

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No.** : 630/MP/2020

**Subject** : Petition for seeking appropriate dispensation and guidance in terms of the Minutes of Meeting dated 10.1.2020 between the Petitioner and the Respondents for implementation of closed bus operation of Unit 1 (connected to STU) and Unit 2 (connected to ISTS) at Petitioner's 2x300 MW coal based thermal generating station located at Tadali, Chandrapur in the State of Maharashtra.

**Date of Hearing** : 7.12.2021

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

**Petitioner** : Dhariwal Infrastructure Limited (DIL)

**Respondents** : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited ('PGCIL') and 6 Ors.

**Parties present** : Shri Sanjay Sen, Sr. Advocate, DIL  
Shri Avijeet Lala, Advocate, DIL  
Ms. Meha Chandra, Advocate, DIL  
Ms. Mandakini Ghosh, Advocate, DIL  
Ms. Suparna Srivastava, Advocate, CTU  
Ms. Soumya Singh, Advocate, CTU  
Shri Tushar Mathru, Advocate, CTU  
Shri Subir Kumar Saha, DIL  
Shri Aveek Chatterjee, DIL  
Mr. Rabi Chowdhury, DIL  
Mr. Bhaskar Kumar Ganguly, DIL  
Mr. Shubhayu Sanyal, DIL  
Mr. Aditya Das , WRLDC  
Ms. S.Usha, WRLDC  
Mr. Sudhanshu S Choudhari, MSLDC & MSETCL  
Mr. Mahesh Shinde, MSLDC & MSETCL

**Record of Proceedings**

The matter was called out for virtual hearing.

2. The learned senior counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the instant petition has been filed seeking directions to allow inter-connection of 400 kV buses of STU connected Unit-1 and CTU-connected Unit-2 of the Petitioner's generating station, without prejudice to the existing connectivity of Unit-1 with STU and Unit-2 with CTU. The gist of submissions made by the learned senior counsel are as follows:



- a) The Petitioner has set-up a 2x300 MW coal based thermal generating station("the generating station") at Tadali in the State of Maharashtra. Unit-1 of the generating station is connected with the intra-State transmission system i.e. of Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. whereas Unit-2 is connected with inter-State transmission system (ISTS).
- b) The Petitioner has tied up 270 MW capacity (170 MW with NPCL and 100 MW with TANGEDCO) from its Unit-2. However, there is no long-term/ medium-term PPA for Unit-1 till date, leading it to be stranded.
- c) Presently, from Unit-1, the Petitioner is supplying power to MSEDCL on short-term basis, which is about to expire soon. In addition, there are limited short-term opportunities for sale of power within the State of Maharashtra from Unit-1. As a result, PLF of Unit-1 has always remained low ever since its COD causing financial stress to the Petitioner.
- d) The Central Electricity Authority (CEA) in its meeting held on 10.1.2020 has also observed that the Petitioner's proposal to allow closed bus operation of Unit-1 and Unit-2 is technically feasible.
- e) The proposal to connect the presently disconnected station buses of STU-connected Unit-1 and CTU-connected Unit-2 of its generating station would provide additional options to the Petitioner for evacuation of the idle capacity available in Unit-1 through ISTS for buyers outside the State of Maharashtra at competitive tariffs.
- f) There are no technical issues in operating both Units in connected bus mode, as is evident from the MoM with CEA. The proposed connection of STU-connected Unit-1 and CTU-connected Unit-2 of the Petitioner's generating station will not impose any technical or grid security-related issues.
- g) Regulation 13(11) of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Sharing of Inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulations, 2010 (in short, "the 2010 Sharing Regulations") and Regulation 6.4.2(c)(iii) of the Grid Code recognises that a generator may be connected to both the STU network and ISTS.
- h) The principle on applicability of appropriate transmission charges and losses based on the utilization of ISTS or STU network has been affirmed by the Commission in its order dated 9.3.2018 in Petition No. 20/MP/2017 (Kanti Bijlee Utpadan Nigam Ltd. vs Central Transmission Utility & Ors.) and order dated 30.3.2017 in Petition No. 291/MP/2015 (Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Ltd. & Ors. vs Southern Regional Load Despatch Centre & Anr.)
- i) The Commission through its orders has adequately addressed the issues related to scheduling, control area jurisdiction and applicable transmission charges and losses in cases of generating stations connected to or planning to get connected to both ISTS and STU network, and even otherwise.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of CTU submitted that the only issue to be considered is whether the arrangement proposed by the Petitioner is legally permissible under the Regulations of the Commission. As per CEA, technically such



arrangement is permissible. However, the commercial and regulatory aspect has to be considered by the Commission. She submitted that the responsibility of scheduling, despatch and accounting of electricity in the course of Inter-State transmission System and Intra-State transmission System has been statutorily entrusted to the concerned RLDC and SLDC respectively who are to discharge the same “in accordance with the contracts entered into with the licensees or the generating companies operating in the region/ State” and also in accordance with the provisions of the Grid Code. Referring to the order dated 9.3.2018 in Petition No.20/MP/2017 and Clause 1.4 of Regulation 8 of the Detailed Procedure, she submitted that the Commission has observed that it is a settled position that under the Grid Code, a generator may opt to be connected to both the inter-State Transmission System and the Intra-State Transmission System. In such a situation, connectivity has to be for separate and distinct capacities as indicated in the applications for connectivity by the generator and that scheduling and despatch of power is to be done in accordance with the provisions of clause 6.4 of the Grid Code. The order dated 9.3.2018 does not permit the utilisation of ISTS connectivity for undertaking power transaction for the quantum for which connectivity has been granted for Intra-State transmission System or vice-versa. She submitted that there is no provision in the Statutes/ Regulations which permits connectivity of the same capacity to both the CTU and STU systems. Therefore, the prayers of the Petitioner cannot be granted in the existing legal regime.

4. The representative of WRLDC and POSOCO submitted that technically there is no issue in implementing the arrangement proposed by the Petitioner. She submitted that since the Petitioner wants 100% flexibility in scheduling of power between STU and CTU network, she suggested that the Petitioner may surrender STU connectivity for Unit-I and obtain additional 300 MW ISTS connectivity from CTU, only then 100% scheduling of power can be done by RLDC.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Maharashtra SLDC and MSETCL submitted that they have no objection to the arrangement proposed by the Petitioner and reply to the instant petition has been filed.

6. The Commission permitted the Petitioner to file short note by 28.12.2021 with a copy to the Respondents.

7. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved order in the matter.

**By order of the Commission**

**Sd/-**

(V. Sreenivas)  
Deputy Chief (Law)

