

**PASCHIM GUJARAT VIJ COMPANY LIMITED**

Zonal office, "Vij Seva Sadan",

Chavdigate, Bhavnagar

PH : (0278) 2521760/61/62 Fax : (0278) 2521763

CIN : U40102GJ2003SGC042908

E-mail: wbzone@gebmail.com

No: BZ/FORUM/44/20-21 (R)/

2054

Date: 12 JUL 2021

To,

The Ex. Engineer,  
PGVCL; D.O.,  
Rural Dn.  
Bhavnagar.

**Sub: Review of CGRF Order Case No.44/20-21 in respect of  
M/s S.S. Industries – Bhavnagar.,**

**Ref : 1) CGRF Order No. BZ/Forum/44/20-21/239 Dtd. 19.01.21,  
2) Your letter No. BRD/T-1/CGRF/R.P./1495 Dtd. 05.03.20.**

In context with CGRF Order (Ref.01) of Case No. 44/20-21, You respondent of the CGRF case had made review application as per letter under ref. at 02, and hearing of the same was kept on 25.03.2021 and 01.07.21, in presence of followings.

For applicant of review application..

- 1) Shri D.V. Lakhani –Suptd. Engr. PGVCL, C.O. Bhavnagar (25.03.21)
- 2) Shri P.C. Panchal –Ex. Engr., PGVCL, Rural Dn. Bhavnagar (25.03.21 and 01.07.21)

For respondent of.

- 1) Shri V.L. Shah : Authorized Representative.

The review Order of Forum for this matter is appended herewith.

Encl: As above.

( R.K. Vegda )  
Convenor, CGRF,  
PGVCL, Z.O. Bhavnagar

by R.P.A.D.

Copy to : M/s S.S. Industries,  
205, B-Wing, Lila F-C,  
Waghawadi Road.  
Bhavnagar.

2) The Superintending Engineer : PGVCL, C.O., Bhavnagar.





**: Review Application Order :**

M/s S S Industries had filled the complaint no. 44/20-21 regarding estimate issued to complainer for additional load of 540 KVA be given from nearby feeder instead of laying new feeder from Sub- Station. PGVCL respondent. Forum has given reasoned order dated 19.01.2021 in the Case No. 44/20-21. Respondent PGVCL has filled 'Review Application' on 26.02.2021 in the matter of Case Nno. 44/20-21.

- As per **Regulations, 2019 Notification No. 2 of 2019 (Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum and Ombudsman):**

**Review of Order**

2.64. *Any person may file an application for review of order before the Forum, on ground of discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was passed or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record, within thirty (30) days of the date of the order, as the case may be.*

2.65. *The applicant shall in the application for such review clearly state the matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was passed or the mistake or error apparent on the face of the record. The application shall be accompanied by such documents, supporting data and statements to substantiate such review.*

2.66. *When it appears to the Forum that there is no sufficient ground for review, the Forum shall reject such review application: Provided that no application shall be rejected unless the applicant has been given an opportunity of being heard.*

- Forum has given order dated 19.01.2021 as under:  
*Considering representations of both side, documents produced before Forum and relevant regulations, Respondent is directed to check the technical feasibility for catering additional load of 540 KVA (CD 1000 KVA + Add Load 540 KVA) from nearby*






feeder and issue revised estimate. Complainer shall make payment of revised estimate, or respondent will take further course of action for releasing additional load of 540 KVA as per section 4.95 of GERC Supply Code.


- In their review application, PGVCL (Respondent has given the "Ground of Review Application", which is reproduced here bellow:

"If PGVCL implements this order, numbers of such parallel grievances arise to re-shuffle load of existing / proposed HT connection, load enhancement and others. Which further affect the technical feasibility for the prospective connections, load demand and system stability. This will create n times possibility as per own desire in each and every case, which ultimately create a lot of confusion to find out better solution. To maintain of the system stability, it is required to review the said order".

- In their review application, Respondent (PGVCL) has not submitted any new documentary evidence or considerable submission in their review application. PGVCL has not given substantial ground to review order.
- **In view of aforesaid Regulations, Complainer's submission against review application and Respondent (PGVCL)'s submission, Review Application is rejected.**

  
( Smt. J.M. Mehta)  
Independent Member

Absent  
( P.N. Ajakiya )  
Technical Member

  
( M.R. Vajriya )  
Chairman, C.G.R.F.  
PGVCL, Bhavnagar

Date : 01.07.21.  
Place : Bhavnagar.

