

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Review Petition No. 200/TT/2018**

- Subject** : Petition for trueing up of transmission tariff of 2009-14 tariff block and determination of tariff for 2014-19 tariff block of 4 assets under NRTSS in Northern Region.
- Date of Hearing** : 24.5.2019
- Coram** : Shri P.K Pujari, Chairperson  
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member  
Shri I.S Jha, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Rajasthan Rajya Vidhut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. and others.
- Parties present** : Shri R.B Sharma, Advocate BRPL & BYPL  
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL & BYPL  
Ms. Sanya Sud, Advocate, BRPL & BYPL  
Shri S.S.Raju, PGCIL  
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL  
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri Pankaj Sharma, PGCIL  
Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that tariff for the 2009-14 period for Assets I and II was approved vide order dated 26.2.2016 in Petition No. 32/TT/2013 and for Asset III and IV vide order dated 29.2.2016 in Petition No. 110/TT/2013. He further submitted that pursuant to the directions of the Commission in ROP dated 24.1.2019, the petitioner has submitted all the information vide affidavit dated 18.2.2019. He submitted that the principal reason for time over-run is delay in getting possession of land at Jind. He further submitted that delay in acquisition of land has already been condoned by the Commission in its order dated 29.2.2016 in Petition No. 110/TT/2013.

2. Referring to Asset-III, learned counsel for BRPL submitted that petitioner installed 500 MVA ICT in lieu of originally proposed 315 MVA capacity and no financial justification or any other justification regarding the same has been given. The initial spares for the subject assets should be allowed as per the ceiling



norms specified in Regulation 8 of the 2009 Tariff Regulations. He further submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, petitioner's claim towards IDC is unjustified and liable to be rejected. Besides this, he submitted that the petitioner has not filed the details of communication system in relation to use of OPGW in place of earth wire for all the transmission assets.

3. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the issues raised by BRPL have been addressed in their rejoinder filed vide affidavit dated 23.1.2019.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the year-wise and asset-wise breakup of initial spares discharged during the period 2009-14 and 2014-19. by 21.6.2019 with an advance copy to the respondents.

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

**By order of the Commission**

**Sd/-**  
(V. Sreenivas)  
Dy. Chief (Law)

