

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram:

- 1. Shri Ashok Basu, Chairperson**
- 2. Shri Bhanu Bhushan, Member**

**IA No.9/2007
in Petition No. 26/2005**

In the matter of

Miscellaneous petition under Regulations 24, 111 and 114 of the CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations 1999 for 'restoration of equity depletion occurred as a result of fixation of tariff by Government of India under Section 43 A(2) of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, through various tariff notifications for the block 1992-1997

And in the matter of

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd., Gurgaon **Petitioner**

Vs

1. Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna
2. West Bengal State Electricity Board, Kolkata
3. Gird Corporation of Orissa, Bhubaneswar
4. Damodar Valley Corporation, Kolkata
5. Department of Power, Govt. of Sikkim, Gangtok
6. Jharkhand State Electricity Board, Ranchi
7. Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd, Ajmer
8. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd, Jaipur
9. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd, Jodhpur
10. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
11. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
12. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd., Panchkula
13. Power Development Department, Govt. of J&K, Jammu
14. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow
15. Delhi Transco Ltd., Delhi
16. Chandigarh Administration, Chandigarh
17. Uttaranchal Power Corporation Ltd., Dehradun
18. Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Ltd., Hyderabad
19. Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd., Bangalore
20. Kerala State Electricity Board, Thiruvananthapuram
21. Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Chennai
22. Electricity Department, Pondicherry,
23. Electricity Department, Govt. of Goa, Panaji.
24. Madhya Pradesh State Electricity Board, Jabalpur
25. Maharashtra State Electricity Board, Mumbai
26. Gujarat Electricity Board, Vadodara
27. Electricity Department, Admn of Daman & Diu, Daman

ORDER

Presently, the Commission is considering revision of transmission tariff for the period 1.4.2004 to 31.3.2009 in respect of the assets of the petitioner, wherein the Appellate Tribunal by its judgement dated 16.5.2006 had allowed restoration of equity.

2. The Commission by its order dated 15.1.2007 had directed the petitioner to file copies of all tariff orders for the period 1992-97 with amendments, if any, latest by 31.1.2007 with copy to the respondents and also the documentary evidence in regard to the value (gross block or net asset value) at which the transmission assets were transferred to it on 1.4.1992. On receipt of the information, all individual cases were to be processed separately for further hearing.

3. Earlier, the petitioner had filed the interlocutory applications (IA No.10/2007 – Northern Region, IA No.11/2007 – Southern Region, IA No.12/2007-Eastern Region and IA No.58/2006 – Western Region) for revision of transmission tariff, one application for each zone, four applications in all. These interlocutory applications were not being processed pending receipt of information from the petitioner. The petitioner was advised by the office to file separate application for each asset, in respect of which revision of tariff was sought.

4. Through the present interlocutory application, the petitioner has sought time up to 5.3.2007 to file the information called for by order dated 15.1.2007. The petitioner has also prayed for admission of its interlocutory applications earlier filed on regional basis for revision of tariff as per the directions of the Appellate Tribunal. It has expressed practical difficulties in filing of separate interlocutory application for each asset.

5. Since the time prayed for has already expired, no order is required to be made on this part of the prayer.

6. The petitioner has filed one interlocutory application in several petitions which does not conform to the established procedure. However, in view of the practical difficulties expressed by the petitioner in regard to filing of separate application in each case, we direct that the interlocutory application earlier filed by the petitioner for each zone be treated as fresh petition for revision of tariff. The petitioner shall deposit fee in each case as applicable to the fresh petition and also publish its revised proposals for approval of tariff in accordance with the procedure specified by the Commission.

7. With the above, the present interlocutory application stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(BHANU BHUSHAN)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(ASHOK BASU)
CHAIRPERSON

New Delhi dated the 15th March 2007