CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

Petition No. 87/TT/2017

Subject	:	Determination of transmission tariff of 400 kV Seoni (MP)- Sarni (MP) line and 400 kV Seoni (MP) Bhilai (Chhattisgarh) line, deemed ISTS lines, for 2009- 14 tariff period for inclusion in computation of PoC charges in accordance with the 2009 Tariff Regulations and Sharing of Inter-State Transmission charges and losses) Regulations, 2010
Date of Hearing	:	3.8.2017
Coram	:	Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson Shri A. K. Singhal, Member Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member
Petitioner	:	Madhya Pradesh Power Transmission Company Limited (MPPTCL)
Respondents	:	Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)
Parties present	:	Shri Aditya Singh, Advocate, MPPTCL Shri G. Umapathy, Advocate, MPPTCL Shri Abhinav Anand, MPPTCL Shri Rajeev Jain, RRVPNL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff of two deemed ISTS lines, i.e 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) line and 400 kV Seoni (MP) Bhilai (Chhattisgarh) line for 2009-14 tariff period for inclusion in PoC charges. Learned counsel submitted that the Commission in order dated 15.10.2015 in Petition No. 217/TT/2013, while approving the tariff for other deemed ISTS lines for the 2009-14 period for inclusion in the computation of PoC Charges, observed that the instant lines could be considered for PoC computation only if the instant lines are used for carrying inter-State power and accordingly certified by the concerned WRPC. He further submitted that WRPC in its 31st meeting approved that the instant lines are natural ISTS lines and hence tariff may be allowed for these

ROP in Petition No. 87/TT/2017

assets and they may be included in the PoC computation.

2. In response to query of the Commission on whether these lines were included in the ARR granted by the State Commission, the learned counsel submitted that they are not included in the ARR already granted by the State Commission. The Commission directed the petitioner to confirm that these lines are not included in the ARR approved by MPERC, on an affidavit by 20.8.2017 with a copy to the respondents.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to implead the constituents of WR who would be benefitted by the instant lines and liable to pay the transmission charges, file amended memo of parties and serve a copy of the petition on the respondents by 11.8.2017.

4. The Commission further directed the respondents to file their reply by 4.9.2017 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 18.9.2017. The Commission also directed to list the matter on 26.9.2017

By order of the Commission

sd/-(T. Rout) Chief (Law)

