Petition No.102/2004

In the matter of

Approval for transmission tariff for Singrauli Transmission System in Northern Region for the period from 1.4.2004 to 31.3.2009.

And in the matter of

Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Vs

1. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited, Jaipur
2. Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd., Ajmer
3. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd., Jaipur
4. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd., Jodhpur
5. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
6. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
7. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd., Panchkula
8. Power Development Deptt., Govt. of Jammu & Kashmir, Jammu
9. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited, Lucknow
10. Delhi Transco Limited, New Delhi
11. Chandigarh Administration, Chandigarh
12. Uttaranchal Power Corporation Limited, Dehradun
13. Northern Railway, New Delhi

The following were present:

1. Shri U.K. Tyagi, PGCIL
2. Shri C. Kannan, PGCIL
3. Shri P.C. Pankaj, PGCIL
4. Shri M.M. Mondal, CM (Fin), PGCIL
5. Shri B.P. Kundu, PGCIL
6. Shri S. Mazumdar, PGCIL
7. Shri K.K. Mittal, XEN, RRVPNL
8. Shri S.R.G. Sabal, Dy. CE (RPPC), Jaipur
9. Shri Yashpal Singh, AEM (RPPC), Jodhpur
10. Shri T.P.S. Bawa, OSD, PSEB
11. Shri V.K. Gupta, Consultant, PSEB
12. Shri V.K. Malhotra, DTL

ORDER
(DATE OF HEARING : 18.8.2005)

We heard the representatives of the petitioner and those of the respondents present at the hearing.

2. Earlier, the petitioner had filed petition No.13/2002 for approval of tariff for Singrauli Transmission System for the period 2001-04, which was disposed of by order dated 31.7.2003. It is noted that there are certain discrepancies as regards the scope of the transmission system and the date of commercial operation of some of the elements thereof as given in petition No.13/2002 and in the present petition, although the total line length and number of bays remain unchanged. These discrepancies noticed are listed below:

(a) Kanpur-Panki transmission lines I & II were not included in the scope of work in petition No.13/2002, but are indicated in the present petition.

(b) In the present petition the petitioner has shown transmission lines from Muradnagar to Dadri and from Dadri to Panipat with the date of commercial operation as 16.10.1984 whereas in petition No.13/2002 the line was shown from Murannagar to Panipat, with the date of commercial operation as 1.6.1986.

(c) In the present petition, Singrauli-Anpara transmission line is shown to have been under commercial operation since 5.4.1982, whereas in petition No 13/2002 the transmission line was shown from Singrauli to Obra with the date of commercial operation as 1.2.1982.
(d) The date of commercial operation of Kanpur-Agra line is indicated as 26.11.1986 in the instant petition whereas the same was indicated as 14.3.1987 in the petition No 13/2002.

(e) In the instant petition, one transmission line is indicated as Agra-Bassi with the date of commercial operation of 30.11.1986 whereas in the petition No 13/2002, the transmission line was shown as Agra-Jaipur line with the date of commercial operation as 14.3.1987.

3. The petitioner shall explain these discrepancies through a proper affidavit, with a copy to the respondents. The petitioner shall also furnish the details of the original assets created under the transmission system with modifications (such as LILO of lines) in chronological order, along with name of the project and petition No. through which the approval for tariff for the assets, if not claimed in the present petition, has been sought.

4. The affidavit shall be filed latest by 10.9.2005. Subject to above, the order on tariff is reserved.
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