

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 44/TT/2014**

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff period for (1) 3x80 MVAR line reactor with associated bays at Gwalior Sub-station (COD 1.2.2014) used as bus reactor till commissioning of 765 kV Bina-Gwalior ckt-3, (2) 3x80 MVAR line reactor with associated bays at Bina Sub-station (anticipated COD: 1.3.2014) to be used as bus reactor till commissioning of 765 kV S/C Bina-Gwalior till commissioning of 765 kV Bina-Gwalior ckt-3, (3) 765 kV S/C Bina-Gwalior ckt-3 (anticipated COD: 1.3.2014) under "Transmission System for Phase-I Generation Projects in Orissa Part-C" in Western Region.

Date of Hearing : 27.1.2016

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Company Ltd. and 7 others

Parties present : Shri Piyush Awasthi, PGCIL  
Shri A. M. Pavgi, PGCIL  
Shri P. V. Nath, PGCIL  
Mohd. Mohsin, PGCIL  
Shri M. M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL  
Smt. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL  
Shri Subhash C. Taneja, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff period for (1) 3x80 MVAR line reactor with associated bays at Gwalior Sub-station used as bus reactor till commissioning of 765 kV Bina-Gwalior ckt-3, (2) 3x80 MVAR line reactor with associated bays at Bina Sub-station to be used as bus reactor till commissioning of 765 kV S/C Bina-Gwalior till commissioning of 765 kV Bina-Gwalior ckt-3, (3) 765 kV S/C Bina-Gwalior ckt-



3 under "Transmission System for Phase-I Generation Projects in Orissa Part-C" in Western Region.

b) The petitioner has claimed total additional capitalization of ₹241.26 lakh for 2009-14 tariff period.

2. The Commission observed that there is substantial difference in cost Asset-I and II even though they are of the same configuration and enquired the reason for such huge variation. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that spare reactor has been considered as a part of Asset-II as per CEA Regulations, therefore the cost of such spare reactor is included in capital cost of Asset-II and hence there is difference in the cost of Asset I and II.

3. As regards cost over-run in case of Asset-II, the representative of the petitioner submitted they will submit the revised apportionment of additional capitalization based on RCE.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the RCE on affidavit by 11.2.2016 with copy to respondents. The Commission directed that the above information should be filed within the specified date, failing which the matter would be decided on the basis of the information already available on record.

5. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

sd/-

V. Sreenivas  
Dy. Chief (Law)

