power requirement was at a voltage level of 11 KV.

The Petitioner approached KEPIP on 6th June 2005 with their request for additional power allocation of 1400KVA at 11 KV. The Petitioner wanted to avail the additional power from the auxiliary supply feeder taken to the Petitioner's premises from the RMU adjacent to their compound wall. The Licensee issued Power Allocation of 4600 KVA requested for by the Petitioner on 21/8/2004. The Power is fed through 2 independent feeders to the Petitioner's premises and after installing separate Meters for charging the Power consumption under two different tariffs and assigning different consumer Nos. as 110 and 111. The Licensee has stated that separate feeding arrangement at 2 locations through different feeders was necessitated to eliminate the influence of Harmonics in the circuits of other Consumers in the vicinity and since the Petitioner had not installed Harmonic Suppressors/Filters in their installation..

KEPIP could not approve the additional power allocation required by the petitioner in 6/2005, since the SERC's notification of new Supply Code had been issued by that time limiting the maximum Load that can be fed through an 11KV Feeder to a HT Consumer as 3000 KVA at 11KV.

KEPIP have informed the Commission that they were considerate towards the Petitioner in the matter of allowing the non-remittance of Capital Cost of construction of Substation and in metering the separate consumption of energy for the 'Power Intensive and 'Industrial Loads' in the Petitioner's premises assigning 2 independent Consumer Nos. etc.

Hearing of the matter

In the hearing on 25th November, both the parties to the Petition were heard.

The Petitioner's representative prayed before the Commission that the limitation of HT Load of 3000KVA at 11 KV Voltage level need not be considered in their case, since two independent Feeders are already there in their premises, from two sources. The Petitioner has stated that the additional power of 1400 KVA now requested for, is needed to cater the re-rolling as well. The Petitioner produced before the Commission, 2 No.s bills pertaining to 2 No.s TOD meter readings arranged in their premises, by the Licensee (KEPIP).

The Licensee's representative has also requested the Commission to take a decision, whereby the need of the Petitioner for additional load can be safely met. He has pointed out before the Commission certain lapses on the part of the Petitioner to install the Harmonic Suppressor etc. to reduce the harmonics induced in the System due to the running of the Arc Furnace and Heating Chamber within the Petitioner's premises. Licensee's argument is that it is to take care of this phenomenon, they had assigned separate 11 KV Feeder to meet such loads.

To the enquiry by the Licensee, the Petitioner's representative has also ruled out the possibility of forming another Company to avail the Power Connection at a second point. Even for this proposal, the condition to have a 'physical as well as electrical separation' between two independent Consumers within the premises, the Petitioner was not ready for its fulfilment.

Commission's Findings:

The Commission has observed the following irregularities on the part of the Petitioner in availing the power, and on the Licensee, in fixing the pattern of Power Supply to the Petitioner's premises.

- a. The power to the Auxiliary Transformer is taken through a separate 11KV Feeder, contrary to the normal pattern of providing 'Single Point Supply' to the consumer's premises.
- b. The Licensee has arranged separate metering of power fed through two independent feeders, categorizing them as 'HT Power Intensive' and 'HT Power (Industrial)'. This is found to be not in order. Even the representative of the Petitioner has stated that the Arc Furnace Auxilliaries use power from the Auxilliary Transformer. Hence all the power consumed by the Petitioner has to be categorized under "HT Power Intensive".
- c. Provision of power supply to two independent consumers shall be such that there should be 'electrical' and 'physical separation' between them. This is not possible in the case of the Petitioner, considering the space limitation and the remote possibility of forming another Company, as pointed out by them. At present, approximately 60KVA Load in the Furnace area is fed from the Second Feeder and hence both the loads are combined.

d. Even for providing Single Point Supply at 11KV with two Feeders, there shall be a full-fledged 'internal bus arrangement'. This arrangement is not provided in the premises of the Petitioner.

Commission's Order :

a. The Commission orders to allow the Licensee to provide 'single point supply' to the Petitioner's premises through 2 No.s of 11KV Cables. The existing 11KV Cable catering 4250 KVA can be retained as such and another 11KV U.G. Cable can be provided limiting the load to 3000 KVA as envisaged in the Supply Code 2005.

b. The Licensee shall arrange to meter the power consumed by the Petitioner through the Single Point Supply at the Bus, using a single TOD Meter with CT/PT arrangement of the Summation type.

c. The Petition dated 18/10/2005 of M/S Koyenco Steels Pvt. Ltd , Cochin is disposed off accordingly

sd/-
C. Abdulla,
Member

sd/-
C. Balakrishnan
Chairman

Authenticated Copy for Issue

Aji Thi.S
Secretary