

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

PETITION NO. 25/TT/2014

Coram:

Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member

Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member

Date of Hearing : 14.03.2016

Date of Order : 18.03.2016

In the matter of:

Determination of transmission tariff from DOCO to 31.3.2014 for kV Salem Pooling Station-Salem 400 kV D/C Quad Line alongwith new 765/400 kV Pooling Station at Salem (initially charged at 400 kV) and Bay Extensions at Salem 400/200 kV existing Sub-station under Transmission System associated with Common System Associated with Coastal Energen Private Limited and Ind-Bharat Power (Madras) Limited LTOA Generation Projects in Tuticorin Area-Part-B in Southern Region under Regulation 86 of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 and Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009.

And in the Matter of:

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd,
SAUDAMINI, Plot No.-2, Sector-29,
Gurgaon-122001 (Haryana)

.....Petitioner

Versus

1. Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Limited,
(KPTCL), Kaveri Bhawan, Bangalore – 560009
2. Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Limited,
(APTRANSCO), Vidyut Soudha,
Hyderabad- 500082



3. Kerala State Electricity Board (KSEB),
Vaidyuthi Bhavanam,
Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram - 695 004
4. Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Limited,
NPKRR Maaligai, 800, Anna Salai,
Chennai - 600 002
5. Electricity Department,
Govt. of Pondicherry,
Pondicherry - 605001
6. Eastern Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Limited,
(APEPDCL) P&T Colony, Seethmmadhara,
Vishakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh
7. Southern Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Limited,
(APSPDCL), Srinivasasa Kalyana Mandapam Backside,
Tiruchanoor Road, Kesavayana Gunta,
Tirupati-517 501, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh
8. Central Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Limited,
(APCPDCL), Corporate Office, Mint Compound,
Hyderabad - 500 063, Andhra Pradesh
9. Northern Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Limited,
(APNPDCL), Opp. NIT Petrol Pump,
Chaitanyapuri, Kazipet, Warangal - 506 004, Andhra Pradesh
10. Bangalore Electricity Supply Company Ltd. (BESCOM),
Corporate Office, KR.Circle
Bangalore - 560001, Karnataka
11. Gulbarga Electricity Supply Company Ltd (GESCOM)
Station Main Road, Gulbarga, Karnataka
12. Hubli Electricity Supply Company Ltd, (HESCOM)
Navanagar, PB Road, Hubli, Karnataka
13. MESCOM Corporate Office,



Paradigm Plaza, AB Shetty Circle,
Mangalore – 575001, Karnataka

14. Chamundeswari Electricity Supply Corporation Ltd.,
(CESC), # 927, L J Avenue, Ground Floor,
New Kantharaj Urs Road, Saraswatipuram,
MYSORE - 570 009, Karnataka

15. Coastal Energen Private Limited
5th Floor, Buhari Towers,
No. 4, Moores Road
Chennai – 600006
Tamil Nadu

16. Ind-Bharath Power (Madras) Limited
Plt No 30-A, Road No 1,
Film Nagar, Jubilee Hills,
Hyderabad – 500 033
Andhra Pradesh

....Respondent(s)

The following were present:

For Petitioner: Shri Piyush Awasthi, PGCIL
Shri Pankaj Shah, PGCIL
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL

For Respondents: None

ORDER

The petition has been filed by Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (hereinafter referred to as “the petitioner”) for determination of tariff of 400 kV Salem Pooling Station-Salem 400 kV D/C Quad Line alongwith new 765/400 kV Pooling Station at Salem (initially charged at 400 kV) and Bay Extensions at Salem 400/200 kV existing



Sub-station under Transmission System associated with Common System Associated with Coastal Energen Private Limited and Ind-Bharat Power (Madras) Limited LTOA Generation Projects in Tuticorin Area-Part-B in Southern Region under the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as “the 2009 Tariff Regulations”) for the period starting from COD to 31.3.2014.

2. The Investment Approval (IA) for the instant project was accorded by the Board of Directors of the petitioner vide Memorandum Ref: C/CP/LTA Tuticorin Part-B dated 19.9.2011 at an estimated cost of ₹194013 lakh including IDC of ₹12092 lakh at the price level of first quarter of 2011. As per the IA, the instant assets were scheduled to be commissioned within 36 months from the date of IA. Accordingly, the instant assets were scheduled to be commissioned on 19.9.2014.

3. The instant petition was filed on 14.2.2014 and the assets were anticipated to be commissioned on 1.3.2014. However, during the hearing on 7.3.2014, the petitioner submitted that the instant asset was anticipated to be commissioned during the 2014-19 period and prayed for grant of Annual Fixed Cost (AFC) under Regulation 7(7) for inclusion in the PoC charges. Accordingly, AFC was allowed for instant asset under the said provision vide order dated 23.6.2014.

4. During the hearing on 14.3.2016 the representative of the petitioner in response to our query submitted that the asset covered in the instant petition has not yet been commissioned due to severe ROW issues and the commissioning of the asset is not certain. The representative of the petitioner sought permission of the commission to



withdraw the instant petition and file a fresh petition after commissioning of the asset. He further requested that the filing fee paid in case of the instant petition be adjusted. He further prayed that the expenditure incurred towards publishing the notice in the instant case be reimbursed and the requirement of publication of notice at the time of filing fresh petition be waived.

5. In the instant case, the AFC was allowed vide order dated 23.6.2014 and the assets have not been commissioned even after period of 19 months of granting AFC. No use full purpose will be served to award final tariff to the petitioner in respect of an asset where commercial operation in near future is uncertain. Accordingly, after taking into consideration the submission of the representative of the petitioner, we dispose of the petition as has withdrawn. The AFC allowed vide order dated 23.6.2014 shall be withdrawn from the computation of POC charges, if not already withdrawn. We direct that the filing fees paid by the petitioner shall be adjusted against the filing fee payable for the instant asset when the petitioner approaches by way of a fresh petition. As regards petitioner's request to waive off the requirement of publication of notice in the newspapers, we are of the view that publication of notice is a mandatory requirement and it cannot be waived off. The publication expenses incurred for filing the instant petition shall be borne by the petitioner.

6. This order disposes of Petition No. 25/TT/2014.

Sd/-
(Dr. M.K. Iyer)
Member

Sd/-
(A.S. Bakshi)
Member

