

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 241/MP/2019

Subject : Petition under Sections 79(1)(f) read with 79(1)(c) and 79(1)(b) of the Electricity Act, 2003 relating to adjudication of dispute relating to Energy Meter Data discrepancy at Bhadrawati station leading to commercial loss to GMR Warora Energy Limited.

Date of Hearing : 18.10.2022

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

Petitioner : GMR Warora Energy Ltd. (GWEL)

Respondent : Power System Operation Corporation Ltd. and 2 Ors.

Parties Present : Shri Amit Kapur, Advocate, GWEL
Shri Akshat Jain, Advocate, GWEL
Shri Aditya Dubey, Advocate, GWEL
Shri Pallav Mongia, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Aditya Das, POSOCO & WRLDC
Shri Alok Mishra, POSOCO
Shri Benimadhav, PGCIL
Shri Arjun Malhotra, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the present Petition has been filed seeking directions to the Respondents to consider the transmission loss on the basis of the average loss for the last three months in accordance with the Commission's order dated 5.12.2017 in Petition No. 188/MP/2016 (Lanco Amarkantak Power Ltd. v PGCIL and Ors.), and further to pay Rs. 74 lakh to the Petitioner for commercial losses suffered due to incorrect readings of Special Energy Meter (SEM). Learned counsel further circulated a note of argument and mainly submitted as under:

(a) The generating station of the Petitioner is connected to ISTS at 400/220 kV Bhadravati by a dedicated 400 kV D/C line and its injection is computed from the readings of the main meters installed on 400 kV GWEL-Bhadrawati D/C at Bhadrawati end.

(b) On account of under-recording by SEM at line-1 at Bhadrawati end (PGCIL-end), incorrect data was recorded from 26.4.2018 to 25.5.2018 ('relevant period'). Moreover, though this under-recording was notified to PGCIL on 3.5.2018, it was rectified only on 25.5.2018 i.e. after a delay of 22 days.

(c) In this intervening period, the injection was computed by WRLDC using the standby meter readings of line 1 at GWEL end after applying the notional losses of 2%. This notional loss of 2% as applied by WRLDC is 1.65% to 1.85% higher than the actual transmission loss during the relevant period and as a result of this, the

Petitioner has been wrongly penalized and has incurred the losses of approximately 74 lakh for the relevant period.

(d) Regulation 6.4.21 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Indian Electricity Grid Code) Regulations, 2010 specifically casts an obligation on PGCIL/CTUIL to install SEM on all inter-connection points between the regional entities and other identified points for electricity interchanges and drawals. Further, as per the provisions of the Central Electricity Authority (Installation and Operation of Meters) Regulations, 2006, 'Check Meter' is required to be installed and used for accounting and billing of electricity in case of failure of the main meters.

(e) The obligation to install check meters is on WRLDC and PGCIL and during the relevant period, the Check Meters were not installed at Bhadrawati end and accordingly, the injection was computed by WRLDC using the standby meter reading of line 1 at GWEL end after applying notional losses of 2%.

(f) The Commission in its order dated 5.12.2017 in Petition No. 188/MP/2016 has already held that in case PGCIL did not have requisite data to determine transmission losses, transmission losses would be considered on the basis of average loss for the last three months. The said order squarely applied to the present case.

(g) The Petitioner is entitled to be compensated for the losses incurred to the tune of Rs. 74 lakh for the relevant period along with carrying cost/interest on such amount till the date of actual payment.

2. The representative of the Respondents, POSOCO and WRLDC submitted that the Respondents have already filed its reply in the matter. He further submitted that the methodology followed by WRLDC for loss computation using standby meter data with 2% notional loss for 400 kV lines, in absence of correct data from the main meter, was as per the extant practice in WRPC which was deliberated and agreed upon in the Commercial Co-ordination Committee meetings of WRPC in which the Petitioner is also a member.

3. Learned counsel for the Respondent, PGCIL submitted that PGCIL has also filed its reply in the matter, wherein it has explained the time taken by it in rectification of SEM.

4. After hearing the learned counsel and representative of the parties, the Commission reserved the matter for order.

**By order of the Commission
Sd/-**

**(T.D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)**