

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 367/TT/2023

- Subject : Petition for the determination of transmission tariff from the COD to 31.3.2024 in respect of Asset-1: 2 No. of 220 kV Line Bays at 220 kV Navsari Sub-station (GIS) for Navsari-Bhestan 220 kV D/C line; Asset-2: 1 X 125 MVAR, 400 kV Bus Reactor at Vododara Sub-station along with associated 400 kV Bus Reactor Bay; and Asset-3: 1 No. of 400 kV Line Bay at 400 kV Vadodara (GIS) Sub-station under "Transmission System associated with DGEN TPS (1200 MW) of Torrent Power Limited".
- Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
- Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Ltd. and 9 Others
- Date of Hearing : **20.8.2024**
- Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member
Shri Harish Dudani, Member
- Parties Present : Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Sneha, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Utkarsh Singh, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri. Subham Arya, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Reema Singh, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri Saurabh Mishra, Advocate, MPPMCL
Ms. Sikha Sood, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Harshit Gupta, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Shashwat Kumar, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Rahul Chouhan, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Harshit, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL
Shri. Mohd. Moshin, PGCIL
Shri Arjun Malhotra, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Petitioner made detailed submissions in the matter and submitted that IDC and IEDC might be allowed to the Petitioner since, the



Petitioner's assets covered under the instant petition were ready for use, however, they could not be utilized due to non-availability of shutdown and non-readiness of the associated transmission system under the scope of Torrent Power Limited (TPL). She added that though the TPL has encashed the Bank Guarantee and utilizing the transmission assets without paying any charges, it has not filed any reply in the matter.

2. The learned counsel for the Respondent, MPPMCL, also made detailed submissions from the reply filed in the instant Petition, specifically emphasizing that the DGENTCL and TPL are sister concerns. He further emphasized deliberation on the treatment of relinquishment charges paid by TPL to CTUIL and invocation of Bank Guarantee by TPL.

3. The learned counsel for CTUIL referred to the Commission's direction in an order dated 16.2.2023 in Petition No. 365/TT/2018, regarding the revocation of the transmission licence and encashment of Bank Guarantee by the concerned LTTC in terms of TSA along with modalities regarding the treatment of encashing the Bank Guarantee. She further submitted that no other case(s) had been found where the revocation of the transmission licence and Bank Guarantee have been affected simultaneously.

4. The learned counsel for MSEDCL submitted that the Initial Spares had been claimed over and above the permissible limit, and the same may be restricted to the permissible limit. *Per contra*, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner, in its rejoinder, has given its reasons and justification for claiming excess Initial Spares.

5. After hearing the parties, the Commission directed the Petitioner to provide the following information/clarification on an affidavit with a copy to the Respondents within two weeks:

- a. The COD of Asset 3 in the instant Petition has been claimed as 24.5.2022, and the same has been mentioned in the Auditor's Certificate as 21.5.2022. Clarify the mismatch and provide the actual COD of Asset-3.

6. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

