

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Review Petition No. 8/RP/2019 in Petition No. 238/MP/2017

- Subject** : Review Petition No. 8/RP/2019 seeking review of order dated 29.3.2019 in Petition No. 238/MP/2017.
- Date of Hearing** : 16.9.2019
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member
- Review Petitioner** : Darbhanga-Motihari Transmission Co. Ltd. (DMTCL)
- Respondents** : Bihar State Power Transmission Co. Ltd. and 9 Others
- Parties present** : Shri M. G. Ramachandran, Sr. Advocate, DMTCL
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, DMTCL
Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PSPCL
Shri Neeraj Verma, DMTCL
Shri Siddharth Sharma, PGCIL
Ms. Swati Verma, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned senior counsel for the Darbhanga-Motihari Transmission Co. Ltd. (DMTCL), the Review Petitioner, submitted that the instant Review Petition is filed for review of the order dated 29.3.2019 in Petition No.238/MP/2017 and submitted the grounds on which the review was sought. He also submitted that though the amount paid to the forest authorities and the taxes and duties was allowed in the impugned order, the quantum of relief allowed in terms of percentage increase in yearly transmission charges as allowed in the TSA has not been specified and requested to issue a clarification in this regard. He further submitted that as the scheduled COD of the transmission assets covered in Petition No.238/MP/2017 was extended, the tariff of the first year must be made applicable from the extended COD.

2. In response, the learned counsel for PSPCL submitted that the tariff applicable for the first year was neither raised in the Main Petition nor in the Review Petition. She further submitted that there are no grounds for review and hence the Review Petition may not be admitted.



3. After hearing the parties, the Commission reserved the order on admissibility of the Review Petition and observed that Review Petitioner's prayer for clarification regarding the quantum will be considered. As regards the Review Petitioner's prayer for considering the first year tariff from the extended COD of the asset, the Commission observed that it is extraneous to the present Review Petition and hence the Review Petitioner may take action as per law.

4. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order on admissibility of the Review Petition.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(V. Sreenivas)
Deputy Chief (Legal)

