

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 268/TT/2018**

- Subject** : Approval of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for NRSSS-XIX in Northern Region.
- Date of Hearing** : 9.4.2019
- 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** : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. and 17 others
- Parties present** : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri S. K. Niranjana, PGCIL  
Shri V. P. Rastogi, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that instant petition is filed for determination of tariff for **Asset-I**: One No. 220 kV line Bays (205 no. Bay) associated with Baghpat GIS Sub-station **Asset-II**: One No. 220 kV line Bays (210 no. Bay) associated with Baghpat GIS Sub-station, **Asset-III**: One No. 220 kV line Bays (206 no. Bay) associated with Baghpat GIS Sub-station, **Asset-IV**: One No. 220 kV line Bays (207 no. Bay) associated with Baghpat GIS Sub-station and **Asset-V**: One No. 220 kV line Bays (212 no. Bay) associated with Baghpat GIS Sub-station under “Northern Region System Strengthening Scheme- XIX” in Northern Region”.

2. He submitted that the instant assets were scheduled to be put into commercial operation on 15.2.2012 as per the Investment Approval dated 16.2.2009. The instant assets were charged on “no load” condition on 3.7.2016, 3.7.2016, 20.8.2016, 26.1.2017 and 26.6.2017 respectively and there is a time over-run ranging from 52 months to 59 months. He sought the COD of the instant assets under proviso (ii) of the Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations as the instant assets were not put into commercial operation because of the delay in COD of the downstream network of UPPTCL. The completion cost of the instant assets is more than the FR apportioned approved cost but it is within the RCE. He further requested for grant of AFC for the instant assets under Regulation 7(7) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations for inclusion in the PoC computation.



3. The learned counsel for BRPL submitted that some of the bays are not charged and the mismatch between the COD of the instant assets and the downstream assets of UPPTCL is due to the lack of co-ordination by the petitioner. He submitted that the COD of an asset can be approved only when they are put into regular use and in this case they have not been put into regular use and hence COD of these assets may not be approved. As the instant assets have not been put to regular use, they should be excluded from the capital cost of the project as provided under Regulation 9(6) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

4. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that in similar other cases, the Commission had approved the COD of the assets under proviso (ii) of the Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. He further submitted that the reply was received only yesterday and sought time to file rejoinder in the matter.

5. The Commission observed that the matter will be decided after hearing UPPTCL. The Commission also directed the petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, by 14.5.2019. The parties shall comply with the directions within the due date mentioned above and no extension of time shall be granted.

6. The next date hearing will be intimated in due course of time.

By order of the Commission

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

