

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
New Delhi**

Coram: Shri S. Jayaraman, Member
Shri V.S. Verma, Member
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member

Petition No.: 30/TT/2011

Date of Hearing: 15.12.2011

Subject: Approval under Regulation 86 of CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations 1999 and CERC (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations 2009 for determination of Transmission Tariff for LILO connectivity to DVCs ANDAL TPS through 400 kV D/C Durgapur-Jamshedpur transmission line associated with transmission system for ERSS-I in Eastern Region from DOCO(1.2.2011) TO 31.3.2014.

Petitioner: Power Grid Corporation of India Limited, Gurgaon

Respondents: Bihar State Electricity Board and 5 others

Parties present: Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Rajeev Gupta, PGCIL
Shri R B Sharma, Advocate for BSEB and JSEB

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The representative of the petitioner submitted that transmission tariff has been prayed for LILO Connectivity to DVCs ANDAL TPS through 400 kV D/C Durgapur-Jamshedpur Transmission Line associated with transmission system for ERSS-I in Eastern Region for the tariff period 2009-14. He submitted that due to severe ROW issues at both ends of Durgapur-Jamshedpur the entire line as per the investment approval could not be completed. Based on the request of DVC, a decision was taken during the 14th meeting of ERPC, held on 11.6.2010 that one circuit of the line was to be LILOed at DSTPP (Andal) to provide start up power for the new 500MW as a temporary arrangement. Accordingly, 19 kms of the total 187 kms of the line was commissioned on 1.2.2011.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the Investment Approval was granted in October 2006 and the project was to be commissioned within 36 months, i.e. by October 2009. The line was commissioned on 1.2.2011 and accordingly, there was a delay of 15 months. He submitted that the delay was due to forest clearance which was given in May 2010 and due to railway crossing in four locations, for which clearance was given in January, 2011. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the reasons for delay were beyond its control and requested to condone the delay in commissioning of the line.

3. The learned counsel for BSEB and JSEB submitted that this is a contingency arrangement to supply power to DVC who has agreed to pay the transmission charges. The learned counsel for the respondents sought time to file its reply within 10 days.

4. The Commission directed the respondents to file reply, if any, before 30th December, 2011 and the petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, before 11.1.2012.

5. Order in the petition was reserved.

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Joint Chief (Law)
26.12.2011