

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
New Delhi**

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition No. 160/2011

Subject: Determination of transmission tariff for the period 2009-14 for assets under ERSS -II in Eastern Region for tariff block 2009-14 period

Date of Hearing: 17.4.2012

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

Petitioner: PGCIL, New Delhi

Respondents: Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna & 5 others

Parties present: Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Rajeev Gupta, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri Tarun Johri, PGCIL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate for BSEB & JSEB

This petition has been filed by PGCIL for determination of tariff for various elements covered under ERSS-II, in Eastern Region for 2009-14.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-

(a) Investment approval for ERSS-II scheme was accorded by Board of Directors of PGCIL on 24.12.2007 and the scheme was to be completed in 30 months from the date of investment approval, i.e., by July 2010. As against that, the assets covered under the petition have been commissioned on different dates from February 2011 to April 2012;

(b) Delay in the commissioning of the assets has been explained in the petition as well as in affidavits filed by PGCIL. Durgapur-Maithon line was commissioned on 1.3.2012, and the delay was due to serious right of way problem. Details in this regard will be submitted to the Commission shortly. As regards delay in the commissioning of new reactors at Purnea and Siliguri, he

submitted that it was due to litigation with the supplier (AREVA), non-availability of shutdown, and rain during Monsoon months, i.e., April to October, 2009;

(c) There was no increase in IDC and IEDC due to delay in commissioning of reactors as there was delayed payment on account of delay in supply of reactors.

3. On a query of the Commission, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the actual cost is within the estimated cost.

4. The learned counsel for BSEB and JSEB sought time to file reply, after obtaining a copy of the petition from the petitioner.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following:-

(a) The details, along with relevant documents, regarding delay due to non-availability of shutdown including the period and dates for which shutdown was requested, the period and dates of actual shutdown approved and consequent delay in shutdown as well as in construction work;

(b) Reason and justification for delay for the Durgapur- Maithon 400 kV D/C line up to the date of commissioning of the line;

(c) The Management Certificate/ CA Certificate indicating capital expenditure and funding as on actual date of commercial operation of these assets and the additional capital expenditure and funding thereafter;

(d) The rejoinder to the reply of the respondents.

6. Order in the petition was reserved.

Sd/-

(T.Rout)
Joint Chief (Law)
25.4.2012