

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 53/TT/2020**

**Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 of 400 kV Dharmapuri (Salem New) Somanahalli 400 kV D/C Quad Line along with Bay Extensions at Dharmapuri (Salem New) and Somanahalli Sub-stations under Transmission System associated with System Strengthening XIV in Southern Region.

**Date of Hearing** : 19.8.2020

**Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Shri I. S. Jha, Member  
Shri Arun Goyal, Member

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

**Respondents** : TANGEDCO and 15 Others.

**Parties present** : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL  
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL  
Dr. R. Kathiravan, TANGEDCO

**Record of Proceedings**

The matter was heard through video conference.

2. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 of the 400 kV Dharmapuri (Salem New)- Somanahalli 400 kV D/C Quad Line along with Bay Extensions at Dharmapuri (Salem New) and Somanahalli Sub-stations under Transmission System associated with System Strengthening XIV in Southern Region. The instant asset was put into commercial operation on 30.3.2019 after a time over-run of about 55 months. He submitted that the time over-run was mainly due to severe RoW issues, court cases, and excessive urbanization in and around Bengaluru area, and the detailed justification for the same has been submitted with the petition.

3. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that apportioned approved cost for the instant asset has been revised by RCE-1 and RCE-2. He submitted that the variation in cost is mainly due to an increase in compensation paid, cost of construction material,



tax, angle towers, and IDC due time over-run. The reasons for item-wise cost variation along with justification have been submitted in the petition. The estimated completion cost of the instant asset is within RCE-2. He further submitted that the information as directed vide RoP (record of proceedings) of hearing dated 13.2.2020 has been filed vide affidavit dated 5.5.2020. He also submitted that no reply has been filed by the Respondents in the matter and requested the Commission to approve the tariff as prayed in the petition.

4. The representative of TANGEDCO, Respondent No.1, sought four weeks' time to file reply to the petition. The Commission observed that TANGEDCO has not been filing its reply in time despite a general Notice and advance hearing schedule published on the Commission's website and has been asking for an extension of time to file reply on regular basis in almost all petitions. The Commission further observed that in the instant case despite a direction in the RoP dated 13.2.2020, TANGEDCO has not filed the reply. The Commission, while granting time in the instant matter, directed TANGEDCO to file its reply in future in all petitions in time and observed that no extension of time will be granted in future.

5. The Commission directed the Petitioner to submit the reasons for the following variation on affidavit by 14.9.2020 with a copy to the Respondents:-

- a) Debt as per IDC statement is ₹31,298.98 lakh, whereas as per Form(s) 6 & 9C it is ₹30,836.56 lakh.
- b) As per IDC Statement, undischarged IDC is indicated as ₹660.53 lakh, whereas as per Form-5 liabilities on account of IDC are NIL.
- c) As per Form-5, capital cost as on COD is ₹47,769.83, whereas as per Form 4A value is shown as ₹45,289.07 lakh.

6. The Commission observed that despite the general Notices dated 14.1.2020 and 12.3.2020 directing the beneficiaries/ Respondents to file reply in the matter, none of the Respondents have filed their reply in the matter. The Commission further directed the Respondents, including TANGEDCO, to file their reply by 7.9.2020 and the Petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, by 14.9.2020. The Commission further directed the Parties to adhere to the above-specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

7. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

**By order of the Commission**

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

