

**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 : 11.7.2013

Coram : Shri V.S.Verma, Member  
Shri A.S.Bakshi, Member (EO)

Petitioner : East-North Interconnection Company Limited

Respondents : Punjab State Transmission Corporation Limited and Others.

Parties present : 1. Shri Venkatesh, Advocate for the petitioner  
2. Shri T.A.Reddy, ENICL  
3. Shri Pulkit Sharma, ENCIL  
4. Shri S.Krishnan, ENCIL  
5. Shri T.P.S.Bawa, PSPCL

**Record of Proceedings**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had filed the petition for tariff for additional 80 kms of work. However, as per the directions of the Commission in order dated 5.5.2013, Central Electricity Authority has got the actual line length verified. As per the report, the additional scope of work is only 27 kms. Learned counsel submitted that Purnea-Biharshariff transmission line including the additional scope of work has been progressing as per the schedule and will be commissioned by the end of this month. As regards the Bongaigaon-Siliguri transmission line, learned counsel submitted that the forest related issues are being sorted out for which compensatory afforestation land has been identified.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Commission may issue appropriate order in the light of the report of CEA. Learned counsel further submitted that the Commission may consider to issue appropriate direction for provisional billing of the transmission charges. Learned counsel also submitted that the order in the petition was reserved on February 2012 but on account of the LTTCs, the order could not be issued. Learned counsel submitted that the Commission may consider to grant IDC since February 2012.

3. The Commission enquired that no such for IDC prayer has been made in the petition. Learned counsel submitted that the petitioner is making this prayer as delay in resolution of the dispute has affected the financial viability of the project. Learned counsel sought permission of the Commission to file a short written submission.

4. The representative of the Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. (PSPCL) requested for three weeks time for convening a meeting of LTTCs and file consolidated views in the matter on behalf of all LTTCs.

5. After hearing the parties, the Commission directed that PSPCL, as a lead LTTC shall take steps to convene the meeting of all LTTCs and file the views/comments on the report of the CEA on affidavit by 22.7.2013 with advance copy to the petitioner. The Commission directed the petitioner to file its written submission including rejoinder to the submission of PSPCL by 25.7.2013.

6. Subject to above, the Commission reserved order in the petition.

**By order of the Commission,**

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

