

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 241/TT/2014

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at Gorakhpur Extn. under "Immediate Evacuation System Associated with Barh-II TPS (1320 MW)" in Northern Region.

Date of Hearing : 23.11.2015.

Coram : Shri A. S. Bakshi, Member
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Nigam Limited and 16 Others

Parties present : Shri S.K. Niranjana, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri Anshul Garg, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.K Venkatesan, PGCIL
Smt. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Aggarwal, Advocate, JVVNL
Shri B.L Sharma, JVVNL
Shri Vinod Yadav, JVVNL



Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at Gorakhpur Extn. under “Immediate Evacuation System Associated with Barh-II TPS (1320 MW)” in Northern Region; and
 - b) As per the investment approval, the commissioning schedule of the project is 32 months from the date of investment approval i.e. from 27.12.2011. The instant assets were scheduled to be commissioned on 28.8.2014. The instant asset was commissioned on 26.5.2014. There is no time over-run.
2. The learned counsel for the Rajasthan Discoms submitted that he has taken up this case recently and hence requested for time to file their reply.
3. In response to the Commission’s query regarding completion cost of the instant asset, the representative of the petitioner submitted that estimated completion cost of the instant asset is within the apportioned approved cost.
4. As regards the request of learned counsel for Rajasthan Discoms for two weeks time to file reply, the Commission observed that the petition was filed in August, 2014 and the respondent should have filed the reply by now. The Commission while granting ten days to Rajasthan Discoms to file the reply observed that in future no additional time would be given to the respondents to file the reply. The Commission further observed that the pleadings should be completed before the date of hearing and directed all the respondents to file the reply ten days before the date of hearing so that the petitioner could submit its rejoinder before the date of hearing.
5. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply on affidavit by 3.12.2015 with an advance copy to the petitioner who shall file its rejoinder, if any, by 9.12.2015. The Commission further directed that the above information should be filed by the date indicated, failing which the matter would be decided on the basis of the information already available on record.



6. The Commission further directed the petitioner to file its rejoinder to the reply filed by BRPL by 3.12.2015 on affidavit with a copy to BRPL.

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(V. Sreenivas)
Dy. Chief (Law)

