

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 256/TT/2018

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for 1 nos. 400 kV bay each at Salem New (Dharmapuri) and Madhugiri for terminating Salem New (Dharmapuri)-Madhugiri 765 kV S/C Line-2 (Initially charged at 400 kV) being implemented under tariff based bidding and 1 no. 63 MVAR line reactor at Madhugiri end of Salem New (Dharmapuri)-Madhugiri 765 kV S/C Line-2 (Initially charged at 400 kV) being implemented under tariff based bidding under "Common Transmission scheme associated with ISGS projects in Nagapattinam/Cuddalore area of Tamil Nadu Part-A1 (b)" in Southern Region.
- Date of Hearing** : 19.2.2019
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. (KPTCL)
and 16 others
- Parties present** : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatsan, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri Ansul Garg, PGCIL
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL
Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO
Ms. Amali, Advocate, TANGEDCO
Shri R. Kathiravan, TANGEDCO

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of tariff for 2 nos. of 400 kV bays each at Salem and Madhugiri Sub-stations and the associated transmission line is being executed under TBCB line. He submitted that the asset has been put into commercial operation on 26.1.2019. The RLDC certificate, CEA certificate and Auditor's certificate and tariff forms alongwith cash



IDC qua the said asset have also been furnished vide affidavit dated 15.2.2019. He submitted that as against the total approved apportioned cost of ₹25.54 crore, the estimated completion cost is only ₹21.59 crore. He submitted that there is time over-run of 6 months and 26 days in case of the instant asset as the petitioner was aligning the COD of the instant asset with the TBCB line and the reasons for time over-run is explained in the petition. He further submitted that they have filed rejoinder to the reply of TANGEDCO.

2. Learned counsel for TANGEDCO submitted that the instant asset was developed for the generators including IL&FS and PELPL. However, IL&FS and PELPL are not impleaded as respondents in the instant petition and the petitioner has not given any reason for their non-impleadment inspite of a query by the Commission. He submitted that the instant transmission system was envisaged in particular for four IPPs who have not come up except for IL&FS. The IPPs have not signed the LTA and there are no identified beneficiaries. TANGEDCO is purchasing 550 MW of power from IL&FS. He submitted that the remaining transmission corridor is redundant and the transmission charges for that portion should not be loaded in the POC. He further submitted that the generators at whose instance the transmission system was developed should be made liable to pay the transmission charges as was held by the Commission vide order dated 6.11.2018 in Petition No. 261/MP/2017. He submitted that the Appellate Tribunal in Appeal No. 151 of 2015 has affirmed the similar view. He also referred to the various provisions of 2010 Sharing Regulations in support of his above submissions.

3. In response, representative of the petitioner submitted that in the regulatory approval for the subject transmission assets, the transmission charges are required to be included in POC as observed by the Commission. He requested for time to file Written Submissions to deal with the issues raised by TANGEDCO.

4. The Commission permitted the petitioner to file its Written Submissions by 15.3.2019 with a copy to the respondents. The Commission further directed the petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit by 15.3.2019 with an advance copy to the respondents:-

(a) Details of time over-run and chronology of activities alongwith documentary evidence as per the following format:-

SI No.	Task Name	Schedule		Actual		Remarks, if any.
		From	To	From	To	
1.	Investment Approval by Board					
2.	LOA					
3.	Supplies					
4.	Foundation					
5.	Erection					



6.	Testing and Commissioning					
----	---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

(b) Reasons for non-impleadment of IL&FS and PELPL

5. The Commission also directed the petitioner to comply with the above directions within the specified time and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.
6. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

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

