

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Review Petition No. 11/RP/2018**

**in**

**Petition No. 88/TT/2017**

**Coram:**

**Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member  
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member  
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member**

**Date of Order : 12.06.2018**

**In the matter of:**

Review Petition under Section 94 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 103 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999, seeking review of order dated 19.12.2017 in Petition No. 88/TT/2017.

**And in the matter of:**

Madhya Pradesh Power Transmission Company Limited,  
Block No. 2, Shakti Bhawan,  
Rampur, Jabalpur – 482 008

**.....Review Petitioner**

**Vs**

1. Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,  
Saudimini, Plot No. 2, Sector 29  
Near IFFCO Chowk,  
Gurgaon-122001
2. Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. (MSETCL)  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, A Wing Prakashganga E-Block,  
Plot No. C-19 BKC Bandra (East), Mumbai  
Maharashtra – 400051
3. Gujarat Energy Transmission Corporation Ltd.  
Sardar Patel "Vidyut Bhawan",  
Race Course, Vadodara,  
Gujarat – 390007



4. Chhattisgarh State Power Transmission Company Ltd., (CSPTCL),  
SLDC Building  
CSEB, Daganiya,  
Raipur, Chhattisgarh - 492013
5. Rajasthan Rajya Vidhyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. (RVPNL)  
Room No. 223, Vidhyut Bhawan, Jan Path, Jaipur  
Rajasthan - 302005
6. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited  
"Shakti Bhawan", 14 Ashok Marg, Lucknow U.P.  
Lucknow - 226001

....Respondents

**For Review Petitioner** : Shri M. G. Ramachandran, Advocate, MPPTCL  
Shri Pulkit Aggarwal, Advocate, MPPTCL  
Shri Vincent D'souza, MPPTCL  
Shri S. R. Sharma, MPPTCL

**For Respondent** : None

### **ORDER**

This is a review petition filed by Madhya Pradesh Power Transmission Company Ltd. (MPPTCL) against the Commission's order dated 19.12.2017 in Petition No. 88/TT/2017 wherein IWC and O&M Expenses were only allowed for 2014-19 period for 7 out of the 11 ISTS lines owned by MPPTCL as per the new methodology approved by the Commission as the said 7 lines were more than 25 years old.

2. MPPTCL has submitted that the useful life of the transmission lines should be considered as 35 years and not 25 years. Out of the 11 lines, only 3 lines have completed 35 years of life and hence all the five elements of tariff should have been allowed for the remaining 8 lines. MPPTCL has submitted that the tariff allowed in the impugned order is much less than the tariff for the 9 lines in order dated 15.10.2015 in



Petition No.217/TT/2013 for the 2011-14 period and the implementation of lower tariff will result in substantial financial adjustments adverse to MPPTCL.

3. During the hearing on 5.6.2018, learned counsel for MPPTCL submitted that tariff approved in order dated 15.10.2015 continued to be realized for the 2014-19 period and giving effect to lower tariff approved in the impugned order dated 19.12.2017 retrospectively from 1.4.2014 would cause difficulties in adjustments as the instant ISTS lines have not been included in the ARR approved by the State Commission. He requested to continue with the methodology approved in order dated 15.10.2015 for determination of tariff for the ISTS lines.

4. We have considered the submissions of MPPTCL. MPPTCL has made out a prima facie case. We admit the review petition. Issue notice to the respondents.

5. MPPTCL is directed to serve a copy of the review petition on the respondents by 14.6.2018. The parties are directed to complete the pleadings by 29.6.2018 and no further time will be granted in the matter. List the matter on 3.7.2018 for final hearing.

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

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

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

sd/-  
**(P. K. Pujari)**  
**Chairperson**

