

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 198/TT/2017**

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from anticipated COD to 31.3.2019 for Asset-I:  $\pm$  800 kV 3000 MW HVDC POLE-III and LILO of Bishwanath Chariali-Agra HVDC line for parallel operation of the HVDC station at Alipurduar, Asset-II:  $\pm$  800 kV 3000 MW HVDC POLE-IV alongwith Earth electrode station and Earth Electrode line at Alipurduar and Agra end, Asset-III:LILO of Bongaigaon-Siliguri 400 kV D/c line (quad) (under pvt. Sector) alongwith associated bays at Alipurduar, Asset-IV:LILO of Birpara-Salakati 220 kV D/c line alongwith associated bays at new pooling station in Alipurduar, Asset-V: 1x315 MVA 400/220 kV, ICT-I at Alipurduar, Asset-VI: 1x315 MVA 400/220 kV ICT-II at Alipurduar, Asset-VII: 1x125 MVA 400 kV Bus Reactor-I at Alipurduar and Asset-VIII: 1x125 MVA 400 kV Bus Reactor-II at Alipurduar under the transmission system associated with "Transmission system for development of pooling station in Northern part of West Bengal and transfer of power from Bhutan to NR/WR".
- Date of Hearing** : 28.8.2018
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Shri A. K. Singhal, Member  
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Assam Electricity Grid Corporation Ltd. (RRVPL) and 80 others
- Parties present** : Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL  
Shri S.K. Venketesh, PGCIL  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri Pankaj Sharma, PGCIL  
Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL  
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL  
Shri Nitin Kala, Advocate, TPDDL  
Shri Mansoor, TPDDL  
Shri R.B. Sharma, Adovcate, BRPL and BYPL



Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL and BYPL  
Shri Raj Kumar Mehta, Advocate, GRIDCO  
Ms. Himanshi Andley, Advocate, GRIDCO  
Shri Rajeev Kumar Gupta, MPPMCL  
Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO

### **Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that there is time over-run of about 32 months and 6 days in case of the instant assets. The time over-run was due to delay in acquisition of land for HVDC station at Alipurduar, delay in land acquisition for Earth Electrode Station at Alipurduar and Agra, Right of Way and law and order issues during construction of transmission lines, litigations, heavy monsoon and flood. He submitted that all the details including the time over-run and cost over-run alongwith justifications have been furnished and as such tariff of the assets as claimed in the present petition may be allowed. He submitted that replies to the objections raised by the respondents/beneficiaries have already been filed.

2. Learned counsel for GRIDCO submitted that the transmission charges should be shared by all the beneficiaries/DICs. Learned counsel submitted that Standing Committee Meetings on Power System Planning and CEA right from the beginning were in consensus that the transmission charges will be shared by the beneficiaries of WR and NR. He further submitted that the Commission's order qua sharing of transmission charges in Petition No. 67/TT/2015 is under challenge in an Appeal before the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity and as such the Commission may not determine tariff in the present matter.

3. The representative of the petitioner submitted that keeping in mind the peculiar circumstances of the transmission assets, the Commission vide order dated 31.8.2017 in Petition No. 67/TT/2015 declared the subject transmission assets as assets of strategic and national importance. He further submitted that MoP, Government of India has in its letter dated 10.3.2017 declared the assets as scheme of national importance and as such tariff may be allowed as claimed in the petition.

4. Learned counsel for TPDDL submitted that the petitioner has stated that the land was identified on 8.11.2012 i.e. after 30 months of Investment Approval in April, 2010 and the land acquisition process started in November, 2013 i.e. after about 42 months of Investment Approval. He submitted that no justification has been provided by the petitioner for delay in identifying and acquisition of land. Learned counsel submitted that certain facts such as poor progress of hydro-electric projects in Arunchal Pradesh, advise by CEA to develop only 3000 MW terminal at Bishwanath and LILO the same HVDC at Alipurduar in Cooch Bihar and Bhutan border etc. has not been disclosed by the petitioner and the petitioner should respond to these issues categorically.



5. Learned counsel for BRPL and BYPL submitted that in the present case, there are neither designated generators nor designated beneficiaries nor any TSA with the beneficiaries. However, this line has been constructed and the petitioner is claiming tariff for the same. He further submitted that the project was executed at the instance of MoP and as per the Commission's order, most of the funds would be provided by PSDF and therefore, transmission charges should be reduced accordingly.

6. The representative of the petitioner sought time to file rejoinder to the replies filed by GRIDCO, TPDDL, BRPL and BYPL. The Commission directed the petitioner to file its rejoinder by 14.9.2018 with a copy to the respondents.

7. The Commission observed that the petition will be listed for hearing in due course.

By order of the Commission

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

