

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 159/TT/2018

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff for 2014-19 tariff block from COD to 31.3.2019 of 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Manesar Sub-station Extension under “Bus Reactor Scheme in Northern Region, Phase-II”.

Date of Hearing : 23.10.2018

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. (RRVPL) and 16 others

Parties present : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri V. P. Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri S. K. Niranjana, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of tariff for 125 MVAR Bus Reactor at 400/220 kV Manesar Sub-station Extension under “Bus Reactor Scheme in Northern Region, Phase-II”. He submitted that as per the Investment Approval dated 2.2.2015, the instant asset was scheduled to be put into commercial operation before 1.8.2017 and the COD of the asset was 2.10.2017. Thus, there is a time over-run of little more than two months. He submitted that the reactor was damaged in the transit which is beyond the control of the petitioner and requested to condone the time over-run. He submitted that the approved apportioned cost was ₹1876.95 lakh and the estimated completion cost is ₹2076.43 lakh which is within the RCE approved apportioned cost of ₹2097.13 lakh. He submitted that the reason for cost over-run has already been explained in the petition and requested to allow the cost over-run and the tariff as claimed in the petition.

2. The learned counsel for BRPL submitted that the time over-run was due to damage to the reactor in transit and it should be settled between the contractor and the



petitioner and the time over-run should not be condoned. He further submitted that L2 network does not clearly show the time envisaged at the FR stage for different activities and the time actually taken by the petitioner in execution of the project and as such it is very difficult to understand who is responsible for the time over-run. He submitted that the petitioner has not been given the details inspite of repeated directions by the Commission and hence the time over-run should not be condoned.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to give the details of time envisaged for different activities and the actual time consumed by the petitioner. The Commission also directed the petitioner to submit the details of the insurance amount recovered and the cost recovered from the contract for the damages of the reactor during the transit. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the above information on affidavit with an advance copy to the respondents by 15.11.2018.

4. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit the reasons for time over-run alongwith documentary evidence in the following format by 15.11.2018:-

Activity	Schedule		Actual		Remarks
	From	to	From	to	
Investment approval					
Scheduled COD					
Supply of bus reactor					
Bus reactor received at site					
Time taken in erection					

5. The Commission observed that no extension of time will be granted and directed the petitioner to comply with the above direction within the specified timeline and further stated that the information received after the specified time will not be taken on record.

6. Subject to above, the Commission reserved order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

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

