

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 54/RP/2016 alongwith I.A. No. 48/2016

Subject : Review of the order dated 19.7.2016 in Petition No. 403/TT/2014.

Date of Hearing : 15.12.2016

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Karnataka Power transmission Corporation Limited and 15 others

Parties present : Shri Sanjay Sen, Sr. Advocate, PGCIL
Mrs. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri K.K. jain, PGCIL
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL
Mrs. Manju Gupta, PGCIL
Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO

Record of Proceedings

Learned senior counsel for the review petitioner submitted that the instant scheme has been developed as a system strengthening scheme for Southern Region and developed to feed Bangalore. The main purpose of the scheme was to strengthen the Southern Regional Grid for the benefit of all the beneficiaries and was not planned for Karnataka alone. Hence, recovery of the transmission charges through PoC mechanism cannot be linked to the commissioning of the downstream assets by KPTCL. Learned senior counsel requested to "admit" the present review petition.

2. The learned counsel for TANGEDCO submitted that the contention of PGCIL is entirely wrong. He submitted that if anybody is aggrieved by the order of 19.7.2016, it should be KPTCL as it has to bear the transmission charges till it commissions the assets under its scope. It is not clear why PGCIL has filed the present review petition. He further submitted that conditions laid down by the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity in



its judgment dated 2.7.2012 in Appeal No. 123 of 2011 for declaration of COD has not been fulfilled in the instant case.

3. The Commission observed that comments sought vide letters dated 7.11.2016 and 28.11.2016 from CEA have not been received. The Commission directed the staff of the Commission to study the comments furnished by SRLDC and to seek the comments from SRPC on the PGCIL's contention that Gooty-Madhugiri 400 kV D/C line alongwith the associated bays is system strengthening scheme and it is not merely to serve the distribution companies of Karnataka and whether the line could be utilized effectively with the commissioning of Madhugiri-Bidadi line in the absence of downstream system of Karnataka.

4. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order on the issue of "maintainability".

By order of the Commission

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

