

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. I.A. 14/2014 & 18/2014 in 224/TT/2012

Subject : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from anticipated commercial operation date (1.9.2012) to 1.4.2013 of Asset I:400 kV D/C Pallatana-Silchar Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line- 247 km (anticipated DOCO: 1.9.2012), Asset II: 400 kV D/C SilcharByrnihat Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line-210 km (anticipated DOCO:1.1.2013) and Asset III: 400 kV D/C Byrnihat-Bongaigaon Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line-204 km (anticipated DOCO:1.4.2013)

Date of Hearing : 22.5.2014

Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member

Petitioner : NETCL

Respondents : Tripura State Electricity Corporation Limited and others

Parties present : Shri Vishal Gupta, Advocate, NETCL
Shri Rajeev Mohan, NETCL
Shri H.N. Sharma, AEGCL
Shri S.S. Barpanda, NLDC

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the instant petition has been filed seeking transmission tariff for Asset I:400 kV D/C Pallatana-Silchar Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line- 247 km, Asset II: 400 kV D/C Silchar-Byrnihat Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line-210 km and Asset III: 400 kV D/C Byrnihat-Bongaigaon Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line-204 km. The petitioner was granted transmission license vide order dated 16.6.2009 in Petition No. 16 of 2009 for



two assets, viz- 400 kV D/C Pallatana-Silchar transmission line (twin moose) and 400 kV D/C Silchar-Bongaigaon transmission line (twin moose). The Silchar-Bongaigaon transmission line has been split into two parts of Silchar-Byrnihat Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line-210 km and 400 kV D/C Byrnihat-Bongaigaon Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line-204 km. Provisional tariff for all these three assets (as claimed in the instant petition) was granted vide order dated 26.9.2012.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that Asset III of Byrnihat-Bongaigaon is 160 km, out of which 42 km (22%) from Byrnihat-Azara portion has been completed and will be commissioned soon and the remaining 78% i.e. Azara-Bongaigaon portion would take some more time. The delay in commissioning of Asset III is due to delay in getting forest clearance. Learned counsel requested to allow splitting of Asset III and submitted that the provisional tariff already allowed for Asset III may also be split on similar lines. He submitted that the petitioner has filed I.A. No.14/2014 for splitting of Asset III and I.A. No. 18/2014 for grant of provisional tariff for the part of the Asset III, which is anticipated to be commissioned soon.

3. The representative of AEGCL submitted that the petitioner was issued licence only for two assets and the petitioner has split the second asset into two parts initially and now seeks to further split one part of second asset into two parts. He submitted that since there is change in the scope of the transmission system for which a tariff has been sought, the petitioner should have sought amendment to the license, under section 18 of the Electricity Act, 2003. Therefore, splitting of assets as prayed by the petitioner may not be allowed.

4. The representative of NLDC submitted that licence was granted for 400 kV D/C Pallatana-Silchar transmission line (twin moose) and 400 kV D/C Silchar-Bongaigaon transmission line. The Pallatana-Silchar transmission line has been commissioned and provisional tariff has been granted and there is no difficulty as far as this line is concerned. He submitted that one circuit of the Silchar-Bongaigaon line is to be LILoed and the second circuit is to be LILoed at Azara. Now, the configuration is Silchar-Byrnihat - Byrnihat-Bongaigaon and the other circuit is Silchar-Azara - Azara-Bongaigaon. The Commission granted provisional tariff for 400 kV D/C Silchar-Bongaigaon transmission line. As only one circuit of the Silchar-Bongaigaon line was commissioned, the issue was discussed in the Validation Committee Meeting and the second circuit was removed from the computation of PoC charges.

5. The learned counsel of the petitioner reiterated that there is no change in the scope of the project and it is a mere splitting of the asset. He also submitted that AEGCL should have raised the issue of splitting of the assets as soon as the provisional tariff order was issued in the instant case.

6. The Commission admitted both the IAs and directed to issue notice to the respondents. The respondents were directed to file their replies before 24.6.2014 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, before 4.7.2014. The Commission also directed NLDC to file its submissions in writing, if any, before 24.6.2014.

7. The Commission directed to list the petition on 8.7.2014.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief Legal

