

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 362/TT/2014**

Subject : Transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block for (A) 500 MVA 400/220 kV Spare Transformer for Northern Region at Neemrana under Augmentation of Transformers in Northern Region Part – A of Northern Region

Date of Hearing : 27.1.2016

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board & 16 Others

Parties present : Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri S.K Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Smt. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL  
Shri S.C. Taneja, PGCIL  
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL  
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL  
Shri Anshul Garg, PGCIL  
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate BRPL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block for (A) 500 MVA 400/220 kV Spare Transformer at Neemrana under Augmentation of Transformers in Northern Region Part – A of Northern Region
  - b) As per the investment approval dated 19.12.2012, the instant asset was
- 



scheduled to be commissioned in 22 months, i.e. 18.10.2014. However, the instant asset was commissioned in November, 2013 and thus there is no time over-run in commissioning of the asset.

c) The apportioned approved cost of the instant asset is ₹1621.25 and the estimated completion is ₹1172.46 and thus there is no cost over-run.

d) The revised additional capital expenditure has been submitted vide affidavit dated 1.12.2015.

2. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that reply to the petition has been filed vide affidavit dated 21.1.2016. He submitted that installation of spare transformer would improve the NATAF and it would be benefit the petitioner and hence the cost of the spare transformers should be borne by the petitioner and their cost should not be passed on to the beneficiaries. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the installation of spare transformers have been discussed and approved in the 26<sup>th</sup> NRPC Meeting and hence the cost should be borne by the beneficiaries.

3. The Commission observed that though the instant asset was commissioned on 1.11.2013, the petition has been filed in September, 2014 and there is a considerable delay in filing the instant petition. The Commission directed the petitioner to file the petitions in time.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to file the rejoinder to the reply filed by BRPL 5.2.2016. The Commission observed that in case the above information is not received within the specified date, the petition will be disposed 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)

