

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. TT/120/2013**

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff for 240 MVAR Switchable Line Reactor along with associated bays at Bilaspur Pooling Station under Common Scheme for 765 kV Pooling Stations and Network for NR, Import by NR from ER and Common Scheme for Network for WR and Import by WR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER in Western Region for tariff block 2009-14

Date of Hearing : 26.8.2014

Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson  
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member  
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member  
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

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

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
  
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-

- (a) The instant petition is for determination of transmission tariff for 240 MVAR Switchable Line Reactor along with associated bays at Bilaspur Pooling Station under Common Scheme for 765 kV Pooling Stations and Network for NR, Import by NR from ER and Common Scheme for Network for WR and Import by WR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER in Western Region for tariff block 2009-14;



- (b) The petitioner has submitted reasons for delay in the commissioning of the asset, vide affidavit dated 31.3.2014. The main reason for delay is that manufacturing and testing of reactors was done in the country through JV route under the supervision of ZTR personnel, who had visa issues;
- (c) There is variation of cost in switchyard (37%) and auxiliary system (42%) due to increase in quantity and award cost;
- (d) Rejoinder to the reply of MSEDCL, Respondent No. 2, has been filed.

2. None appeared for the respondents.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit, with advance copy to the respondents, by 15.9.2014:-

- (a) Documentary evidence in support of the reason cited for delay in the commissioning of the asset, i.e. visa related issues for ZTR personnel;
- (b) Details of variation in quantity, etc. leading to high apportioned cost in comparison to estimated completion cost.

4. In case the above information is not received by 15.9.2014, the Commission shall be at liberty to issue order without taking into consideration the submission made by the review petitioner subsequently.

5. Order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

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

