

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 166/TT/2013

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block for Asset-1:Raigarh PS (Near Kota)-Raipur PS (Near Tamnar) 765 kV D/C T/L with associated bays; Asset 2:765/400 kV 1500 MVA Auto-transformer and 765 kV 4x80 MVar Bus reactor at Raigarh (near Tamnar) with associated bays under establishment of Pooling stations at Raigarh (near Kotra) and Raigarh (near Tamnar) for IPP Generation Projects in Chhattisgarh (Set "B" /WR1-IPPB).

Date of Hearing : 3.2.2016

Coram : Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Ltd. & 47 others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri J Majumder, PGCIL
Shri Shashi Bhushan, PGCIL
Smt. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri S.C. Taneja, PGCIL
Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL
Smt. Sonam Gangwar, PGCIL
Shri A.M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Mohd. Mohsin, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for



2009-14 tariff block of Asset-1:Raigarh PS (Near Kota)-Raipur PS (Near Tamnar) 765 kV D/C T/L with associated bays; Asset 2:765/400 kV 1500 MVA Auto-transformer and 765 kV 4x80 MVar Bus reactor at Raigarh (near Tamnar) with associated bays under establishment of Pooling stations at Raigarh (near Kotra) and Raigarh (near Tamnar) for IPP Generation Projects in Chhattisgarh (Set "B" /WR1-IPPB).

- b) Asset I was commissioned on 1.11.2013 and Asset II was split into Asset IIA and IIB and were commissioned on 1.11.2013 and 1.12.2013 respectively. The instant assets were commissioned within the approved timeline and there is no time over-run.
- c) There is cost over-run in case of Asset I and the same has been explained vide affidavit dated 9.5.2014.

2. In response to a query of the Commission, the representative of the petition submitted that the increase in cost in case of Asset I was due to higher crop compensation paid to the farmers. He submitted that the RCE is under process and it will be submitted shortly.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the reasons for splitting Asset II and who has approved the splitting and whether the beneficiaries have been informed about the same. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit the RCE and the above said information by 18.2.2016 on affidavit with a copy to the beneficiaries.

4. The Commission further directed that the above information should be filed within the time stipulated, failing which the matter would be decided on the basis of the information already available on record.

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

By order of the Commission

SD/
(V. Sreenivas)
Dy. Chief (Law)

