

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Review Petition No. 06/RP/2015**

**in  
Petition No.100/TT/2012**

**Coram:**

**Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson  
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member  
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member  
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member**

**Date of Order : 15.09.2016**

**In the matter of:**

Review petition under Section 94(1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 103 (1) of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999, seeking review of order dated 20.1.2015 in Petition No. 100/TT/2012.

**And in the matter of:**

Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,  
"Saudamini", Plot No. 2,  
Sector 29, Gurgaon-122001  
Haryana

.....**Petitioner**

**Vs**

1. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited,  
Vidyut Bhawan, Vidyut Marg,  
Jaipur-302 005
2. Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited,  
400 kV GSS Building (Ground Floor),  
Ajmer Road, Heerapura, Jaipur
3. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited,  
400 kV GSS Building (Ground Floor)  
Ajmer Road, Heerapura, Jaipur



4. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited,  
400 kV GSS Building (Ground Floor),  
Ajmer Road, Heerapura, Jaipur
5. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board,  
Vidyut Bhawan, Kumar House Complex Building II,  
Shimla-171 004
6. Punjab State Electricity Board  
The Mall, Patiala-147 001
7. Haryana Power Purchase Centre,  
Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6,  
Panchkula (Haryana)-134 109
8. Power Development Department,  
Govt. of Jammu and Kashmir,  
Mini Secretariat, Jammu
9. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited,  
(Formerly Uttar Pradesh State Electricity Board),  
Shakti Bhawan, 14, Ashok Marg,  
Lucknow-226 001
10. Delhi Transco Limited,  
Shakti Sadan, Kotla Road,  
New Delhi-110 002
11. BSES Yamuna Power Limited,  
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,  
New Delhi
12. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited,  
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,  
New Delhi
13. North Delhi Power Limited,  
Power Trading & Load Dispatch Group,  
Cennet Building, Adjacent to 66/11kV Pitampura-3,  
Grid Building, Near PP Jewellers,  
Pitampura, New Delhi-110 034
14. Chandigarh Administration,  
Sector-9, Chandigarh



15. Uttarakhand Power Corporation Limited,  
Urja Bhawan, Kanwali Road, Dehradun

16. North Central Railway,  
Allahabad

17. New Delhi Municipal Council,  
Palika Kendra, Sansad Marg,  
New Delhi-110 002

....Respondents

**For petitioner** : Ms. Ranjitha Ramachandran, Advocate for PGCIL  
Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL  
Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL  
Shri Subash C. Taneja, PGCIL  
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL

**For respondent** : None

### **ORDER**

This review petition has been filed by Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL) under Section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 103 (1) of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 seeking review of the order dated 20.1.2015 in Petition No.100/TT/2012, wherein the transmission tariff of six assets in (Group-2) associated with 765 kV System for Central Part of Northern Grid Part-II in Northern Region for 2009-14 period was determined. Aggrieved by the said order, PGCIL has filed the instant petition seeking review in respect of the following:-

- a) Disallowance of time over-run of 8 months and 12 months in commissioning of Combined Assets I to IV and Combined Assets V and VI respectively; and
- b) Non-consideration of COD of Combined Assets V and VI as 1.2.2013.



## **Brief facts of the case**

2. Transmission tariff for Asset-I: 765/400/33 kV, 1500 MVA ICT-I at Jhatikara Sub-station, Asset-II: 765/400/33 kV, 1500 MVA ICT-II at Jhatikara Sub-station, Asset-III: 765/400/33 kV, 1500 MVA ICT-III at Jhatikara Sub-station, Asset-IV: 765/400/33 kV, 1500 MVA ICT-IV at Jhatikara Sub-station, Asset-V: 765/400/33 kV, 1500 MVA ICT-I at Meerut Sub-station, Asset-VI: 765/400/33 kV, 1500 MVA ICT-II at Meerut Sub-station, was allowed for these assets for the 2009-14 tariff period vide order dated 20.1.2015 in Petition No.100/TT/2012. Assets I to IV at Jhatikara Sub-station was commissioned on 1.10.2012 and hence combined tariff was allowed for those assets (hereinafter collectively referred to as Combined Assets I to IV). Similarly, Assets V and VI were commissioned on 1.2.2013 and hence combined tariff was allowed for those assets (hereinafter collectively referred to as Combined Assets V and VI). As per the Investment Approval (IA) accorded by Board of Directors of the review petitioner, vide letter No. C/CP/765KV System in Northern Grid dated 30.7.2009, the project was scheduled to be commissioned by 1.2.2012. As the Combined Assets-I to IV were commissioned on 1.10.2012 and Combined Assets-V and VI were commissioned on 1.2.2013, there was a delay of 8 months in the case of Combined Assets-I to IV and 12 months in the case of Combined Assets-V and VI. Time over-run of 8 months and 12 months was not condoned in case of Asset-I to IV and Asset-V and VI respectively. Therefore, an amount of ₹1661.69 lakh and ₹1440.93 lakh on account of IDC and IEDC was disallowed in case of Asset-I to IV and Asset-V and VI respectively. The relevant portion of order dated 20.1.2015 in Petition No.100/TT/2012 is as under:-

“32. ....As regards the delay in commissioning Combined Assets I to IV, the petitioner, vide its affidavit dated 7.3.2014, has attributed the same to RoW issues in commissioning



Jhatikara-Bhiwani 765 kV S/C line and LILO of both Ckts of Mundka/Bawana-Bamnouli 400 kV D/C line at Jhatikara Sub-station. We notice that no documentary evidence such as letters to concerned authorities such as DC/ Police etc have been submitted substantiating the quantum of time lost in resolving the RoW issues. We therefore hold that the delay of 8 months in commissioning of Combined Assets I to IV, cannot be condoned. Same is the case with the delay in commissioning of Combined Assets V and VI, which is also attributed to RoW issues pertaining to the delay in commissioning of 765 kV S/C Agra-Meerut line (NCR-Part-I). In the absence of documentary evidence in support of the averments of the petitioner, we hold that there is no justification for condoning the delay of 12 months in commissioning of the Combined Asset V and VI.”

3. Further, the Commission vide order dated 20.1.2015 in Petition No. 100/TT/2012, in the case of Combined Assets-V and VI has considered the date of commercial operation to be 1.6.2013 instead of 1.2.2013 as claimed by the review petitioner. The relevant extract of the said order is as follows:-

“31. ....We are at pains to note the petitioner has not responded to our query as to when the final approval of energization was issued by CEA, who had issued the certificate for temporary charging for conducting pre-commissioning tests. It is our view that system should not be declared under commercial operation based on temporary energization certificate. Further, ICTs remain unused without connection to 765 kV side. The 765 kV line (Agra-Meerut line) which was also to be built by the petitioner. Charging of 765 kV line reactor through ICT for controlling 400 kV Voltage is not proper. They are designed for controlling voltage of 765 kV line. For the sake of obtaining approval for transmission tariff the petitioner has provided trivial justification. We cannot load the beneficiaries without substantive utilization of the assets. Accordingly we hold that the date of commercial operation of Combined Assets V and VI should be 1.6.2013 i.e. aligned with the commissioning of 765 kV Meerut-Agra Line. The petitioner is at liberty to submit revised cost as on 1.6.2013 for the assets at Meerut which will be considered at the time of truing-up in accordance with law.”

### **Grounds for Review**

4. The review petitioner has submitted that the Commission vide order dated 20.1.2015 in Petition No. 100/TT/2012 had held that no documentary evidence to substantiate the time over-run was submitted by the review petitioner. The review petitioner has submitted that the details of court cases filed by landowners on erection and installation on their land as well as various communications to the authorities regarding obstruction/resistance in execution of works was submitted in Petition No. 100/TT/2012 vide affidavit dated



7.3.2014, which perhaps has not been considered. The review petitioner has submitted the following justification for condoning the time over-run in case of Combined Assets I to IV and Combined Assets IV and V:-

**Time over-run in case of Combined Assets I to Asset-IV**

a) Commissioning of 4x1500MVA 765/400/33kV ICTs at Jattikara Sub-station (under NCR part II project) being Combined Assets I to IV was planned with the commissioning of 765kV S/C Jattikara-Bhiwani Line under NCR Part-I project covered in Petition No. 82/TT/2012 and LILO of both circuits of Mundka/Bawana-Bamnouli 400kV D/C line at Jattikara Sub-station under NCR Part-I Project covered in Petition No. 199/TT/2012. The Combined Assets I to Asset-IV could not have been commissioned in absence of the Transmission Line and LILO at the sub-station due to technical reasons as the ICTs could not be charged at the Jattikara Sub-station without the availability of 765 kV Voltage at Jattikara Sub-station;

b) Due to severe RoW issues, Jattikara-Bhiwani 765 kV S/C line and LILO of both circuits of Mundka/Bawana-Bamnouli 400 kV D/C line at Jattikara Sub-station could not be completed on time. Therefore, the delay in completion in the above delayed the commissioning of Combined Asset I to Asset IV;

c) The delay of 7 months in the completion of Jattikara-Bhiwani 765 kV S/C line and LILO of both circuits of Mundka/Bawana-Bamnouli 400 kV D/C line at Jattikara Sub-station has already been condoned vide order dated 3.7.2014 in Petition No. 82/TT/2012 and order dated 9.1.2015 in Petition No. 199/TT/2012;

d) The Commission has accepted the delay on account of the court cases filed by the



landowners in different courts, hindrance and obstruction created by the villagers and the delay in obtaining forest and tower clearances for which the petitioner had filed the documentary evidence to the satisfaction of the Commission. Therefore, the Commission has already recognized that the delay was beyond the control of the petitioner;

e) The commissioning of all the assets is inter-related and since the time over-run has already been condoned in the Line and LILO of both circuits, the delay in commissioning of ICTs is also to be condoned; and

f) In view of above, the Combined Asset-I to Asset-IV could not be put under commercial operation as per schedule. After the disposal of court cases and with the help of police protection, the Combined Asset-I to Asset-IV i.e. 4x1500MVA ICTs at Jattikara Sub-station were put under commercial operation with effect from 1.10.2012 after a delay of 8 months from scheduled date of commercial operation. It is submitted that delay in commissioning of above-mentioned assets was beyond the control of the petitioner.

#### **Time over-run in case of Combined Assets V and VI**

a) Commissioning of Combined Assets V and Asset VI was planned with the commissioning of the 765 kV S/C Agra-Meerut Line under project NCR Part-I covered in Petition No. 199/TT/2012 due to technical reasons. This was because the Combined Assets V and VI could not be commissioned in absence of the Agra-Meerut Line and the consequent non-availability of 765 kV voltage at Merit.



b) Due to RoW issues, the Agra-Meerut Line could not be commissioned on time. The delay in completion in the above delayed the commissioning of Combined Asset V and VI.

c) The delay in commissioning of the Agra-Meerut Line by 15 months has already been condoned by the Commission vide order dated 9.1.2015 in Petition No. 199/TT/2012. The Commission in the said order has accepted the petitioner's reasons and evidence submitted therein for delay in commercial operation due to the court cases filed by the land owners in different courts and the delay in obtaining forest clearance and tower clearances. Therefore, the Commission has already recognized that the delay is beyond the control of the petitioner.

5. As regards the change in the date of commercial operation of Assets IV and V from 1.2.2013 to 1.6.2013 by the Commission, the review petitioner has submitted that in order to mitigate the high voltage problem encountered at Meerut Sub-station during the light load conditions, the CEA accorded concurrence to commissioned line reactors at Meerut end through ICT vide letter dated 31.1.2013. The petitioner commissioned the ICTs at Meerut after receipt of concurrence from CEA. Accordingly, the ICTs at Meerut alongwith reactors (covered in Petition No. 37/TT/2013) were commissioned and put into operation on 1.2.2013. The review petitioner has submitted that approval of CEA was obtained for charging the reactor and the commissioning of the ICT is essential for commissioning of the 765 kV reactor and the commissioning of ICT is essential for commissioning of the 765 kV reactor and in the absence of which the reactor could not have commissioned. Therefore, the 765/400 kV





ICTs were commissioned at Meerut Sub-station to charge the 765 kV Line Reactor for controlling the 400 kV Bus Voltage. The charging of 765 KV Bus Reactor has improved the voltage profile and the voltage level of 415 kV came down to 410 kV. It is further submitted that the Meerut Sub-station is very critical for evacuation of power from Tehri and Koteshwar generation, thus, the voltage level is required to be maintained properly for better reliability of the system. As both the ICTs were ready, they were charged to have redundancy. In case of outage of any ICT, the reactor may remain in service. This has advantage in avoiding the sudden change in reactive power. Therefore, the commercial operation date of the Combined Asset V and Asset VI is to be considered as 1.2.2013 and not as 1.6.2013.

6. During the hearing on 29.3.2016, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that disallowance of time over-run of 8 months in commissioning of Combined Assets-I to IV and 12 months in commissioning of Combined Assets V and VI and disallowance of COD of Combined Assets V and VI are errors apparent on the face of the record and it requires to be rectified in review. The learned counsel further submitted that condonation of time over-run was not sought on account of any RoW issues connected with the instant assets but on account of the RoW issues related to Jattikara-Bhiwani 765 kV S/C line and LILO of both circuits of Mundka/Bhiwani-Bamnouli 400 kV D/C line (Asset-I to IV) and Agra-Meerut 765 kV S/C line (Asset-V and Asset-VI). The learned counsel also submitted that delays on account of RoW issues have been condoned vide order dated 3.7.2014 and 9.1.2015 in Petition No. 82/TT/2012 for Jattikara-Bhiwani 765 kV S/C line and Petition No. 199/TT/2012 for LILO of both circuits of Mundka/Bhiwani-Bamnouli 400 kV D/C line and Agra-Meerut 765 kV S/C line respectively. In addition, the learned counsel submitted that



allowing the date of commissioning of Combined Assets V and VI as 1.6.2013 instead of 1.2.2013 is not correct as the instant assets were ready for use and there were no technical issue or difficulty in using the 765 kV line reactor for controlling the voltage of 400 kV transmission system as is clear from the approval of CEA as well as documents filed vide affidavit dated 7.3.2014 by the review petitioner. The review petition was admitted vide order 29.3.2016 and the respondents were directed to file their replies. Thereafter, during the hearing on 28.4.2016, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that notice was issued to all the respondents, however, no reply was received. She further, submitted that in a similar case, the Commission in its order dated 18.3.2016 in Petition No.37/TT/2013 has condoned the delay and requested to condone the time over-run in the instant case.

7. On the basis of the pleadings made by the review petitioner, the following two issues are framed:-

- a) Whether disallowing of time over-run of 8 months and 12 months in case of Combined Assets I to IV and Combined Assets V and VI amount to an error apparent on the face of record; and
- b) Whether disallowing COD in case of Combined Assets V and VI as 1.2.2013 would amount to an error apparent on the face of record.

8. We have considered the submissions of the review petitioner and have perused the material on record. On the first issue of disallowance of time over-run, it is observed that Combined Assets I to IV at Jattikara Sub-station were planned to be commissioned on 1.2.2012 alongwith the commissioning of 765 kV S/C Jattikara-Bhiwani Line (covered in



Petition No.82/TT/2014) and LILO of both circuits of Mundka/Bawana-Bamnouli 400 kV D/C line at Jattikara Sub-station (covered in Petition No.199/TT/2012) under NCR Part-I. The Combined Assets I to IV are technically dependent on the 765 kV S/C Jattikara-Bhiwani Line and LILO of both circuits of Mundka/Bawana-Bamnouli 400 kV D/C line at Jattikara Sub-station and Combined Assets I to IV cannot be commissioned without the commissioning the said assets covered in Petition Nos. 82/TT/2012 and 199/TT/2012. The Jattikara-Bhiwani 765 kV S/C line and LILO of both circuits of Mundka/Bawana-Bamnouli 400 kV D/C line at Jattikara were commissioned on 1.10.2012 and there was time over-run in commissioning of the said assets. The time over-run in case of the both the assets was condoned by the Commission. We are of the view that the Combined Assets I to IV are dependent on 765 kV S/C Jattikara-Bhiwani Line and LILO of both circuits of Mundka/Bawana-Bamnouli 400 kV D/C line at Jattikara Sub-station and they can be commissioned alongwith the said assets only on 1.10.2012. The time over-run in commissioning of the said assets has already been condoned vide orders dated 3.7.2014 and 9.1.2015 in Petition Nos. 82/TT/2012 and 199/TT/2012 respectively. Accordingly, the time over-run of 8 months in case of combined Assets I to IV should have also been condoned as they cannot be commissioned without 765 kV S/C Jattikara-Bhiwani Line and LILO of both circuits of Mundka/Bawana-Bamnouli 400 kV D/C line at Jattikara Sub-station. Condonation of time over-run in case of the assets on which Combined Assets I to IV was not considered by us while passing the impugned on 20.1.2015 and it is an error apparent on the face of record and requires to be rectified. Accordingly, the time over-run of 8 months in case of Assets I to IV is condoned and the IDC and IEDC is allowed to be capitalized.



9. Similarly, Combined Assets V and Asset-VI at Meerut Sub-station were planned to be commissioned on 1.2.2012 alongwith 765 kV S/C Agra-Meerut Line under NCR Project I and they are dependent and cannot be commissioned without the commissioning of 765 kV S/C Agra-Meerut Line under NCR Project I. There was time over-run of 15 months in case of 765 kV S/C Agra-Meerut Line, covered in Petition No. 199/TT/2012, and were commissioned on 1.6.2013 due to delay in getting forest clearance, court cases and RoW issues. The reasons due to time over-run were considered to be beyond the control of the review petitioner and the time over-run was condoned vide order dated 9.1.2015 in Petition No.199/TT/2012. The Combined Assets I to IV can be commissioned only after or alongwith the commissioning of 765 kV S/C Agra-Meerut Line, i.e. on or after 1.6.2013. This aspect was overlooked by us at the time of passing the impugned order. Therefore, it is an error apparent on the face of record requiring interference in review. Accordingly, the time over-run of 15 months in case of Combined Assets V to VI is condoned and the IDC and IEDC for the said period are allowed.

10. As regards the second issue of considering the COD of Combined Assets V and VI as 1.6.2013 instead of 1.2.2103, the review petitioner has submitted that in order to mitigate the high voltage problem encountered at Meerut Sub-station during the light load conditions, the line reactors were commissioned on 1.2.2013 as bus reactors with the approval of CEA. The submissions of the review petitioner in this regard are as follows:-

“12. In addition it is submitted that in order to mitigate the high voltage problem encountered at Meerut Sub-station during the light load conditions, Central Electricity Authorities (hereinafter referred to As 'CEA') accorded concurrence to commission Line reactors at Meerut end through ICT(for associated 765 kV lines) vide letter dated 31.1.2013. The Petitioner commissioned the ICTs at Meerut after the receipt of the concurrence from the CEA. A copy of the letter dated 31.1.2013 was submitted by the Petitioner with Affidavit dated 7.3.2014. Accordingly, the ICTs at Meerut along with



Reactors (which are covered under Petition No. 37/TT/2013) were commissioned and put under date of Commercial Operation on 1.2.2013.

13. It is submitted that the CEA approval was obtained for charging the reactor and the commissioning of the ICT is essential for commissioning of the 765 kV reactor and in the absence of which the reactor could not have been commissioned. Therefore the 765/400 kV ICTs were commissioned at Meerut Sub-station to charge the 765 kV Line Reactor for controlling the 400 kV Bs Voltage. The charging of 765 kV bus reactor has improved the voltage profile and the voltage level of 415 kV came down to 410 kV. It is further submitted that the Meerut Sub-station is very critical for evacuation of power from Tehri and Koteshwar generation, thus the voltage level is required to be maintained properly of better reliability of the system. As both the ICTs were ready, they were charged to have redundancy. In case of outage of any ICT, the reactor may remain in service. This has advantage in avoiding the sudden change in reactive power. Therefore the commercial operation date of the Combined Assets V and VI is to be considered as 1.2.2013 and not as 1.6.2013.”

11. We have considered the submissions of the review petitioner. The contention of the review petitioner is that letter, dated 31.12.2013, issued by CEA for commissioning of 765 kV line reactors through ICT at Meerut and Sasaram Sub-stations, submitted vide affidavit dated 7.3.2014 in the main petition was not considered while passing the impugned order. We have perused the said letter issued by CEA. We have also gone through the submissions made by the review petitioner in the main petition. On perusal of the same, it is noticed that the review petitioner has placed on record a temporary energisation certificate issued by the Regional Inspectorial Organisation (North), CEA on 31.12.2013. The Commission also took note of the submissions made by PSPCL in its reply vide affidavits dated 3.7.2012 and 11.2.2013 with reference to the CEA's letter dated 31.2.2013. However, the Commission in its decision has not considered the said letter. The Commission first considered whether the energisation certificate issued by RIO is sufficient to declare the date of commercial operation of the ICTs at Meerut. The letter issued by RIO is extracted hereunder:-

“With reference to above and telephonic discussion on 30.1.2013 regarding test charging schedule, test energisation permission is hereby accorded for energising the subject equipment temporarily under sub-regulation (2) of Regulation 43 of CEA (Measures relating



to Safety and Electric Supply) Regulation, 2010 for the purpose of tests specified in Regulation 46 of said regulations. This is subject to successful completion of all the necessary pre-commissioning tests and obtaining charging clearance from OS Deptt. PGCIL.

All safety measures for human apparatus and fire etc. specified under the Regulation shall be ensured by PGCIL, Meerut.

Copy of pre-commissioning tests shall be sent by PGCIL, Meerut for conducting actual inspection of subject equipment.”

12. On perusal of the said letter, it was observed that it was temporary energisation certificate and the review petitioner was required to complete the pre-commissioning formalities and seek a final certificate for energisation from RIO, CEA before commissioning. The letter from the Planning Division of CEA permitting the review petitioner to use the line reactors as bus reactors could be of any use only if the assets commissioned after getting the final approval of RIO, CEA. In that context, the Commission rejected the plea of the petitioner for commissioning of the asset in para 31 of the order dated 20.1.2015. It is further pertinent to note that the Commission vide letter dated 11.11.2014 had asked the following questions to the petitioner:-

- (i) Whether the temporary approval for test energization of 765 kV equipment at Meerut (vide RIO letter: NRIO/PGCIL-233/Meerut/UP/2940-941 dated 31.1.2013) under Regulations 43(2) of CEA (measures related to Safety and Electricity Supply) Regulations is sufficient approval for trial operations and regular service of 765 kV ICTs, bays and reactors?
- (ii) When was final approval of energization under Regulation 43, read with 46 and other Regulations of CEA (Measures related to Safety and Electricity Supply) Regulations was given by CEA. A copy of the same may be furnished.
- (iii) How 765 kV ICTs, its bays and reactors were used without being connected with any 765kV line.

13. In response, the review petitioner vide affidavit dated 17.12.2014 has submitted as under:-

“Based on the clearance of CEA, charging of ICT-1 was done on 31.1.2013 after carrying out all the necessary pre-commissioning tests and after obtaining charging clearance from OS Deptt, PGCIL (as desired by CEA) and is in service since then and hence declared



under commercial operation w.e.f. 1.2.2013. 765 kV Reactor was put into service through 765/400 kV ICTs to contain high voltage in the 400 kV network around Meerut area which remained 420 kV and above for around 16% of the time during December, 2012 and January, 2013. This clearly justifies the requirement and utilization of these assets.”

14. In support of the utilization of the asset, the petitioner has submitted a letter dated 31.1.2013 from the System Planning and Project Appraisal Division of the CEA. The Commission has considered all documents on record and in paras 30 and 31 of the impugned order observed that charging of 765 kV line reactor through ICT for controlling 400 kV voltage was not proper and the beneficiaries cannot be loaded without substantive utilization of the assets. Further, the petitioner had not placed on record any document to state that the beneficiaries were consulted before deciding the utilization of line reactor as bus reactor. It is mentioned that such issues are to be discussed in the RPC forum under Regulation 2.2.2 of the Indian Electricity Grid Code Regulations, 2010

15. The petitioner is seeking the review of the said decision by reiterating that the line reactors were commissioned on 1.2.2013 as bus reactors with the approval of CEA in order to mitigate the high voltage problem encountered at Meerut Sub-station during the light load conditions. In our view, the review petitioner is trying to reargue the matter on merit which is a subject matter of appeal. Since there is no apparent error on the face of the record, the review petitioner is not entitled for any relief on this ground.

16. The review petition is partly allowed. The consequential revision of tariff of Combined Assets I to IV and Combined Assets V to VI due to condonation of time over-run shall be carried out at the time of truing-up of tariff of 2009-14 tariff period.



17. The Review Petition No.6/RP/2015 is disposed of in terms of the above.

sd/-  
**(M.K. Iyer)**  
Member

sd/-  
**(A.S. Bakshi)**  
Member

sd/-  
**(A.K. Singhal)**  
Member

sd/-  
**(Gireesh B. Pradhan)**  
Chairperson

