

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 10/TT/2019

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff of the Inter-State transmission lines connecting two states for the APTRANSCO owned transmission lines/system as per the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission's order dated 5.9.2018 in Petition No. 07/Suo-Motu/2017 and order dated 21.6.2018 in Petition No. 237/TT/2016 for inclusion in POC Transmission charges in accordance with Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014

Date of Hearing : 18.11.2019

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

Petitioner : Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Ltd.(APTRANSCO)

Respondents : Transmission Corporation of Telangana Ltd.(TSTRANSCO) and 4 others

Parties present : Shri Vallinayagam, Advocate, APTRANSCO
Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, TSTRANSCO
Shri Damodar Solanki, Advocate, TSTRANSCO

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in Petition No. 237/TT/2016, APTRANSCO claimed the tariff for 42 nos. of ISTS lines connecting Andhra Pradesh with the neighbouring States. However, the Commission vide order dated 21.6.2018 in Petition No. 237/TT/2016 allowed the tariff for 2016-17 for only 40 nos. of ISTS lines and tariff for Assets-VIII and IX was not allowed and the petitioner was directed to file a fresh petition for the said two assets. Accordingly, the present petition is filed for determination of tariff for 40 nos. of lines for rest of the control period 2014-15 (pro rata for 10 months), 2015-16, 2017-18 and 2018-19 and determination of tariff for Assets VIII and IX from COD to 31.3.2019.

2. Learned counsel for TSTRANSCO, Respondent No.1, submitted that 400 kV Sattenapally-Srisailam-I and II feeders are formed by making LILO of both circuits of 400 kV Srisailam-Nunna-I and II lines which were originally executed on 23.10.2000.



She submitted that only LILO portion of 7 km out of 165 km of 400 kV Sattenapally-Srisailam line achieved COD on 12.2.2014 and as such the petitioner should be allowed to recover the YTC for the said 7 km LILO portion that was put into commercial operation on 12.2.2014. Thus, petitioner's claim for recovery of the cost of line of 158 km for 14 years more is untenable.

3. She also submitted that similarly in the case of 220 kV Chillakallu-Pulichintala and 220 kV Chillakallu-Suryapeta feeders are formed by LILO to 220 kV Chillakallu-Narketpally I and II lines which achieved COD on 29.3.1999. She submitted that out of the total length of the line, only 12 km falls within the State of AP. She further submitted that the petitioner is claiming excess tariff of 11 years more by reckoning its COD as 10.3.2010 instead of its actual COD as 29.3.1999. She, however, asserted that YTC of both the above lines can only be claimed from 29.3.1999 i.e. COD of both the lines.

4. In response, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the position of the aforesaid two lines has been clarified by way of line diagram shown as Annexures 'A' and 'B' in rejoinder filed vide affidavit dated 6.9.2019.

5. The Commission observed that the petitioner has submitted the statement of capital expenditure as on 30.8.2018 in case of Assets-VIII and Asset IX, which has been certified by the Advisor and Controller of Accounts and directed the petitioner to submit the statement of capital expenditure as on COD of the said assets (17/18 November 2016) duly certified by the Auditor by 20.12.2019.

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

By order of the Commission

sd/
(V. Sreenivas)
Dy. Chief (Law)

