

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 361/TT/2018**

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for assets covered under System Strengthening XII in Southern Region under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014.
- Date of Hearing** : 8.8.2019
- Coram** : Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member  
Shri I.S. Jha, Member
- Petitioner** : Powergrid Corporation of India Limited
- Respondents** : Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. & 15 others
- Parties present** : Shri B.D.Das, PGCIL  
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that initially in the petition claimed tariff for Asset-1: LILO of 400 kV S/C Neelmangala-Hoody Transmission Line at new 400/220 kV GIS Sub-station at Yelahanka with 1X63 MVAR 420 kV Bus reactor along with associated bays and equipment and Asset-2: 2X500 MVA, 400/220 kV ICTs alongwith associated bays and equipment at 400/220 kV Yelahanka Sub-station under System Strengthening XII in Southern Region. Later, split Asset-2 into two parts. The representative of the petitioner has sought approval of COD of the assets in terms of proviso (ii) to Regulation 4(3) of 2014 Tariff Regulations with effect from 1.4.2018, as 6 no. 220 kV downstream bays at Yelahanka Sub-station under the scope of work of KPTCL were not ready. He further submitted that out of 6 no. 220 kV bays, power flow commenced in 2 nos. 220 kV downstream line bays on 13.10.2018. He submitted that power flow in remaining 4 no. 220 kV downstream bays could not be done due to their non-readiness by KPTCL. He prayed that the transmission charges in respect of 2 nos. 220 kV line bays from COD i.e. 1.4.2018 to 13.10.2018 be loaded on KPTCL and from 13.10.2018, onwards they should be included POC. He submitted that power flow has not yet commenced in 4 nos. 220 kV downstream bays which are to be executed by KPTPCL therefore, their tariff may be approved under proviso (ii) to Regulation 4(3) of 2014 Tariff Regulation.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the time over-run of 69 months in case of the instant assets is not attributable to the petitioner and the reasons for time



over-run has been submitted alongwith documentary evidence and requested to condone the same. He submitted that IEDC in the present case has gone up due to time over-run and requested the Commission to allow the same by taking into consideration the RCE. He further submitted that they have furnished all the information sought vide RoP dated 24.5.2019 and the rejoinder to the reply of TANGEDCO.

3. Learned counsel for TANGEDCO submitted that time over-run of 69 months in the facts and circumstances of the case may not be allowed.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with advance copy to the respondents by 6.9.2019:-

- a. Statement showing year-wise discharge of IEDC and Initial Spares including amount of IEDC and Initial Spares discharged from SCOD to COD.
- b. CEA Energisation Certificate and RLDC charging Certificate for Asset-2B.
- c. Revised tariff Form-5 for Asset-2A and Asset-2B.
- d. The apportioned approved cost (FR) of Asset-2A and Asset-2B.

5. After hearing the parties, the Commission reserved order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

