

**BEFORE THE HARYANA ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION AT
PANCHKULA**

Case No. HERC/P. No. 84 of 2025

Date of Hearing : 05/03/2026

Date of Order : 05/03/2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

Petition under Section 43, 45, 46 , 47, 86(1)(i)(k) and Section 181(1) and (2)(x) of the Electricity Act 2003 and Regulations 16 & 17 of the HERC Electricity Supply Code Regulation 2014 read with Regulations 9, 10 & 11 of the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Duty to Supply Electricity on Request and Power to Recover Expenditure and Power to Require Security) Regulations, 2016 (Regulation no. 34) and its 3rd Amendment dated 27.09.2023 and Regulations 65, 68, 69, 70 & 71 of HERC (Conduct of Business Regulations, 2019 seeking requisite amendments / clarification removal of difficulty and quashing of the memo no. Ch-51/GC-149 dated 16.12.2024 and other memos issued by the respondents Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam demanding a sum of Rs.1,97,29,558/- towards differential cost of external infrastructure between 33 kV and 11 kV as per 33kV estimates whereas the connection is feasible only at 11 kV voltage level for which the estimated cost of Rs. 1,16,96,495/- has already been borne by the petitioner as per 11kV estimates made therein for release of single point connection comprising of ultimate load of 2640.64 kW or 2934.04 kVA as against sanctioned load of 5742.19 kW or 6380.21 kVA for its IT Park project and to grant stay on the disconnection of electricity supply during pendency of this petition.

Petitioner

M/s Realtech Infrastructure Ltd., Anangpur Village, Sector 37, Faridabad.

VERSUS

Respondent:

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Through its Officers

1. The Chief Engineer / Commercial, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar.
2. The Chief Engineer / Operation, DHBVN Delhi Zone, HETRI IDC, Sector-16, Gurgaon.
3. The Superintending Engineer / Operation Circle, DHBVN Complex, Sector-23, Faridabad.
4. Executive Engineer / Operation, Old Faridabad Division, DHBVN, BSNL Building, Sector-15, Faridabad.
5. Sub Divisional Officer / Operation, Mathura Road Sub-Division, DHBVN, Mathura Road, 220 kV S/Stn., Palla, Faridabad.

Present

On behalf of the Petitioner

1. Sh. Akshay Gupta, Advocate
2. Sh. Sajeev Chopra

On behalf of the Respondent.

1. Ms. Aerika Singh, Advocate
2. Sh. Lovepreet Singh, Advocate
3. Sh. Naresh Kumar, SDO, DHBVN

QUORUM

Shri Nand Lal Sharma, Chairman
Shri Mukesh Garg, Member
Shri Shiv Kumar, Member

INTERIM ORDER

1. The case was heard on 05/03/2026, as scheduled, in the court room of the Commission.
2. At the outset, Shri Akshay Gupta, Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that Petitioner has developed only its 46% share of the project, whereas the remaining 54% FAR, earmarked for development by M/s ABW, could not be developed on account of the said entity being under insolvency proceedings and is not likely to be developed in the foreseeable future. In view of the fact that the ultimate load corresponding to the Petitioner's 46% share is less than 5 MVA, the Petitioner prays that the Electrical Plan may be re-approved for supply at 11 kV based on this reduced load, and that the differential cost between 11 kV and 33 kV infrastructure, earlier computed on the basis of the full-project load exceeding 5 MVA, may not be recovered from the Petitioner. He further submitted that 33 kV infra is neither available nor likely to be made available in near future in the area by the DISCOM.
3. Ms. Aerika Singh, counsel for respondents submitted that the electrification plan was originally approved for the entire project, considering the total load envisaged as exceeding 5 MVA, which warranted supply at 33 kV. The applicable Regulations in force mandate the deposit of the differential cost between 11 kV and 33 kV external infrastructure in such cases, and the Respondents therefore contend that the Petitioner is liable to pay the said differential cost in accordance with the approved plan and the extant regulatory framework, irrespective of the fact that only a part of the project has been physically developed at present.
4. To the query of the Commission, the concerned SDO intimated that HVPN has proposed a 220/33 kV sub-station in the area but the development of same will take another 2-3 years

5. The arguments advanced by both parties being inconclusive, the Commission directs them to submit their written arguments, supported by relevant documents, within two (2) weeks. The order is reserved.
6. This order is signed, dated and issued by the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission on 05/03/2026.

Date: 05/03/2026	Sd/- (Shiv Kumar)	Sd/- (Mukesh Garg)	Sd/- (Nand Lal Sharma)
Place: Panchkula	Member	Member	Chairman

Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission