

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

**Review Petition No. 42/RP/2018 in Petition No.264/TT/2017 alongwith IA
No.42/IA/2018**

- Subject** : Review of order dated 20.7.2018 in Petition No. 264/TT/2017 under section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003.
- Date of Hearing** : 18.12.2018
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member
- Review Petitioner** : Powergrid Corporation of India Limited
- Respondents** : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited & 16 others
- Parties present** : Shri Sitiesh Mukherjee, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Deep Rao, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Divyanshu Bhatt, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Niranjan, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that the Commission erred in the impugned order by holding that the Review Petitioner has not produced any document to show that the COD of the instant bay was postponed to match with the downstream assets under the scope of the RRVPNL. He submitted that the Commission did not consider the correspondence made by Review Petitioner with RRVPNL informing that the bay is ready for commercial operation and seeking the status of their downstream transmission system. He also submitted that the Commission failed to take into consideration the Minutes of the 31st and 32nd RPC meeting placed in the original record. He submitted that Review Petitioner deliberately delayed the COD of the instant asset to match with the COD of the downstream assets of RRVPNL. He prayed for condonation of time over-run and allowance of IDC and IEDC for the period from 6.8.2014 to 19.3.3016.



2. After hearing the Review Petitioner, the Commission reserved order on admission of the Review Petition.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief (Law)

