

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
New Delhi

Petition No. 278/MP/2023

Subject : Petition under Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 111, 112 and 119 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 for the enforcement/execution of the Commission's tariff order dated 31.3.2021 in Petition No. 104/TT/2020 directing bilateral billing and payment of the transmission charges by the Respondent Intra-State Transmission Licensee to the Petitioner on account of delay in commissioning of its downstream transmission networks.

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Power Transmission Corporation of Uttarakhand Limited (PTCUL) and Another

Petition No. 104/TT/2020 (On Remand)

Subject : Petition for truing up of the transmission tariff for the 2014-19 tariff period and determination of the transmission tariff for the 2019-24 tariff period under Regulation 86 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 and the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Condition of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 and the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Condition of Tariff) Regulations, 2019 for **Asset-I**: Combined Assets: One circuit of 400 kV D/C Dehradun-Bagpat line along with associated bays at both ends. Part of second circuit of 400 kV D/C Dehradun-Bagpat transmission line as 400 kV S/C Roorkee- Dehradun line from Dehradun end and partly as 400 kV S/C Saharanpur-Bagpat line from Bagpat end using part of one circuit of 400 kV D/C Roorkee Saharanpur line (under-NRSS XXI) at intersection point alongwith associated bays at Dehradun and Bagpat end., **Asset-II**: 400/220 kV, 315 MVA ICT-1 at Dehradun and associated bays with 1 no. 220 kV line bay, 400/220 kV, 315 MVA ICT-II at Dehradun and associated bays with 1 no. 220 kV line bay, and 80 MVAR bus reactor at Dehradun and associated bays and **Asset III**: 04 Nos. 220 kV bays at Dehradun sub-station under "Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme – XVIII" in the Northern Region.

Petitioner : Powergrid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Power Transmission Corporation of Uttarakhand Limited (PTCUL) & 16 Others



Date of Hearing : **22.9.2026**

Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member
Shri Harish Dudani, Member
Shri Ravinder Singh Dhillon, Member

Parties Present : Ms. Poorva Saigal, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Pallavi Saigal, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Abhishek Kumar, Advocate, PTCUL
Shri Karan Arora, Advocate, PTCUL
Shri Nived Veerapaneni, Advocate, PTCUL
Shri Aditya Pratap Singh, Advocate, PTCUL
Shri Mohit K. Mugal, BRPL and BYPL
Shri Sachin Dubey, BRPL and BYPL
Ms. Harshita Sinha, BRPL and BYPL
Shri Divyanshu Singh, Advocate, BRPL & BYPL

Record of Proceedings

The above Petitions were taken up together for hearing.

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for PTCUL (in Petition No. 278/MP/2023) submitted that in terms of the APTEL's judgment dated 2.7.2026 in Appeal No. 410 of 2022, the Execution Petition No. 278/MP/2023 has become infructuous.

3. The learned counsel for PGCIL in Petition Nos. 278/MP/2023 and 104/TT/2020 (On Remand) submitted that the instant Execution Petition and the Remand Petition may be kept in abeyance till the outcome of its Review Petition filed (before the APTEL) for review of the APTEL's judgment dated 2.7.2026 in Appeal No. 410 of 2022.

4. After hearing the parties, the Commission directed the Petitioner to implead CTUIL as a Respondent in Petition No. 104/TT/2020.

5. The Commission further directed as under:

(i) As per the observations of the APTEL in its judgment dated 2.7.2026 in Appeal No. 410 of 2022 & IA No. 1512 of 2022, **CTUIL** is directed to submit the following information on affidavit within two (2) weeks:

(a) Whether a definite target date or implementation schedule for the downstream network was identified and communicated during the regional transmission planning meetings? If not, what were the reasons?

(b) Whether CTUIL had assessed the necessity and likely utilisation of the transmission bays proposed to be created, particularly in the absence



of an assured downstream network or a definite implementation schedule?

- (c) Whether CTUIL had considered deferring, phasing or otherwise regulating the execution of the bays until adequate clarity regarding the availability of the downstream system?
 - (d) Whether CTUIL/ the Functioning Authority had issued any communication, advisory or direction to PGCIL/ the Concerned Authority regarding the execution of the bays in the absence of corresponding downstream network development? If so, the details thereof.
 - (e) Whether CTUIL had undertaken any review of the planning decision after it became apparent that the downstream system was not being developed within the envisaged timeframe? If not, the reasons for not undertaking such review.
- (ii) The Petitioner is directed to submit the following information, on an affidavit, within two (2) weeks.
- (a) Whether the Petitioner, in its capacity as the transmission system developer and, at the relevant time, also in its capacity as CTUIL, had adequate clarity regarding the agency responsible for development of the downstream network before undertaking the execution of the transmission bays?
 - (b) Whether the Petitioner had sought confirmation from the concerned agency regarding the development of the downstream network and its target date before proceeding with the execution of the bays? If so, submit the relevant correspondence and responses.
 - (c) In the absence of an assured downstream system or a definite implementation schedule, whether the Petitioner had examined the feasibility of deferring or phasing the execution of the bays? If such an option was not considered, state the reasons for the same.
 - (d) Whether the Petitioner had brought the uncertainty regarding the downstream network to the notice of the CTUIL/ regional planning authorities and sought a specific decision before proceeding with the bay works?
 - (e) Whether the Petitioner received any response from PTCUL to its communications concerning the downstream network? If no response was received, what steps were taken by the Petitioner to resolve the uncertainty and ascertain the status of the downstream system?
 - (f) Whether the Petitioner had considered the likely financial implications of the proceeding with the bays in the absence of a corresponding
-



downstream system, including the possibility of the bays remaining unutilised? If so, the assessment report may be furnished.

- (g) Whether the Petitioner undertook any subsequent review of the decision to execute the bays after it became apparent that the downstream network was not being developed as envisaged? If not, state the reasons.

6. The Petitions will be listed for hearing on **10.11.2026**.

By order of the Commission

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

