

## CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Record of Proceedings

#### Petition No. 217/2010

Sub: Determination of transmission tariff for combined assets of (i) 400/220 kV Damoh sub-station along with bays & 400 kV 63 MVAR Bus Reactor along with associated 400 kV bay at Damoh sub-station and (ii) 400/220 kV ICT -I at Damoh sub-station along with bays and 400/220 kV, 315 MVA ICT-II along with associated 400 kV and 220 kV bays at Damoh substation under WRSS-IV transmission scheme in Western Region for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014.

Date of hearing : 13.1.2011

Coram : Shri S.Jayaraman, Member  
Shri V.S.Verma, Member  
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd., Gurgaon

Respondents : MPPTCL, MSEDCL, GUVNL, Govt, of Goa, Daman and Diu, Dadra Nagar Haveli, CSEB and MPAKVNIL

Parties present : Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL  
Shri Rajeev Gupta, PGCIL Shri M.M.Mondal,  
PGCIL Shri Manoj Dubey, Advocate  
MPPTCL

This petition has been filed for approval of transmission tariff in respect of combined assets of (i) 400/220 kV Damoh sub-station along with bays & 400 kV 63 MVAR Bus Reactor along with associated 400 kV bay at Damoh sub-station and (ii) 400/220 kV ICT -I at Damoh sub-station along with bays and 400/220 kV, 315 MVA ICT-II along with associated 400 kV and 220 kV bays at Damoh sub-station under WRSS-IV transmission scheme in Western Region for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014 after accounting of projected additional capital expenditure, based on the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as the 2009 regulations).

2. The learned counsel for the Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Company Limited (MPPTCL) submitted that MPPTCL has filed a reply confined to the issue of relaxation of the provisions of the 2009 regulation and time over-run and sought permission to additional detailed reply touching upon the merit of the issues raised in the petition. The Commission clarified that MPPTCL should have filed a detailed reply including therein the issue of preliminary submission with regard to additional capital expenditure.

3. Learned counsel further submitted that the prayer of the petitioner for additional capital expenditure on account of undischarged liabilities is not in conformity with Regulation 9 (2) of the 2009 regulations and should not be allowed. The learned counsel submitted that the petitioner should be directed to give detailed justification for relaxation of the provisions of the 2009 regulations including the details of liabilities to establish that the undischarged liabilities claimed were within the original scope of work.

4. The Commission directed MPPTCL to file a detailed reply to the petition latest by 21.1.2011, with an advance copy to the petitioner. The petitioner shall file rejoinder, if any, by 28.1.2010.

5. Commission further directed the petitioner to file the following information and clarification latest by 21.1.2011, with an advance copy to the respondents;

- I. Break-up of the item- wise final and retention payments; and
- II. Final outcome of recovery process and amount of liquidated damages which have been recovered from the contractor to be adjusted against the capital cost of the transmission system.

6. Subject to above, order in the petition was reserved.

Sd/-

(T.Rout)  
Joint Chief (Law)