

**BEFORE THE GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
GANDHINAGAR**

**Petition No. 1930 of 2021.**

**In the Matter of:**

**Petition under Section 32 and 33 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with  
Regulation 11.18 of GERC (Grid Code) Regulations, 2013.**

Petitioner : State Load Despatch Centre - Gujarat  
132 kV, Gotri Sub-Station Compound  
Gotri Road, Near T.B. Hospital,  
Vadodara – 390007, Gujarat.

Represented By : Ld. Adv. Mr. Utkarsh Singh along with  
Mr. Utpal Patel

V/s.

Respondent No. 1 : M/s SAL Steel Limited  
5/1, Shreeji House, 5th Floor,  
Behind M.J. Library, Ashram Road,  
Ahmedabad, Gujarat – 380006.

Represented By : Ld. Sr. Adv. Mr. Rashesh Sanjanwala

Respondent No. 2 : Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited  
Sardar Patel Vidyut Bhavan  
Race Course Circle, Vadodara – 390001.

Represented By : Ld. Adv. Ms. Srishti Khindaria along with  
Mr. Jaydip Chavda

Respondent No. 3 : Uttar Gujarat Vij Company Limited  
Visnagar Road, Mehsana – 384001.

Represented By : Ld. Adv. Ms. Srishti Khindaria along with

Mr. R.B Ninama & Mr. K.B. Chaudhari

Respondent No. 4 : Paschim Gujarat Vij Company Limited  
Off. Nana Mava Main Road,  
Near Bhaktinagar Railway Station,  
Laxminagar, Rajkot-360004.

Represented By : Ld. Adv. Srishti Khindaria along with  
Mr. S.N Parmar

**CORAM:**

**Mehul M. Gandhi, Member**

**S. R. Pandey, Member**

**Date: 01/10/2025.**

**DAILY ORDER**

1. The present matter was kept for hearing on 04.09.2025.
2. Ld. Adv. Mr. Utkarsh Singh appearing on behalf of the Petitioner SLDC, submitted that there are two Petitions i.e. Petition No. 1930 of 2021 filed by SLDC and another Petition No. 2023 of 2021 filed by the Respondent No.1 and both these Petitions involve similar aspects.
  - 2.1. He submitted that the Petitioner SLDC is an Independent statutory body, wholly owned subsidiary of GETCO performing the role of monitoring real time power system network, managing line and unit outages of the entire Intra-State Transmission Network. Under Section 32 & 33 of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Petitioner SLDC is responsible for the optimum scheduling and despatch of electricity within the State in accordance with the contracts entered into by the generating companies operating within the State. The Respondent No.

1 is not selling electricity to distribution companies but have wheeling contract for supply of electricity to its other unit located at village Santej, Ta. & District Gandhinagar.

- 2.2. He submitted that the Petitioner being a load dispatch centre, is not concerned with the commercial terms of the Power purchase/wheeling agreement but only with the issue of substantial deviation between the schedule finalised by the SLDC and the actual injection of power by the Respondent.
- 2.3. He submitted that the issue involved in the present Petition that the Respondent No. 1 having indulged in gaming pursuant to consistent under injection *qua* the Schedule, despite several notices being issued by the Petitioner to the Respondent No. 1 directing to maintain injection as per Schedule and also put to notice about large scale deviation by providing details of same.
- 2.4. He submitted that the Petitioner SLDC on several occasions specifically directed the Respondent No. 1 to clarify the reason for the under injection and also directed them to maintain the injection as per the schedule. He submitted that the Petitioner has written 41 letters to the Respondent No. 1 on different dates, months and years to clarify the reason for the under injection. The Petitioner did not receive any reasonable explanation from the Respondent No. 1 and due to their consistent under injection, the Petitioner, SLDC reported the above to the Commission on 17.08.2020.
- 2.5. He submitted that the Commission vide its letter dated 27.08.2020 directed the Petitioner SLDC to provide complete report in regard to non-compliance of directives by the Respondent No. 1 including the

block-wise schedule and injection during blocks where deviation has been observed. The SLDC vide letter dated 08.09.2020 submitted the complete report along with the notices sent to the Respondent No. 1.

- 2.6. He submitted that the Commission in its Interim Order dated 09.10.2020 in Petition No. 1888 of 2020 had directed SLDC to submit a comprehensive report detailing necessary issues, analysis, observations alongwith relevant documents in case of gaming in respect of consistent under-injection qua the Schedule despite several notices and data within 30 days and also directed that in case, SLDC has noticed similar situation in regard to other intra-state constituents, SLDC is required to approach the Commission through appropriate Petition as per the Regulations. Thus, the Petitioner was directed to file comprehensive report regarding consistent under-injection under UI mechanism indulging in gaming to make undue gains. In compliance to the above directive of the Commission the Petitioner has filed this Petition.
- 2.7. He submitted that the Commission has passed Order in Petition No. 1888/2020 on 13.07.2022 wherein the similar issue was involved of under injection by the Petitioners, the Commission directed the Petitioners to refund the excess amount to the Respondent. The said Order has been upheld by the APTEL. The matter was remanded back to the Commission for deciding certain issues and the Commission has passed its order on remand back matter also.
- 2.8. He further submitted that the Petitioner in the present petition is praying for (a) to take on record the consistent under injection done by the Respondent No. 1 as compared to schedule from FY 2012-14 to FY 2019-20, (b) to call for explanation and pass appropriate

directions against the Respondent No. 1 for not following the instruction, (c) to direct Respondent No. 1, M/s SAL Steel to refund an amount of Rs. 85,60,69,685.88 to the distribution companies similar to the terms of its direction passed in the Order dated 09.10.2020 in IA No. 07 of 2020 & 08 of 2020 in Petition No. 1888 of 2020 as an interim measure.

3. In response to the above submissions of the Petitioner, Ld. Sr. Adv. Mr. Rashesh Sanjanwala appearing on behalf of the Respondent No. 1, M/s SAL Steel Limited has requested the Commission to grant short adjournment as the matter requires detailed arguments.
4. Ld. Adv. Ms. Srishti Khindaria appearing on behalf of the Respondent No. 2 to 4 submitted that the Respondents are supporting the present Petition filed the Petitioner.
5. Heard the parties. We note that the Respondent No. 1, M/s SAL Steel Limited has sought for an adjournment and there is no objection to the same by the Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 to 4 and hence, the matter stands adjourned.
6. Next date of hearing will be intimated separately.
7. Order Accordingly.

**Sd/-**  
**[S. R. Pandey]**  
**Member**

**Sd/-**  
**[Mehul M. Gandhi]**  
**Member**

Place: Gandhinagar.

Date: 01/10/2025.