

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 162/MP/2011

Sub: Petition under Section 62 read with Section 63 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for determination of transmission charges for additional scope of work and corresponding amendment of transmission charges approved by Commission vide its order dated 28.10.2010 for transmission system being established by petitioner as there is a change/addition in the scope of work of the project.

Date of hearing : 8.11.2012

Coram : Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson
Shri S.Jayaraman, Member
Shri V.S.Verma, Member
Shri .M.Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner : East-North Interconnection Company Limited

Respondents : Punjab State Transmission Corporation Limited and Others.

Parties present : 1. Shri Vikas Singh, Senior Advocate for the petitioner
2. Miss Ambica Garg, Advocate for the petitioner
3. Shri T.A.Reddy, ENICL
4. Shri Pulkit Sharma, ENCIL
5. Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
6. Shri S.N.Jangid, Ajmer Discom
7. Shri V.K.Gupta, Ajmer Discom

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. (PSPCL) submitted that only PSEB represented through PSTCL, PGCIL and CEA have been made parties to the petition. It was clarified by the staff of the Commission that in pursuance of the directions of the Commission in the Record of Proceedings for the hearing on 8.9.2011, the petitioner has served the copies of the petition on all Long Term Transmission Customers (LTTCs) and has filed the affidavit of service on 9.11.2011.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner clarified that copies of the petition have been served on the LTTCs first in the month of November, 2011 in pursuance of the ROP of 8.9.2011 and subsequently in the month of October 2012 in pursuance of the notice dated 11.10.2012 .
3. The representative of the PSPCL submitted that schedule 8 of the Transmission Service Agreement (page 394 of the petition) does not authorize the lead LTTC to represent all LTTCs before the Commission. He submitted that all LTTCs should be heard before any decision in the matter. Learned senior counsel of the petitioner referred to the Article 18 of the TSA and submitted that as per the said Article, the lead Long Term Transmission Customer is authorized to discharge the right and obligation on behalf of the LTTCs.
4. The Commission observed that there is no issue on this point since the Commission has already directed to hear all LTTCs.
5. The representative of the PSPCL submitted that as a lead LTTC, PSPCL should be allowed to three weeks` time to convene a meeting of all LTTCs and submit the response to the petition.
6. The representative of the Rajasthan distribution companies submitted that copy of the petition has not been received and requested for supply of copy of the petition and time for filing the reply.
7. The Commission directed the petitioner to serve copy of the petition on Rajasthan Discoms.
8. The Commission directed that PSPCL as a lead LTTC convene a meeting of all LTTCs within three weeks and submit a consolidated reply to the petition with copy to the petitioner, by 12.12.2012. LTTCs are at liberty to file their individual replies to the petition after serving copies on the petitioner by 10.12.2012. The petitioner may file its rejoinder, if any, by 17.12.2012.
9. The petition shall be listed for hearing on 20.12.2012.

By order of the Commission

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