

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No.158/MP/2016

Coram:

Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson

Shri A.K. Singhal, Member

Shri A.K. Bakshi, Member

Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Date of Order : 21st of September, 2016

In the matter of

Petition under Section 79 (1) (b) read with Section 79 (1) (f) and (k) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 1 (j) of the CERC (Payment of Fees) Regulations, 2012, inter alia seeking a declaration that clause 3.1, 4 and 6.2 of the proposed Memorandum of Understanding to be executed between the petitioner and the Respondent No. 1 for operation and maintenance of the petitioner's 2 nos of 400 kV line bays including 2 Tie Bays at 765/400 kV switchyard at Power Grid, Bharari, sub-station, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh are contrary to the Regulation 3 (42) of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 and consequent direction to bring the said clauses in conformity with Regulation 3 (42) of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 and other reliefs.

And

In the matter of

Lanco Amarkantak Power Ltd
Lanco House, Plot No. 397, Udyog Vihar, Phase-III,
Gurgaon-122 016, Haryana.

....Petitioner

Vs

1. Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
Plot No.2, Saudamini, Sector-29,
Gurgaon, Haryana-122 001

2. Regional Load Despatch Centre,
F-3, MIDC Area, Marol
Andheri (East), Mumbai-400 093

....Respondents

Parties Present:

Shri Deepak Khurana, Advocate, LAPL

Shri Vikas Mishra, Advocate, LAPL

Ms. Palak Mahajan, Advocate, PGCIL

Ms. Aditi Kashyap, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Jaideep Singh, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Debil Banerjee, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Shashi Bhushan, PGCIL
Shri Aryaman Saxena, PGCIL

ORDER

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that one of the issues regarding energy accounting has been addressed by the CTU which was confirmed by the learned counsel for CTU. Learned counsel for the petitioner sought permission to amend the petition to persue the remaining prayers. Alternatively, learned counsel for the petitioner sought permission to withdraw the petition and file a fresh petition after crystallising the remaining issues and prayed for adjustment of fees paid in the present petition.

2. Noting the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner, we dispose of the Petition No. 158/MP/2016 as withdrawn. The petitioner is at liberty to file the fresh petition, if any, in accordance with law. If any petition is filed relating to the issues covered in the present petition, the filing fee paid in the present petition will be adjusted.

Sd/-
(Dr. M.K.Iyer)
Member

sd/-
(A.S. Bakshi)
Member

sd/-
(A. K. Singhal)
Member

sd/-
(Gireesh B. Pradhan)
Chairperson