

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Petition No. 284/2010

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff for transmission system associated with 400 kV D/C Raigarh-Raipur TL along with bays associated with East West Transmission Corridor in Western Region for the period from DOCO to 31.3.2014.

Date of hearing : 16.7.2013

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

Petitioner : PGCIL, New Delhi

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Company Limited & 7 others

Parties present : Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri Upendra Pande

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that there was a time over-run of 15 months in commissioning of the assets covered in the instant petition. The Commission in its order of 8.6.2011, while approving the transmission tariff for the assets condoned the delay of 8 months and did not condone the delay of 7 months. The petitioner filed an Appeal against the said order before Hon'ble APTEL (the Tribunal). The Tribunal vide its order dated 27.4.2012 in Appeal No.134/2011 had upheld the disallowance of IDC and IEDC for four months and set aside the part of the Commission's order disallowing IDC and IEDC for three months and remanded the matter to the Commission for considering the explanation given the petitioner for the delay of three months.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the information sought by the Commission has already been filed by the Petitioner. In response to the Commission's query, the representative of the petitioner submitted that an application for Railway clearance was filed on 19.1.2009 and the amount

required for clearance was deposited with the Railways within four days of receipt of letter from Railways and that there was no delay on the part of the petitioner. The Railways granted the clearance on 8.9.2010 and there was a delay of 18 months in granting clearance by the Railways and the petitioner cannot be held responsible for the delay.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the time taken by Railways generally to grant clearance, three live examples to demonstrate the time usually taken by Railways and the time taken in the instant case before 31.7.2013 with a copy to the respondents.

4. The representative of the petitioner submitted that subsequent to filing of the present petition, the petitioner filed Petition No. 355/2010, where Raipur-Raigarh line and the Ranchi-Rourkela line have been combined and the cost of the Raipur-Raigarh has been revised. He requested to revise the present petition taking into consideration the revised cost of Raipur-Raigarh line.

5. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By the order of the Commission,

Sd/-
T. Rout
Joint Chief (Law)