

BEFORE THE HIMACHAL PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION,  
SHIMLA

In the matter of:-

M/S IQU Hydro Power Co. Pvt. Ltd.  
H.O. 4, Ward No. 2  
Tea Estate Bundla, Bundla, Palampur  
District Kangra (H.P.)

...Petitioner

V/s

Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd.  
(through its Chief Engineer)  
Kumar House, Shimla.

...Respondent

Petition No. 6 of 2012

(Decided on 18.2.2012)

**CORAM**  
**SUBASH C. NEGI**  
**CHAIRMAN**

Petitioner represented by:

Sh. Ajay Vaidya  
Advocate

Respondent represented by:

Sh. Ramesh Chauhan  
(Authorised representative)

Er. J.P. Kalta,  
Chief Engineer (Comml.)

**ORDER**

M/S IQU Hydro Power Co. Pvt. Ltd., having its H/O. 4, Ward No. 2 Tea Estate Bundla, Bundla Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.), through Sh. Madan Singh Kanwar, Project Incharge, has moved this petition stating that it has installed 4.5 MW capacity IQU Hydro project in Kangra District, which has commissioned on 18.2.2011. This Commission on a petition No. 91/2010,

filed by the petitioner Company, granted it the permission to evacuate its power to Banner 33 kV Sub-station of the Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Ltd. (for brevity hereinafter referred as HPSEB Ltd) through LILO system with 33 kV line owned by Lanco on temporary basis upto 31.3.2012 and the petitioner Company started evacuating the power to Banner 33 kV Sub-station of the HPSEB Ltd, through LILO system with 33 kV lines owned by M/S LANCO on temporary basis.

2. The petitioner's own 33kV/132 kV pooling Sub-station is under construction at Neogal. According to the transmission network of the area, where the project is constructed, the power generated is to be evacuated through their 33 kV lines upto 33 kV/132 kV pooling station at village Neogal and thereafter the power is to be transmitted to the HPSEB Ltd's Sub-station at Dehan through 132kV, S/C transmission lines. But due to delay in procuring forest clearances and other difficulties, this work could not be picked up.

3. Per submissions made by the petitioner both the power projects IQU I, being developed by the petitioner Company, and I KU II, being developed by M/S LANCO, are situated in the same vicinity and the current carrying capacity of the line is adequate to evacuate the power from IQU-I SHP. It has, therefore, prayed that the period of temporary arrangement, which is to end on 31.3.2012, be allowed to be extended for further period of nine months upto 31.12.2012.

4. From the facts, as narrated by the petitioner Company, it is evident that the proposed arrangements involve the user of the lines laid by the various developers to cater the needs of their own projects. Such user, after taking into consideration various factors such as capacity of the system to carry the load, the quantum of power to be generated and prospective users of the system and also questions involving the cost sharing and maintenance of the system etc., is to be bilaterally deliberated upon and settled by the developers of the projects involved and the respondent HPSEB Ltd. is required to be sure that the power generated is conveniently, economically and efficiently transmitted through its system.

5. In the matters to be settled by way of mutual agreements, this Commission has no power to give any direction either to the project

developers involved or to the licensee i.e. HPSEB Ltd. Consequently the parties are to work out the terms and conditions of their transmission agreements and the HPSEB Ltd. is to examine the feasibility thereof in the first instance.

6. The HPSEB Ltd, which is ultimately to plan/set up its evacuation system in the area, has to ensure to keep in view the requirements of the power developers in the area. Since the petitioner Company is already making use of the transmission lines, the HPSEB Ltd. should consider the needs of the petitioner Company by giving priority over the requests of similarly situated prospective users of the transmission system of the HPSEB Ltd.

7. Keeping in view the facts and the reasons set out in the proceeding paras of this Order the Commission declines to admit this petition for consideration.

It is so ordered.

Date: 18.02.2012

(Subhash C. Negi)  
Chairman