

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 23/RP/2014

Subject : Review of the order dated 2.7.2014 in Petition No. 71/MP/2014 titled as "Power Grid Corporation of India Limited Vs Western Region Transmission (Maharashtra) Private Limited".

Date of hearing : 27.11.2014

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

Petitioner : Western Region Transmission (Maharashtra) Pvt. Ltd.

Respondents : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. and others

Parties present : Shri Amit Kapur, Advocate for the review petitioner
Shri D.Marwah, Advocate for the review petitioner
Ms. Sugandha Somani, Advocate for the review petitioner
Shri L.N.Mishra, WRTMPL
Shri Naveen Nagpal, WRTMPL
Shri Rupin Rawat, WRTMPL
Shri Krishna Keshav, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri R.K.Dutta, PGCIL
Shri P.Pasi, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that Western Region Transmission (Maharashtra) Private Limited (**WRTML**) has filed the present petition seeking review of the Commission's order dated 2.7.2014 (Impugned order) in Petition No. 71/MP/2014, filed by Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (**PGCIL**) for extension of Required Commercial Operation Date (**RCoD**) of Western Region System Strengthening Scheme-II, Project B (**Project B**) on account of events analogous to Force Majeure which have occurred subsequent to the award of the Project. Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner further submitted as under:

(a) In Para 10 of the Impugned order, the Commission has erroneously observed that WRTML had accepted that extension in RCoD of Project B would not have any impact on transmission charges.

(b) Any change to transmission charges was a separate matter, not a subject matter of this proceeding and Impugned order should be reviewed as presently it takes away the petitioner's right to legally approach this

Commission for any changes in the transmission charges, if any, beyond 31.8.2011.

(c) The Commission vide order dated 30.12.2008 in Petition No. 27/2008 did not consider the question of determination/escalation of transmission charges.

(d) Learned counsel requested to review and rectify the Impugned order to the effect that WRTML accepted PGCIL's submissions only insofar as they related to the extension of RCoD of Project B and any impact of the extension of RCoD on the transmission charges payable by the beneficiaries will be subject to approval of the Commission.

2. Learned counsel for PGCIL submitted that the role of PGCIL under the IA is primarily of a facilitator for the execution of the Project by the Review Petitioner. The beneficiaries of the Project will pay the transmission charges to the Review Petitioner.

3. After hearing the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner, the Commission reserved order in the Review Petition.

By order of the Commission

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