

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 4/TT/2015

Subject : Truing up tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and determination of tariff for 2014-19 tariff block for (A) 15.5 km loop in portion of both circuits of 400 KV D/C Bareilly-Lucknow Transmission Line to provide arrangement for evacuating Rosa Power out of LILO of both circuits and (B) 315 MVA 400/220 kV ICT at Bhiwadi under NRTSS in Northern 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 (PGCIL)

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidhyut Prasaran Nigam Limited (16 others)

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri J Majumder, PGCIL
Shri Shashi Bhushan, PGCIL
Smt. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri S.C. Taneja, PGCIL
Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL
Smt. Sonam Gangwar, PGCIL
Shri A.M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Mohd. Mohsin, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Agarwal, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms
Shri S.P. Das, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

a) The instant petition has been filed for truing up tariff for 2009-14 tariff block



and transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff block for (A) 15.5 km loop in portion of both circuits of 400 KV D/C Bareilly-Lucknow Transmission Line to provide arrangement for evacuating Rosa Power out of LILO of both circuits and (B) 315 MVA 400/220 kV ICT at Bhiwadi under NRTSS in Northern Region

- b) The assets were commissioned on 1.4.2012. The petitioner has sought approval of actual cost as on COD and additional capital expenditure for the 2009-14 tariff period and estimated additional capital expenditure for the 2014-19 tariff period
- c) The petitioner has submitted that projected additional capital expenditure during 2014-15 is on account of balance/retention payments towards contract closing works.

2. In response to a query of the Commission regarding the reasons for significant reduction in the additional capital expenditure in case of Asset B i.e. ₹328.07 lakh against ₹1134.6 lakh approved, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the order for ICT was given to Vijay Electricals. As type test of the ICT of Vijay Electricals was not done, the work was given to CG at very low cost and hence there is reduction in the cost of Asset B. He further submitted that they will submit the detailed reasons for the cost reduction of Asset B.

3. Learned counsel for Rajasthan Discoms, i.e Respondent Nos.1, 2, 3 and 4 submitted that reply to the petition has been served on the petitioner and will be filed during the course of the day.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit rejoinder to the respondents reply and reasons for cost variation by 10.2.2016. The Commission further directed that the above information should be filed in the time stipulated, 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

(V. Sreenivas)
Dy. Chief (Law)

