

**PUNJAB STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
SITE NO. 3, BLOCK B, SECTOR 18-A MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH

**Petition No. 16 of 2021**  
**Date of Order: 16.07.2021**

Petition under Section 142 and 146 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for taking necessary action against the respondents for violating the provisions of Regulation 6.3, 9.1.3 and 9.2 of the Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations, 2014 (hereinafter to be called Supply Code-2014) and further for seeking directions to the PSPCL to comply with the clause 9.1.3 and 9.2 of the supply code-2014 and release the extended load of the petitioner through idle circuit of Double Circuit 66 kV line already existing near the factory of the petitioner, and further in case the load cannot be released from this line then to recover charges as per clause 9.1.3 (iii) of the Supply Code- 2014 only, in the interest of justice.

AND

In the matter of: M/s G.O. Steel Pvt. Ltd., Badinpur Road, Village Kahanpur, Amloh, District Fatehgarh Sahib, through its authorized signatory Mr. K.. Parti.

.. Petitioner

1. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. through its Chairman cum Managing Director, The Mall Patiala.
2. Chief Engineer/ Commercial, Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. Patiala.

.. Respondents

Present: Sh. Viswajeet Khanna, Chairperson  
Ms. Anjuli Chandra, Member  
Sh. Paramjeet Singh, Member

## ORDER

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 142 and 146 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for taking necessary action against the respondents for violating the provisions of Regulation 6.3, 9.1.3 and 9.2 of the Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations, 2014 and for directions to PSPCL to comply with the above clauses of the Supply Code and release the extended load of the petitioner through idle circuit of double circuit 66 kV line already existing near its factory and in case the load cannot be released from this line then to recover charges as per clause 9.1.3 (iii) of the Supply-Code 2014.

2. The petition was admitted vide Order dated 26.03.2021. PSPCL was directed to file comprehensive details including, inter alia, descriptive sketch(s) depicting route map of existing 66 kV Nahar Sugar line fed from 66kV sub-station Badipur, location of 220 kV feeding sub-station and proposed supply arrangement to release extension in load/demand to the petitioner. PSPCL was also directed to submit the details of expenditure booked on the erection of existing 66kV Nahar Sugar Line on double circuit towers and the amount recovered, if any, from the Nahar Sugar Mills. PSPCL vide memo No. 5971 dated 22.04.2021 made their submissions and the petitioner filed rejoinder dated 18.05.2021. The final arguments in the petition were heard on 23.06.2021.
3. The petitioner has submitted that the sanctioned load of the petitioner company is 2127 KW/ CD 2000 KVA. The petitioner applied for extension of load by 5054 KW/4252 KVA on 26-2-2020 and after extension the total load of the petitioner company would come to 7251 KW/ 6252 KVA. The petitioner company uploaded all the

necessary documents required for the extension of the load on the website/portal of the PSPCL and also deposited Rs. 3,18,900/- as earnest money on 2-3-2020.

- 3.1 That the extension of load was applied on 26-2-2020 and as per clause 6.3.2 of the Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations 2014, PSPCL is required to grant feasibility clearance within 60 days of the receipt of a request for extension of load and where the clearance is likely to take more than 60 days, the distribution licensee shall, within 30 days of the receipt of an application, seek the approval of the Commission for extending the period in which the feasibility clearance would be granted. PSPCL was required to give Feasibility Clearance upto 26-4-2020 but it failed to do the same. PSPCL has not taken any permission from the Commission for extension of time. When PSPCL failed to grant Feasibility Clearance the petitioner sent a letter dated 1-9-2020 to the CMD of PSPCL. The CE/ Commercial, PSPCL, Patiala sent a letter dated 1-10-2020 and issued Feasibility Clearance to the petitioner after about 7 months from the date the petitioner had applied for the extension of load.
- 3.2 That PSPCL has issued Feasibility Clearance to the petitioner but it has been mentioned that the load would be extended by erecting 6 No. multi ckt towers in place of existing 5 No. Double Circuit towers of 66 kV Nahar Sugar Line at the expenses of the petitioner. As per Regulation 4.2 of the supply code the extension of load in the case of the petitioner has to be released on 66 kV line. A 66 kV double circuit line is passing nearby the factory of the petitioner and same is used to give supply to M/s Nahar Sugar Mills. The second circuit in the above said line is vacant/ idle and can be used to give 66 kV power

supply to the petitioner after extension of load. The load of M/s Nahar Sugar Mills is also of continuous nature and the load of the petitioner is also for a continuous process and as such the load of the petitioner can be released from the same line.

- 3.3 The petitioner is ready to pay Service Connection Charges as per provisions of clause 9.1.3 of the supply code. However, the respondents for reasons best known to them are asking for charges for laying a new line by using 6 No. multi ckt towers instead of releasing the load from the existing double circuit 66 kV line. PSPCL wants to upgrade, extend and strengthen its distribution system at the cost of the petitioner. As per clause 9.2 of the Supply Code, 2014 in order to meet the demand for electricity in its area of supply including the expected future growth of such demand for its existing consumers, the Distribution Licensee is required to upgrade, extend and strengthen the Distribution System. The distribution licensee is required to meet the cost of such strengthening/up gradation / extension of the distribution system to meet the existing demand and future expected growth of demand through its annual revenues and such cost is allowed to be recovered through tariff after prudence check by the Commission. Thus, if PSPCL wants to erect a line based on 6 No. multi Ckt. Towers then the same has to be done by the PSPCL itself and the cost of the same has to be incurred by the PSPCL and should be recovered by PSPCL through tariff. PSPCL cannot be allowed to extend its distribution system at the cost of the petitioner.

### 3.4 The petitioner has prayed that

- i) necessary action may kindly be taken against the respondents and its officials under section 142 & 146 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for violating the provisions of Regulation 6.3, 9.1.3 (iii) and 9.2 of the Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and Related Matters) Regulations, 2014, in the interest of justice.
- ii) necessary directions may kindly be issued to the respondents to comply with the clause 9.1.3 and 9.2 of the Supply Code-2014 to release the extended load of the petitioner through idle circuit of Double Circuit 66 kV line already existing near the factory of the petitioner, in the interest of justice.
- iii) in case the Commission comes to conclusion that the extended load of the petitioner can not be released through idle circuit of Double Circuit 66 kV line already existing near the factory of the petitioner, then the necessary directions may kindly be issued to the PSPCL to recover the charges from the petitioner for additional load as per Clause 9.1.3(iii) of the Supply Code-2014 only, in the interest of justice.

4.0 In reply to the petition, PSPCL has submitted that the petitioner has General Industry Connection being fed from CAT-2 feeder. The consumer has not applied for Continuous process for existing load/Contract Demand, whereas after Connection, the extension will be fed from 66 KV Lines. The Petitioner applied for extension of Load from 2197.514 KW/2000 KVA to 7251 KW/6252 KVA on 02.03.2020. On processing the request of the petitioner, the rough sketch from Addl SE, TLSC Ludhiana was sent on 19-03-2020 for vetting.

Meanwhile the COVID-19 linked Curfew and lockdown was imposed by Govt. of Punjab on 23-03-2020 which resulted in delay for putting up of data required for feasibility clearance. This was beyond the control of PSPCL. The offices resumed working with effect from 07-05-2020 with minimum essential staff. In spite of this constraint, the case of the petitioner for feasibility clearance was sent on 12-05-2020. Afterwards, objections raised by the higher authorities were got cleared and the matter was discussed on 28-07-2020 in the meeting of FCC. Feasibility clearance was granted on dated 01-10-2020. The delay in the feasibility clearance was due to uncontrollable circumstances which arose due to COVID-19 which impacted the working of offices all over the state.

- 4.1 It was pointed out in the FCC meeting held on 28.07.2020 that the 2nd ckt of any existing 66 kV SC on DC line/tower is reserved for the use of PSPCL for future expansion. Thus, an alternative proposal may be explored for releasing this connection. In view of the above, FCC decided to defer the case and directed SE/DS Khanna and SE/TL Jalandhar to jointly explore an alternative proposal of a feeding line for release of this connection.
- 4.2 That CE/TS PSPCL vide letter Memo No. 6059 dated 04.12.2020 has submitted in detail that ROW of a transmission line is a valuable asset and PSPCL always retains its ROW for future use, even if the existing line is idle. However in this case it is not correct to say that the 2<sup>nd</sup> circuit is idle as this is required to be used for future extension. In case five towers of this line are used to provide a connection to the petitioner, then it will lead to loss of ROW for the whole of the line of the 2<sup>nd</sup> circuit (i.e. the balance 19 towers). Thus, substantial investment made in erecting the 2<sup>nd</sup> circuit towers will go waste.

- 4.3 That SE/DS PSPCL Khanna has sent the Joint Inspection Report of Dy.CE/TL Circle Jalandhar and SE/DS Khanna. As per this Inspection Report, 6 No. multi ckt towers can be erected in place of the existing 5 No. double ckt towers. However, there are some issues regarding ROW and erection of line over an existing poultry farm and a plot, which have been discussed in the Inspection Report. However, in the report it has been mentioned that these issues can be handled at the time of execution. The proposal of laying an underground cable was also explored but that proposal was found to be difficult to implement. In view of above, the case was again discussed in FCC held on 17.09.2020.
- 4.4 It was noted in the FCC on 17.09.2020 that the above work shall take time. As such, the connection to the consumer can temporarily be allowed upto 30.04.2021 by erecting a new 66 kV Bay & 66 kV line having ACSR 0.2 sq. inch of 970 meters length using the already existing DC tower of SC on DC line of 66 kV Nahar Sugar from tower No. 20 to 24 emanating from 66 kV S/Stn. Badinpur. However the regular permanent connection shall be released by erecting 6 No. multi ckt towers in place of the existing 5 No. Double Circuit towers of 66 kV Nahar Sugar line as per inspection report of Dy.CE/TL Circle Jalandhar and SE/DS Khanna and erecting a new 66 kV Bay & 66 kV line having ACSR 0.2 sq. inch on these Multi Ckt towers emanating from 66 kV S/Stn. Badinpur.
- 4.5 That PSPCL has demanded the actual charges to be borne for releasing this connection of the petitioner. It is incorrect that PSPCL wants to upgrade, extend and strengthen its Distribution System at the cost of the Petitioner. The charges demanded from petitioner are not covered under the Supply code 2014 Regulation No. 9.2 as the work

of augmentation of DC towers with Multi circuit Towers is not covered under System upgradation but shall only be done for releasing this specific connection of the consumer and charges for supply to only one consumer cannot be recovered through tariff from the general public.

- 4.6 That PSERC in its Order dt.14/02/2017 against Petition no. 52 of 2016 filed by M/s Sporting India Ltd. Village Jeeda, NH-15, Kotkपुरa Road, Distt. Bathinda Vs PSPCL while directing PSPCL to calculate the charges payable by the petitioner for release of extension in load in accordance with the Cost Data approved by the Commission has given the following interpretation/clarification regarding Service Line, Back up/ Common Line & feeding Sub Station for computation of charges recoverable from the applicant for release of new electricity connections/ extension of load cases.

"Service Line "means any electric supply line through which electricity is, or is intended to be supplied-

- i. to single consumer either from a distributing main or Immediately from the Distribution Licensee's premises; or
- ii. from a distributing main to a group of consumers on the same premises or on contiguous premises supplied from the same point of the distributing main.

Thus service line is the electric line through which electricity is supplied or is intended to be supplied to a single consumer. The common/backup line is that portion of line which is used by other consumers also and is connected to the feeding substation. Further, feeding substation for catering to the load of 66 kV supply voltage in



terms of Reg-9 of Supply Code-2014 is a 220 kV substation or it may be a 132 KV and not a 66 kV Substation.

Therefore, Feeding S/S for supply at HT/EHT voltage is that Grid S/S where the Voltage is stepped down for giving supply to HT/EHT consumer at the specified Voltage as per Supply Code Regulations i.e. for 11 kV consumers the feeding S/S shall be any 33/66 kV Grid S/S where 33/66 kV bus is available and 33/66/" 1 kV T/F is installed for feeding the load. Similarly for 66 kV & other higher voltage consumers, the feeding S/S shall be 220/132 kV Grid S/S & for 220 kV supply the feeding S/S shall be 400 kV Grid S/S or any 220 kV Generating Station."

Therefore, in the present case, the Line to be erected is the service line of the petitioner and as per Regulation 9.1.3 (iii) of the Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code and related Matters) Regulations 2014, cost of material and labour cost of erection of this service line or any alteration in the route (Right of Way) of the existing line has to be borne by the petitioner.

- 4.7 With regard to detail of expenditure booked on the erection of existing 66 kV Nahar Sugar Line on Double Circuit towers and the amount recovered if any from M/s Nahar Sugar Mills, PSPCL has submitted that as per sanctioned Estimate No. TWL-23/deposit/2007-08 total of Rs. 1,02,23,568 was recovered from M/s Nahar Sugar as a deposit work for the erection of this 66 kV line.
5. The petitioner filed a rejoinder to the reply filed by PSPCL reiterating its earlier submissions. The petitioner has further submitted that the only reason PSPCL is not releasing the load of the petitioner from this idle circuit is "Future Expansion". There is no provision in the Supply

Code whereby the PSPCL can deny release of Load from a idle circuit solely on the ground of "Future Expansion". PSPCL has failed to place on record letter dated 4-12-2020 mentioned in their reply and as such the same cannot be replied to by the petitioner. PSPCL has failed to place on record the joint inspection report of Dy. CE/TL Circle Jalandhar and SE/DS Khanna for reasons best known to it. In the absence of the said report the contentions of the PSPCL cannot be relied upon or answered by the petitioner.

**Observations and Decision of the Commission.**

6. The Commission has examined the averments made in the petition, the reply filed by PSPCL, rejoinder to the reply filed by PSPCL. After hearing both the parties, the Commission directs as under:-
  - 6.1 The first prayer made by the petitioner relates to alleged violation of the provisions of the Regulations by the respondent PSPCL with respect to Regulation 6.3.2 of the Supply Code-2014 which specifies that the distribution licensee i.e. PSPCL is required to grant feasibility clearance within 60 days of the receipt of the request for extension in load. Where such a clearance is likely to take more than 60 days, the distribution licensee shall, within 30 days of the receipt of an application, seek the approval of the Commission for extending the period in which the feasibility clearance would be granted. In this case, PSPCL issued Feasibility Clearance on 01.10.2020 to the petitioner i.e. after about 7 months. No permission from the Commission, as required under Regulation 6.3.2 of the Supply Code, 2014, has been obtained by the licensee. PSPCL submitted that due to lock down and other restrictions imposed by the State Government from 23.03.2020 to 07.05.2020 due to the COVID pandemic, feasibility clearance was delayed. However, PSPCL has

not explained the reasons for not seeking the permission of the Commission as required under Regulation 6.3.2 of the Supply Code, 2014. While the restrictions imposed due to the covid pandemic including restricted office staff and work are understandable, it is expected that PSPCL show/pay special attention to industrial expansion which are the engine of economic growth. While the regular extension has not been sought from the Commission in this case, keeping in mind the severity of the pandemic circumstances, the Commission in this instance conveys the advisory to PSPCL to meticulously follow the required procedure in the future in every case. Thus it has been established that the distribution licensee has contravened the provisions of Regulation 6.3.2 the Supply Code, 2014.

- 6.2 The petitioner has further prayed that the extension in load/demand may be released by PSPCL by using the idle second circuit of the double circuit towers of the existing 66 kV line from Nahar Sugar Mills to Badinpur Sub-station. It has been alleged by the petitioner that by proposing six multi-circuit towers by replacing existing five double circuit towers, PSPCL wants to upgrade, extend and strengthen its distribution system for future expansion at his cost which is against the provisions of Regulation 9.2 of the Supply Code, 2014. The petitioner has alleged that PSPCL is not only charging the entire actual cost of the erection of new 6 Nos. multi ckt. towers and DC line but also the actual cost of dismantling 5 Nos. existing DC towers and Single Circuit (SC) line which is totally against the clause 9.1.3(iii) of the Supply Code, 2014.

In this regard, the decision of the Feasibility Clearance Committee is as under:

- “.....i) FCC decided to allow extension of 5054 kW/ 4252 kVA CD, having its existing load of 2197 kW/ 2000 kVA, to make total load of 7251 kW/ 6252 kVA by erecting 6 No. multi ckt towers in place of existing 5 No. Double Circuit towers of 66 kV Nahar Sugar line as per inspection report of Dy. CE/ TL Circle Jalandhar and SE/ DS Khanna and erecting new 66 kV Bay & 66 kV line having ACSR 0.2 sq. inch on these Multi Ckt towers emanating from 66 kV S/Stn. Badinpur.
- ii) However, the extended load of the consumer can be released temporarily upto 30.04.2021 by erecting new 66 kV Bay & 66 kV line having ACSR 0.2 sq. inch 970 meters using already existing DC tower of SC on DC line of 66 kV Nahar Sugar from tower No. 20 to 24 emanating from 66 kV S/Stn. Badinpur after acceptance and suitable undertaking from consumer that during the augmentation of line/towers to multi ckt towers, PSPCL will not be responsible for any financial or other loss/damages if their load has to be restricted/discontinued on account of augmentation of line/towers. Further, a suitable undertaking shall also be given by the consumer that he accepts that this connection is only provided temporarily and can be disconnected by PSPCL as per their requirement and consumer shall not file any court case regarding that disconnection. If work of erection of multi- ckt towers in place of existing DC towers as per Sr. No. i above is not completed by 30.04.2021, the field office will re-submit this case for further discussion in FCC.
- iii) In case consumer opts for connection temporarily from existing DC towers as per Sr. No. ii above, the expenditure shall be

*recoverable as per Supply Code Clause No. 9.1.3. Further actual cost of dismantling 5 No. DC towers, DC line and erection of new 6 No. multi ckt towers and DC line shall be payable by the consumer before temporary release of his connection....*

- iv) If consumer doesn't opt for connection temporarily from existing DC towers as per Sr. No. ii above, then proportionate cost of common portion of 66 kV line/Bays and actual cost of new 66 kV Bay as per Supply Code Clause No. 9.1.3 shall be recoverable from the consumer. Also, actual cost of dismantling 5 No. existing DC towers and SC line, erection of new 6 No. multi ckt towers and DC line shall be payable by the consumer.*
- v) FCC directed CE/TS PSPCL shall ensure timely completion of multi ckt towers and associated works keeping in view the lean period of M/s Nahar Sugar Mill and also apprise the status of work in every upcoming FCC Meeting."*

6.3 PSPCL has argued that the Right of Way (RoW) of a transmission line is a valuable asset which can be used by the licensee for future expansion of distribution system to feed other consumers. In case the existing five double circuit towers are used to release load/demand of the petitioner then the RoW for the whole of the balance line and additional investment made in creating the provision for second circuit will go waste. Since no other viable option was available to release the extension in load to the petitioner, it was decided to replace five double circuit towers with six multi circuit towers. The existing five double circuit towers are proposed to be replaced with six multi-circuit towers not for any system improvement but only to release the extension in load of the petitioner. Thus it is not covered under

Regulation 9.2 of the Supply Code, 2014, since the augmentation will only benefit one consumer i.e. the petitioner.

We are not inclined to go into the merits of the technical proposal formulated by the distribution licensee in the present case to release the extension in load/demand. The distribution licensee has the authority to plan its distribution system to fulfil its obligation to ensure uninterrupted quality supply to its consumers as mandated under Section 42 of the Act. The Regulation 9.2 of the Supply Code, 2014 is in accordance with Section 42 of the Act which provides that it is the duty of the distribution licensee to develop and maintain an efficient and economical distribution system in his area of supply. Accordingly, Regulation 9.2.1 of the Supply Code, 2014 provides that to achieve these objectives for the existing consumers, the distribution licensee shall augment and strengthen the distribution system for which expenditure is allowed through ARR. Regulations 9.2.2 of the Supply Code, 2014 relates to the schemes funded by State/Central Governments. By proposing to replace the existing five double circuit towers with six multi-circuit towers, PSPCL has planned to create a third circuit to lay the service line for releasing extension in load/demand of the petitioner while retaining the already available idle second circuit for the future needs of the licensee, which is its decision keeping in mind its future plan. During the hearing, the officers representing PSPCL confirmed that while laying the 66 kV single circuit line on double circuit towers from Nahar Sugar Mill to 66 kV Badnipur, cost of only single circuit line on single circuit towers was recovered from the Nahar Sugar Mills and the expenses for other circuit had been booked to PSPCL. So with this proposal to put multi-circuit towers to supply to the petitioner only, PSPCL is not creating any new infrastructure for its future needs. The Commission is

of the view that the Regulation 9.2 does not apply to the applicants of new connections or for releasing extension in load which are governed by Section 46 of the Act read with Regulation 9 of the Supply Code, 2014. However, the distribution licensee can recover the expenses as specified in the Supply Code, 2014, as amended from time to time.

The recovery of cost for release of extension in load/demand is governed by the provisions of Regulation 9.1.3(iii) of the Supply Code, 2014, as amended from time to time. The relevant provisions of Regulation 9.1.3(iii) of the Supply Code, 2014 are as under:

*“9.1.3 (iii) Supply where Total Load/Demand Exceeds 100 kVA*

*Where the total demand including existing demand of above mentioned categories exceeds 100 kVA, the HT/EHT consumer shall pay the cost of augmentation of individual service line, if any, and proportionate cost of the common portion of main line upto the feeding substation including breaker/bay, as the case may be, for the additional demand only as per the standard cost data approved by the Commission.*

*Provided that -----.*

*Provided further that in case there is change in the specified Supply Voltage of the consumer due to additional demand, the consumer shall pay the cost of the new service line and proportionate cost of the common portion of the line up to feeding sub-station including breaker/bay, as the case may be, shall be payable for total demand including additional demand.*

*-----“*

- 6.4 Thus, in case of extension in load/demand which results in change of Supply Voltage, a consumer is liable to pay the cost of the service line including cost of bay plus proportionate cost of the common

portion of the line including cost of bay at the feeding sub-station for total load/demand as per the cost data approved by the Commission. PSPCL has argued that since the 66 kV line from Badinpur to the premises of the petitioner is a service line only meant for the petitioner, the full cost of this line is recoverable from the petitioner. There is no dispute that the line from 66 kV sub-station Badinpur to the premises of the petitioner is a service line. However, the line from 220 kV sub-station Mandi Gobindgarh (feeding sub-station) to 66 kV sub-station Badinpur is the common portion of the line. The argument of the licensee that since 66 kV line from Badinpur sub-station to the premises of the consumer is a service line so the cost of multi circuit towers proposed to be erected in place of double circuit towers is entirely recoverable from the petitioner is against the explicit provisions of the Supply Code, 2014. It will be relevant to refer to Regulation 9.3.1 of the Supply Code, 2014 which reads as under;

*“9.3.1 The distribution licensee shall be entitled to get Security (works) deposited from an applicant as provided in regulation 9.1.1 & 9.1.3 against estimated expenditure for providing electric line or electrical plant, as the case may be, worked out on the basis of Standard Cost Data and communicated to the applicant through a Demand Notice. **However, where multi-circuit towers/supports are used for erecting a single circuit line/feeder for the applicant, the cost of only single circuit towers/supports shall be recoverable.**”*

Further footnote at Sr. No. 4 of Annexure-3 (relating to 66 kV Line/cables) of Cost Data approved by the Commission vide memo no. 460 dated 24.05.2019 states that **“In case of Right of Way problem, the licensee may erect single circuit line on double**



***circuit towers but as per Supply Code Reg. 9.3.1, charges only for single circuit line on single circuit towers shall be recoverable from the consumer.”***

From the above, it is clear that as per the provisions of Regulations 9.1.3(iii) and 9.3.1 read with cost data approved by the Commission, the petitioner is liable to pay cost of single circuit line on single circuit towers for his service line including cost of bay plus proportionate cost of the common portion of line including cost of one bay at feeding sub-station for total demand including additional demand. Thus PSPCL should keep in mind these provisions of the Supply Code, 2014 while calculating the recovery of charges for release of extension in load/demand to the petitioner.

- 6.5 PSPCL is directed to re-calculate the charges recoverable from the petitioner for release of extension in load/demand as per the provisions of the Supply Code, 2014, as clarified above, within 3 weeks and communicate the same to the petitioner.

After considering the written submissions, documents and oral arguments of the officers of PSPCL, the Commission has reached the conclusion that PSPCL has contravened the provisions of Regulations 9.1.3(iii) and 9.3.1 of the Supply Code, 2014 read with cost data approved by the Commission. Accordingly a penalty of Rs.10,000/- is imposed on the PSPCL under Section 142 of the Act.

The petition is disposed of with the above directions.

Sd/-

(Paramjeet Singh)  
Member

Chandigarh

Dated: 16.07.2021

Sd/-

(Anjali Chandra)  
Member

Sd/-

(Viswajeet Khanna)  
Chairperson