

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. RP/23/2014

Subject : Review of the order dated 2.7.2014 in Petition No. 71/MP/2014 titled as "Power Grid Corporation of India Limited Vs Western Region Transmission (Maharashtra) Private Limited".

Date of hearing : 21.8.2014

Coram : Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member

Petitioner : Western Region Transmission (Maharashtra) Pvt. Ltd.

Respondents : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. and others

Parties present : Shri Amit Kapur, Advocate for the review petitioner
Shri Vishnu Sudarsan, Advocate for the review petitioner
Ms. Sugandha Somani, Advocate for the review petitioner
Shri Davashish M., Advocate for the review petitioner
Shri Naveen Nagpal, WRTMPL
Shri Rupin Rawat, WRTMPL
Shri Ajay Holani, PGCIL
Ms. Ranjana Roy Gawai, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri R.P.Padhi, PGCIL
Ms. Bhavya Bharti, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the review petitioner, Western Region Transmission (Maharashtra) Private Limited (**WRTML**) has filed the present petition seeking review of the Commission's order dated 2.7.2014 (Impugned order) in Petition No. 71/MP/2014, filed by Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (**PGCIL**) for extension of Required Commercial Operation Date (**RCoD**) of Western Region System Strengthening Scheme-II, Project B (**Project B**) on account of events analogous to Force Majeure which have occurred subsequent to the award of the Project.

2. Learned counsel for the review petitioner submitted that in Para 10 of the Impugned order, the Commission has observed that WRTML had accepted that extension in RCoD of Project B would not have any impact on transmission charges. He further submitted that during the course of hearing on 22.5.2014, WRTML had supported the PGCIL's proposal for extension of RCoD of Project B up to 1.1.2014. However, since the transmission charges were beyond the scope of the petition filed by PGCIL, it was a separate matter which could only be decided with the

Commission's approval. Learned counsel submitted that the observation in the para 10 of the Impugned order regarding the transmission charges should be deleted.

3. Learned counsel for PGCIL submitted that the review petitioner has not served copy of the petition so far.

4. After hearing the learned counsels for the review petitioner and PGCIL, the Commission directed to issue notice to the respondents.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to serve copy of the petition on the respondents immediately. The respondents were directed to file their replies by 11.9.2014 with an advance copy to the petitioner who may file its rejoinder, if any, by 17.9.2014.

6. The review petition shall be listed for hearing on 23.9.2014 on admission.

By order of the Commission

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