

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram:

- 1. Shri Ashok Basu, Chairman**
- 2. Shri G.S. Rajamani, Member**
- 3. Shri K.N. Sinha, Member**

**IA No. 62/2002
in Petition No.116/2002**

In the matter of

Approval of tariff for Stage – I of 400 kV Thyristor controlled series compensation project (Facts Device) on Kanpur – Ballabgarh 400 kV S/C line at Ballabgarh in Northern Region from 1.7.2002 to 31.3.2004

And in the matter of

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

..... Petitioner

Vs

Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd & others .

...Respondents

The following were present:

1. Shri V. Mittal, AGM (SO), PGCIL
2. Shri C.Kannan, PGCIL
3. Shri K.K. Mittal, RVPNL
4. Shri Mahendra Kumar, EE, UPPCL
5. Shri D.D. Chopra, Advocate, UPPCL
6. Shri S.K. Mittal, UPPCL
7. Shri S. Sowmyanarayanan, TNEB
8. Shri R.K. Arora, XEN/T, HVPNL

ORDER

(DATE OF HEARING 30.1.2003)

The Interlocutory Application filed by the petitioner for provisional tariff was listed for hearing after notice.

2. It has been stated that strengthening of Stage – I of 400 kV Thyristor controlled series compensation project (Facts Device) on Kanpur – Ballabgarh 400 kV S/C line at Ballabgarh in Northern Region was put under commercial operation with effect from 1.7.2002.

3. The prayer has been made for approval of provisional tariff.

4. The petitioner was entrusted with implementation of scheme for Stage – I of 400 kV Thyristor controlled series compensation project (Facts Device) on Kanpur – Ballabgarh 400 kV S/C line at Ballabgarh in Northern Region at the Sixth meeting of the Standing Committee of Northern Region held on 10.11.1998. It was decided that under the scheme a provision of 55% compensation on Kanpur – Ballabgarh 400 kV S/C line would be provided. 35% fixed series compensation was to be provided by the petitioner and the remaining 20% variable series compensation would be provided by BHEL. The constituents agreed to share the cost for fixed compensation of 35%, which was to be provided by the petitioner.

5. The expenditure sanction for the assets was accorded by the Board of Directors of the petitioner company in its 105th meeting held on 17.5.2000 at a total estimated cost of Rs. 14.76 crore including IDC of Rs. 0.83 crore. Against this, the estimated completion cost of the transmission assets is stated to be Rs.14.40 crore. The petitioner stated that an expenditure of Rs.14.19 crore was incurred up to 15.6.2002 and the balance of expenditure was the anticipated expenditure beyond 15.6.2002.

5. On consideration of the above recorded facts, we allow an annual tariff of Rs.207.51 lakh for the assets covered by the petition, on provisional basis from the date of commercial operation, subject to adjustment after determination of final tariff, considering the expenditure of Rs.14.19 crore.

6. IA No.62/2002 in Petition No.116/2002 is disposed of.

7. The petitioner submitted that the complete audited accounts in respect of the assets were likely to be available by end July 2003. We direct the petitioner to file the up-to-date audited figures by 20.8.2003 on affidavit along with the revised details in the prescribed proformae. The details of the loans shall also be furnished in the enclosed format. Thereafter the petition be listed for hearing in September 2003.

Sd/-
(K.N. SINHA)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(G.S. RAJAMANI)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(ASHOK BASU)
CHAIRMAN

New Delhi dated the 28th March, 2003