Chhattisgarh State Electricity Regulatory Commission
Irrigation Colony, Shanti Nagar, Raipur - 492 001 (C.G.)
Ph.0771-4048788, Fax: 4073553
www.cserc.gov.in, e-mail: cserc.sec.cg@nic.in

Petition No. 23 of 2026

In the Matter of:

"Petition under Sections 50 and 86(1)(c),(e), (h)and (k) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with the Chhattisgarh State Electricity Supply Code, 2011 (as amended) and the Chhattisgarh State Electricity Grid Code, 2011, seeking approval of the Commission for enhancement of power drawl load up to 80 MW through existing dedicated transmission line connection qua UTCL's Rawan Cement Plant connected through the dedicated 132 kV Suhela- Rawan transmission line from CSPTCL's 220/132kV Suhela Sub-station."

M/s Ultratech Cement Limited
'B' Wing, Ahura Centre, 2nd Floor,
Mahakali Caves Road, Andheri (E),
Mumbai -400093 ….. Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Power Transmission Company Limited
   Vidyut Sewa Bhavan
   Danganiya, Raipur – 492013

2. Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Limited
   Vidyut Sewa Bhavan
   Danganiya, Raipur – 492013 ….. Respondents

PRESENT: **Vivek Ganodwale, Member (Law)**

Ajay Kumar Singh, Member (Technical)

Appearance : Shri Abhishek Munot, Shri Malcom Desai and Ms. Reet Nagpal, counsels for M/s Ultratech Cement Ltd.
Smt. Nalini Dwivedi, EE of the respondent CSPTCL.
Smt. Alka Yadav, EE of the respondent CSPDCL.

ORDER

(October 29, 2026)

The Petitioner, M/s Ultratech Cement Ltd. (M/s UTCL), is a company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956, having its cement manufacturing unit at Rawan, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh. The Petitioner has

filed the present petition under Sections 50 and 86(1)(c), (e), (h) and (k) of the Electricity Act, 2003, read with the provisions of the Chhattisgarh State Electricity Supply Code, 2011 and its subsequent amendments and the Chhattisgarh State Electricity Grid Code, 2011, seeking enhancement of its power drawal up to 80 MW through the existing dedicated 132 kV transmission line from the Respondent, CSPTCL's 220/132 kV Suhela Sub-station.

2. The Respondent No. 1, Chhattisgarh State Power Transmission Company Limited (CSPTCL), is the State Transmission Utility responsible for transmission of electricity within the State, while Respondent No. 2, Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Limited (CSPDCL), is the State-owned Distribution Licensee responsible for the distribution and retail supply of electricity in the State.

Petitioner's Submission

3. The Petitioner, presently has a Contract Demand (CD) of 22 MVA at its Rawan Cement Plant with CSPDCL. The Petitioner is connected to the grid at 132 kV through a dedicated single-circuit 132 kV Suhela–Rawan transmission line emanating from 220/132 kV Suhela Sub-station of CSPTCL.

4. The Petitioner also owns Captive Generating Plant (CGP) at its Rawan Cement Plant site. Further, the Petitioner has installed solar based captive generating plant of 67.5 MW (AC), comprising 20.9 MW on a real-time basis and 46.60 MW under banking, in the name of M/s ABReLGreen Energy Limited, located at Village Lachhanpur, Mungeli, and connected to the grid through the 220/132 kV Mungeli Sub-station.

5. The Petitioner was granted Long-Term Open Access (LTOA) by CSPTCL vide its letter dated 04.03.2025 for availing 40 MW (20.9 MW on a real-time basis and 19.1 MW through banking) of power

from its captive solar power plant. Pursuant thereto, a Tripartite LTOA Agreement/Transmission Service Agreement was executed between the Petitioner, CSPTCL and CSPDCL for availing 40 MW of power generated by the Petitioner's Solar PV Plant operated by M/s ABReL Green Energy Limited, for a period of 20 years, from 14.02.2025 to 13.02.2045.

6. Thereafter, the petitioner was granted LTOA for drawl of additional 27.5 MW making it a total of 67.5 MW power drawl from its Solar PV plant at Mungeli, pursuant to which 1st Supplementary Tripartite Agreement enhancing power drawl to 67.5 MW was executed on 29.05.2025.

7. The Petitioner vide their letter dated 14.08.2025 requested this office for enhancing maximum drawl load up to 80 MVA in order to meet its Renewable Consumption Obligation. This office vide letter dated 28.07.2025 directed the petitioner to file an appropriate petition before the Commission in this regard.

8. During the course of the hearing dated 03.07.2026 and in their rejoinder dated 29.05.2026, the Petitioner further submitted that the proposed enhancement of load will be implemented in a controlled and phased manner, which shall be as follows:-

   a) FY 2025-26:10 MVA to 22 MVA
   b) FY 2026-27:22 MVA to 30 MVA
   c) FY 2027-28:30 MVA to 50 MVA
   d) FY 2028-29:50 MVA to 65 MVA
   e) FY 2029-30:65 MVA to 80 MVA

9. The Petitioner has made supporting submissions regarding the Thermal compatibility, system stability, installation of adequate reactive power support to help voltage regulation and contended for short circuit stability of the Sub Station.

10. With the above submission, the petitioner requested for the following reliefs:

a) Approve enhancement of drawal load up to 80 MVA on existing dedicated 132 kV Suhela- Rawan power drawal emanating line from respondent CSPTCL's 220/132kV Suhela Sub- Station;

b) Direct the respondents, CSPTCL and CSPDCL to take all consequential steps to forthwith facilitate such enhancement.

Respondent CSPDCL's Submission:

11. It is submitted that permitting drawl of 80 MVA on a single-circuit line may cause serious operational and reliability concerns, including:

a) Thermal Loading: Excessive continuous loading may result in conductor overheating and line failure.

b) System Stability: Loading a single circuit beyond permissible limits reduces redundancy and contingency margins and may adversely affect system stability.

c) Voltage Regulation: Clause 4.2.1 of the State Grid Code, 2011 requires voltage at 132 kV to remain within ±10%. Enhancement may require suitable reactive power compensation to maintain the voltage profile.

d) Short-Circuit Level: The fault level and breaker interrupting capacity at Suhela and Rawan Sub-Stations are required to be verified in accordance with applicable CEA regulations and IS-13118 before permitting enhancement.

e) Grid Reliability: Excessive loading of a single line without adequate technical assessment may compromise the reliability and security of supply to other consumers.

12. As the Petitioner has already been granted LTOA of 67.5 MW from its captive solar source, any further enhancement should only be allowed after technical feasibility, study of system constraints and contingency requirements, as assessed by the CSPTCL.

13. The permissible thermal limits alone cannot determine the feasibility of enhanced drawal. Load-flow, contingency and short-circuit studies, considering actual field conditions, voltage profile and system stability, are necessary. In the absence of such assessment, enhancement of drawal to 80 MVA cannot be permitted merely on the basis of the indicative thermal capacity of the line.

Respondent CSPTCL's Submission:

14. The technical feasibility for drawl of 80 MW power from 220/132 KV Substation, Suhela, is not found feasible at present scenario. The existing infrastructure and sanctioned Contract Demand do not support such drawl of power up to 80 MVA. The Petitioner is presently connected at 132 kV and is availing solar power under Long-Term Open Access, comprising 20 MW on real-time basis and 46.60 MW through banking.

15. Any enhancement beyond the sanctioned demand is required to be processed in accordance with the applicable provisions governing load enhancement and Open Access and would necessitate corresponding infrastructure augmentation, considering the potential impact on the transmission system, substation equipment, and the quality and reliability of supply to other consumers. In this regard, the proposed enhanced drawal would require installation of an additional 160 MVA transformer at the 220 kV Substation, Suhela, and the cost of such augmentation, if undertaken to meet the Petitioner's additional requirement, should be borne by the Petitioner.

16. Further, the transmission and substation capacity constitute a common utility resource and cannot be blocked or reserved in advance for prospective future requirements without a firm and enforceable application and requisite agreement. Such advance reservation may result in sub-optimal utilisation of the available transmission infrastructure and may prevent the utility from accommodating other prospective consumers or system requirements.

17. Accordingly, the relative allotment priority i.e., first-come-first-served principle under the CSERC (Connectivity and Intra-State Open Access) Regulations, 2011. Capacity can be formally considered only upon receipt of the requisite application and fees, assessment of technical feasibility and execution of the necessary connection/Bulk Power Transmission Agreement.

18. Each proposed phase of enhancement may be considered separately as and when the Petitioner submits a formal application in accordance with the applicable regulations. Such consideration would remain subject to the system load-flow and technical feasibility prevailing at the relevant time, as well as compliance with the applicable commercial, connectivity and other regulatory conditions.

Analysis and Decision

Heard the Parties.

19. As per Supply Code, at 132 KV supply voltage level, drawl of 40 MVA maximum demand is permissible. Any further exceeding this maximum limit shall be relaxed by the Power Companies only after approval of the Commission subject to levy of additional charges as per Tariff Order. Relevant provision (Para 3.4) of the Supply Code is reproduced below:

"*The Supply voltage-wise minimum and maximum contract demands shall normally be as follows:*

Supply Voltage	*Minimum contract demand*	*Maximum contract demand*
230 Volts	*-*	*5 KW*
440 Volts	*5 KW*	*Up to 150 HP or 112KW*
11 KV	*60 KVA*	*500 KVA*
33 KV	*60 KVA*	*15000 KVA*
132 KV	*4000 KVA*	*40000 KVA*
220 KV	*15000 KVA*	*150000 KVA*

**Agriculture/ Industrial and Non-DLF are excluded from these criteria and can be provided 3 phase connections for lower loads also.*

Provided that the due to technical reasons, the licensee may relax above provision after due approval of the Commission. The HT and EHT consumers having contract demand exceeding the maximum limit as prescribed above, shall be levied additional charges specified by the Commission in relevant tariff order."

Provided also that in cases which are having difficulty accessibility, licensee may install HT meters for LT consumers having maximum contract demand over 50 HP or 37.5 kW. Billing of electricity supplied to such consumers shall be done as per applicable LT tariff considering 3% transformation loss."

The above provisions of the supply code are explicit and clear in its intent and purposes. Prudently, the petitioner being a consumer is governed by the Supply Code, 2011 and its subsequent amendments.

20. The Petitioner has also relied on clause 3.3.4 of the Chhattisgarh State Electricity Grid Code, 2011 (The Grid Code) for line loading limits citing their proposed load enhancement to be within the line loading limits. The Grid Code has been designed to ensure an efficient and coordinated State transmission system and allow State transmission utility (STU) to comply with its obligations in relation to the intra-State as well as inter-State (wherever applicable)

transmission of power. Accordingly, the Grid Code provides for overall grid stability. As per the submissions of the Respondent CSPTCL, it is clear that the Suhela Sub-Station caters to other consumers as well and thus the petitioner is not the only consumer drawing power from the Suhela Sub-Station. Therefore, the sub-station shall be augmented to cater to the proposed enhancement up to 80 MVA load of the Petitioner and the cost must be borne by the Petitioner in accordance to the clause 4.3 of the Supply Code, 2011, provided below:

> *"4.3. The cost of extension of distribution mains and extension / upgradation of the system required up to the point of supply for meeting demand of new consumers and load enhancement of existing consumers, shall be borne by the consumer/applicant unless otherwise specifically mentioned in this Code or in Misc. and General Charges as approved by the Commission as per provision in section 46 of the Act."*

21. Pertinently, while petitioner's request for load enhancement, if considered, the same must be subjected to the technical feasibility and fulfilment of requirements of grid stability and safety. The Petitioner has proposed load enhancement in a phased manner. The proposal reveals that additional load requirement by the petitioner by FY 2027-28 would be to the tune of 28 MVA over and above existing 22 MVA CD. The respondent No. 1 have submitted additional 32 MVA load catering plan to various other consumers from 220 KV substation Suhela. Accordingly, total additional load to be released to EHT consumers from 220 KV Suhela would be nearly 60 MVA over 218 MVA, against existing maximum rating of substation of 320 MVA. Therefore, releasing 28 MVA additional load in favour of petitioner qualifies as far as substation capacity is concerned. Further, as per provision available at clause 4.2.1 of the prevailing Grid Code, maximum 75 MVA power is permissible quantum on single circuit 132 KV feeder.

22. In view of the above:-

a) Based on the submissions made by the respondents CSPDCL and CSPTCL, and technical feasibility reports, the load enhancement for FY 2026-27 from 22 MVA to 30 MVA and FY 2027-28 from 30 MVA to 50 MVA is approved.

b) Regarding the load enhancement for FY 2028-29, from 50 MVA to 65 MVA and FY 2029-30 from 65 MVA to 80 MVA, the petitioner shall submit separate petitions for each phase of the proposed load enhancement.

c) The Petitioner shall submit requisite documents for each phase along with necessary undertakings and bear the cost of any augmentation, as may be required, in accordance with the applicable regulations; and

d) The Respondents shall assess the technical feasibility of each proposed load enhancement separately and shall proceed with each stage of load enhancement only upon completion of the prescribed process and satisfaction of the technical feasibility requirements, in accordance with the applicable regulations.

The case is disposed of as above.

Sd/-	**Sd/-**
(**Ajay Kumar Singh)**	**(Vivek Ganodwale)**
Member (Tech.)	**Member (Law)**