

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
**NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 203/TT/2012**

Subject : Approval under Regulation 86 of CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations' 2009 from actual date of commercial operation to 31.3.2014 for 400 kV 80 MVAR bus reactor at Neemrana S/S (actual date of commercial operation 1.4.2012) under the transmission system associated with Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme-XV (NRSS-XV) for tariff block 2009-14 period in Northern Region.

Date of hearing : 6.12.2012

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Lid. & others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL,  
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL,  
Shri R.B.Sharma, Advocate for BRPL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of PGCIL (hereinafter referred to as 'the petitioner') submitted as under:-

- (a) The petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for 400 kV 80 MVAR bus reactor at Neemrana sub-station. The reactor is a part of NRSS-XV scheme and other elements of the scheme have already been commissioned. The total completion cost is within the apportioned approved cost and there is no cost over-run;
- (b) As per investment approval dated 20.2.2009, the transmission assets are to be commissioned within 33 months from date of investment approval. Accordingly, the scheduled date of completion was 20.11.2011. However, the asset was put under commercial operation on 1.4.2012;

- (c) There was a delay about 4 months and the reasons for delay has been submitted vide affidavit date 5.12.2012. The delay was basically due to delay in land acquisition and prioritization of supply of reactors; and
  - (d) The delay has not led to increase in the cost over-run. Requested to condone the minor delay of 4 months and allow the tariff as prayed.
3. The learned counsel for BRPL submitted that the time over-run should not be condoned and the cost details have been certified by the Cost Accountant and not by a Statutory Auditor.
  4. The representative of petitioner clarified that Cost Accountant is a Statutory Auditor in terms of 2009 Tariff Regulations.
  5. The Commission directed the petitioner to file detailed justification for the delay of four months, on affidavit before 26.12.2012, with a copy to the respondents.
  6. Subject to above, order in the petition was reserved.

By the order of the Commission,

sd/-  
(T. Rout)  
Joint Chief (Law)