

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No.32/MP/2017

Subject :Petition under Section 79 (1) (c) and (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with the provisions of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Grant of Connectivity, Long-term Access and Medium-term Open Access in inter-State Transmission and related matters) Regulations, 2009 and Central Electricity Regulatory Commission(Sharing of Interstate Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulations, 2010.

AND

Non-payment of transmission charges by Himachal Sorang Power Private Ltd (HSPPL) pertaining to their LTA of 100 MW power to Northern Region.

Date of hearing : 29.8.2017

Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Himachal Sarong Power Private Limited and Others

Parties present : Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
Shri V. Srinivas, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the present petition has been filed seeking direction to Himachal Sarong Power Private Limited (HSPPL) to pay the past and current dues alongwith surcharge and to establish the LC as payment security mechanism towards the transmission charges. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that none of the respondents have appeared despite repeated notice. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that Greenko group has taken over the respondent company and the copy of the petition along with the notice was served on it. However, Greenko did not accept the same.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Commission vide its orders dated 3.2.2014 and 14.9.2015 in Petition Nos. 78/MP/2013 and 78/MP/2014 respectively, had granted liberty to the petitioner to regulate the power supply/ curtail the short term open access in case of pending dues/ non-establishment of letter of credit. Since, the

generating station of the respondent has not been commissioned, the petitioner is not able to implement the above directions of the Commission.

3. On a specific query of the Commission as to whether the petitioner is recovering the transmission charges from PoC mechanism, learned counsel for the petitioner replied in negative.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, the Commission reserved order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

**Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief (Law)**