



- vi) Pass such other order(s) as this Hon'ble Commission may deem just in the facts and circumstances of the present case.
2. During the proceedings on 23rd February 2021, Sh. Aniket Prason, Counsel of the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner is in the process of setting up of 100 MW Solar Park at Chitrakoot. With reference to the same, the Petitioner had made an application on 14th December 2018 to UPPTCL for grant of grid connectivity of their Solar Park from 132kV/33kV sub-station at Mau, Chitrakoot ("Sub-station") along with all the necessary documents and had also furnished the prescribed fee for the same. At the time of submission of application for grant of grid connectivity, it was informed to the Petitioner that the grid connectivity will be granted by August 2019. Further, as per Grant of Connectivity Regulations, UPPTCL is required to communicate in writing along with the reasons for not allowing interconnection at the nearest pooling station, within forty-five (45) days from the date of receipt of application to the applicant.
3. Counsel of the Petitioner further submitted that in event of rejecting the application, UPPTCL was required to update the status of grant of connectivity to the Petitioner within a period of 90 days. However, the same was not granted after numerous follow ups. The Petitioner meantime also requested UPPTCL to suggest an alternative substation in case connectivity is not available at the proposed substation. It is the contention of the Petitioner that the application for the connectivity was rejected by UPPTCL after twenty months on the grounds of non-availability of grid margin without suggesting any alternative sub-station. The Petitioner also requested the Commission to decide the matter early so that he can avail the incentives provided in the UP Solar Policy,2017.
4. Sh. Puneet Chandra Advocate for the UPPTCL requested the Commission to grant four (04) weeks of time to submit its counter. Sh. Pankaj Saxena on behalf of UPPTCL submitted that the request for grant of connectivity of the Petitioner was denied as there was no capacity at the proposed sub-station. It





was also the argument of the Respondents that proposed evacuation of 100 MW solar power cannot be carried out at 132 kV substation and would require 220 kV substation.

5. During the proceeding, the Commission enquired from the Petitioner that whether he is a Solar Park developer or a generating company. In response to the same, Sh. Aniket Prason, Counsel of the Petitioner submitted that it is a Solar Park Project Developer. Upon further investigation by the Commission, the Petitioner's Counsel submitted that neither the land has been finalized nor it has entered into any PPA as the Petitioner wanted to finalize the sub-station at which connectivity will be granted first and then other procedural requirements will be taken care of. Further, he clarified that the Petitioner is a solar park project developer and under this model therefore, each generator setting up their plant in the Solar park would sign the PPA independently with the buyer. As far as land is concerned, the same will be identified in accordance with the substation from which connectivity is granted.
6. The Commission heard the parties and directed UPPTCL to submit what measures it has taken to evacuate the power in Bundelkhand region for smooth implementation of UP Solar Policy 2017. Accordingly, UPPTCL was directed to submit following details along with its Counter within four (4) weeks.
 - a. Details of existing substations and new substations to be constructed by UPPTCL to evacuate power along with grid margin available at different voltage levels in Bundelkhand region for capacity addition under UP Solar Policy 2017.
 - b. Details of nearest substation where the margin is available and in how many days connectivity shall be granted to the Petitioner.

UPPTCL submitted its Counter Affidavit on 22nd March 2021.



[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten number 2]