

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram:

- 1. Shri Ashok Basu, Chairman**
- 2. Shri K.N. Sinha, Member**

**IA No. 56/2003
in
Petition No.57/2003**

In the matter of

Approval of tariff for LILO of 400 kV SC Chamera-I-Kishenpur line at Chamera-II under the transmission system associated with Chamera HEP Stage-II in Northern Region from 1.8.2003 to 31.3.2004

And in the matter of

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

... Petitioner

Vs

1. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Jaipur
2. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
3. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
4. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Panchkula
5. Power Development Department, Govt. of J&K, Srinagar
6. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow
7. Delhi Vidyut Board, New Delhi
8. Chandigarh Administration, Chandigarh
9. Uttaranchal Power Corporation Ltd., Dehradun

... Respondents

The following were present:

1. Shri P.C. Pankaj, AGM, PGCIL
2. Shri C. Kannan, PGCIL
3. Shri Jane Jose, Manager (Comml), PGCIL
4. Shri Sanjay Mohan, PGCIL
5. Shri S.P. Srivastava, EE, UPPCL
6. Shri TPS Bawa, PSEB
7. Shri G.M. Agarwal, Dy. CE, (Comml), RVPN
8. Shri RK Arora, HVPNL

ORDER
(DATE OF HEARING 7.11.2003)

The Interlocutory Application filed by the petitioner for provisional tariff was listed for hearing after notice.

2. It has been stated that LILO of 400 kV SC Chamera-I-Kishenpur line at Chamera-II under the transmission system associated with Chamera HEP Stage-II in Northern Region was put into commercial operation w.e.f. 1.8.2003.

3. The prayer in the IA has been made for approval of provisional tariff.

4. The petitioner has constructed LILO of 400 kV SC Chamera-I-Kishenpur line at Chamera-II under the transmission system associated with Chamera HEP Stage-II in Northern Region. It is stated that all the works necessary to put the asset have been completed and the asset has been put under commercial operation with effect from 1.8.2003.

5. The sanction for LILO of 400 kV SC Chamera-I-Kishenpur line at Chamera-II under the transmission system associated with Chamera HEP Stage-II in Northern Region was accorded by the Board of Directors of the petitioner in its 130th meeting held on 29.4.2002 and was conveyed vide letter dated 28.5.2002, at a total estimated cost of Rs.4949.00 lakh, including IDC of Rs.381.00 lakh. These assets were to be completed within 24 months from the date of investment approval. Against this, the estimated completion cost of the above noted assets is stated to be Rs.4805.43 lakh, including IDC of Rs.219.96 lakh. The petitioner has stated that an expenditure of Rs.3101.75 lakh was incurred up to 31.3.2003 and a further expenditure of Rs. 413.37 lakh was actually incurred up to 30.6.2003. The petitioner has filed the auditor's

certificate dated 29.8.2003 in support of the expenditure incurred. The balance of expenditure was the anticipated expenditure beyond 30.6.2003.

6. At the hearing, Shri P.C. Pankaj had stated that because of oversight some of the forms annexed to the petition could not be signed and had sought our permission to sign them. We had allowed Shri Pankaj to take necessary action in the matter.

7. HVPNL and UPPCL, the respondents have submitted that although the assets were declared under commercial operation on 1.8.2003, the actual power flow started from mid-October 2003 because of the delay in commissioning of Chamera HEP Stage-II. The respondents have contended that they should be liable to pay tariff from the date the assets have been put to use. The petitioner in its rejoinder has pointed out that the first unit of Chamera HEP Stage II was commissioned with effect from 4.10.2003 and the transmission assets are in use since then. It is further submitted that NHPC who owns Chamera HEP Stage-II had earlier intimated that the generating station was to be commissioned by 1.8.2003 and accordingly the transmission assets needed for evacuation of power were readied before that date and were declared under commercial operation with effect from 1.8.2003. However, there was some delay in commissioning of Chamera HEP Stage II by NHPC. According to the petitioner, it is entitled to claim tariff from the date of commercial operation. It is also submitted that power from Chamera HEP Stage-I was evacuated through these assets meanwhile. We direct the petitioner to file copy of NHPC letter vide which it was intimated that Chamera HEP Stage-II would be commissioned by 1.8.2003. The issue raised on behalf of the respondents will be examined after deeper examination at the time of final disposal of the main petition.

8. On consideration of the facts recorded above, we allow an annual tariff of Rs.393.98 lakh for the assets covered by the petition, corresponding to the expenditure of Rs.3515.12 lakh up to 30.6.2003, on provisional basis from 1.8.2003, subject to adjustment after determination of final tariff. The provisional tariff approved by us represents 85% of the tariff corresponding to expenditure of Rs.3515.12 lakh.

9. IA No.56/2003 in Petition No.57/2003 is disposed of.

10. We direct the petitioner to file the up-to-date audited figures by 31.1.2004 on affidavit along with the revised details in the prescribed proformae as also the revised calculations of tariff with advance copy to the respondents, who may file their replies within four weeks thereafter. The details of the loans shall also be furnished in the prescribed format. The petition will be processed by the office on petitioner's filing the revised details asked for.

**Sd/-
(K.N. SINHA)
MEMBER**

**Sd/-
(ASHOK BASU)
CHAIRMAN**

New Delhi dated the 18th November, 2003