

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 685/TT/2020
along with IA No. 66/IA/2023**

- Subject** : Petition for approval under Regulation 86 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 and Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019 for determination of transmission tariff from anticipated COD to 31.3.2024 for \pm 800 kV 6000 MW Raigarh (HVDC Station)-Pugalur (HVDC Station) HVDC Link along with \pm 800 kV 1500 MW (Pole-I) HVDC terminals each at Raigarh (HVDC Station) & Pugalur (HVDC Station) under “HVDC Bipole link between Western Region (Raigarh, Chattisgarh) and Southern Region (Pugalur, Tamil Nadu)-North Trichur (Kerala)-Scheme 1: Raigarh-Pugalur 6000 MW HVDC System” in Southern Regional Grid.
- Date of Hearing** : 20.9.2023
- Coram** : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri P.K. Singh, Member
- Petitioners** : Powergrid Corporation of India Limited
- Respondents** : Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Limited & Ors.
- Parties Present** : Shri P. Wilson, Senior Advocate, TANGECO
Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Surbhi Gupta, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Utkarsh Singh, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Suparna Srivastava, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri Tushar Mathur, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Divya Sharma, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Tejasvita Dhawan, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO
Shri Apoorv Malhotra, Advocate, TANGEDCO
Shri Aishwarya Mishra, Advocate, TANGEDCO
Shri Prabhas Bajaj, Advocate, KSEB
Shri Priyanshu Tyagi, Advocate, KSEB
Shri Vishrov Mukherjee, Advocate, Sembcorp Energy
Shri Yashaswi Kant, Advocate, Sembcorp Energy



Ms. Priyanka Vyas, Advocate, Sembcorp Energy
Shri Anup Jain, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Shubhranshu Padhi, Advocate, R. No. 12 to 15
Shri Joy Nirupam, Advocate, R. No. 12 to 15
Shri D. Abhinav Rao, Advocate, R. Nos. 9, 10 and 16
Shri Rahul Jajoo, Advocate, R. Nos. 9, 10 and 16
Shri Sidhant Kumar, Advocate, R. Nos. 7 & 8
Ms. Manyaa Chandok, Advocate, R. Nos. 7 & 8
Ms. Muskaan Gopal, Advocate, R. Nos. 7 & 8
Shri A. Naresh Kumar, PGCIL
Shri Mukesh Khanna, PGCIL
Shri Mohd. Mohsin, PGCIL
Shri Arjun Malhotra, PGCIL
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL
Shri Anil Kumar Meena, CTUIL
Shri Siddharth Sharma, CTUIL
Ms. Priyansi Jadiya, CTUIL
Dr. R. Kathiravan, TANGEDCO
Shri Gajendra Singh, NLDC
Shri Rahul Shukla, NLDC
Shri Debajyoti, NLDC

Record of Proceedings

The learned counsels for PGCIL, the Petitioner, TANGEDCO, Telangana Discoms, AP Discoms and KSEB made their submission on the IA No.66/IA/2023 filed by PGCIL limited to the prayers for directions to TANGEDCO, Telangana Discoms and other Respondents not to make any unilateral deductions/ adjustments of the transmission charges already paid towards \pm 800 kV 6000 MW Raigarh (HVDC Station)-Pugalur (HVDC Station) HVDC Link along with \pm 800 kV 1500 MW (Pole-I) HVDC terminals each at Raigarh (HVDC Station) & Pugalur (HVDC Station) and to release the payment that has already been adjusted by them pending final adjudication.

2. The learned counsels for AP Discoms, Telangana Discoms, KSEB and BSP(H)CL submitted that they would file a reply to the petition as well as the IA during the course of the day.

3. The learned counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that in view of hearing for a limited relief indicated by the Commission, IA No.66/IA/2023 is against the SR beneficiaries only, hence, the Respondents from the other regions may not be required to file a reply to the IA. The Commission directed the Respondents to accordingly file their replies in the main petition and the IA by the end of the day. The Commission further directed the Petitioner to make its submissions, if any, in response to the reply filed by the Respondents to the IA by 22.9.2023 and its rejoinder to the replies filed by the Respondents to the main petition by 27.9.2023 and observed that no further extension will be granted.



4. In response to a query of the Commission, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that POSOCO and CTUIL have filed their replies to the petition and no response has been received from the CEA. The Commission observed that it would like to have the benefit of the comments of CEA, especially in view of the APTEL's observations in its judgement dated 18.7.2023 in Appeal No. 433 of 2022.

5. The Commission after hearing the parties, reserved its order in IA No.66/IA/2023.

6. The Commission further directed to list the main petition at 3.00 p.m. on 27.9.2023 and in response to the submissions made by the learned counsel for KSEB, the Commission observed that if the arguments do not conclude on 27.9.2023, it shall be continued on 4.10.2023.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
V. Sreenivas)
Joint Chief (Law)

