

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Record of Proceedings

Petition No. 205/TT/2012

Subject : Approval for determination of transmission tariff for (i) 400/220KV, 315 MVA ICT-I along associated bays at Bhiwani S/S and (ii) 400/220 KV, 315 MVA ICT-II along with associated bays at Bhiwani S/S under 765 KV system for Central Part of Northern Grid Part III.

Date of Hearing : 30.7.2013

Coram : Shri V. S. Verma, Member
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited

Parties Present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri U.K. Tyagi, PGCIL
Shri Prashant Sharma, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL

The representative of the petitioner submitted that as per the Investment Approval (I.A.) dated 3.11.2009, the assets covered in the petition were to be commissioned within 30 months from the I.A., i.e. 1.6.2012. However, the assets covered in the petition were commissioned on 1.12.2012 resulting in a delay of 6 months. The time over-run was due to delay in land acquisition, delay in handing over possession and resistance from local people. Because of the efforts of the petitioner the assets were commissioned in 18 months after getting the possession of land, which would have usually taken 24 months. The detailed reasons for delay were submitted vide affidavit dated 20.2.2013. The reasons for delay are beyond the control of the petitioner and hence the delay of 6 months may be condoned. The representative of the petitioner further submitted that the capital cost is within the FR and requested to approve the transmission charges as claimed in the petition.

2. In response to the query of the Commission, the representative of the petitioner submitted that there is no change in the scope of the petition.

3. The representative of PSPCL submitted land acquisition is a normal feature in the functioning of the petitioner and further the petitioner has not submitted the justification for delay and hence the delay on account of land acquisition should not be condoned and IDC and IEDC for the period of delay should not be allowed. He submitted that the I.A. was for 2X500 MVA but it was later decided in the Standing Committee meeting to change the configuration to 2X315 MVA and as such there is change in the scope of work. He further submitted that the cost of 315 MVA ICT cannot be compared with 500 MVA ICT and concluded that the completion cost is within the approved cost. The petitioner must justify the time over-run through PERT chart.

4. The learned counsel for BRPL submitted that there is change in the scope of work. The petitioner has just submitted that the delay is due to handing over of land for the sub-station and the reasons for delay have not been substantiated and hence the delay should not be condoned.

5. In response the representative for the petitioner submitted that the reasons for delay have already been submitted and there was delay in handing over of land inspite of constant follow-up with the local administration because of resistance from the local people.

6. The Commission directed the petitioner to provide a copy of the affidavit dated 20.2.2013 to the respondents. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit revised cost estimates for the change in the scope and PERT chart indicating the activities on critical path and impact of delay on those activities.

7. The petitioner was directed to file the above information before 19.6.2013 on affidavit with a copy to the respondents. The petitioner was also directed to file the rejoinder to the replies filed by respondents, if any by the same date.

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

By the order of the Commission,

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