

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
New Delhi

Review Petition No. 5/RP/2021 in Petition No. 266/TT/2018
along with I.A. Nos. 18 and 19 of 2021

- Subject** : Review Petition No. 5/RP/2021 seeking review of order dated 27.1.2020 in Petition No. 266/TT/2018
- Petitioner** : Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd.
- Respondent** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. & Ors.
- Date of Hearing** : 20.7.2021
- Coram** : Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
- For Petitioner** : Shri Sudhanshu S. Choudhari, Advocate, MSETCL
Shri Jagannath Chude, MSETCL
- For Respondents** : Shri Manoj Dubey, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri D. K. Biswal, PGCIL
Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri V. P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri Anindya Khare, MPPMCL

Record of Proceedings

The Review Petition was called out for virtual hearing.

2. Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that the instant review petition was filed for review of the order dated 27.1.2020 in Petition No.266/TT/2018. The Commission in order dated 27.1.2020 approved the COD of Asset-1A: 2 numbers 500 MVA, 400/220 kV ICTs along with associated bays at Parli (Powergrid) Switching Station and Asset-1B: 4 numbers 220 kV line bays (for LILO of Parli-Harangul 220 kV lines and Parli Osmanabad 220 kV S/C line) at Parli Sub-station as 12.8.2018 under proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The Commission held that the transmission charges from the COD of Assets 1A and 1B i.e. 12.8.2018 up to COD of the downstream system i.e. 4 numbers 220 kV line bays (for LILO of Parli-Harangul 220 kV lines and Parli Osmanabad 220 kV S/C line) at Parli Sub-station within the scope of MSETCL, would be borne by MSETCL. The Review Petitioner submitted that though it had received the notice in the matter in time, it was not able to present its case before the Commission during the proceedings in Petition No. 266/TT/2018. It came to know about the decision in the order dated 27.1.2020 of the Commission only when PGCIL raised a bill on it.

3. Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner further submitted that IA No.18/IA/2021 and IA No.19/IA/2021 have been filed respectively for condonation of delay in filing the petition and stay of the order dated 27.1.2020. The Review Petitioner submitted that it had preferred



an appeal in APTEL (vide DFR No. 261 of 2020) against the Commission's order dated 27.1.2020 in Petition No. 266/TT/2018 and APTEL vide order dated 28.2.2020 dismissed the said appeal as withdrawn while granting liberty to the Review Petitioner to approach the Commission by way of a review petition.

4. Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner also submitted that PGCIL was directed vide Record of Proceedings dated 16.10.2019 in Petition No. 266/TT/2018 to submit information related to efforts/co-ordination and Implementation Agreement made with MSETCL but PGCIL rather submitted minutes of 38th Standing Committee Meeting wherein the Review Petitioner was requested to implement interconnections at Aurangabad and Parli in the 'Matching Time Frame' of the establishment of ICTs at Parli. The term 'Matching Time Frame' is vague and as such there was no time limit specified in the agreement.

5. The representative of PGCIL denied the contentions of the Review Petitioner and submitted that the Review Petitioner was given an opportunity to represent itself in Petition No. 266/TT/2018 but it did not file any reply in the matter and the Commission based on materials on record issued order and directed the Review Petitioner to pay the transmission charges for the period of mismatch.

6. After hearing the parties, the Commission reserved the order on admissibility of the Review Petition and the IAs.

By order of the Commission

sd/-

(V. Sreenivas)

Deputy Chief (Law)

