

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 124/TT/2018**

**Subject** : Approval of transmission tariff of 220 kV Kishanganga-Amargarh D/C line on M/C tower under “Transmission System associated with Kishenganga HEP.”

**Date of Hearing** : 22.1.2019

**Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member  
Shri I.S. Jha, Member

**Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

**Respondents** : Rjasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited & Others

**Parties present** : Shri S.K. Niranjana, PGCIL  
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri Amit Yadav, PGCIL  
Shri Nitish Kumar, PGCIL  
Shri A.K. Pandey, NHPC Ltd.  
Shri Piyush Kumar, NHPC Ltd.  
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the scheduled COD of the instant asset was 1.7.2017 and it was back charged from Amargarh end on 25.2.2018 as generation at Kishanganga HEP (NHPC) was not available. He submitted that CEA certificate, RLDC certificate of charging and CMD certificate were filed vide affidavit dated 17.10.2018 and requested to approve the COD of the instant asset under proviso (ii) to Regulation 4(3) of 2014 Tariff Regulations as Kishanganga HEP was not commissioned.

2. The representative of NHPC submitted that the first unit of Kishanganga HEP was charged on 28.2.2018 and was brought under commercial operation on 18.5.2018. Thereafter, the trial run of Kishanganga-Amargarh Transmission Line was completed on 22.5.2018. Therefore, COD of Kishanganga-Amargarh transmission line be considered as 23.5.2018. He submitted that NHPC is not liable to pay any transmission charges of the instant transmission line and the transmission charges of the line after its COD



should be shared by its beneficiaries in terms of Regulation 43 of 2014 Tariff Regulations.

3. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that it is not a beneficiary of the Kishanganga HEP and no power is allotted to BRPL. If the instant assets are included in the PoC, it is liable to bear the transmission charges. BRPL has raised the issue of cost and time over-run and non-submission of TSA.

4. The representative of the petitioner submitted that they have filed rejoinder to the reply of BRPL. He submitted that in the PoC regime, all the DICs of Northern Region including BRPL are required to bear the transmission charges of the instant assets. He submitted that details of all expenditure incurred on actual basis on preliminary investigation, ROW issues, forest clearance, PTCC and General Civil Works have been furnished. He requested to allow initial spares as claimed which are higher than the ceiling norms, as higher quantity and value of initial spares are procured for assets in the hilly areas than the plains for smooth running of the system.

5. NHPC in its reply submitted that power from Kishanganga HEP has been allotted by Ministry of Power to J&K, Chattisgarh State Power Distribution Ltd (CSPDL) and Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited (UPPCL). He submitted that however the petitioner has not made CSPDL as a party to the present proceedings. After being pointed by NHPC, the petitioner has made CSPDL as a party to the present proceedings, filed amended "Memo of Parties" and served a copy of the petition on CSPDL. However, CSPDL has not filed any reply to the petition. The Commission directed CSPDL to file reply to the petition by 15.2.2019 with a copy to the petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, by 25.2.2019.

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T. Rout)  
Chief (Law)

