

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 514/MP/2020

- Subject : Petition under Section 63 and 79(1)(c) and 79(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking reliefs due to the occurrence of certain Force Majeure and Change in Law events under the Transmission Service Agreement dated 6.8.2009.
- Date of Hearing : 14.10.2021
- Coram : Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri P. K. Singh, Member
- Petitioner : East-North Interconnection Company Limited (ENICL)
- Respondents : Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited and 18 Ors.
- Parties Present : Shri Sanjay Sen, Sr. Advocate, ENICL
Ms. Mandakini Ghosh, Advocate, ENICL
Shri Deep Rao Palepu, Advocate, ENICL
Ms. Parichita Chowdhury, Advocate, ENICL
Ms. Neha Dabral, Advocate, ENICL
Shri TAN Reddy, ENICL
Shri Gaurav Kumar, ENICL

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. During the course of hearing, the learned senior counsel for the Petitioner advanced detailed submission in the matter by relying upon his pleadings.
3. In response to the specific query of the Commission as to whether any study/ investigation was carried out by any independent agency/Government body including the Central Electricity Authority regarding the collapse of the transmission towers covered in the present Petition, the learned senior counsel for the Petitioner replied in negative. The learned senior counsel, however, pointed out that ERPC as well as the Committee constituted by ERPC in this regard have recognized that the collapse of the towers was due to change in the course of river Ganga and heavy velocity of the flow of water.
4. The Commission, however, directed the Petitioner to file on affidavit by 8.11.2021, the findings of investigation/study, if any, carried out by any independent agency/Government body including the Central Electricity Authority regarding collapse of these transmission towers. The Commission further directed the Petitioner to comply with the above directions within the specified timeline.
5. None was present on behalf of the Respondents despite notice.

6. After hearing the learned senior counsel for the Petitioner, the Commission reserved the matter for order.

By order of the Commission

**Sd/-
(T.D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)**