

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 257/TT/2018**

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for the assets covered under “System Strengthening-XXIV in Southern Region” Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014.
- Date of Hearing** : 23.4.2019
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member  
Shri I.S. Jha, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Ltd  
& 15 Ors
- Parties present** : Shri S.Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL  
Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the scheduled date of commercial operation of the assets covered in the instant petition was 1.7.2018 against which Assets-A and B were put into commercial operation on 25.10.2018 and 4.8.2018 respectively. He submitted that the petitioner has not been able to declare the COD of Asset-C as the Hindpur Sub-station under the scope of APTRANSCO is not ready. Hence, the petitioner has sought approval of COD of Asset-C as 12.10.2018 on “No load” basis under proviso (ii) of Regulation 4 (3) of 2014 Tariff Regulations. He submitted that power flow started in case of Ckts 1 and 2 of Asset-C w.e.f. 22.1.2019 and 23.1.2019 respectively. There is marginal time over-run of 3 months mainly due to delay in obtaining forest clearance and requested to condone the same. He submitted that the estimated completion cost is within the FR cost. He also submitted that the



subject assets were put into commercial operation within the timeline specified in the 2014 Tariff Regulations and hence eligible for grant of additional RoE@ 0.5%. He submitted that petitioner has filed rejoinder to the reply of TANGEDCO. He prayed that the tariff as claimed in the petition may be allowed.

2. Learned counsel for TANGEDCO submitted that there is huge over-estimation in the FR cost. The estimated completion cost is within the FR cost even though there is huge increase in cost of certain items. He further submitted that the reasons given for variation in cost are standard and no proper justification for the variation is given by the petitioner. He requested to direct the petitioner to submit the valid reasons for variation in the cost of the assets.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the detailed reasons for variation in cost of the assets on affidavit by 6.5.2019 with an advance copy to TANGEDCO and other respondents.

4. After hearing the parties, the Commission reserved order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

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

