

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

**Record of Proceedings**

**Petition No. 145/TT/2011**

**Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff of Combined Element of 400 kV S/c URI -1 - URI-2 Inter-connector Transmission Line alongwith bays at NHPC End (Ant. 01.07.2011) and 400 kV S/c URI -2 - Wagoora Transmission Line alongwith bays at Wagoora sub- station ( Ant. DOCO 01.10.2011) associated with URI -2 Transmission System for tariff block 2009-14 period in NR.

**Date of Hearing** : 24.7.2012

**Coram** : Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson  
Shri S. Jayaraman, Member  
Shri V.S. Verma, Member  
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member

**Petitioner** : PGCIL

**Respondents** : U.P. Power Corporation Ltd. & 16 Others

**Parties Present** :

1. Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
2. Shri Avinash M. Pavgi, PGCIL
3. Smt. Anjali Banga, PGCIL
4. Shri U.K. Tyagi, PGCIL
5. Shri B. Vamni, PGCIL
6. Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
7. Shri B.K. Sahu, PGCIL
8. Shri P.K. Jana, PGCIL
9. Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

The representative of the petitioner submitted that instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff of Combined Element of 400 kV S/c URI -1 - URI-2 Inter-connector Transmission Line alongwith bays at NHPC End and 400 kV S/c URI -2 - Wagoora Transmission Line alongwith bays at Wagoora sub-station associated with URI -2 Transmission System for tariff block 2009-14 period in NR. The petitioner has filed Petition No.91/2011 and it relates to URI-1. The assets covered under the instant petition and Petition No. 91/2011 are covered under the same project and both the petitions are related. The issues like cost over-run and delay are to be considered together and hence both the petitions may be taken up together.

2. The learned counsel for the BRPL submitted that the respondent has not filed the reply since the petition is incomplete. The date of commercial operation of Asset-I, covered in Petition No. 91/2011 and Asset-II covered in the instant petition is 1.1.2012. The project is same and both the petitions are required to be combined so that a combined reply can be filed.

3. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the dates of commercial operation of both assets were anticipated to be separate and hence the petitioner had filed two separate petitions. However, both the assets were commissioned on 1.1.2012.

4. The learned counsel for BRPL submitted that the petitioner should be directed to file statutory auditor's certificate instead of the Management Certificate, which is usually submitted by the petitioner. The Commission clarified that the Auditor's certificate is filed for the whole financial year and the Management Certificate is filed for the intervening months, if any. The learned counsel submitted that in such cases, tariff should be allowed only for the period where Auditor's certificate is submitted. The Commission observed that this would burden the beneficiaries as they would be required to pay the transmission charges for the intervening months at a later date as arrears alongwith interest.

5. The Commission directed BRPL and other respondents to file their reply to the petitioner within a period of 15 days and the petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, within one week thereafter. The Commission directed to list the instant petition along with Petition No. 91/2011.

By the order of the Commission,

Sd/-  
(T. Rout)  
Joint Chief (Law)  
31.7.2012