

**BEFORE THE UTTAR PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
LUCKNOW**

Petition No. 831/2012

IN THE MATTER OF:

Issuing necessary directions to concerned parties, for ensuring utilisation of full capacity of long term open access by the open access customers before grant of short term open access to the intra-State transmission system, by suitably modifying/clarifying necessary Regulations/Procedures as applicable.

AND

IN THE MATTER OF:

U.P. Power Transmission Corporation Ltd.
(through its Director (Commercial))
11th Floor, Shakti Bhawan Extn.
14 - Ashok Marg
Lucknow – 226 001

----- **Petitioner**

The following were present:

1. Sri Rahul Srivastava, Advocate and Counsel for UPSLDC
2. Sri Ramesh Mehta, Chief Engineer, SLDC
3. Sri R. K. Gupta, SE, SLDC
4. Sri S. P. Gupta, EE, SLDC
5. Sri Rama Shankar Awasthi, Lucknow
6. Sri B.K. Saxena, Executive Engineer, UPPTCL
7. Sri Amit Jaiswal, Advocate and Counsel for UPPTCL
8. Sri Rajiv Goyal, Head – Projects & Power Trading, NPCL
9. Sri Manoj Jain, Head – Finance, NPCL
10. Sri A. K. Arora, Resident Officer, NPCL

Order

(Date of Hearing : 05.03.2013)

The Commission published a notice dated 14.01.13 in the newspapers on 15.01.13 inviting comments or suggestions or objections on the aforementioned petition from State Load Despatch Centre (SLDC), distribution licensees, generating companies, permitted open access consumers and other stakeholders/interested parties by 04.02.13 with an advance copy to the Petitioner who should file reply to such

submissions by 18.02.13. The hearing in the matter was fixed on 20.02.13. Later the Commission published a notice dated 07.02.13 on 08.02.13 extending the date of submission of comments or suggestions or objections to 15.02.13 and for reply by UPPTCL to 28.02.13 and rescheduled hearing on 05.03.13.

The Petitioner, SLDC, Noida Power Company Ltd. (NPCL) and Sri Rama Shankar Awasthi appeared for hearing. Sri Rama Shankar Awasthi filed written submission during the hearing.

Sri Amit Jaiswal, Advocate and Counsel for the Petitioner, submitted that the Petitioner had received written responses from SLDC and NPCL and none of them had filed para wise reply to the petition and for that reason, the Petitioner had not replied to submissions of SLDC and NPCL. He stated further that the pleadings in the case were not complete as such arguments in the petition could not be taken up. SLDC and NPCL should either file para wise reply to the petition or they express before the Commission that they had not to file para wise reply and the written submission filed by them were final.

Sri Rahul Srivastava, Advocate and Counsel for SLDC, confirmed that SLDC had not to make para wise reply to the petition other than that submitted earlier before the Commission. The representative appearing on behalf of NPCL stated that certain issues specific to NPCL had been raised in their written reply and the petition had not been objected by NPCL. Sri Awasthi did not express desire to file para wise reply to the petition.

In consideration of oral submissions made by above mentioned parties, the Petitioner is directed to file replies to written submissions made before the Commission by SLDC, NPCL and Sri Awasthi with 15 days of receipt of this order. After completion of pleadings, the hearing in the matter shall be fixed by a public notice.

(Meenakshi Singh)
Member

(Shree Ram)
Member

Place : Lucknow
Dated: 11.03.2013