

**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** : 23.6.2022

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

**Petitioner** : DNH Power Distribution Corporation Limited (DHPDCL)

**Respondents** : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited and Anr.

**Parties present** : Shri Anand K. Ganesan, Advocate, DHPDCL  
Ms. Swapna Seshadri Advocate, DHPDCL  
Ms. Ritu Apurva, Advocate, DHPDCL  
Shri Gajendra Singh Vasava, NLDC, POSOCO  
Shri Alok Shankar, Advocate, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

The matter was called out for virtual hearing.

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that earlier the power flow for DNH system was through Gujarat region i.e. Navasari to Magarwada to Kala. Meanwhile, in order to meet the requirement of Maharashtra system, PGCIL erected new 765 kV transmission line from Kudus to Kala. However, Maharashtra system could not develop its 220 kV downstream transmission system from Kudus, such failure by Maharashtra system has resulted into non-usage of transmission system built for Maharashtra. Learned counsel submitted that after the Kudus-Kala transmission line was put into commercial operation, the flow for DNH system changed from 765 kV Aurangabad to Padghe, from Padghe to Kudus and Kudus to Kala. This change in flow for DNH system has resulted in the increase in PoC charges of the Petitioner for no fault of it.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that subsequent to the filing of instant petition, the functions of CTU from PGCIL have been segregated. Accordingly, CTUIL needs to be impleaded in the instant petition. He also requested to permit it to implead MSETCL and MSEDCL as parties to the petition as their interest would be affected if the prayers of the Petitioner are granted.



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of PGCIL submitted that prior to the segregation of the role of CTU from PGCIL, a combined reply was filed on behalf of PGCIL and CTU. However, after the segregation of the CTU role, a separate reply on behalf of CTUIL may be required to be filed.

5. The Commission ordered as under:

- I. The Petitioner to implead CTUIL, MSEDCL and MSETCL and to file revised “memo of parties”
- II. To serve copy of the Petition on the Respondents including the impleaded parties by 1.7.2022. The Commission further directed:
  - a. The Petitioner to submit the Block Diagram Arrangement of power flow between Maharashtra, Gujarat and DHPDCL during the subject period on affidavit by 7.7.2022 with a copy to the other parties.
  - b. NLDC to file its submission including on the issue of POC on affidavit by 18.7.2022 with a copy to the other parties.
  - c. The CTUIL to submit the status of implementation of downstream assets of Maharashtra on affidavit by 18.7.2022 with a copy to the other parties.

6. The Commission directed the Respondents, including CTUIL, MSEDCL and MSETCL, to file their reply by 18.7.2022 after serving copy to the Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, by 29.7.2022 and the parties to comply with the directions within the timeline specified. The Commission also observed that no further extension of time will be granted.

7. The petition shall be listed for final hearing in due course for which a separate notice will be issued.

**By order of the Commission**

**sd/-**  
(V. Sreenivas)  
Joint Chief (Law)

