

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram:

- 1. Shri Ashok Basu, Chairman**
- 2. Shri K.N. Sinha, Member**

**Review Petition No.23/2003 in
Petition No.122/2002**

In the matter of

Review of order dated 21.1.2003 in the matter of Approval of tariff for Talcher-Kolar HVDC line with HVDC Pole-I at Talcher & Kolar. Kolar-Madras line, LILO of Cuddapah-Bangalore S/C line, Kolar-Hoody D/C line, 4x167 MVA auto transformer, 400 KV Hossur-Salem S/C line and 2x315 auto transformer with associated bays for line and ICT etc., under Transmission system associated with Talcher-II project (from 1.11.2002 to 31.3.2004)

**Review Petition No.31/2003 in
Petition No.132/2002**

And in the matter of

Review of order dated 17.2.2003 in the matter of Approval of tariff for Talcher HVDC Terminal stations at Talcher and Kolar related with Pole II, 400 kV D/C Kolar-Hosur line along with associated bays at Kolar and Hossur and 400 kV S/C Salem-Udumalpet line along with associated bay Extensions at Salem and Udumalpet, etc under Transmission system associated with Talcher-II project (East-South interconnector-II) for the period up to 31.3.2004.

And in the matter of

Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Limited

.....Petitioner

Vs

1. Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd, New Delhi
2. Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd., Bangalore
3. Kerala State Electricity Board, Thiruvananthapuram
4. Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Chennai
5. Electricity Department, Govt. of Pondicherry, Pondicherry **.....Respondents**

The following were present:

1. Shri S.S. Sharma, AGM, PGCIL
2. Shri D Kumar, AGM, PGCIL
3. Shri Dilip Rozekar, Chief Manager, PGCIL
4. Shri U.K. Tyagi, Chief Manager, PGCIL
5. Shri C. Kannan, Chief Manager, PGCIL

6. Shri M. H. Sastry, APTRANSCO
7. Shri M.N. Krishnan, APTRANSCO

ORDER
(DATE OF HEARING 26.8.2003)

Review Petition No.23/2003 has been filed seeking review of the Commission's order dated 21.1.2003 in IA No.68/2002 in Petition No.122/2002. Similarly, Review Petition No.31.2003 is filed to seek review of the Commission's order dated 17.2.2003 in IA No.75/2002 in Petition No.132/2002.

2. The basic grievance projected in both these review petitions is that the provisional tariff has been approved by the Commission for the transmission assets connected with Talcher Stage-II Super Thermal Power Station from 1.12.2002 and subsequent dates, though Unit I of Talcher Stage II of Super Thermal Power Station was declared under commercial operation with effect from 1.8.2003. Therefore, it is submitted that the liability to pay transmission service charges for these assets should arise from the date of commercial operation of Unit I. It has been admitted in the petition that infirm power was flowing through the transmission assets even prior to 1.8.2003, which is the date of commercial operation of Unit I.

3. The representative of the Respondent No.1 pointed out that in the Commission's order dated 21.1.2003 notice has been taken of the fact that Talcher Stage-II Super Thermal Power Station was not declared under commercial operation when the IA was heard on 8.1.2003 culminating into the order dated 21.1.2003. He submitted that the Commission also took notice of the fact that the transmission assets were being utilised for evacuation of surplus power from Eastern Region to Southern Region constituents. The petitioner has not contested the correctness of these statements recorded in the order. The representative of Respondent No.1 has

further placed before us a copy of record note of discussion of the meeting of Union Minister of Power with Power Ministers of Southern States held on 10.7.2000, according to which, the Respondent No.1 was asked to expedite commissioning of one pole of Talcher-Kolar HVDC link by 2002, delinking it with commissioning of generating units at Talcher STPS Stage-II, for transfer of surplus power that was available in Eastern Region. It was submitted that the Respondent No.1 had proceeded to commission the assets in pursuance of the said decision arrived at the Power Ministers Conference.

4. In the light of above noted facts, the representative of the petitioner after arguing the matter for some time, prayed for withdrawal of both the petitions, with a liberty to raise and argue the issue at the time of final hearing of the petition.

5. Liberty is granted as prayed for. The review petitions are dismissed as withdrawn.

**Sd/-
(K.N. SINHA)
MEMBER**

**Sd/-
(ASHOK BASU)
CHAIRMAN**

New Delhi dated the 28th August, 2003