

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No.365/MP/2022**

- Subject : Petition under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 6.4 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Indian Electricity Grid Code) Regulations, 2010 in regard to the non-compliance by the Respondents No. 1 - 5 with the provisions of the Indian Electricity Grid Code and other allied Regulations of this Commission and directives issued by the Petitioner - State Load Despatch Centre, Gujarat under Section 33 of the Electricity Act, 2003.
- Date of Hearing : 10.8.2023
- Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson  
Shri I. S. Jha, Member  
Shri Arun Goyal, Member  
Shri P. K. Singh, Member
- Petitioner : State Load Despatch Centre, Gujarat (SLDC)
- Respondents : Western Railways (WR) and 6 Ors.
- Parties Present : Ms. Kriti Soni, Advocate, SLDC  
Ms. Puja Priyadarshini, Advocate, WR  
Shri Devyanshu Sharma, Advocate, WR  
Shri Debajyoti Majumdar, NLDC  
Shri Alok Mishra, NLDC

**Record of Proceedings**

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Respondent, WR, submitted that subsequent to the filing of the present Petition, tied-up capacity of WR had already been increased to 120 MW (as against 90 MW), and this capacity has now been further increased to 180 MW to meet its demand in the State of Gujarat and consequently, to adhere to its drawl schedules.

2. The Learned counsel for the Petitioner, on the other hand, prayed for an adjournment on ground of the non-availability of the arguing counsel.

3. In response to the specific query of the Commission regarding the need for further oral hearing in the matter in view of the remedial action(s) taken by WR as indicated, the learned counsel for the Petitioner urged for another opportunity of oral hearing in the matter.

4. Keeping in view the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, the Commission directed the Respondent, WR, to file an additional affidavit indicating actions taken by it for reducing the overdrawal, including an increase in the

firm tied-up capacity, within two weeks, with a copy to the Petitioner who may file its response thereon, including on the aspect as to the sufficiency of WR's increased tied-up capacity vis-à-vis its demand/schedules within a week thereafter. Further, keeping in view the nature of prayers made by the Petitioner and the action(s) stated to have been taken by WR, the Commission did not find any need for further oral hearing in the matter.

5. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the matter for order.

**By order of the Commission**

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