

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram:

1. **Shri Ashok Basu, Chairman**
2. **Shri K.N. Sinha, Member**
3. **Shri Bhanu Bhushan, Member**
4. **Shri A.H. Jung, Member**

**IA No.31/2005
in
Petition No.131/2002**

In the matter of

Approval of tariff for Talcher-Meramundali transmission line in Eastern Region for the period 1.12.2003 to 31.3.2004

And in the matter of

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

.....**Petitioner**

Vs

1. Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna
2. West Bengal State Electricity Board, Kolkata
3. Grid Corporation of Orissa Ltd., Bhubaneshwar
4. Damodar Valley Corporation, Kolkata
5. Power Deptt., Govt. of Sikkim, Gangtok
6. Jharkhand State Electricity Board, Ranchi

....**Respondents**

The following were present:

1. Shri P.C. Pankaj, AGM, PGCIL
2. Shri U.K. Tyagi, PGCIL
3. Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
4. Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL

**ORDER
(DATE OF HEARING : 22.9.2005)**

The main petition has been filed for approval of tariff for the period 1.12.2003 to 31.3.2004 in respect of 400 kV D/C Talcher-Meramundali transmission line and was heard on 16.3.2004. When finalisation of the tariff order was under consideration, the petitioner has made the present interlocutory application wherein it has prayed that

finalisation of the tariff order be held in abeyance because the revised cost estimates for the transmission line were to be approved by the competent authority. In the alternative, it has been prayed that the order be issued with liberty to the petitioner to seek revision of tariff after approval of the revised cost estimates, which is likely to take 3-4 months' time.

2. None of the respondents has filed reply to the interlocutory application. Neither is anyone present at the hearing before us.

3. We have heard Shri U.K. Tyagi in support of the application. He has submitted that after the revised cost estimates are approved by the competent authority, the petitioner will be required to amend the tariff petition. He has submitted that the proposal for approval of revised cost estimates is presently under consideration before the Board of Directors of the petitioner. He, therefore, sought time for submission of the amended application and accordingly prayed for withholding of the order in the meantime.

4. We take notice of the fact that the present petition is pending for a very long time and even after hearing was completed. The disposal of the petition will get further delayed in case order is held in abeyance for 3-4 months' time as indicated in the interlocutory application. We express our serious concern that the petitioner did not take any steps for approval of the revised cost estimates, if it was considered to be necessary, till now. Nevertheless, in the interest of justice we consider it appropriate to allow some time to the petitioner to file the amended petition, particularly in the absence of any assistance from the respondents. Accordingly, we direct that the

amended tariff petition may be filed by the petitioner latest by 30.11.2005 in accordance with the procedure presently in vogue. In case the amended tariff petition is not filed by the time allowed, the tariff order shall be finalised based on the available records, within next one week.

5. With the above, IA No.31/2005 in Petition No.131/2002 stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(.A.H. JUNG)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(BHANU BHUSHAN)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(K.N. SINHA)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(ASHOK BASU)
CHAIRMAN

New Delhi dated the 22nd September 2005