

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 294/TT/2015**

- Subject : Truing up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff period and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff period for Asset-I: 400 kV D/C Manesar-Neemrana Line along with associated bays, Asset- III(A): 500 MVA 400/220 kV ICT-1 at Neemrana, Asset-III(B): 315 MVA 400/220 400/220 kV ICT-2 at Neemrana under transmission system associated with Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme- XV.
- Date of Hearing : 3.2.2016
- Coram : Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member  
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member
- Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
- Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and 16 others
- Parties present : Smt. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL  
Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL  
Shri S.C. Taneja, PGCIL  
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL  
Shri B.L Sharma, Rajasthan Discoms  
Shri S.K. Agarwal, Rajasthan Discoms  
Shri S.P. Das, Rajasthan Discoms

**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 and determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff period for assets above mentioned assets under transmission system associated with Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme-XV.
- b) The transmission charges for the asset was approved by the Commission vide order dated 2.12.2014 in Petition No. 69/TT/2012.
- c) The petitioner has claimed total additional capitalization of ₹4102.50 lakh for 2009-14 tariff period. Further, additional capital expenditure of ₹716.12 lakh has been claimed for 2014-19 tariff period.



2. The learned counsel for the Rajasthan discoms submitted that reply to the petition has already been filed and the same has been served on the petitioner.
3. The petitioner has submitted that RCE for the transmission system is in the advanced stage of approval and it will be submitted shortly. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the RCE by 18.2.2016.
4. In response to the Commission's query regarding variation in capital cost in case of Asset-III(A) and Asset-III(B) though they are of same configuration, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the basic ICT cost is same in case of both the assets, however the variation in cost is due to variation in cost of land, building, control room & other costs. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the reasons for variation in cost on affidavit with a copy to the beneficiaries by 18.2.2016.
5. The Commission directed the petitioner to file rejoinder and submit the above clarification and replies to the queries sought vide letter dated 30.1.2016 on affidavit with copy to respondents by 18.2.2016. The Commission further 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.
6. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

sd/  
V. Sreenivas  
Dy. Chief (Law)

