

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Petition No. 314/ 2010

Subject : Determination of Transmission Tariff for Asset-1: Combined Elements of (a) 30% FSC on 400 kV Bareilly-Mandola Ckt-1 & Ckt-2 at Bareilly; (b) 45% FSC on 400 kV D/C Unnao-Bareilly Ckt-1 & Ckt-2 at Unnao end; and (c) 30% FSC on 400 kV Gorakhpur-Lucknow Ckt-1 at Lucknow and Asset-2: 30% FSC on 400 kV Gorakhpur-Lucknow Ckt-2 at Lucknow under System associated with enhancement of transmission capacity in East-West Corridor of Northern Region for tariff block 2009-14 period

Date of hearing : 18.6.2013

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

Petitioner : PGCIL, New Delhi

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd & 16 others

Parties present : Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL
Shri Prashant Sharma, PGCIL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
Shri T.P.S. Bawa, PSPCL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of PSPCL submitted as under:-

- (a) There is delay of 8 months in commissioning in case of Ckt.-I and 11 months in case of Ckt.-II. PGCIL letter dated 6.11.2009 enclosed with its affidavit dated 16.7.2012 shows that for carrying out relocation works for FSC, the shut-down of both the circuits of the 400 kV D/C Unnao- Bareilly Transmission Line was availed from 9.11.2009 to 22.11.2009. These works are carried out much in advance. Moreover, it is the responsibility of CTU under Section 38 (2) (b) of the Electricity Act, 2003 to co-ordinate with STU;

- (b) Ckt.-I was commissioned on 1.4.2010 and Ckt.-II was commissioned on 1.7.2010. There was thus three months' gap between commissioning of Ckt.-I and Ckt.-II. For the period from 1.4.2010 to 30.6.2010 it would not be justified to charge transmission tariff of FSC of Lucknow-Gorakhpur Ckt. I. This tariff should be charged only from 1.7.2010 when the FSC of Ckt. II was commissioned, since the mismatch in commissioning is due to the petitioner which should have commissioned both the FSCs of Ckt. I & Ckt. II. The petitioner should confirm that FSC of Ckt. I actually remained in service during the period;
- (c) The date of award and date of completion of work, as mentioned in page 68 of the petition, are 30.7.2007 and 30.3.2009. The assets were actually put under commercial operation on 1.4.2010 and 1.7.2010. The delay on the part of contractor is a bilateral issue between contractor and petitioner and delay cannot be passed on to beneficiaries. The flooding in Lucknow in Monsoon 2008 cannot be said to affect the actual commissioning on 1.7.2010.

2. The representative of BRPL submitted that BRPL has filed reply vide affidavit dated 20.4.2012 in which issue of time over-run has been raised. He further submitted that the petitioner, being a Central Transmission Utility, is mandated to coordinate with State Transmission Utility, under section 38 (2) (b) of the Electricity Act, 2003. The delay in the present case is due to lack of coordination with UPPCL and hence the delay should not be condoned.

3. The representative of the petitioner clarified that the clearance for shut-down is vital for the petitioner to carry out relocation works for FSC. The petitioner approached UPPCL for shut-down in July, 2009 only after seeing the progress of FSC equipments. There was delay of 6-7 months in getting permission and the petitioner finished the work within 1 to 2 months of getting the permission. In case of Lucknow- Gorakhpur line, the work was affected because of severe flooding for 3-4 months.

4. After hearing the parties, the Commission directed the petitioner to furnish the following information on affidavit, before 29.6.2013:-

- (a) CA/ Management certificate depicting separate element-wise capital cost along with IDC/IEDC for Asset-1;
- (b) Element-wise additional capital expenditure incurred from 1.4.2010 (date of commercial operation of Asset-1) to 30.6.2010 (date of commercial operation of Asset-2).

5. Order in the petition was reserved.

By the order of the Commission,

(T. Rout)
Joint Chief (Law)