

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 109/TT/2018

- Subject** : Truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff block for **Asset:** two nos. of 63 MVAR 400 kV Line Reactor at 400 kV Balia (PG) Sub-Station (Extension) under Northern region system strengthening scheme-XXIV in Northern region.
- Date of Hearing** : 23.10.2018
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. (RRVPL) and 16 others
- Parties present** : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri V. P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri S. K. Niranjana, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for truing up the tariff of the 2009-14 tariff block allowed vide order dated 15.10.2015 in Petition No. 31/TT/2014 of two nos. of 63 MVAR 400 kV Line Reactor at 400 kV Balia (PG) Sub-Station (Extension) under Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme-XXIV in Northern Region and determination of tariff of the said assets of the 2014-19 tariff block. He submitted that the initial approved apportioned cost of the instant assets was ₹962.29 lakh and the expenditure as on COD was ₹994.82 lakh and accordingly the capital cost was restricted to the approved apportioned cost in order dated 15.10.2015. However, the final completion cost of ₹1165.01 lakh of the instant assets is within the RCE cost of ₹1436.49 lakh. He further submitted that the additional capital expenditure claimed is also within the "cut-off" period and requested to allow the tariff as claimed in the petition.



2. Learned counsel for BRPL has submitted that there is cost variation in case of the instant assets and the Commission accordingly directed the petitioner in order dated 15.10.2015 to submit the reasons for the variation in the FR cost and the actual cost and the basis for arriving at the FR cost. However, the petitioner has not submitted the same and hence the cost variation should not be allowed. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the reasons for the cost variation have already been given in the petition and its rejoinder to the BRPL's reply. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the specific reasons for the variation in the cost and submit the methodology and the basis for arriving at the FR cost not only in this petition but also in all petitions. The Commission further directed to submit the said information in case of the instant assets on affidavit by 12.11.2018 with an advance copy to the respondents, including BRPL.

3. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 30.11.2018 with an advance copy to the petitioner who shall file their rejoinder, if any, by 10.12.2018. The Commission further directed the parties to comply with the above directions within the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

4. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief (Law)

