

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram:

- 1. Shri Ashok Basu, Chairperson**
- 2. Shri Bhanu Bhushan, Member**
- 3. Shri A.H. Jung, Member**

Petition No.99/2005

In the matter of

Maintaining the regional grid frequency above 49.0 Hz by curbing overdrawals in line with Section 6.2(l) and 7.4.4 respectively of the Indian Electricity Grid Code (IEGC).

And in the matter of

Northern Regional Load Despatch Centre, New Delhi

...**Petitioner**

Vs

1. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow
2. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd., Panchkula
3. Power Development Department, Govt of Jammu & Kashmir, Jammu
4. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
5. Delhi Transco Limited, New Delhi
6. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd., Jaipur
7. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
8. Uttaranchal Power Corporation Ltd., Dehradun
9. Electricity Dept., Union Territory of Chandigarh, Chandigarh..... **Proforma Respondents**

...**Main Respondent**

The following were present:

1. Shri P.K. Agarwal, NRLDC
2. Shri S.R. Narasimhan, Chief Manager, NRLDC
3. Shri Devender Kumar, Chief Manager, NRLDC
4. Shri Jasbir Singh, NRLDC
5. Shri D.D. Chopra, Advocate, UPPCL
6. Shri S.K.Agrawal, Director (Finance), UPPCL
7. Shri Y.P. Singh, EE, UPPCL
8. Shri Padamjit Singh, PSEB

**ORDER
(DATE OF HEARING: 20.6.2006)**

The petitioner in the present petition has, *inter alia*, sought a direction to the first respondent, namely, Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation to clear all dues on account of Unscheduled Interchange charges and also to pay the current dues regularly.

2. The petition was last heard on 8.6. 2006 when Shri D.D. Chopra, learned counsel for the first respondent had filed an affidavit with an undertaking that against the total outstanding amount of about Rs. 311 crore, payable on account of UI charges, a sum of Rs. 50 crore was to be deposited within first week of June 2006. In our order dated 8.6.2006, we had directed the first respondent to deposit the amount before the next date of hearing, if not paid already.

3. We have been informed that an amount of Rs.50 crore has not been deposited by the first respondent so far. This is in clear violation of the commitment made on oath in the affidavit.

4. Shri S. K. Agrawal, Director (Finance) has stated that the payment could not be made because of the financial constraints being faced by the first respondent. He assured us that an amount of Rs. 50 crore would be paid before the end of June 2006 and another Rs. 50 crore would be paid in the month of July 2006. Thereafter, as undertaken by Shri Agrawal, the first respondent shall deposit the arrears on account of UI charges @ Rs. 75 crore during August to October 2006. The amount so paid during October 2006, will include a part of interest payment. After liquidation of the principal amount, the interest shall be paid in lump sum which shall be conveyed by the petitioner to the first respondent. Shri Padamjit Singh for PSEB pleaded that arrears on account of UI charges shall be paid at the earliest. Shri Agrawal has further undertaken to pay the current dues regularly.

5. Let the payments be made in accordance with the undertaking given by Shri Agrawal.

6. We make it clear that any violation of the undertaking given will draw appropriate penal proceedings in accordance with law. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to bring to the notice of the Commission the instances, if any, of contravention of the undertaking.

7. With the above directions, the petition stands disposed of.

**sd-/
(A.H. JUNG)
MEMBER**

**sd-/
(BHANU BHUSHAN)
MEMBER**

**sd-/
(ASHOK BASU)
CHAIRPERSON**

New Delhi dated the 20th June 2006