

**BEFORE THE HARYANA ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
BAYS No. 33-36, SECTOR-4, PANCHKULA- 134112, HARYANA**

**Case No. HERC/PRO – 63 of 2017**

DATE OF HEARING :14.12.2018  
DATE OF INRERIM :18.12.2018  
ORDER

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

Application seeking clarification as to the supersion/ departmental charges payable by Ambience Developers & Infrastructures Pvt. Ltd. who have executed the 66KV line themselves at their own cost to receive grid energy on 66 KV line themselves at their own cost to receive grid energy on 66 KV pressure against a single delivery connection in terms of HERC Regulation No. HERC/34/2016 notified by HERC on 11.07.2016 and as circulated by Dy. Secy. OP HVPN vide his no. Ch. 24/DSO-214/L-154/VOL-II dated 12.05.2017

**Petitioner** M/s Ambience Developers & Infrastructure Pvt.  
Ltd.

**V/s.**

**Respondents** Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & Ors.

**PRESENT**

On behalf of the Petitioner Shri. S.S Vohra

On behalf of the Respondents Shri RP Sharma,XEN, HVPNL, Gurgaon

**QUORUM**

**Shri Jagjeet Singh, Chairman**  
**Shri Pravindra Singh Chauhan, Member**

**INTERIM ORDER**

1. The representative of Petitioner Shri S.S. Vohra made submissions as per the contents in the original Petition and requested the Commission to direct the Respondents that they should not levy the 4% supervision charges on the electric works to be constructed, owned and not to be handed over to the transmission licensee HVPN.
2. The Petitioner further submitted that the Respondent has not carried out any supervision of his works i.e. the 66 KV substations constructed

in the premises of M/s Ambience Developers & Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd, Gurgaon to receive the supply and which is to be operated and maintained by the Petitioner only.

3. The Counsel for Respondent argued that the supervision charges on the works to be retained by the Petitioner are also chargeable in view of judgment of APTEL Tribunal for electricity in Appeal no. 282 of 2014. The copy of the judgment was also supplied.
4. The Petitioner representative again impressed upon that the Respondent have not inspected the works for which the exemption of supervision charges is being prayed for.
5. The Commission asked the Petitioner to provide document, citing that the Respondent have not carried out any inspection of the works of the Petitioner during course of its construction, within 7 days. So that further view in the matter is taken.

This order is signed, dated and issued by the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission on 18.12.2018.

**Date: 18.12.2018**

**(Pravindra Singh Chauhan)**

**(Jagjeet Singh)**

**Place: Panchkula**

**Member**

**Chairman**