

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Record of Proceedings

Petition No.	81/2009 (Suo motu)
Coram	Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson Shri R.Krishnamoorthy, Member Shri S. Jayaraman, Member Shri V.S.Verma, Member
Date of Hearing	21.4.2009
Subject	Maintenance of Grid Discipline –Non- Compliance of provisions of the Indian Electricity Grid Code.
Respondents	1.Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Chennai, and 2.Shri C.P.Singh, Chairman, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Chennai
Parties present	Shri P Soma Sundaram Advocate Shri R. Murugan, TNEB Shri .K.Ramakrishna, SRLDC Shri Ajit Singh , SRPC

Representative of the respondents filed replies in the court. He stated that over-drawal during the period 1.4.2009 to 9.4.2009 was because of exceptional circumstances. He clarified that during the above period demand had gone up due to hot weather conditions coupled with parliamentary elections and the examination season. He claimed that the respondent had increased hydro generation to the maximum to ensure grid safety. He also cited the curtailment of 250 MW from Atomic Power Station as a further cause for further aggravation of the situation. He also informed that efforts by the respondent to procure power from outside the State could not material because it was not scheduled due to transmission constraints. He added that TNEB had introduced Restriction and Control measures (R&C measures) since 1.11.2008. According to him, the respondent did not have power to disconnect supply to the consumer under the R&C measures, except on grounds of non-payment of bills..

2. The Commission observed that the reply of the respondent indicated that over-drawal would be a permanent feature whenever similar conditions would prevail. The representative of TNEB clarified that after the examinations were over on 9.4.2009, the respondent had stopped to over-draw from the grid. He also assured that the respondent would ensure security of the grid. The Commission also informed the representative of the respondent that under section 23, the respondents could seek orders from the TNERC for handling such a situation. The representative of the respondents replied that TNERC had not approved the request made by the respondents to that effect. The Commission pointed out that nothing prevented the respondents from imposing load shedding to curtail over-drawal.

3. The Commission asked the representative of the respondents to clarify the statement in the reply that RLDC was diverting power to other regions and deliberately bringing down the frequency. The representative of the respondent stated that when TNEB started over-drawal the frequency was above 49.5 Hz, RLDC exported power to other regions and thereby brought down the frequency below 49.5 Hz. This according to him enhanced their liability to UI charges and also made them liable for proceedings for grid indiscipline. SRLDC representative submitted that inter-regional export of power when the frequency was higher was permissible under the Grid Code. He also clarified that Southern Region had mostly been importing power from other regions and very rarely exported power to other regions. The Commission observed that stray instances of export would not establish the allegation of deliberate export by the RLDC to the detriment of the respondents.

4. The Commission pointedly enquired about the settings of the Under Frequency Relays (UFRs) in the State. The representative of the respondents intimated that they were set at 48.5 Hz. The representative of SRLDC intimated that the setting was very low as 48.5 Hz frequency never reached in the region. He also clarified that as per para 5.2 (m) of the Grid Code, the setting was to be decided by the RPC forum and neither RLDC nor RPC had exclusive power to determine the settings of UFRs. He added that the proposal to enhance the settings to 48.8 Hz. was not accepted by the constituents.

5. The representative of SRLDC submitted that contrary to the agreement arrived at the RPC forum, the respondents failed to shut down the radial feeder and RLDC had to physically regulate the supply by disconnecting the inter-connectors on three four occasions.

6. With regard to the second respondent, learned counsel intimated that he had received a telephonic message that the Hon'ble Madras High Court had stayed the proceedings against the second respondent in WP(Civil) 7185/2008 and further details were awaited. .

7. The Commission directed the respondents to supply copy of the order of the Hon'ble High Court within one week and case be processed for order on receipt of the copy of the order of the Hon'ble High Court.

Sd/=
(K.S.Dhingra)
Chief (Legal)