

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 80/TT/2016

Subject : Determination of tariff for the licensed transmission business from actual COD to 2018-19 for 400 kV Srinagar Sub-station as per the Commission's order dated 31.1.2013 in Petition No. 133/MP/2012.

Petition No. 81/TT/2016

Subject : Determination of tariff for the licensed transmission business from COD to 2018-19 for 400 kV Srinagar-Srinagar PH line as per the Commission's order dated 31.1.2013 in Petition No. 133/MP/2012.

Date of Hearing : 16.6.2020

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

Petitioner : Power Transmission Corporation of Uttarakhand Ltd.

Respondents : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL) and 24 others

Parties present : Shri Aryaman Saxena Advocate, PTCUL
Shri Vikas Sharma, PTCUL
Shri S. P. Arya, PTCUL
Shri Pradeep Misra, Advocate, UPCL
Shri B.C.K. Mishra, UPCL

Record of Proceedings

The matter was heard through video conferencing.

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that PTCUL has filed Petition No. 80/TT/2016, in respect of 400 kV Srinagar Sub-station, and Petition No. 81/TT/2016, in respect of 400 kV Srinagar-Srinagar PH line, for determination of tariff for the 2014-19 tariff period under the 2014 Tariff Regulations. He submitted that both 400 kV Srinagar-Srinagar PH Line and 400 kV Srinagar Sub-station were conceived as a part of Uttarakhand Integrated Transmission Project (UITP) scheme to evacuate the power



from various HEPs in Uttarakhand. The Commission vide common order dated 20.4.2018 in the instant petition allowed provisional tariff in respect of the subject assets. He submitted that all the information sought by the Commission for determination of final tariff in respect of the subject assets has already been submitted by them. He further submitted that the Petitioner intends to file rejoinder to the reply of UPCL subject to leave of the Commission.

3. In response to a specific query of the Commission regarding the present status of the Srinagar-Kashipur transmission line being executed by the Petitioner, learned counsel submitted that re-tendering for Srinagar-Kashipur transmission line has been undertaken after cancellation of the previous tender. He, however, sought two weeks' time to submit the information on the present status of the Srinagar-Kashipur transmission line, contractual obligations involved in the assets, load flow details of the assets, usage of assets by the beneficiaries, etc.

4. Learned counsel for UPCL submitted that the instant assets are covered by inter-State transmission scheme and, therefore, their tariff should be apportioned amongst all the beneficiaries. He submitted that UPCL alone should not be burdened with the tariff of the instant assets.

5. In response to a query of the Commission about the power flow, the representative of UPCL submitted that 12% of royalty power from GVK HEP, which is connected to Srinagar Sub-station, is flowing through the Srinagar Sub-station because of laws of flow of electricity and they do not have any arrangement with PTCUL for use of the PTCUL system. He further submitted that they were receiving 12% of royalty power from GVK HEP even before the COD of the Srinagar-Srinagar PH Transmission Line and Srinagar Sub-station through 400 kV Vishnuprayag-Muzaffarnagar Transmission Line through Northern Grid. To a further query of the Commission regarding the reason for UPCL getting connected to the instant assets if UPCL was already receiving 12% of royalty power from GVK HEP through Northern Grid, UPCL did not respond.

6. Accordingly, the Commission directed UPCL to file a detailed reply on utilisation of the instant assets by UPCL on affidavit by 10.7.2020 and PTCUL to file its rejoinder by 20.7.2020. The Commission further directed the Petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with an advance copy to the Respondents by 20.7.2020:

A. In case of the asset covered in Petition No. 80/TT/2016:

- a) Year-wise capital cost incurred for each of the bays claimed at 400 kV (11 nos.), 220 kV (10) and 80 MVar Bus Reactor separately, duly certified by the Auditor.
- b) The scheduled COD of the asset as per the 2014 Tariff Regulations with supporting documents.



B. In case of the asset covered in Petition No. 81/TT/2016, the scheduled COD of the asset as per the 2014 Tariff Regulations with supporting documents.

C. The present status of Srinagar-Kashipur Transmission Line, reasons for cancellation of tender and present status of re-tendering, power flow details, utilization of assets by the beneficiaries including the details of grant and/or loan received.

7. The Commission further directed the Petitioner to comply with the above directions within the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

8. Subject to above, the Commission reserved the order in the matters.

By order of the Commission

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

