

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No.19/RP/2018
in Petition No. 62/MP/2017**

Subject : Petition for review of the order dated 26.3.2018 in Petition No. 62/MP/2017 under Section 94 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of the CPC and Regulation 103(1) of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999.

Date of hearing : 12.12.2018

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid N M Transmission Ltd. (PGNMTL).

Respondents : IL & FS Tamil Nadu Power Company Ltd. and Others

Parties present : Shri Sitiesh Mukherjee, Advocate for PGNMTL
Shri Deep Rao, Advocate for PGNMTL
Shri Harish Kaushik, Advocate for PGCIL
Shri R.P.Padhi, PGCIL
Ms. Manju Gupta, PGCIL
Shri V.C. Sehkar, PGCIL
Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate for TANGEDCO
Shri R.Katihraavan, TANGEDCO
Shri B.Vamsi, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that the present Review Petition has been filed for seeking review of the order dated 26.3.2018 in Petition No. 62/MP/2017 in which the Commission refused to approve the methodology for apportionment of transmission charges between 765 kV D/C Nagapattinam-Salem transmission line and Salem-Madhugiri transmission line and to approve the payment of transmission charges for Nagapattinam Salem transmission line with effect from 23.10.2016.

2. Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that 25th Empowered Committee in its meeting dated 1.2.2011 and CEA vide its letter dated 4/5.9.2017 apportioned the transmission charges in the ratio of 60:40 for 765 kV D/C Nagapattinam-Salem transmission line and Salem-Madhugiri transmission line. However, the Commission declined to approve the payment of transmission charges for the Nagapattinam-Salem transmission line on the ground that CEA had not certified that independent commissioning of the Nagapattinam-Salem transmission line would be in the interest of the power system and safety and security of the grid.

3. Shri Vallinayagam appearing on behalf of TANGEDCO submitted that the Commission in its letter directed PGCIL to make TANGEDCO party to the petitions. In this Petition, TANGEDCO is the sole beneficiary of the transmission system. However, despite the Commission`s direction, the Petitioner has not impleaded the TANGEDCO as party to the Petition even though TANGEDCO is paying the transmission charges for this transmission system.

4. In response, learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that since TANGEDCO is not a signatory of the TSA, it has not been impleaded as party to Petition/Review Petition. If TANGDCO wants to participate in the proceeding, he is required to file application for impleadment of TANGDCO as party to the petition.

5. Order was reserved on the issue of impleadment of TANGEDCO in the Review Petition.

By order of the Commission

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