

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
New Delhi**

Coram: Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson
Shri S. Jayaraman, Member
Shri V.S. Verma, Member

Petition No.: 56/TT/2011

Date of Hearing: 22.12.2011

Subject: Approval under Regulation 86 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations 1999 and Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations 2009 for determination of transmission tariff for (i)400kV D/C Pirana – Dehgam T/L along with associated bays at Pirana and Dehgam Sub-station and 400/220 kV Pirana Sub-station (New) (Anticipated DOCO:1.3.2011) (ii) ICT-I (1X315 MVA) 400/220 kV at Pirana Sub-station along with associated bays (Anticipated DOCO: 1.3.2011) (iii) Combined Assets of ICT-I (1X315 MVA) 400/220 kV at Pirana Sub-station and associated bays(Anticipated DOCO:1.4.2011) (Notional DOCO:1.4.2011) (iv) Combined asset of Bina Bay (DOCO:1.11.2010) and 400/2010 kV Gwalior (Extension) Sub-station with 1X315 MVA ICT along with associated 400/220 kV Bays (Anticipated DOCO:1.4.2011)(Notional DOCO:01.04.2011) under WRSS-VI Scheme in Western Region for tariff block 2009-14 period. .

Petitioner: Power Grid Corporation of India Limited, Gurgaon

Respondents: Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Company Ltd. and 7 others

Parties present: Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Rajeev Gupta, PGCIL
Shri Manoj Dubey, Advocate for MPPTCL

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The representative of the petitioner submitted that transmission tariff for four assets are covered in the instant petition. He submitted that the Investment Approval was granted in February 2008 and the project was to be commissioned within 33 months, i.e. by December 2010. Assets 1 and 2 were commissioned on 1.3.2011 and Assets 3 and 4 were commissioned on 1.4.2011 result in a delay of 3 and 4 months respectively. In case of Pirana Sub-station, delay occurred due to time taken by the Government of Gujarat in granting land acquisition clearance, cases filed by the farmers in the High Court

of Gujarat and construction of the additional 2.3 km Multi-circuit Towers which was not originally envisaged. It was submitted that due to the above reasons the petitioner lost 6 months. It was submitted that the Gwalior ICT was awarded to Areva and as Areva failed the type test an ICT from Siemens was diverted to Gwalior and thus there was a delay of 3 months. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the reasons for delay are beyond its control and requested to condone the delay.

2. Replying to a query of the Commission, the representative of the petitioner submitted though the case before the Gujarat High Court was disposed in October, 2009, two review applications were filed and the case was finally disposed only in May, 2010. The Commission directed the petitioner to file all the details regarding the court cases and their disposal. Further, the Commission directed the petitioner to give the reasons for increase in the cost of land of Pirana Sub-station by 85%, with a copy to the respondents.

3. The representative of the petitioner submitted that there has been some change in the funding pattern and it would submit the same to the Commission.

4. The learned counsel for MPPTCL sought some time to file reply.

5. Commission directed the respondents to file reply, if any, before 13th January, 2012 and the petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, before 27.1.2012.

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

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Joint Chief (Law)
29.12.2011