

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Coram:**

- 1. Shri K.N. Sinha, Member**
- 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 Limited, Lucknow
2. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd., Panchkula
3. Power Development Deptt., Govt. of Jammu & Kashmir, Jammu
4. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
5. Delhi Transco Limited, New Delhi
6. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited, Jaipur
7. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
8. Uttaranchal Power Corporation Limited, Dehradun
9. Electricity Department, UT Chandigarh, Chandigarh

**.....Respondents**

**The following were present:**

1. Shri S.K. Soonee, ED, NRLDC
2. Shri P.K. Agarwal, CM, NRLDC
3. Shri A. Mani, DGM, NRLDC
4. Shri S.R. Narasimhan, Chief Manager, NRLDC
5. Shri V.V. Sharma, NRLDC
6. Shri D.D. Chopra, Advocate, UPPCL
7. Shri Ashok Kumar, UPPCL
8. Shri Brijendra Nath, UPPCL
9. Shri D.P. Singh, UPPCL
10. Shri T.P.S. Bawa, OSD (Comml), PSEB
11. Shri N.K. Joshi, DGM, Delhi Transco Limited

**ORDER**  
**(DATE OF HEARING : 20.10.2005)**

It has been submitted that the first respondent, namely, Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited has been recklessly overdrawing power from the Northern Regional Grid in violation of the provisions of Indian Electricity Grid Code and despite the instructions to the contrary from the petitioner. It is alleged that the first respondent's conduct has the tendency to endanger the grid security, and has the propensity to cause irreparable damage. It is further alleged that the first respondent has failed to make payments of UI charges for the overdrawals, and the amount outstanding against the first respondent stood at Rs.203.62 crore for the period up to 17.7.2005, which has increased further. It has been pointed out that despite an undertaking given by the representative of the first respondent in the earlier proceedings in Petition No.33/2005 filed by fifth respondent (Delhi Transco), the first respondent has failed to make payments of UI charges.

2. We have heard the representatives of the parties present at the hearing. Shri S.K. Soonee for the petitioner submitted that the amount of UI charges due up to the first week of October 2005 stood at nearly 390 crore. It was submitted that the first respondent continued to overdraw without heeding to the instructions from the petitioner even at frequency of 48.50 Hz and below. Shri Soonee placed before us the state of drawal by different constituents of Northern Region on 10.8.2005

3. The representative of the first respondent submitted that it was forced to overdraw power from the Northern Regional Grid since some of the generating stations of NTPC supplying power to the first respondent were under forced outage for a considerable period. He submitted that during the week immediately preceding the

date of hearing, the first respondent had not resorted to any overdrawal but had drawn less than its allocated capacity. He had assured that the first respondent would make all possible efforts to contain overdrawals in future, without making any express commitment. On the question of payment of UI charges, it was submitted that the Commission's decision to enhance rate of UI at Rs.5.70/kWh is under challenge before the Lucknow Bench of Allahabad High Court. He, however, admitted the liability of the first respondent to pay UI charges at the rate of Rs.4.20/kWh, that is, the pre-revised rate. The representative of the first respondent could not quantify even the amount computed on the basis of UI rate of Rs.4.20/kWh. Neither could he give any indication regarding to the time for the settlement of UI account. We had asked the representative of the first respondent to give us a firm date for full payment of UI charges. He was unable to make any commitment since, according to him, this decision was to be taken by the top management. We do not appreciate this kind of attitude for the reason that the person detailed for hearing before the Commission has to be suitably briefed on the issues raised.

4. We direct the petitioner to place on record the drawal pattern of all constituents of Northern Region for at least 10 days, at low frequency, which shall include period prior to when the generating stations alleged by the first respondent were under forced outage.

5. The first respondent is also directed to file the following details:

- (a) Additional load sanctioned by the first respondent during the years 1996-2005;

- (b) Year-wise demand forecast for the next 10 years commencing from 1.1.2006;
- (c) Efforts made to meet the present and future demand;
- (d) Steps taken and to be taken to curtail overdrawals from the Regional Grid and the specific time-frame therefor; and
- (e) Time schedule for payment of UI charges presently due as per the petitioner.

6. The affidavits as aforesaid shall be filed by the petitioner and the first respondent latest by 30.11.2005. They will exchange their affidavits before submitting before the Commission.

7. List this petition on 15.12.2005 for further directions.

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

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

**Sd/-  
(K.N. SINHA)  
MEMBER**

**New Delhi dated the 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2005**