

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 38/TT/2015

Subject : Truing up transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff block for Transmission System associated with TALA HEP East-North Inter-connector and Northern Region Transmission System, an inter-regional asset between Northern Region and Eastern Region.

Date of Hearing : 23.11.2015.

Coram : Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Rajsathan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and 23 Others

Parties present : Shri S.K. Niranjana, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
Shri Anshul Garg, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.K Venkatesan, PGCIL
Smt. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri Pradeep Mishra, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms
Shri B.L Sharma, Rajasthan Discoms
Shri Vinod Sharma, Rajasthan Discoms

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff block
-



- for transmission system associated with TALA HEP East-North Inter-connector and Northern Region Transmission System, an inter-regional asset between Northern Region and Eastern Region;
- b) The transmission charges for the Combined Assets I (Eastern) and Combined Assets II (Northern) were approved by the Commission vide Order dated 21.6.2011 in Petition No. 328/2010;
 - c) Additional capital expenditure has been claimed for ₹322.94 lakh and ₹2025.98 Lakh for Combined Asset I and Combined Asset II respectively during 2009-14 tariff period, and ₹67.39 lakh for Combined Asset II during the tariff period 2014-19, towards balance and retention payments;
2. The learned counsel for the Rajasthan Discoms requested for one week time to file their reply.
3. In response to the Commission's query regarding higher actual additional capital expenditure in case of Combined Asset II as compared to the approved additional capital expenditure during 2009-14, the petitioner submitted that the figures approved by the Commission vide Order dated 21.6.2011 were based on the projections submitted by the petitioner and there is minor deviation in actual additional capital expenditure.
4. The Commission observed that the instant assets were commissioned in 2007 but the petitioner is still claiming balance and retention payments to be made to the contractors. The Commission further observed that admittedly eight years have passed and still there are retention payments to the contractors and there seems to be lack of sincere efforts and follow up for finalizing contracts. The Commission directed the petitioner to expedite such payments on account of balance and retention in future and to take necessary action at the local level for following up with the contractors for raising bills on time.
5. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 30.11.2015 and the petitioner to file rejoinder (if any) by 7.12.2015. The Commission further directed that the above information should be filed by the date indicated, failing which the matter would be decided on the basis of the information already available on record.



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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(V. Sreenivas)
Dy. Chief (Law)

