

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 24/RP/2016

Subject : Review of Order dated 29.4.2016 in Petition No. 58/TT/2015 under Section 94 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 103, 111 and 114 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999.

Date of Hearing : 10.8.2016

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited and 7 others

Parties present: Shri M. M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri A. M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Ms Suparna Srivastava, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Matrugupta Mishra, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Piyush Singh, Advocate, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The learned counsel of the petitioner submitted that transmission tariff for Asset-I: 765 kV D/C Wardha-Aurangabad transmission line 1 and associated bays along with 765 kV, 3X80 MVAR line reactor at Aurangabad Sub-station, Asset-II: 765/400 kV, 1500 MVA ICT-1 with bays and equipments at Aurangabad Sub-station, Asset-III: 400 kV, 80 MVAR switchable line reactor for Aurangabad-Boiser transmission line ckt-1 charged as bus reactor at Aurangabad Sub-station, Asset-IV: 400 kV, 80 MVAR switchable line reactor for Aurangabad-Boiser transmission line ckt-2 charged as bus reactor at Aurangabad S/s, Asset-V: 400/220 kV, 500 MVA ICT-3 with bays and equipments at Boiser, Asset-VI: 400 kV, 80 MVAR line reactor for Aurangabad-Boiser transmission line ckt-1 charged as bus reactor at Boiser Sub-station, Asset-VII: 400 kV, 80 MVAR line reactor for Aurangabad-Boiser transmission line ckt-2 charged as bus reactor at Boiser Sub-station was allowed vide order dated 29.4.2016 in Petition No.58/TT/2015. The petitioner has prayed for additional ROE of 0.5% for Assets I to IV as they have been commissioned within the timelines specified in 2014 Tariff Regulations. However, the petitioner's claim for additional ROE of 0.5% for Assets I to IV was not allowed stating that the whole project was not completed and as the review petitioner has not filed the RPC certificate clearly



stating that commissioning of the assets that commissioning of the assets will benefit the system operation in the regional/ national grid.

2. The learned counsel for the review petitioner has submitted that the WRPC certificate was filed vide affidavit dated 11.4.2016 and the same was not considered by the Commission. Thus, the disallowance of additional ROE is an error apparent on the face of record and it needs to be rectified.

3. None of the respondents were present.

4. The Commission admitted the Review Petition and directed to issue notice to the respondents. The respondents were directed to file their reply by 23.8.2016 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 25.8.2016. The Commission further directed to list the petition on 24.8.2016.

By order of the Commission

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

