

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Review Petition No. 007/RP/2015

In Petition No.207/TT/2012

Coram:

**Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member**

Date of Hearing : 16.04.2015

Date of Order : 27.04.2015

In the matter of:

Review Petition under Section 94(1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 17 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999, seeking review of order dated 16.1.2015 in Petition No. 207/TT/2012 in the matter of determination of transmission tariff for

And in the matter of:

Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,
"Saudamini", Plot No. 2,
Sector 29, Gurgaon-122001
Haryana

.....Petitioner

Vs

1. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited,
Vidyut Bhawan, Vidyut Marg,
Jaipur- 302 005
2. Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited,
400 kV GSS Building (Ground Floor),
Ajmer Road, Heerapura, Jaipur
3. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited,
400 kV GSS Building (Ground Floor),
Ajmer Road, Heerapura, Jaipur
4. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited,
400 kV GSS Building (Ground Floor),
Ajmer Road, Heerapura, Jaipur



5. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board,
Vidyut Bhawan, Kumar House Complex Building II,
Shimla-171 004
6. Punjab State Electricity Board
The Mall, Patiala-147 001
7. Haryana Power Purchase Centre,
Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6,
Panchkula (Haryana)-134 109
8. Power Development Department,
Govt. of Jammu and Kashmir,
Mini Secretariat, Jammu
9. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited,
(Formerly Uttar Pradesh State Electricity Board),
Shakti Bhawan, 14, Ashok Marg,
Lucknow-226 001
10. Delhi Transco Limited,
Shakti Sadan, Kotla Road,
New Delhi-110 002
11. BSES Yamuna Power Limited,
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi
12. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited,
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi
13. North Delhi Power Limited,
Power Trading & Load Dispatch Group,
Cennet Building, Adjacent to 66/11kV Pitampura-3,
Grid Building, Near PP Jewellers,
Pitampura, New Delhi-110 034
14. Chandigarh Administration,
Sector-9, Chandigarh
15. Uttarakhand Power Corporation Limited,
Urja Bhawan, Kanwali Road, Dehradun



16. North Central Railway,
Allahabad.

17. New Delhi Municipal Council,
Palika Kendra, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi-110 002

....Respondents

For petitioner : Mr. M.G Ramachandran, Advocate for PGCIL
Ms. Ranjitha Ramachandran, Advocate for PGCIL
Ms. Stuti Venkat, Advocate for PGCIL
Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL
Shri M.M Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.K Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri Upender Pande, PGCIL

For respondent : None

ORDER

This review petition has been filed by Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL) seeking review of the order dated 16.1.2015 in Petition No.207/TT/2012, wherein the transmission tariff for assets (6 nos. Bus Reactors-Part-IV) under “Common Scheme for 765 kV Pooling Stations and network for NR, Import by NR from ER and Common Scheme for network for WR and import by WR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER” in Northern Region for 2009-14 period was allowed.

2. Tariff for 6 bus reactors at various Sub-stations associated with the above mentioned scheme in Northern Region was allowed in the order dated 16.1.2015. The petitioner submitted that the Commission has disallowed the cost of ₹1314 lakh for Asset III (765 kV 3x80 MVAR bus reactor at Lucknow alongwith associated bays) on the basis that there is no justification for difference in the capital cost of Asset I (765 kV



3x80 MVAR bus reactor at Balia alongwith associated bays) and Asset III which are both 240 MVAR Bus Reactors. The capital cost of Asset III was restricted to the capital cost of Asset I as a result of which capital cost of ₹1314 lakh in respect of Asset III was not considered in the tariff.

3. Learned counsel for PGCIL submitted that variation in the capital cost between Asset III and Asset I is natural and cannot be attributed to the petitioner for the following reasons:-

(a) Switchgear (CT, PT, Circuit Breaker, Isolator etc.): The cost of switchgear for Asset III was ₹23 crore and for Asset I was ₹11.57 crore which accounts for a difference of ₹11.43 crore;

(b) Basic cost of Reactor/compensating Equipment: The cost of the bus reactor for Asset III was ₹19.31 crore and for Asset I was ₹17.60 crore which accounts for a difference of ₹1.71 crore; and

(c) Taxes and Duties paid for bus reactor: For Asset III was ₹1.77 crore and for Asset I was ₹0.41 crore.

4. Learned counsel further submitted that there is also difference in the structure of switchgear because of technical requirements in Lucknow Sub-station than Balia Sub-station. He further submitted that there are errors apparent on the face of the record which need to be rectified and there is otherwise sufficient cause for rectification of the order dated 16.1.2015.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner on 'admission'. Admit. Issue notice.



6. The petitioner is directed to serve copy of the application for review, along with this order, on the respondents, latest by 5.5.2015. The respondents may file their reply by 20.5.2015, with advance copy to the petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, by 30.5.2015.

7. Matter to be listed for final hearing on 2.6.2015.

sd/-
(A.S. Bakshi)
Member

sd/-
(A.K. Singhal)
Member

sd/-
(Gireesh B. Pradhan)
Chairperson

