

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 337/TT/2022**

Subject : Petition for approval under Regulation 86 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 and Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019 for determination of the transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2024 for the asset under the “Transmission System for Transfer of Power from generation projects in Sikkim to NR/WR (Part – B1)” in the Eastern Region.

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Limited (BSPHCL) and Others

Date of Hearing : **11.12.2025**

Coram : Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member  
Shri Harish Dudani, Member

Parties Present : Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL  
Shri Utkarsh Singh, Advocate, PGCIL  
Ms. Rupinder Kaur, Advocate, PGCIL  
Shri Vidhan Vyas, Advocate, TPTL and TUL  
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL  
Shri Angaru Naresh Kumar, PGCIL  
Shri Mukesh Bhakar, PGCIL  
Shri Piyush Awvasthi, PGCIL  
Shri G. Vijay, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Corrigendum dated 29.10.2025 issued by the Central Electricity Authority (CEA), rectifying the typographical error in the nomenclature of the CEA Certificate dated 4.3.2016, thereby confirming that the asset under approval for tariff is for LILO, has been placed on record by the Petitioner. She further submitted that the parties have filed their written submissions in this regard and requested that the order be reserved in the matter.

2. The learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 7 and 8, i.e., Teesta Valley Power Transmission Limited (TPTL) and Teesta Urja Limited (TUL), respectively, submitted that the CEA Energisation Certificate was issued in 2016. Subsequently, the CEA, upon filing an RTI in 2018, stated that it had neither inspected the loop-out portion of



the transmission line nor granted any approval for the same. He strongly opposed the issuance of the said Corrigendum by the CEA after nearly a decade since the inspection.

3. In response, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that there is no dispute about the fact that both the loop-in and loop-out portions were ready, and this is corroborated by other documents available on record. She further submitted that the Petitioner has placed on record multiple letters written to the CEA requesting correction of the error in the Energisation Certificate, even after the order was reserved in the matter, which has now been accepted by the CEA, leading to the issuance of the Corrigendum dated 29.10.2025.

4. After hearing learned counsels for the parties, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

**By order of the Commission**

**Sd/-**

**(T. D. Pant)**

**Joint Chief (Law)**

