CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

<u>Coram</u>

- 1. Shri D.P. Sinha, Member
- 2. Shri G.S. Rajamani, Member
- 3. Shri K.N.Sinha, Member

Petition No. 27/2000

In the matter of

Approval of bidding methodology, evaluation criteria, tariff structure, etc. for Pipavav Mega Power Project.

And in the matter of

Power Trading Corporation of India Ltd. Petitioner

VS

Gujarat Electricity Board and Others Respondents

The following were present:

- 1. Shr Mahendra Kumar, Executive Vice President, PTC
- 2. Shr O.P. Maken, Vice President, PTC U.K. Singhal, Sr.
- 3. Shr Manager, PTC. G.S. Dhir, Manager (Law), PTC S.
- 4. Shr | Seth Vedanthans, Advisor, PTC.
- 5. Shr

ORDER (DATE OF HEARING 05-12-2001)

This petition has been filed by Power Trading Corporation of India Ltd.

(PTC) seeking the Commission's approval to the RfP document covering

bidding methodology, evaluation criteria, technical and functional specifications, tariff structure, etc. in respect of Pipavav Mega Power Project. During pendency of the petition, the petitioner proposed to file certain amendments to the documents earlier filed by it with the Commission. The petitioner was allowed to file the amended documents latest by 31-01-2001. The petitioner, however, filed amended RfP document Volume-I and sought three months' time for filing of amended RfP documents, Volumes-II & III. Vide Order dated 14-03-2001, the Commission allowed time up to 30-04-2001, as prayed for, for filing amended Volumes-II & III of RfP documents and sought extension of six months for their submission. The time was granted. As per the Commission's Order, the amended Volumes-II & III of RfP documents were to be filed by 31-10-2001. The petitioner, however, instead of filing the amended documents, filed an IA (No. 109/2001) and again sought extension of time upto 30-04-2002 for submission of amended Volumes-II & III of RfP document.

2. We have heard Shri Mahendra Kumar, Executive Vice President in support of IA. He has stated that the Payment Security Mechanism and State Support Agreement have not been finalised on account of which it has not been possible to file amended RfP documents, Volumes-II & III. He informed that the petitioner has been pursuing the matter with the respondent States for this purpose. But its efforts have not yield any fruitful results. In view of this he has

sought time upto 30-04-2002 for submission of revised volumes-II and III of RfP document.

- 3. We have carefully considered the matter. Despite the repeated extensions of time allowed to the petitioner, it has failed to file the amended document. In view of the tardy progress made in finalization of payment security mechanism, etc. so far, we do not find any justification for granting further time for the purpose of submission of revised documents. Therefore, the prayer made by the petitioner is declined and IA No.109/2001 is dismissed.
- 4. In the absence of revised RfP documents, the petitioner has expressed its inability to pursue the present petition. In view of this, the petition also stands dismissed. Liberty is, however, granted to the petitioner to file a fresh petition in accordance with law after completion of necessary steps and finalization of revised documents.

—**'**y

(K.1V. Sinha) Member (G.S. Rajamani) Member

-Member

New Delhi dated:

December, 2001.