

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram

1. Shri D.P. Sinha, Member
2. Shri G.S. Rajamani, Member
3. Shri K.N. Sinha, Member

Petition No.20/2001

In the matter of

**Review of order dated 16.1.2001 on Grid Disturbance in
Northern Regional Grid on 2nd January, 2001**

And in the matter of

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

.... Petitioner

The following were present:

1. Shri Bhanu Bhushan, Director (Operations), PGCIL
2. Shri Alok Roy, AGM (NRLDC), PGCIL
3. Shri T.S.P.Rao, DGM(Law), PGCIL
4. Shri V. Mittal, DGM(SO), PGCIL

**ORDER
(DATE OF HEARING 12.6.2001)**

There occurred a major grid disturbance in Northern Region on 2.1.2001. A hearing to enquire into the causes of the grid disturbance was held on 15.1.2001 by the Commission. The Commission constituted a Special Bench comprising Shri D.P. Sinha, Member and Shri G.S. Rajamani, Member delegating the function of carrying on further proceedings in this enquiry. The findings recorded by the Special Bench were communicated to all concerned.

2. PGCIL has filed the present review petition as it feels aggrieved by certain observations made by the Special Bench. The review petition has been heard by the Commission with the prescribed quorum. The review petition is listed for admission.

3. In the first place, a clarification has been sought by PGCIL whether the order dated 16.1.2001 is to be treated as an order of the Commission or that of the Special Bench since the letter dated 5.2.2001, under which the order was conveyed, gives an impression that the order has been passed by the Commission. We make it clear that the order conveyed to the parties is that of the Special Bench. The forwarding letter dated 5.2.2001 inadvertently refers to it as "the order passed by the Commission." With this observation, the matter stands clarified.

4. In para 3 of the order dated 16.1.2001, it has been stated that the Panipat breaker problem has been continuing since earlier grid disturbance and that the recommendations in this regard by the earlier Enquiry Committee have not been complied with. It has been pointed by PGCIL that no problem in regard to 400 KV breaker at Panipat sub-station belonging to BBMB, to which reference has been made in the order of the Special Bench, has been reported in the past. We have considered the issue raised by the petitioner. We find that a reference to "breaker" in the order appears to be a clerical error. In fact, the observation was in the context of the "sub-station" at Panipat. We direct that the clerical error

shall be corrected and " breaker" shall be substituted by the word "sub-station" in the statement under reference therein in para 3 of the order.

5. In the order dated 16.1.2001, the Special Bench had not agreed with some of the submissions made by PGCIL (CTU) regarding islanding of the grid in view of Section 6.2(b) and 6.2(m) of IEGC (December 1999). It has been pointed out by PGCIL that the conclusion drawn by the Special Bench does not flow from the provisions of Section 6.2(b) and 6.2(m) of IEGC. According to PGCIL, a proper load generation balance is the basic necessity for any island to survive and in the absence of free governor mode of operation of generating units or automatic load shedding by under frequency relays, the load generation balance may not be achieved and the island may not survive. We have considered the submission made by PGCIL. The Special Bench in its order had stated that the island can survive only if there is proper load generation balance. During grid disturbance, the integrated operation of the grid is lost and the observations made in the order on this issue are the outcome of discussions during the hearing in the context of early restoration of the grid following the disturbance. We, therefore, do not feel that the order dated 16.1.2001 needs to be reviewed on this ground.

6. In the order of the Special Bench, it has been stated that the 132 KV Singrauli-Pipri line belongs to UPPCL. According to PGCIL, the statement is factually incorrect since the line belongs to NTPC. We find that the representative

appearing on behalf of NTPC made the statement recorded in the order of 16.1.2001. However, the discrepancy pointed out by PGCIL does not in any manner affect any of the directions contained in the order on merits. The discrepancy pointed out by PGCIL may at best be a recording error. This may be suitably corrected.

7. In para 6 of the order of the Special Bench, the submissions made by the representative of Bhakra Beas Management Board (BBMB) have been reproduced. It is recorded that the representative of BBMB stated that PGCIL is offering the line protection scheme which is 15 years old and is obsolete, but BBMB is requesting for the state of the art, latest protection scheme. The order further records the statement attributable to the representative of BBMB that the issue remains unresolved. PGCIL in its review petition has referred to the efforts made by it for replacing the line protection scheme. It has pointed out that in the events of 2.1.2001, the protection scheme provided at 400 KV Panipat sub-station did not mal operate. According to PGCIL, the subject of replacement of protection scheme was neither relevant nor an issue in the proceedings and, therefore, the recordings under para 6 need to be reviewed. As we have already noted para 6 of the Special Bench's order records only the submission made by the representative of BBMB, without any further directions. PGCIL has not denied the correctness of the submissions made by the representative of BBMB. Therefore, it does not call for any further review.

8. The CTU was directed to ensure compliance of the recommendations of the earlier Enquiry Committees. According to PGCIL, the function of compliance of the recommendation of earlier Enquiry Committees is assigned to CEA and therefore, has sought review of the direction. We take notice of the fact that the compliance of the recommendations of the Enquiry Committees was being monitored by CEA. With the amendment of Indian Electricity Act 1910 in 1998 and creation of the CTU for discharge of functions under sub-section (2) of Section 27A of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910, it is considered appropriate that further action for implementation of the recommendations of the earlier Enquiry Committees is taken by the CTU. The directions given by the Special Bench are to be seen in the light of the present statutory framework. Therefore, we do not consider it necessary to review the direction given by the Special Bench. As already observed by the Special Bench, the CTU may take assistance of the Government on this issue who in turn might avail of the good offices of CEA in this matter.

9. In the order of 16.1.2001, the Special Bench made an observation that the CTU has not been able to manage the grid in a satisfactory manner. It has been pointed out by PGCIL that under Section 55(1) of the Electricity (Supply) Act 1948, the statutory responsibility of the CTU is to "operate the RLDCs" and not to "manage the grid". According to PGCIL (CTU), the function of management of grid is that of RLDCs. PGCIL has thus sought review of the observation. Shri Bhanu Bhushan, Director (O), PGCIL has submitted that the provisions of

Section 55(1) of the Electricity (Supply) Act 1948 imply that CTU shall provide only the administrative and financial support to RLDCs. We are not inclined to agree with the contention raised on behalf of PGCIL. In accordance with the sub-section (1) of Section 55 of Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, until otherwise specified by the Central Government, the Central Transmission Utility shall "operate" the Regional Load Despatch Centres. The "operate" means "to put in action and supervise the working of; to perform a work of labour; to effect any result; to bring about a specified result; to produce the proper or intended effect. (P. Ramanathan Aiyar's Law Lexicon, Second Edition). The word "operation" which is a grammatical variation of the word "operate" is defined "as the exertion of power, physical, mechanical or moral; methods of working, etc." The word "operate" used in Section 55(1) is to be construed accordingly. In view of this, we do not have an iota of doubt that the CTU (PGCIL having been notified as the CTU), has the ultimate responsibility for operation of the grid through the Regional Load Despatch Centres. PGCIL has not disputed the observation made by the Special Bench regarding the improper management of the grid. Its only grievance in the present review petition is that the CTU does not have a role in the management of the grid and we have negated such a contention raised by PGCIL. In view of this, we do not find any error in the observation made by the Special Bench.

With the above observations, the review petition is disposed of at admission stage.

Sd/-

(K.N. SINHA)
Member

Sd/-

(G.S. RAJAMANI)
Member

Sd/-

(D.P.SINHA)
Member

Place: New Delhi
Dated: 20.6.2001