

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 297/TT/2015**

Subject : Truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff period and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff period for **Asset-A**:- LILO of one circuit (ckt-1) of 400 kV D/C Maithon-Jamshedpur line at Mejia "B" TPS including PLCC equipment (excluding wave trap) for the transmission line **Asset-B**:- 400 kV D/C Koderma TPS- Biharsharif transmission line and 2 nos. associated line bays at Biharsharif Sub-station and **Asset C**: 400 kV D/C Maithon RB- Maithon (PG) transmission line and associated bay Extension at Maithon Sub-station under transmission system for start-up power to DVC and Maithon Right Bank Generation projects in Eastern Region.

Date of Hearing : 3.2.2016

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Ltd and 8 others

Parties present: Shri M. M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL

**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 period and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff period for above mentioned assets under transmission system for start-up power to DVC and Maithon Right Bank Generation projects in Eastern Region.
- b) The transmission charges for the asset was approved vide order dated 13.5.2015 in Petition No. 106/TT/2013.
- c) The petitioner has claimed total additional capitalization of ₹4719.8 lakh for 2009-14 tariff period and ₹178.14 lakh has been claimed for 2014-19 tariff period.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that in case of Asset-C, there was time over-run and, therefore, IEDC/IDC of ₹125.35 lakh was disallowed in order



dated 13.5.2015 in Petition No. 106/TT/2013. This reduction on account of IEDC/IDC has not been considered in the instant petition and the same may be deducted from the capital cost claimed.

3. In response to a query of the Commission regarding increase in additional capitalization in case of Asset-B, the representative of the petitioner submitted that it is due to balance and retention payments and might be because of tax, cess etc. He further submitted that the clarification for the same would be filed. He further submitted that reasons for cost over-run in case of Asset-B would also be submitted.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the above and the information sought vide letter dated 30.1.2016 on affidavit with copy to respondents by 10.2.2016. The Commission further directed that the above information should be filed within the specified date, failing which the matter would be decided on the basis of the information already available on record.

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

By order of the Commission

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

