

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 267/2010

Subject : Approval under Regulation 86 of CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 and CERC (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 for determination of Transmission Tariff for Barh-Balia 400kV D/C (Quad) line under Transmission System associated with Barh Generation Project (3x660 MW) in Eastern Region from DOCO (1.7.2010) to 31.3.2014. – In terms of judgement of APTEL dated 2.7.2012 in Appeal No.123/2011 (PSPCL vs PGCIL & ors.)

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd. and 16 others

Petition No. 227/TT/2013

Subject : Approval under Regulation 86 of CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 and CERC (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 for determination of Revised Transmission Tariff for Barh-Balia 400kV D/C (Quad) line along with associated bays at Balia S/s after approval of revised cost estimate under Transmission System associated with Barh Generation Project (3x660 MW) in Eastern Region from DOCO (1.7.2010) to 31.3.2014.

Date of Hearing : 22.4.2014

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd. and 16 others

Parties present : Shri Sanjay Sen, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Shikha Ohari, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Seema Gupta, PGCIL
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL



Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri U. K. Tyagi, PGCIL
Shri A. M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Shri R. P. Padhi, PGCIL
Shri Sanjay Sen, PGCIL
Ms. Shikha Ohari, PGCIL
Shri Manoj Kumar Sharma for Shri Pradeep Misra Advocate,
PSPCL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
Shri T. P. S. Bawa, PSPCL
Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of PSPCL sought adjournment due to non-availability of the counsel and also sought time to file the reply.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submitted that all the information called for by the Commission vide ROP of 29.10.2013 have been filed, and NTPC has been impleaded as a party to the proceedings in Petition No. 267/2010. He also submitted that no comments have been received from the respondents.

3. The learned counsel for NTPC submitted that NTPC was not a party in the proceedings in Petition No.267/2010 and accordingly did not participate in the said proceedings. He submitted that the scope of remand is limited and making NTPC a party to the petition will exceed the scope of the remand. He also submitted that NTPC has filed its objections vide affidavit dated 21.4.2014.

4. The petitioner submitted that the estimated expenditure of the bays at Balia substation i.e. ₹28.50 crore was inadvertently not included in the subject asset and it was included in the apportioned approved cost of Balia-Bhiwadi Pole I in Petition No. 150/TT/2013. The Commission directed the petitioner to confirm on affidavit by 15.5.2014, with a copy to the respondents, whether the amount of ₹28.50 crore was considered only for apportionment of Balia-Bhiwadi Pole-I or was included in the completed cost of Balia-Bhiwadi Pole-I in Petition No. 150/TT/2013, and if it was included in completed cost of Balia-Bhiwadi Pole-I for tariff purpose, then how the petitioner is going to reduce the amount from that cost.

5. Taking into consideration the request of PSPCL, the Commission adjourned the matter to 20.5.2014.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief Legal

