

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Petition No. 8/RP/2013

Subject : Review of order dated 9.5.2013 in Petition No.147/TT/2011 in the matter of approval of transmission tariff for Combined Elements of 315 MVA 400 kV/220 kV ICT-I and ICT-II at GIS Sub-station at Gurgaon (New) along with associated bays under Transmission System associated with NRSS-VI.

Date of hearing : 13.8.2013

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

Petitioner : PGCIL, New Delhi

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd. (UPPCL) & 16 others

Parties present : Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri Prashant Sharma, PGCIL
Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri D. Nikhandia, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted that:-

- (a) The review petition has been filed seeking review of order dated 9.5.2013 in Petition No. 147/TT/2011;
- (b) The delay in commissioning of the instant assets was due to non-availability of test bed at KEMA, Netherlands for testing the ICT and delay in acquisition of land for the sub-station at Gurgaon;
- (c) The delay in acquisition of land for the Gurgaon sub-station was condoned in the case of ICT-I, whereas the delay has not been condoned in the present case where the ICT-II is also erected in the

Gurgaon sub-station. The delay condoned in case of ICT-I is applicable for ICT-II as well;

(d) Additional information filed vide affidavit dated 25.4.2013, giving justification for delay was not considered by the Commission;

(e) Allow the review petition by condoning the delay taking into consideration the justification given in affidavit 25.4.2013.

2. The Commission observed that Petition No.147/TT/2011 was last heard on 27.11.2012 and the additional information, vide affidavit dated 25.4.2013, was filed after the last hearing and hence it was not considered in the order. The Commission further pointed out that any information filed after the hearing should be filed in the form of an I.A. so that the respondents get an opportunity to present their views on the additional information filed by the review petitioner.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following by 28.8.2013 (a) the date of placing order for the ICTs, (b) scheduled date of delivery, (c) the actual date of delivery of ICT, (d) PERT chart, (e) detailed reasons for delay and (f) whether the delay due to land acquisition falls in the critical activity.

4. The Commission directed that based on the information furnished, the Commission will take a view on the admissibility of the review petition.

By the order of the Commission,

Sd/-
T. Rout
Chief (Law)