



Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission
Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi – 110017.

No. F.11(1817)/DERC/2020-21/6946

Petition No. 45/2020

In the matter of : Petition u/S 86 of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking suitable directions to enable the Petitioner to implement the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Deviation Settlement Mechanism and related matters) Regulations, 2014, as amended.

BSES Rajdhani Power Limited

....Petitioner

Vs.

Delhi Transco Ltd. & Ors.

....Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Shri Justice Shabihul Hasnain 'Shastri', Chairperson

Hon'ble Dr. A. K. Ambasht, Member

Appearance:

1. Mr. Buddy A. Ranganadhan , Adv. BRPL
2. Mr. Dushyant Manocha, Adv., BRPL
3. Mr. Jordan R., Adv., DTL and SLDC
4. Mr. Anand K. Srivastava, Adv., TPDDL
5. Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Adv., PPCL & IPGCL
6. Mr. Bharat Gurjar, DTL
7. Mr. Abhishek, BRPL

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 14.09.2021)

(Date of Order: 14.09.2021)

1. Heard Mr. Buddy A. Ranganadhan, Counsel for the Petitioner, as well as Mr. Jordan. R, Counsel for the Respondent Nos. 1 & 2. Ms. Swapna Seshadri has put in appearance of the opposite parties Nos. 6, 7 & 8. The dispute appears to be mainly between the Petitioner as well as opposite parties Nos. 1 and 2. After hearing Mr. Ranganadhan for some time, it appears that even the word dispute is not proper to the pleadings made by Mr. Ranganadhan. In fact, there is a situation where a harmonious understanding of technology between opposite parties Nos. 1 & 2 and the Petitioner is the requirement of the day. The stability of the grid is the concern of the Petitioner as well as the opposite parties. Both the Counsels have agreed to this without any hesitation.

WEAR FACE MASK

WASH HANDS REGULARLY

MAINTAIN SOCIAL DISTANCING

2. The prayer of the Petitioner appears to be to the effect that the meters at the disposal of the Petitioner do give them an indication of the power being drawn at a particular moment but the opposite parties take about a month's time after the incident, to intimate the DISCOMs about the over drawl or under drawl. It has been agreed by both the parties and the Commission also appears to be *prima facie* in tandem with the arguments that if the measurement systems of the Petitioner as well opposite parties Nos. 1 & 2 can be synchronized somehow, the problem will be resolved to a great extent to the benefit of all.
3. In this situation the Commission is of the view that instead of getting a reply filed by the opposite parties No. 1 & 2, it will be better that responsible officers or officials from both the sides may mutually agree to sit on a particular date together and do a brainstorming session with the advancing technology in view and find a technical solution to the issue in question. Instead of fixing a particular date we leave it to the good officer(s) of both the parties to come to some conclusion within a period of a month from today. At this juncture, Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Counsel for Respondent No. 6, 7 & 8 as well as Anand Srivastava, Counsel for opposite party no. 4 have also requested to be participants in this discussion/meeting which the Commission permits. The BRPL will host the meeting.
4. List this case on 09.11.2021.

Sd/-
(Dr. A.K. Ambast)
Member

Sd/-
(Justice Shabihul Hasnain 'Shastri')
Chairperson