

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Record of Proceedings

PETITION No. 159/2009 and 275/2009

Date of hearing : 8.7.2010

Coram : Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson
Shri V.S.Verma, Member

Petition No. 159/2009

Sub: Petition for determination of interim transmission tariff of 400 kV LILO of Gandhar (Jhanor)- Vapi at Sugan generation switchyard in Western Region for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014

Petition No. 275/2009

Sub: Petition for determination of interim transmission tariff of 400 kV LILO OF Gandhar (Jhanor) Vapi at Sugan generation switchyard in Western Region for the period from 1.3.2009 to 31.3.2009.

Petitioner : Torrent Power Grid Limited, Ahemdabad

Respondent : Torrent Power Limited, Ahemdabad

Parties present : 1. Shri Samir Shah,TPGL
2. Shri C.M.Bundilla,TPGL
3. Shri Pramod Choudhery, MPPTCL
4. Shri Vijya Kumar, CTU

These petitions have been filed for the determination of transmission tariff from the date of commercial operation i.e. 1.3.2009 to 31.3.2009 and period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014 in respect of 400 kV LILO of Gandhar (Jhanor) Vapi at Sugan generation switchyard in Western Region (transmission assets) under the provisions of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of tariff) Regulations, 2004 and Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of tariff) Regulations, 2009, respectively.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that it has received a copy of the objection filed by the Gujarat Mineral Development Corporation Limited (GMDCL), Ahmedabad. He further submitted that present petitions were filed for the fixation of the tariff for the transmission system meant for evacuation of power from their power plant at Sugan to distribution area at Ahmedabad and Surat. He submitted that as the transmission line was crossing through the Tadkeshwar mines of the objector, it approached M/s PGCIL for shifting of the line. An MOU was signed between the petitioner, GMD and Power Grid in which it was agreed that the cost of the shifting the transmission line will be borne by GMDC. Based on the cost of the project as prepared by the CA, GMDC was requested to pay Rs. 7.86 crore whereas payment of Rs. 3 crore only has been received. As regards serving copy of the petition on the objector, he clarified that a copy was served on the objector on 9.10.2009. However, the objector was also informed that the copy of the application was available on its website. With regard to making the objector a party to the petition, he submitted that the objector is not a beneficiary of the transmission line and is not a necessary party in the petition.

3. The representative of the petitioner sought one week's time to file its detailed reply to the submission of the objector. The representative of the MPPTCL also requested for ten days' time to file reply on the petitions.

4. The representative of the Central Transmission Utility (CTU) submitted that the scheme was already approved by the CTU.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to file its response latest by 23.7.2010, with an advance copy to the objector. The Commission also directed the MPPTCL to file its reply latest by 23.7.2010, with an advance copy to the petitioner, who may file its rejoinder latest by 6.8.2010.

6. Subject to the above, order in these petitions was reserved.

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Joint Chief (Law)