

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission  
New Delhi**

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Petition No. 93/TT/2011**

Subject: Approval for determination of transmission tariff for 1st LILO of 400 kV Bawana-Bahadurgarh-Hissar Line at Bhiwani Sub-station (anticipated date of commercial operation: 1.5.2011) under 765 kV System for central part of Northern Grid Part III in Northern Region for 2009-14

Date of Hearing: 6.3.2012

Coram: Shri S. Jayaraman, Member  
Shri V.S. Verma, Member  
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner: PGCIL, New Delhi

Respondents: Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & 17 others

Parties present: Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri Rajeev Gupta, PGCIL  
Shri Mukesh Khanna, PGCIL  
Shri Prashant Sharma, PGCIL  
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate for BRPL  
Shri Sanjay Srivastav, BRPL  
Shri T.P.S. Bawa, PSPCL

The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-

- (a) As per the investment approval accorded by the Board of Directors of PGCIL on 3.11.2009, the 765 kV transmission system for central part of Northern Grid Part III in Northern Region was scheduled for completion in 30 months from the date of investment approval, i.e., by May 2012. As against this, the transmission system was put under commercial operation on 1.9.2011. Hence additional return on equity of 0.5% has been claimed;
- (b) As per the original scheme the LILO covered in the present petition was to be terminated at Bhiwani Sub-station. Since Bhiwani Sub-station is not ready due to land dispute, the LILO

line is presently connected directly to Mohindergarh-Bhiwani line of Adani Power Ltd. (APL);

- (c) The assets covered in the present petition have been executed as per scope of the approved scheme with exception that instead of terminating the line at Bhiwani Sub-station, it is temporarily connected directly to APL's transmission line, in line with discussions and agreement in NRPC meeting.

2. The representative of Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. (PSPCL), respondent No. 6, submitted that additional return on equity is not admissible because only interim arrangement has been made in view of delay in construction of new Bhiwani Sub-station. He further submitted that the claim of additional return on equity is not admissible also because the LILO of transmission line is commissioned without breakers, and thus the transmission line work is incomplete.

3. The representative of BRPL, respondent No. 12, submitted that the asset is not complete in accordance with the approved scheme. The present asset is a temporary arrangement and since there is no provision in the 2009 regulations for approval of tariff for such assets, the transmission tariff cannot be approved in the present case.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following:

- (a) The provisions in the regulations under which the present interim arrangement is made allowing flow of ISTS power other than that from the APL generating station through the dedicated transmission line of APL, which is not a transmission licensee;
- (b) The details of the assets covered in the petition and the corresponding approved transmission system along with colour diagram, clearly indicating the present and the approved scheme and the final configuration, and also the details of the material and cost thereof which is used in the present interim arrangement and would not be used in final arrangement as per approved scheme;
- (c) Rejoinder, if any, to the replies submitted by the respondents, by 5.4.2012.

4. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

**By order of the Commission**

Sd/

(T. Rout)  
Joint Chief (Law)  
20.3.2012