

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 244/TT/2015

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff period for **Asset I:** 4*500 MVA,765/400 KV ICT-2 with one spare unit at Jabalpur 765/400 KV PS (DOCO:01.04.2014), **Asset II:** 3*80 MVAR,765 KV Line Reactor to be used as Bus Reactor at Jabalpur PS for Dharamjaygarh ckt.#1 (DOCO:01.04.2014), **Asset III:** 765 KV,3*110 MVAR, Bus Reactor-1 at Dharamjaygarh S/S along with associated bays and LILO of 765 KV S/C Ranchi-WR Pooling Station (near Sipat) T/L at Dharamjaygarh (DOCO:01.04.2014), **Asset-IV:** 765,3*110 MVAR Bus Reactor-2 at Dharamjaygarh S/S along with associated bays (DOCO:18.04.2014), **Asset V:** 765 KV D/C Jharsuguda Pooling Station-Dharamjaygarh (near Korba) Line (Ant. DOCO:25.07.2014) under "Transmission System for Phase-I Generation Projects in Orissa (Part-B)" in Western Region.

Date of Hearing : 14.3.2016

Coram: Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited and 7 others

Parties present: Shri Piyush Awasthi, PGCIL
Shri. Mohd. Mohsin, PGCIL
Shri Pankaj Sharma, PGCIL
Shri A. M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Shri P.V. Nath, PGCIL
Smt. Archana Kumari, PGCIL
Shri Amit Yadav, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri Jashbir Singh, PGCIL
Shri Aryaman Saxena, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-



- a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff period for above mentioned assets under “Transmission System for Phase-I Generation Projects in Orissa (Part-B)”in Western Region.
 - b) The petitioner has claimed total additional capitalization of ₹1733.96 lakh, ₹310.94 lakh, ₹7814.04 lakh, ₹787.60 lakh and ₹9095.10 lakh for Asset-I, Asset-II, Asset-III, Asset-IV and Asset-V respectively, for 2014-19 tariff period.
2. The Commission observed that there is substantial difference in cost of Asset-III & Asset-IV even though they are of same configuration and directed the petitioner to submit the reasons for difference in cost along with the cost breakup for Asset-III & Asset-IV.
 3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the above information on affidavit with copy to respondents by 18.3.2016, failing which the matter would be decided on the basis of the information already available on record.
 4. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
V. Sreenivas
Dy. Chief (Law)

