

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 30/TT/2021

Subject : Petition for approval under Regulation 86 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 read with the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 for the truing up of the transmission tariff for the 2014-19 period and the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019 for the determination of the transmission tariff for the 2019-24 period for 2 Nos. 765 kV line bays at 765/400 kV Raipur Pooling Station (POWERGRID) for Raipur PS (POWERGRID)-Rajnandgaon (TBCB) 765 kV D/C line under the "POWERGRID works associated with additional System Strengthening Scheme for Chhattisgarh IPPs (Part-B)" in the Western Region.

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited (MPPMCL) and Others

Date of Hearing : **18.6.2026**

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

Parties Present : Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Namrata Saraogi, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Rupinder Kaur, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Ravi Sharma, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Aryan Chanda, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Akhil Hasija, Advocate, CSPDCL
Shri Rohan Mishra, Advocate, CSPDCL
Shri Hemant Singh, Advocate, RRWTL
Shri Lakshyajit Singh Bagdwal, Advocate, RRWTL
Ms. Lavanya Panwar, Advocate, RRWTL
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL
Shri Angaru Naresh Kumar, PGCIL
Shri Raman Singh, PGCIL
Shri Vijay G., PGCIL
Shri Arjun Malhotra, PGCIL
Shri Yatin Kalra, PGCIL
Shri Ashish Alankar, PGCIL



Record of Proceedings

The matter was heard through a virtual hearing.

2. At the outset, the learned counsels for the Petitioner and Respondent No. 12, i.e., Raipur-Rajnandgaon-Warora Transmission Limited (RRWTL), submitted that they had already argued the matter at length during the previous hearings and that the matter is listed today for arguments on behalf of Respondent No. 1, i.e., Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited (MPPMCL).
3. The learned counsel for MPPMCL made detailed oral submissions on the issues of Return on Equity and Additional Capital Expenditure. He further submitted that liability for the period of mismatch due to the delay in commissioning the downstream transmission system may not be passed on to the beneficiaries, and that the defaulting party may be held liable for the transmission charges for that period.
4. After the hearing, the Commission directed all parties to submit their written submissions, if any, within two weeks.
5. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

