

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 108/TT/2016**

**Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff for Teesta III-Rangpo section of 400 kV D/C Transmission Line with Quad Moose Conductor up to LILO Point at Rangpo for control period of 2014-19 under the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations 2014.

**Date of Hearing** : 9.2.2023

**Coram** : Shri I. S. Jha, Member  
Shri Arun Goyal, Member  
Shri P.K. Singh, Member

**Petitioners** : Teesta valley Power Transmission Limited (TPTL)

**Respondents** : PTC India Limited and Others

**Parties Present** : Shri Tarun Johri, Advocate, TPTL  
Shri Ankur Gupta, TPTL  
Shri Ashish Chandra Barnard, Advocate, PTC India Limited  
Shri Paramhans Sahani, Advocate, PTC India Limited

The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted as follows:

- a) The instant petition had been filed by the Petitioner claiming transmission tariff for Circuit-2: 400 kV D/C Teesta III-Rangpo line (One ckt line from Powergrid LILO point to gantry tower at Teesta-III), Circuit-1(a): 400 kV D/C Dikchu-Teesta-III line (One ckt line from Teesta-III switchyard to LILO tower of Dikchu) and Circuit-1(b): 400 kV D/C Dikchu HEP - Rangpo line (One ckt line) for the control period of 2014-19.
- b) The time over-run from 1.7.2016 to 14.11.2016 (4 months 13 days) in case of Circuit 2 and Circuit 1(a) was not allowed in order dated 15.5.2018 as the Petitioner had not explained the reasons for time over-run in stringing from 1.7.2016 to 14.11.2016.
- c) The Petitioner filed Review Petition No. 25/RP/2018 against order dated 15.5.2018 along with certain additional documents. The Commission vide order



dated 30.12.2019 disposed of the Review Petition refusing to look into the additional material at the stage of review.

- d) The Review Petitioner filed Appeal No. 55 of 2022 before APTEL against the order dated 15.5.2018 in Petition No. 108/TT/2016 and the order dated 30.12.2019 in Review Petition No.25/RP/2018.
- e) APTEL, vide judgment dated 18.8.2022, has set aside the Commission's orders and remanded the matter to the Commission with the direction to reconsider the time period from 1.7.2016 to 14.11.2016 in the light of the pleadings and entire material submitted in support including the additional documents presented in the review proceedings.

2. The learned counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that the information/documents which were filed by the Petitioner vide affidavit dated 19.8.2017 were in response to the queries raised by the Commission in RoP dated 11.7.2017. He also submitted that the time over-run was due to RoW issues in the stringing of the Circuit 1(a) & 2 leading to the delay of 31 months from August 2013 to March 2016 and afterwards due to the hurdles created by the local landowners which could be cleared in November 2016 on the intervention of the administration.

3. The learned counsel prayed that the documents placed in the Review Petition No. 25/RP/2018, which were not considered at the stage of review, may be considered as per the APTEL's direction.

4. The Commission directed the Petitioner to submit the documents placed in the Review Petition No. 25/RP/2018 by 20.2.2023 with advance copy to the Respondents who shall file their reply by 6.3.2023 and the Petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 17.3.2022. The Commission further directed the parties to comply with the above directions within the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

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

**By order of the Commission**

Sd/-  
(V. Sreenivas)  
Joint Chief (Law)

