

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Record of Proceedings**

**Petition No. 326/2009**

Subject: Petition under Section 79 (1) (c) and Section 79 (1) (h) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking directions for curtailment of over-draw of Electricity by various utilities.

Date of hearing: 15.7.2010

Coram: Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson  
Shri V.S.Verma, Member  
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner: Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Corporation Ltd.,  
Mumbai.

Respondents: UPPCL, HVPNL, DHBVNL, UHBVNL, and PSEB.

Parties present: Shri Ashish Bernard, Advocate, MSEDCL  
Shri Varun Pathak, Advocate, MSEDCL  
Shri Rahul Srivastava, Advocate, UPPCL  
Shri Mukesh Kumar, UPPCL  
Shri Satish Chandra, UPPCL  
Shri T.P.S.Bawa, HPPC  
Shri S.K.Bansal, UHBVNL  
Shri Sanjay Arora, HVPNL  
Shri R.K.Porwal, NRLDC  
Ms. Jyoti Prasad, NRLDC

Through this petition, the petitioner Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Corporation Ltd has *inter, alia* sought direction for restraining the constituents/utilities to over-draw electricity beyond their allocated share and to maintain grid discipline as laid down in the Indian Electricity Grid Code.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it has filed amended petition on 17.6.2010 impleading the Regional Power Committees (Western and Northern) and the Regional Load Despatch Centres (Western and Northern) and had served copies of the said application upon them. The learned counsel pointed out that it has not received any comments/reply from these parties. He also prayed that WRLDC & NRLDC may be directed to submit information on the draws by the utilities.

3. The representative of the respondent, HPPC submitted that it may be granted two weeks time to file its reply to the amended petition.

4. The learned counsel for the first respondent, UPPCL submitted that the reply filed by it on 11.5.2010 may be considered as reply to the amended petition filed by the petitioner.

5. The representative of the respondent, NRLDC submitted that it would file its reply to the petition during the course of the day. He also submitted that the issue of under-drawal and overdrawal by utilities has been brought to the notice of the Commission earlier through its various petitions and in the *Suo motu* petitions initiated by the Commission.

6. On a specific query by the Commission as to whether it was possible to submit the details of over drawal by utilities, the representative of NRLDC replied in the affirmative. The representative further submitted that Under Frequency Relay (UFR) in the system was to protect against major contingencies and though the petitioner had indicated the operation of UFRs in its system, the requisite quantum of load relief was not achieved. He further added that the load relief from all the constituents of Northern and Western Regions were also not as per requirement.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner requested that WRLDC & NRLDC be directed to include in its submissions, the details of the drawals for the period from April to June, 2010.

8. The Commission allowed the amended petition to be taken on record and directed WRLDC & NRLDC to submit the details of over drawal by each of the constituents, along with the details/quantum of messages issued to the constituents, with copy to the petitioner, latest by 26.7.2010.

9. The petitioner was directed to serve copies of the above information to other respondents, within one week thereafter. Respondents to file reply, with copy to the petitioner, latest by 9.8.2010. Rejoinder, if any, by the petitioner, within 16.8.2010.

10. Matter will be listed for hearing on 26.8.2010

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