



Uttar Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission

UTTAR PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Vidyut Niyamak Bhawan, Vibhuti Khand, Gomti Nagar, Lucknow-226010.

Petition No 1828/ 2022

Quorum

Shri Raj Pratap Singh, Chairman
Shri Kaushal Kishore Sharma, Member
Shri Vinod Kumar Srivastava, Member (Law)

In the matter of:

“Petition under Regulation 38 of Uttar Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions for Open Access) Regulations, 2019 read with Regulation 59 of UPERC ((Conduct of Business) Regulation 2019 and other relevant provisions of Electricity Act, 2003 against the rejection of Open Access NoC by the PVVNL Discom.”

M/s Crosslays Remedies Ltd. W-3, Sector-1, Vaishali Ghaziabad, UP- 201010.

.....Petitioner

Versus

1. Paschimanchal Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited (PVVNL), Urja Bhawan Victoria Park, Meerut – 250001.
2. Uttar Pradesh Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. (UPPTCL), Shakti Bhawan, 14- Ashok Marg, Lucknow – 226001.
3. Uttar Pradesh State Load Despatch Centre (UPSLDC), Phase – II, Vibhuti Khand, Lucknow – 226010.

.....Respondent

The following were present:

1. Shri D.K Gupta, Executive Engineer, PVVNL





2. Shri Shashwat Singh, Advocate, UPSLDC.
3. Shri Divyanshu Bhatt, Advocate, UPSLDC
4. Shri Rohan Singh, Legal Consultant, IERS
5. Shri M.K. Gupta, Executive Engineer, SLDC.

ORDER

(Date of Hearing 19.07.2022)

1. The Petitioner M/s. Crosslays Remedies Ltd, located at W-3, Sector-1, Vaishali Ghaziabad, UP-201010, is a commercial consumer of PVVNL (Pashchimanchal Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Limited).
2. The Petitioner had applied online on UPSLDC portal on 10.05.2021 for grant of Open Access NoC. The Petitioner received the NoC in ST-11 format from the transmission side i.e. UPPTCL on 16.06.2021 but, the Respondent No.1 Pashchimanchal Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Limited rejected the Petitioner's Open Access NoC on the ground that feeder capacity is not available.
3. The Respondent No. 1 also rejected the Petitioner's Open Access NoC on the ground that the total of Open Access quantum and contracted demand is exceeding the feeder capacity, but as per the general understanding of the process, the Open Access quantum is supplied to the feeder within the contracted capacity.
4. As per the submission, the Petitioner's Demand for Open Access Quantum is well within the contracted capacity which the Petitioner have with the PVVNL, the Petitioner just seek an alternative source of power on the same line, the Petitioner's Open Access quantum is lower than the contracted demand. So, in this way the criteria of feeder capacity would not be violated.

(Handwritten mark)



(Handwritten signature)