

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 163/MP/2019

Subject : Petition under Section 79(1)(c) and (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 for adjudication of disputes which have arisen on account of the incorrect billing of PoC charges by the Respondents on the Petitioner.

Date of Hearing : 22.9.2022

Coram : Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri P. K. Singh, Member

Petitioner : DNH Power Distribution Corp. Ltd. (DNHPDCL)

Respondents : Powergrid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL) and 4 Ors.

Parties Present : Shri Anand K Ganesan, Advocate, DNHPDCL
Ms. Ritu Apurva, Advocate, DNHPDCL
Ms. Ashabari, Advocate, DNHPDCL
Shri Alok Shankar, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Chitikena Abhijith, PGCIL
Shri Arjun Malhotra, PGCIL
Shri Pankaj Sharma, PGCIL
Shri Shashank Shekhar, CTUIL
Shri Ranjeet Singh, CTUIL
Shri Siddharth Sharma, CTUIL
Shri Alok Mishra, POSOCO
Shri Sanny Machal, POSOCO

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that pursuant to the Record of Proceedings for the hearing dated 23.6.2022, the Petitioner has impleaded CTUIL, MSEDCL and MSETCL as party to the Petition. The learned counsel submitted that while the Petitioner had immediately mapped them as Respondents on e-filing portal, an amended memo of parties to this effect has been filed recently and thus, a formal notice needs to be issued to these Respondents especially to MSEDCL & MSETCL since as per the Petitioner the abnormal increase in its PoC charged (approximately 3 times) without there being any corresponding increase in usage of inter-State network has been on account of failure of implementation of downstream assets in Maharashtra.

2. The representative of CTUIL submitted that as per the direction of the Commission vide Record of Proceedings for the hearing dated 23.6.2022, CTUIL has already filed its affidavit providing the status of the downstream assets being implemented by MSETCL.

3. In response to query of the Commission as to the reasons for increase in PoC charges as stated by the Petitioner in the present Petition, the representative of CTUIL

submitted that if the Commission deems fit, CTUIL may convene a meeting with concerned stakeholders including MSETCL, MSEDCL & PGCIL in this regard and will, thereafter, file the minutes of such meeting for consideration of the Commission.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the Petitioner and the representative of the CTUIL, the Commission directed to issue notices to the Respondents, MSEDCL & MSETCL and further directed the CTUIL to convene a meeting to look into the aspects of increase in the PoC Charges of the Petitioner as raised in the petition with the concerned stakeholders within two weeks and to file the minutes of meeting within period of two weeks thereafter. Pursuant to filing of such minutes, the Respondents may also file their reply to the Petition, if any, within two weeks with copy to the Petitioner who may file its rejoinder thereafter within two weeks thereafter.

5. The Petition shall be listed for hearing after receiving request from the Petitioner for listing.

By order of the Commission

**Sd/-
(T.D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)**