

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 1/2011

Coram:

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

Date of hearing : 20.03.2014

Date of Order : 18.05.2015

In the matter of

Revision of the Commission's order dated 4.10.2011 in Petition No. 1/2011 in the light of the judgment of the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity dated 24.9.2013 in Appeal No.43 of 2012.

And

In the matter of:

Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,
"Saudamini", Plot No.2,
Sector-29, Gurgaon -122 001

.... 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 Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited,
Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6,
Panchkula (Haryana) 134 109
8. Power Development Department,
Govt. of Jammu & 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,
33 KV S/STN Building, Hudson Line,
Kingsway Camp, New Delhi
14. Chandigarh Administration,
Sector-9, Chandigarh
15. Uttrakhand Power Corporation Limited,
FRI Complex, Kalagarh,
Dehradun
16. North Central Railway,
Allahabad
17. New Delhi Municipal Council,
Palika Kendra, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi-110 002

... Respondents



For petitioner : Shri M.G. Ramachandran, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Anushree Bardhan, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL
Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL

For respondents : Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
Shri T.P.S. Bawa, PSPCL

ORDER

This order is being issued in compliance of the judgment of the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as "Tribunal") for Electricity dated 24.9.2013 in Appeal No. 43 of 2012.

Background of the case

2. PGCIL filed Petition No. 1/2011, seeking approval of transmission tariff for (i) LILO of 220 kV, Tanakpur-Bareilly transmission line (Ckt.-II) at Sitarganj along with associated bays and (ii) 220/132 kV ICT-I at Sitarganj along with associated bays, under System Strengthening Scheme in Uttaranchal for tariff block 2004-09. The transmission tariff in Petition No. 1/2011 was approved by the Commission by its order dated 4.10.2011 for the period 2004-09. While approving the transmission tariff, the Commission disallowed Interest During Construction (IDC) and Incidental Expenses During Construction (IEDC) for a period of six months. The relevant portion of the order is extracted overleaf:-

“TIME OVER-RUN

8. The investment approval for the project was granted on 13.7.2004 and the project was scheduled to be commissioned within 24 months from the date of first letter of award for transfer package. The first letter of award for transformer package has been issued in March 2005 and the project was to be commissioned in April 2007. But, the project has been put under commercial operation on 1.3.2009. Thus, there has been a time over-run of 25 months.

9. The petitioner submitted that the delay has been due to delay in delivery of ICT (due to CRGO shortage), court case in respect of part of sub-station land, re-routing of 220 kV LIL and objections raised by the irrigation department during excavation of foundation near Nanak Sagar dam.

10. It is observed that the supplier of ICT rescheduled the supply of second transformer from June to September 2007 due to CRGO shortage. The ICT has been supplied in June 2008. The delay from September 2007 to June 2008 has not been explained by the petitioner. It has also been observed that M/s Areva, in their letter dated 3.10.2007 mentioned that it had requested the petitioner to intimate them the date of delivery of the transformer at site. The petitioner has failed to inform M/s Areva about the date of delivery of transformer. The supplier was ready to deliver the transformer and there has been delay on the part of the petitioner. No justification has been provided by the petitioner regarding the delay in commissioning the transformer beyond September 2007. Though the petitioner has submitted the reasons for delay in construction of transmission line, no specific reasons have been provided for the delay during the period September 2007 to June 2008.

11. The petitioner has submitted that no work could be carried out from March 2007 to April 2008 on account of the pending of a court case filed by one Shri Gurbhchan Singh in the Khatima District Court, claiming adequate compensation for his land from the petitioner. The work started on 21.4.2008 after depositing ₹30 lakh with the Collector, U.S. Nagar in compliance with the directions of the Uttarakhand High Court.

12. The project was due for completion by March 2007. The progress of work was affected due to rescheduling of supply of ICT by the manufacturer. However, it is observed that the petitioner could have carried out all the work related to bay equipments except the ICT by March 2007. Moreover permission for work was given by the Uttarakhand High Court on 21.4.2008. All the residual work, including the commissioning of the ICT, could have been completed within a reasonable period, say four months, from the date of permission by the High Court and the project could have been completed much ahead of the actual date of commissioning. The delay of four months from April to August 2008 is condoned. The delay of six months beyond August 2008, i.e. from September 2008 to February 2009 is not condoned and accordingly, IDC and IEDC for this period of 6 months are not allowed.

3. Aggrieved by the Commission's order dated 4.10.2011, PGCIL filed an appeal being Appeal No. 43 of 2012 before the Tribunal, challenging the decision of the Commission with regard to disallowance of IDC and IEDC for 6 months.

4. The Tribunal in its judgment dated 24.9.2013 in Appeal No. 43 of 2012 has disposed of the appeal with the following findings and directions:-

"23. Summary of our findings:

(a) The Central Commission has not considered the detailed reasons given by the Appellant for the delay that has occurred and did not provide basis for arriving at the figure of four months for completion of balance works.

(b) Perusal of the Commission's findings on the issue of time over-run in the Impugned Orders would also reveal that the Commission has dealt with only the delay in commissioning of ICTs. The Commission has not given any finding on delay in commissioning of the line. It has not discussed as to whether the delay in commissioning of the line could be or could not be attributed to the Appellant either wholly or partially. The grievance of the Appellant is that the Central Commission has wrongfully disallowed IDC and IEDC both for Transmission line and ICTs. Considering that both, the line as well as ICT could put to use simultaneously and accordingly could have attained commercial operation on the same day, it is necessary to know the findings of the Commission on this aspect.

24. In view of above, the impugned orders on this aspect are set aside remanding back to the Central Commission with the direction that it shall examine the reasons for the delay in commissioning the transmission line as well as the ICTs afresh, considering all the relevant particulars furnished by the Appellant and the Respondents and decide the matter by passing reasoned order uninfluenced by its earlier findings and the observations made by this Tribunal.

25. We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the issue to be decided by the Central Commission. We advise the Central Commission to pass the order on this issue after hearing both the parties preferably within 3 months from the date of this judgment.

26. The Appeals are partly allowed to the extent indicated above."

5. In terms of the remand order, the petitioner and respondents were heard on 20.3.2014. During the hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that as

per investment approval dated 13.7.2004, the project was to be completed within 24 months from the date of first Letter of Award, i.e., 30.3.2005. Thus, the scheduled date of commissioning of the project is 1.4.2007. From March, 2007 onwards the work in the switchyard area could not be carried out on account of stay orders of Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand till 21.4.2008. Non-availability of CRGO steel caused delay in the supply of ICT. The petitioner further submitted that it cannot recover liquidated damages from the supplier because non-availability of CRGO steel was on account of force majeure. The installation of ICT was also affected by rains during May to September, 2008. In view of the above, the actual work period available to the petitioner was between June, 2008 and 20.12.2008, i.e. about 6 months time and another 2 months time for CEA to undertake the inspection for approval for charging. The erection of ICT involves activities like oil filtration, oil filling and erection of assemblies which are avoided in rainy season. Thus, the delay in the commissioning of ICT was due to reasons beyond the control of the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel for BRPL, Respondent No. 12, during the hearing submitted as under:-

- a) PGCIL in its affidavit dated 13.4.2011 has submitted that no work could be done from July to September, 2006 due to heavy rains in Sitarganj. It is submitted that heavy rains during this period are normal and PGCIL has not given any reasons as to why the ground level of switchyard was not raised;

- b) The supplier of ICT has accepted the delivery schedule of PGCIL, knowing fully the paucity of CRGO core laminations;
- c) On the issue of stay granted by the District Court at Khatima, it is evident from the petition that PGCIL has constructed the boundary wall covering a chunk of land without acquiring it. The consequent delay in dealing with this act of occupation of 0.244 hectare land in a court case thus squarely lies with the petitioner;
- d) As regards the objections raised by Irrigation Department, Government of Uttar Pradesh, no effort was made by PGCIL at senior level, and the entire correspondence was done at the lowest level. There is also no document to show if any meeting was ever held on the issue;
- e) PGCIL completed its work and the project was ready for inspection by Electricity Inspector on 17.2.2009. PGCIL letter dated 27.11.2009 for inspection was in the nature of advance information to complete the statutory requirements of depositing inspection fee, etc. PGCIL has not claimed any time over-run on this account in its affidavits dated 13.4.2011 and 24.6.2011, and this delay of two months on this account is being claimed for the first time.

7. The Commission during the hearing on 20.3.2014 directed PGCIL to file the following information:-

“(i) Whether the contract for ICT was a fixed price contract or price variation was provided for ;

(ii) Documentary proof that the disputed land of 0.244 hectare was part of the demarcated land provided by the State government of Uttarakhand, and also when and at what stage the petitioner approached Hon’ble High Court of Uttarakhand for vacation of stay.”

8. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited (UPPCL), Respondent No.9, in its reply, filed vide affidavit dated 5.5.2014 has raised the following issues:-

(a) The petitioner’s contention that the figure of four months arrived at by the Commission for carrying out the residual activities of installation and commissioning of the ICT is based on assumption and without any justification is not correct as PGCIL itself had stated in its affidavit dated 27.6.2011 that the balance work of sub-station could be completed within 2 months and 20 days after completion of civil works. The Commission had provided additional one month and 10 days deeming it adequate. Accordingly, PGCIL is estopped for claiming IDC and IEDC for more than 2 months and 20 days;

(b) PGCIL submitted that the foundation work started in March, 2006 but it could not carry out any foundation work during July, 2006 to October, 2006 because of heavy rains and consequently the foundation work was completed in May, 2007. The rain during monsoon months is a normal phenomenon and PGCIL should have anticipated this and planned the work accordingly to avoid any delay but PGCIL failed to do so. Further, PGCIL has failed to explain the reasons for not increasing the ground level of the

switchyard. As PGCIL failed to discharge its obligations under the law, the burden of time over-run should not be passed on to the beneficiaries;

- (c) PGCIL had submitted that the ICT was installed in all respects on 31.12.2008 but the inspection was carried out by the Electrical Inspector on 17/18.2.2009 and attributed the delay of two months to the delay in inspection. However, PGCIL submitted before the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity that the project was ready for inspection only on 17.2.2009 and the inspection was done on 17/18.2.2009. Therefore, there was no delay in grant of clearance by CEA;
- (d) PGCIL stated that during March, 2007 to April, 2008 the work was affected because of court cases pertaining to the switchyard land and shortage of CRGO steel. Though the supplier was ready to deliver the ICT in June, 2007, PGCIL was not able to take delivery of the ICT because of the dispute pertaining to the switchyard land and stay granted by the Court. The supplier was fully aware of the worldwide shortage of CRGO core laminations and still accepted the delivery schedule. The supplier has to compensate PGCIL for the breach of contract and the beneficiaries cannot be burdened with the lapses on the part of the supplier;
- (e) The Commission in the impugned order observed that the supplier requested PGCIL to intimate the delivery date of the transformer at site but PGCIL failed to inform the supplier inspite of repeated reminders. The dispute regarding the switchyard land was well known to PGCIL and hence, PGCIL should have informed the supplier about the court case. The failure

on the part of PGCIL to inform the supplier makes the veracity of PGCIL's statements suspect;

- (f) PGCIL has not come forth with any justification for the delay in starting the work before the filing of court case in March, 2007. PGCIL could have completed all other work except the commissioning of the ICT. However, PGCIL failed to do so and has not provided any justification for the lapses on its part; and
- (g) PGCIL contended before the Hon'ble Tribunal that the Commission dealt only with the time over-run in case of commissioning of the ICTs and it did not render any findings with respect to the transmission line. It is observed that PGCIL itself centered around the issue of commissioning of ICTs and the same was also observed by the Tribunal in its order. PGCIL simply submitted that the transmission line was delayed due to objections raised by U.P. Irrigation Department and re-routing of the line as PTCUL had occupied the PGCIL's corridor. The Tribunal in its order dated 24.9.2013 had observed that PGCIL failed to address the issues raised by BRPL like the reasons for delay in commissioning of the line are not sufficient and the line could have been commissioned beforehand as it was not covered by the Court's stay order.

9. PGCIL vide affidavit dated 7.5.2014 has submitted its reply to the queries raised by the Commission and has also given its clarifications to the issues raised by the

learned counsel for BRPL during the hearing. The submissions made by the petitioner are as under:-

- (a) The LOA for the ICT is with price variation;

- (b) 4.876 hectares of land was acquired through State Govt. for construction of sub-station. One of the land owners filed a Civil Suit No. 39/07 at the Court of Civil Judge of Khatima District, Udham Singh Nagar and obtained a stay order on 2.3.2007. The 132 kV switchyard was to be constructed in the disputed land. In the month of October, 2007 an interim order was passed directing PGCIL not to do any construction work. An appeal was filed against the order of the Civil Judge in the court of District Judge Rudrapur on 6.11.2007 but the appeal was dismissed on 15.2.2008. A writ petition was filed in Uttarakhand High Court in Nainital on 28.2.2008 against the order of Khatima and Rudrapur Court. The High Court gave the permission to start the work on 21.4.2008. Therefore, no work was carried out on the disputed land from March, 2007 to April, 2008 and this attributed to delay of 14 months in completion of the project;

- (c) The switchyard at Sitarganj was submerged in water due to heavy rains during July, 2006 to September, 2006. The terrain of the line comes under the tarai belt of Uttarakhand and most of the locations of line fall in the nearby area of Nanak Sagar Dam. Water table is very high near Nanak Sagar dam

and there was unprecedented rain and flood. Due to water logging, raising of ground level of switchyard was not practically possible;

(d) During the year 2005 and 2006 there was global crises in availability of CRGO core lamination and condenser bushing and there was abnormal increase in the price of raw materials in the international market hence the supplier could not manufacture and supply the ICT as per delivery schedule. The petitioner was not able to take the delivery of ICT due to un-availability of land on account of court case at the project site. Though the ICT was ready in June, 2007 PGCIL was not able to take delivery because of the land dispute which was beyond the control of the petitioner. ICT is a sensitive item which cannot be stored in a make-shift arrangement. It requires a proper space for its storage and a proper procedure for its upkeep pending installations and commissioning. In view of the uncontrollable circumstances, ICT was supplied at site on 19.6.2008. The erection of ICT involves the activities of unloading, oil filtration, oil filling and erection assemblies which should be avoided in the rainy season as per manual of transformers prepared by the Central Board of Irrigation and Power;

(e) Due to stay granted by the District Court in Khatima in a civil suit filed by a land owner, the works on the project site could not proceed till the High Court of Uttarakhand gave permission to PGCIL to start the work after depositing the compensation amount. The delay due to court case and the impact on

the subsequent activities are beyond the control of the petitioner and hence, the delay may be condoned;

(f) Matter relating to Irrigation Department was taken up with higher authorities of Irrigation department, Bareilly and supporting documents have already been submitted with Petition No. 117/2010;

(g) The petitioner approached CEA on 27.11.2008 to carry out inspection of 220/132 kV Sitarganj Sub-station. After repeated requests the inspection was carried out by CEA on 18.2.2009 and approval was issued on 26.2.2009. This resulted in two months delay in commercial operation of the transmission assets; and

(h) Therefore, the delay in commissioning of LILO at Tanakpur-Bareilly transmission line and ICT-I at Sitarganj is beyond the control of the petitioner.

10. The Appellate Tribunal has observed that the Commission has not considered the detailed reasons given by the petitioner for the delay and the basis of arriving at the figure of 4 months for completion of balance work. The Appellate Tribunal has remanded the matter to consider the delay in commissioning of the transmission line.

11. We have considered the submissions of the petitioner and the respondents on the issue of time over-run as directed by the Appellate Tribunal. As per Investment Approval dated 13.7.2004, the transmission assets were scheduled to be commissioned within 24 months from the date of first Letter of Award, i.e. March 2005. Accordingly, the

transmission assets were scheduled to be commissioned by 1.4.2007. However, the transmission assets were declared under commercial operation on 1.3.2009, with a time over-run of 23 months. The Commission had condoned the time over-run of 17 months and did not condone the delay of 6 months from September, 2008 to February, 2009. We now examine the reasons given by the petitioner vide affidavit dated 13.4.2011 and 7.5.2014 and during the hearing on 20.3.2014 for the delay in commissioning of the LILO of the 220 kV Tanakpur-Bareilly Transmission Line (Ckt-II) at Sitarganj along with associated bays and the ICT-I at Sitarganj.

12. The petitioner has submitted that the delay in the commissioning of transmission line was due to objections raised by the local farmers at tower location no. 66 & 67, most of the location of lines comes under nearby area of Nanak Sagar Dam where the water level is very high and lot of unprecedented rain and flood was there in the vicinity, high water level in most of the locations of line, unprecedented rains and floods and due to objection by farmers and Irrigation Department. The petitioner has further submitted that way leave problems were faced due to standing crops in fields for almost 12 months. The stretch is highly fertile and two to three crops of paddy is grown in a year keeping fields water logged. Re-routing of 220 kV LILO from LOC no. 47 to. 60 was done as PTCUL was also constructing line in the same corridor. This was mentioned by PGCIL in its letter dated 8.10.2006 addressed to Superintending Engineer, Nanak Sagar dam. As regards high water level in Nanak Sagar dam and unprecedented rains and floods in the area, petitioner in its submissions made during hearing on 20.3.2014 has stated that heavy rainfall at Sitarganj area affected the erection work of ICT-I. The

petitioner has submitted photocopy of newspaper cuttings showing flood like situation during May-September, 2008. Work suffered due to objection raised by Irrigation Department during execution of foundation near Nanak Sagar dam and the petitioner has submitted copy of letter dated 8.10.2006 addressed to Superintending Engineer, Nanak Sagar dam, Bareilly requesting for grant of permission for construction of line at suitable locations and also reminders dated 4.12.2006 and 11.2.2007. Nanak Sagar Dam Authority, vide its letter dated 8.3.2007, denied permission. Work suffered also due to objection by local farmers at tower location nos. 66 & 67. The petitioner has submitted copies of letter dated 13.6.2008 and 15.7.2008 addressed to D.C., Udham Singh Nagar regarding agitation by the locals and has requested for resolving the issue so that the work could be completed.

13. On perusal of Form 5C, it is noted that the sub-station package for 220/132 kV Sitarganj Sub-station was awarded to M/s. Areva on 26.12.2005 for supply and erection by 25.5.2007. The turnkey package for Tanakpur-Bareilly Transmission Line was awarded on 10.8.2005 to M/s. Utkal for supply and erection by 10.11.2006. It is mentioned that the packages for ICT and transmission line were awarded to different agencies.

14. The Tribunal has observed that the Commission has not given any finding on delay in commissioning of the line and has not discussed as to whether the delay in commissioning of the line could be or could not be attributed to the petitioner either wholly or partially. The petitioner has claimed the date of commercial operation of

Asset-I and II as 1.3.2009. Asset-I, the LILO of 200 kV Tanakpur-Bareilly transmission line (Ckt-II) at Sitarganj is connected to Asset-II i.e. the 220/132 kV ICT-I at Sitarganj and accordingly the commissioning of Asset-I without the commissioning of Asset-II would not serve any purpose. Accordingly, we are of the view that Asset-I has to be commissioned simultaneously along with Asset-II. As commissioning of Asset-I is dependent on Asset- II and they cannot be commissioned independent of each other, the time over-run in case of these two assets is considered together. The petitioner has submitted that the work related to construction of line has been delayed for 5 months from 8.10.2006 to 8.3.2007 due to shifting of location on account of objection raised by Irrigation Department. The petitioner has further submitted the line was delayed due to flood-like situation during May-September, 2008 and agitation by the local farmers.

15. The petitioner has submitted shortage of CRGO steel in international market during 2005-06 as one of the major reasons for delay in commissioning ICT-I. We are of the view that the time over-run due to shortage of CRGO steel during 2005-06 was beyond the control of the petitioner. Accordingly, period of 14.5 months from 1.4.2007 (scheduled date of commercial operation) to 19.6.2008 (date of supply of ICT-I) is therefore condoned in view of shortage of CRGO. The court case from March 2007 to April 2008 did not have any additional impact on the delivery of ICT-I. The petitioner has submitted, vide affidavit dated 16.6.2014, that as per L2 network, time required for commissioning of 100 MVA transformer after delivery at site is 6.5 months. Taking into consideration the submission of the petitioner that during rainy season, erection of ICT which involves activities of unloading, oil filtration, oil filling and erection assemblies

should be avoided as per manual of transformers prepared by the Central Board of Irrigation and Power (CBIP), we allow a period of approximately 3 months from mid-June to September 2008, this being the normal rainy season as aforesaid activities could not have been performed during the rainy season. The petitioner has submitted on 20.3.2014 in Petition No. 117/2010 that commissioning of ICT-II was completed with all activities related to erection and commissioning in a short span of two months. We are, therefore, inclined to allow five and half months (from 19.6.2008 to November, 2008) for commissioning of ICT-I. Thus, out of a total delay of 23 months in commissioning of the instant assets, a delay of 20 months is being condoned and remaining period of 3 months (December, 2008 to February, 2009) is not being allowed. Accordingly, IDC and IEDC for 20 months are allowed to be capitalized. In view of the above, the transmission charges of Asset-I and II are revised in the succeeding paras.

16. Details of disallowed IDC and IEDC are as follows:-

(₹ in lakh)

Details of IDC and IEDC as per CA Certificate dated 27.12.2010		
Asset-I		
	IEDC	IDC
Up to 28.2.2009	525.34	228.79
From 1.3.2009 to 31.3.2009	0.00	0.00
Total IDC and IEDC Claimed	525.34	228.79
Details of IDC and IEDC disallowed for 3 months		
IDC and IEDC disallowed for three months	33.53	14.60
Asset-II		
	IEDC	IDC
Up to 28.2.2009	322.19	131.84
From 1.3.2009 to 31.3.2009	0.00	0.00
Total IDC and IEDC claimed	322.19	131.84
Details of IDC and IEDC disallowed for 3 months		
IDC and IEDC disallowed for three months	20.57	8.42

CAPITAL COST

17. Calculations of capital cost asset considered for the purpose of tariff calculations as on the date of commercial operations are given hereunder:-

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	Capital cost as on DOCO	IDC & IEDC deducted due to delay in commissioning	Capital cost considered for tariff calculation	Add-cap during 2008-09	Total completion cost as on 31.3.2009
Asset-I	2555.22	48.13	2507.08	69.71	2576.79
Asset-II	1620.05	28.98	1591.07	122.94	1714.01

DEBT-EQUITY RATIO

18. Details of revised opening debt equity of assets considered for the purpose of tariff calculation as on the date of commercial operation are as under:-

(₹ in lakh)

	Asset-I		Asset-II	
	Amount	%	Amount	%
Debt	1823.70	72.74	1234.45	77.59
Equity	683.39	27.26	356.61	22.41
Total	2507.08	100.00	1591.07	100.00

19. Details of revised debt-equity of the assets as on 31.3.2009 are given hereunder:-

(₹ in lakh)

	Asset-I		Asset-II	
	Amount	%	Amount	%
Debt	1872.49	72.67	1320.51	77.04
Equity	704.30	27.33	393.50	22.96
Total	2576.79	100.00	1714.01	100.00

RETURN ON EQUITY

20. The revised return on equity in respect of transmission assets is given hereunder:-

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)	
	Asset-I 2008-09 (pro-rata)	Asset-II 2008-09 (pro-rata)
Opening Equity	683.39	356.61
Addition due to additional capital expenditure	20.91	36.88
Equity	704.30	393.50
Average Equity	693.85	375.06
Return on Equity	8.09	4.38

INTEREST ON LOAN

21. The revised interest on loan in respect of the transmission assets is as per details given under:-

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)	
	Asset-I 2008-09 (pro-rata)	Asset-II 2008-09 (pro-rata)
Gross Normative Loan	1823.70	1234.45
Cumulative Repayment upto Previous Year	-	-
Net Loan-Opening	1823.70	1234.45
Addition due to Additional Capitalisation	48.80	86.06
Repayment during the year	6.50	4.47
Net Loan-Closing	1865.99	1316.04
Average Loan	1844.84	1275.25
Weighted Average Rate of Interest on Loan	9.39%	9.35%
Interest	14.43	9.94

DEPRECIATION

22. Details of revised depreciation in respect of the transmission assets are as given overleaf:-

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I 2008-09 (pro-rata)	Asset-II 2008-09 (pro-rata)
Opening Gross Block	2507.08	1591.07
Addition during 2009-14 due to Additional Capitalisation	69.71	122.94
Closing Gross Block	2576.69	1714.01
Rate of Depreciation	3.07%	3.24%
Depreciable Value	2263.54	1438.87
Remaining Depreciable Value	2263.54	1438.87
Depreciation	6.50	4.47

INTEREST ON WORKING CAPITAL

23. The revised interest on working capital in respect of transmission assets is given hereunder:-

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I 2008-09 (pro-rata)	Asset-II 2008-09 (pro-rata)
Maintenance Spares	25.07	15.91
O & M expenses	6.45	10.97
Receivables	73.09	61.31
Total	104.61	88.19
Rate of Interest	12.25%	12.25%
Interest	1.07	0.90

Transmission Charges

24. The revised transmission charges in respect of transmission assets is as under:-

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	Asset-I 2008-09 (pro-rata)	Asset-II 2008-09 (pro-rata)
Depreciation	6.50	4.47
Interest on Loan	14.43	9.94
Return on equity	8.09	4.38
Advance against Depreciation	-	-
Interest on Working Capital	1.07	0.90
O & M Expenses	6.45	10.97
Total	36.55	30.65

25. All other terms contained in order dated 4.10.2011 in Petition No.1/2011 remains unaltered.

sd/-
(A.K. Singhal)
Member

sd/-
(Gireesh B. Pradhan)
Chairperson

