

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 152/TT/2013**

- Subject : Determination of revised transmission tariff for LILO of Kahalgaon-Patna 400 kV D/C (Quad) line at Barh Sub-station after approval of revised cost estimate under transmission system associated with Barh Generation Project(3X660 MW) in Eastern Region from date of commercial operation (1.11.2009) to 31.3.2014.
- Date of Hearing : 17.9.2013
- Coram : Shri V.S. Verma, Member  
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
- Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation India Limited
- Respondents : Bihar State Electricity Board & 6 others
- Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri B.K. Sahoo, PGCIL  
Shri B.C. Pant, PGCIL  
Shri Shailendra Singh, NTPC  
Shri Ajay Dua, NTPC  
Shri Rohit Chhabra , NTPC  
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, JSEB  
Shri Mohit Kumar Shah, Advocate, BSPHCL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed seeking revision of transmission tariff for LILO of Kahalgaon-Patna 400 kV D/C (Quad) line at Barh Sub-station after approval of revised cost estimate under transmission system associated with Barh Generation Project (3X660 MW);
- b) The petition was heard on 8.8.2013 and the rejoinder to the reply of JSEB and NTPC has already been filed vide affidavits dated 11.9.2013;



- c) The Commission while allowing transmission charges, vide order dated 8.4.2011 in Petition No. 252/2010, had restricted the cost to the apportioned approved cost of `10482.00 lakh as against total estimated completed cost of `17426.92 lakh claimed by it; and
- d) Subsequently, the RCE of `18407 lakh has been approved. The petitioner has claimed the revision of tariff after the approval of RCE and requested to allow the revised tariff claimed.
2. The learned counsel for Bihar State Power Holding Company Limited submitted that copy of the petition has not been provided to it. He further sought two weeks time to file the reply.
3. The representative of NTPC submitted that the cost has increased by 72% and IDC has gone up by four times. He requested to allow the increase in cost and IDC strictly as per the Regulations.
4. The learned counsel for JSEB submitted that reply on behalf of JSEB has already been filed.
5. In response to a query of the Commission, the representative of the petitioner has submitted that the cost increased mainly because of price variation by `74.80 lakh, increase in cost of land and compensation by `31.04 lakh, FERV by `273.34 lakh and IDC by `233.85 lakh. He further submitted that the number of towers has gone up near Barh end due to ROW issue.
6. The Commission directed BSPHCL to file the reply before 4.10.2013 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, before 15.10.2013.
7. The Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

sd/-  
(T. Rout)  
Chief Legal

