

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 268/TT/2018

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for 5 line bays at Baghpat GIS Sub-station NRSSS-XIX in Northern Region.

Date of Hearing : 18.6.2019

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL)

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. and 17 others

Parties present : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Niranjana, PGCIL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri V.P. Rastogi, PGCIL

Record of Proceeding

The representative of the petitioner submitted as follows:-

- a. The instant petition is filed for determination of tariff for Asset-I: One No. 220 kV line Bays (205 no. Bay) associated with Baghpat GIS Sub-station Asset-II: One No. 220 kV line Bays (210 no. Bay) associated with Baghpat GIS Sub-station, Asset-III: One No. 220 kV line Bays (206 no. Bay) associated with Baghpat GIS Sub-station, Asset-IV: One No. 220 kV line Bays (207 no. Bay) associated with Baghpat GIS Sub-station and Asset-V: One No. 220 kV line Bays (212 no. Bay) associated with Baghpat GIS Sub-station under "Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme- XIX" in Northern Region".



- b. The tariff for the instant assets was claimed in Petition No.253/TT/2015, but the tariff was not allowed. The instant petition is filed as per the directions in order dated 30.6.2016 in Petition No.253/TT/2015.
 - c. The instant assets at Baghpat Sub-station were put into commercial operation without downstream network under the scope of UPPTCL. He further submitted that in the 38th SCM it was decided that UPPTCL shall complete the 220 kV downstream network at Baghpat by 2016.
 - d. The COD of the instant assets be approved under proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations as the downstream assets under the scope of UPPTCL have not achieved COD.
2. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that instant assets are not put into use and Regulation 5(2) of the 2014 Tariff Regulation is not complied with by the petitioner. Hence, the capital cost of 5 nos. line bays at Baghpat cannot be capitalized for tariff purposes. He submitted that the petitioner's prayer for approval of COD under proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations may not be approved. He requested to consider his reply filed in the matter.
3. In response, to a query of the Commission, the representative of the petitioner submitted that out of 5 assets, two are utilised at present.
4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with an advance copy to the respondents by 15.7.2019:-
- (i) Revised 'statement showing IDC discharged upto COD' indicating rate of interest against all loan items (including loan from SBI). Computation of rate of interest in respect of floating loans.
 - (ii) The amount of capital liability included in opening and closing gross block as per Form 4A does not tally with the amount claimed under Form 7 under Balance and Retention payment (Regulation 14(1)(i)) and revised reconciled forms.
 - (iii) Year wise discharge of initial spares for all the assets.
5. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the Petition.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(V. Sreenivas)
Dy. Chief (Law)

