Petition No. 62/TT/2012

Subject : Petition for approval of tariff for Extension of 765/400 Bilaspur Poling Station (near Sipat) along with LILO of Sipat-Seoni Ckt-2 with 3x80 MVAR Switchable Line Reactor and 765/400 kV, 1500 MVA Auto-transformer 3 under WRSS XI Scheme in WR for tariff block 2009-14

Date of hearing : 30.7.2013

Coram : Shri V.S.Verma, Member
        Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL)

Respondent : Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Co. Ltd. & 7 others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
                 Shri U.K. Tyagi, PGCIL
                 Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL

The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-

(a) The present petition has been filed for determination of tariff for Extension of 765/400 Bilaspur Poling Station (near Sipat) along with LILO of Sipat-Seoni Ckt-2 with 3x80 MVAR Switchable Line Reactor and 765/400 kV, 1500 MVA Auto-transformer 3 under Western Region System Strengthening Scheme XI in Western Region for tariff block 2009-14;

(b) Investment approval for the transmission project was accorded by Board of Directors of PGCIL on 16.2.2009 and the project was to be completed within 36 months from the date of investment approval, i.e., by 1.3.2012. As against that, LILO of 765 kV Sipat-Seoni Ckt-2 at Bilaspur Sub-station with associated bays and 240 MVAR Switchable
Line Reactor for Seoni at Bilaspur Sub-station along with associated bays were commissioned on 1.4.2012 after a delay of one month, and ICT III at Bilaspur Sub-station was commissioned on 1.8.2012 after a delay of five months;

(c) The delay of one month in case of LILO of 765 kV Sipat-Seoni-II at Bilaspur Sub-station and 240 MVAR Switchable Line Reactor for Seoni-II at Bilaspur Sub-station is due to severe ROW problems. The delay of five months in case of 1500 MVA ICT III at Bilaspur Sub-station is due to bad weather condition in Northern Europe. The order for supply of transformer was placed on CGL Electric System, Hungary and transportation of the transformer, which usually takes two months, took six months in this case, because of freezing of river and sea. Detailed justification for delay has been given by the petitioner in its affidavit dated 26.7.2013. The delay in both the cases may be condoned as it is not attributable to the petitioner.

2. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the liquidated damages recovered for the delay, Indemnification Agreement and also PERT chart, clearly indicating the critical activities and the delay in regard to the same, on affidavit, by 16.8.2013.

3. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By the order of the Commission,

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