

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 87/TT/2017**

**Coram:**

**Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson  
Shri A. K. Singhal, Member  
Shri A. S. Bakshi, Member  
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member**

**Date of Order : 03.11.2017**

**In the matter of:**

Petition for determination of transmission tariff for the transmission lines belonging to the petitioner (MPPTCL) conveying electricity as deemed ISTS lines, in continuation to the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission's order dated 15.10.2015 under Petition No. 217/TT/2013 for inclusion of 2 nos. 400 kV lines in computation of point of connection transmission charges in accordance with the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 and (Sharing of inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulations, 2010 namely, 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) line and 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chhattisgarh) line.

**And in the matter of:**

Madhya Pradesh Power Transmission Company Limited  
Block No.2, Shakti Bhawan  
Rampur, Jabalpur- 482008

.....**Petitioner**

**Vs**

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

.....**Respondent**

**For Petitioner** : Shri G. Umapathy, Advocate, MPPTCL  
Shri Aditya Singh, Advocate, MPPTCL  
Shri Abhinav Anand, MPPTCL



**For Respondents :** Shri S.K. Venkateshan, Advocate, PGCIL  
Shri Jasbir Singh, PGCIL  
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL  
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL

### **ORDER**

Madhya Pradesh Power Transmission Company Limited (“MPPTCL”) has filed the instant petition for approval of the transmission tariff of 400 kV lines namely Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) and Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chhattisgarh) Transmission Lines, deemed ISTS lines, from 2011-12 to 2013-14 period, for inclusion in computation of point of connection transmission charges in accordance with the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as “the 2009 Tariff Regulations”). MPPTCL has submitted that the instant petition has been filed as per the Commission’s order dated 15.10.2015 in Petition No. 217/TT/2013.

2. MPPTCL has sought tariff for the following nine inter-State transmission lines connecting two States for the period 2011-14 under the 2009 Tariff Regulations for inclusion in the computation of PoC charges. The Commission approved the tariff for these assets vide order dated 15.10.2015 in Petition No.217/TT/2013:-

<b>Srl. No.</b>	<b>Name of Line</b>	<b>Voltage Level</b>	<b>Connecting States</b>	<b>COD</b>
1	220 kV Malanpur-Auraiya	220 kV	MP-UP	23.1.1993
2	220 kV Mehgaon-Auraiya	220 kV	MP-UP	23.1.1993
3	220 kV Badod-Kota	220 kV	MP-Rajasthan	12.8.1977
4	220 kV Badod-Modak	220 kV	MP-Rajasthan	27.12.1988
5	220 kV Kalmeshwar-Pandhurna	220 kV	MP- Maharashtra	1972
6	220 kV Kotmilkala-Amarkantak-Ck.I	220 kV	MP-Chhattisgarh	March,1975
7	220 kV Kotmilkala-Amarkantak-Ck.II	220 kV	MP-Chhattisgarh	July, 1979
8	400 kV Sardar Sarovar-Rajgarh-Ck-I	400 kV	MP-Gujarat	20.10.2004
9	400 kV Sardar Sarovar-Rajgarh-Ck-I	400 kV	MP-Gujarat	20.10.2004



The petitioner has also submitted that the TSA/RSA has been signed between MPPTCL and PGCIL for facilitating disbursement of the transmission charges approved by the Commission.

3. MPPTCL has submitted that the petitioner and MPPMCL requested the Commission to consider the 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) and 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chattisgarh) transmission lines in Petition No. 217/TT/2013 as power is flowing in the said lines. However, the Commission in order dated 15.10.2015 observed that the STU lines used for carrying inter-State power can be considered for inclusion in the PoC only if its certified by the NRPC in terms of Para 2.1.3 of Annexure I to the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Sharing of inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulation, 2010.

4. MPPTCL has submitted that subsequently, Western Regional Power Committee (WRPC) in its 31<sup>st</sup> meeting has approved the 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) as deemed ISTS line and 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chattisgarh) as natural ISTS line for the purpose of inclusion in the POC computation and requested to grant tariff for these lines as per the provisions of 2009 tariff Regulations.

5. MPPTCL was directed by the Commission to confirm whether these lines were included in the ARR granted by the State Commission and implead the constituents of WR who would be benefitted by the instant lines and liable to pay the transmission charges and file amended memo of parties. MPPTCL has submitted vide affidavit dated 19.8.2017 has submitted the ARR of MPPTCL is approved by the State Commission for the whole Transmission Network. Being a part of the network, ARR of the instant two



lines are also included in the ARR approved by MPERC for the period 2009-14. However, MPPTCL did not file the amended “Memo of Parties”.

6. Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited (MPPMCL), one of the beneficiaries of the instant lines and constituent of WR has submitted that the YTC may be approved for the instant lines as per the procedure adopted by the Commission in order dated 15.10.2015 in Petition No.217/TT/2013 while granting tariff for the inter-State transmission lines owned by MPPTCL.

7. In a similar case filed by Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited (RRVPNL) seeking tariff for inter-State transmission lines for the 2009-14 tariff period, the Commission vide order dated 18.10.2017 in Petition No.26/TT/2017 has declined to allow YTC retrospectively for the 2009-14 period. The relevant portion of the order is extracted hereunder:-

“6. We have considered the submissions made by RRVPNL. RRVPNL has claimed transmission tariff for seven inter-State transmission lines retrospectively for the 2009-14 tariff period. The instant transmission lines are part of the State network and are shared by STU. The State Commission has already granted ARR for the State network for the 2009-14 period which is inclusive of the tariff for the transmission lines covered in the instant petition. As such, RRVPNL has already recovered tariff for these lines. Further, PoC charges for the 2011-14 period have already been processed and recovered. Granting of tariff for these transmission lines afresh by this Commission and inclusion in the PoC charges would lead to revision of the PoC charges retrospectively. Further, it would require revision/adjustment of the ARR already granted by the State Commission for the 2011-14 period. Hence, we are not inclined to allow tariff for these lines retrospectively for the period 2011-14. RRVPNL has already filed the petition claiming tariff for the inter-State transmission lines under its State network for the 2014-19 tariff period under the 2014 Tariff Regulations and will be granted tariff accordingly as per the relevant regulations.”



8. We have considered the submissions made by MPPTCL. MPPTCL has claimed transmission tariff for two inter-State transmission lines retrospectively for the 2009-14 tariff period. As in the case of RRVPNL, the instant transmission lines are part of the State network. MPERC has already granted ARR for the State network for the 2009-14 period which is inclusive of the YTC of the transmission lines covered in the instant petition. As such, MPPTCL has already recovered tariff for these lines. Further, PoC charges for the 2011-14 period have already been processed and recovered. Granting of tariff for these transmission lines afresh by this Commission and inclusion in the PoC charges would lead to revision of the PoC charges retrospectively. It would also require revision/adjustment of the ARR already granted by MPERC for 2009-14 period. Hence, we are not inclined to allow YTC for these lines for the period 2011-14. MPPTCL has already filed the petition claiming tariff for the inter-State transmission lines owned by it for the 2014-19 tariff period under the 2014 Tariff Regulations and accordingly tariff will be allowed as per the relevant regulations.

9. In view of the above discussion, tariff is not allowed for the instant assets for the 2009-14 period. The filing fee deposited by MPPTCL in the instant case shall be adjusted in future.

10. Accordingly, Petition No. 87/TT/2017 is disposed of.

sd/-  
**(Dr. M. K. Iyer)**  
Member

sd/-  
**(A.S. Bakshi)**  
Member

sd/-  
**(A.K. Singhal)**  
Member

sd/-  
**(Gireesh B. Pradhan)**  
Chairperson

