

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 283/TT/2018

- Subject :** Petition for determination of transmission tariff for Asset-I: 50 MVAR Line reactor at Jaipur (South) in 400 kV D/C Kota- Jaipur (South) line (Part of 400 kV D/C Rapp- Jaipur TL) utilized as Bus reactor at Jaipur (south) Sub-station and Asset-II:400 kV D/C Kota - Jaipur (South) line along with associated bays at Kota and Jaipur(South)(part of RAPP-Jaipur (S) 400KV D/C line with one ckt LILO at Kota)under “Transmission system associated with RAPP 7 & 8, Part-B” in Northern Region” for 2009-14 tariff period.
- Date of Hearing :** 16.10.2019
- 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 Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited & 17 Ors
- Parties present :** Shri R.B Sharma, Advocate, BRPL & BYPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL & BYPL
Ms. Sanya Sud, Advocate, BRPL & BYPL
Ms. Shreya Seth, NPCIL
Shri S.S.Raju, PGCIL
Shri B.D Das, PGCIL
Shri A.K Verma, PGCIL
Shri V.P Rastogi, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for determination of transmission tariff for the subject assets under “Transmission System associated with RAPP 7 & 8, Part-B” in Northern Region for 2014-19 tariff period. He further submitted that Asset-I 50 MVAR Line reactor at Jaipur (South) in 400 kV D/C Kota-Jaipur (South) line (Part of 400 kV D/C RAPP-Jaipur TL) used as bus reactor at Jaipur (South) Sub-station was put into commercial operation on 5.3.2018 and Asset-II



400 kV D/C Kota-Jaipur (South) line alongwith associated bays at Kota and Jaipur (South) (part of RAPP-Jaipur (S) 400 kV D/C line with one ckt LILo at Kota) was put into commercial operation on 23.3.2019. He submitted that there is time over-run of 3-4 months in execution of Asset-I which is attributable to delay in execution of Kota-Jaipur (South) line i.e. Asset-II. He also submitted that time over-run in case of Asset-II is of 15 months and 27 days which is mainly due to delay in grant of approvals and ROW issues. He submitted that LTA quantum of 1400 MW operationalized from 12.4.2019 and NPCIL generation pertains to RAPP 7 and 8 which is anticipated to be commissioned in March, 2020. He submitted that in terms of Implementation Agreement executed between NPCIL and the petitioner, the zero date for Kota-Jaipur (South) 400 kV D/C line (part of RAPP-Jaipur (South) 400 kV D/C line with one circuit LILoed at Kota) alongwith associated bays at both end is 1.12.2017.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the information sought in RoP dated 24.5.2019 was submitted vide affidavit dated 19.6.2019. He further submitted that they could not file rejoinder to the reply filed by NPCIL and they have given a written request to the Commission on 14.10.2019 to condone the delay in filing rejoinder to the reply of NPCIL and prayed that they may be permitted to file the rejoinder and upload the same on e-filing portal.

3. Learned counsel for BRPL and BYPL submitted that the tariff claimed for Asset-II 400 kV D/C Kota-Jaipur (South) line cannot be allowed as the Investment Approval granted to the petitioner is for RAPP-Jaipur (South) 400 kV line and not for Kota-Jaipur (South) line. He submitted that RAPP 7 and 8-Jaipur (South) 400 kV line was not complete upto Jaipur and the line shunt reactor from bus at RAPP end was to be installed by NPCIL and at Jaipur end it was to be installed by the petitioner. He further submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the use of line reactor as bus reactor is highly objectionable as it serves only the commercial interest of the petitioner and not the voltage stability. He submitted that transmission tariff of Kota-Jaipur (South) line cannot be granted as it was incomplete and against the spirit of Regulation 6(1) of 2014 Tariff Regulations as well as against principles enunciated in the judgment of Appellate Tribunal dated 18.1.2018 in Appeal Nos. 198 of 2015 and 6 of 2016. He objected to allowing the charges relating to realignment line works near Kota submitting that it is the duty of the petitioner to do the correct alignment of the line and for realignment of line beneficiaries should not be burdened.

4. In response, the representatives of the petitioner clarified that Investment Approval clearly mentions the line as Kota-Jaipur (South) 400 kV D/C line (part of RAPP-Jaipur (South) 400 kV D/C line with one ckt. LILoed at Kota). He further submitted that RAPP-Jaipur line was divided into two parts, one of which was RAPP-Kota line and the other was Kota Jaipur line. Regarding RAPP-Kota line, he submitted that it was part of RAPP-7 and 8 that was executed long ago and they have also received its tariff. He submitted that as a measure of contingency arrangement for the present case, double circuit line was LILoed at Kota on RAPP-Jaipur line and the same was covered in



Petition No. 206/TT/2017. He further submitted that present petition is filed for Kota-Jaipur D/C line wherein tariff is claimed for 3 no. bays i.e. one bay at Kota and two bays at Jaipur. He clarified that they claimed and received the tariff for one bay at Kota in Petition No. 206/TT/2017 and it is for this reason that they did not claim four bays in the present petition. He submitted that the use of line reactor as bus reactor was approved in 40th NRPC and 37th TCC meeting held on 28.10.2017. He further submitted that realignment work was part of the scope of the Investment Approval.

5. After hearing, the Commission directed petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit with advance copy to the respondents by 15.11.2019:-

- a) Initial Spares discharge statement year-wise from SCOD to actual COD and thereafter for Asset-I;
- b) Statement showing rate of interest considered in the IDC statement against loan carrying floating rate of interest for the instant assets.
- c) Form 5 and Form 7 for Asset-II.
- d) There is a mismatch in the amount of loan as claimed in the IDC statement vis-à-vis Form 6 and Form 9C in respect of instant assets. Clarification for mismatch in loan amount between IDC statement vis-à-vis Form 6 and Form 9C.

6. The Commission further permitted the petitioner to file its rejoinder to the reply of NPCIL by 31.10.2019 and serve a copy thereof on the respondents.

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

By order of the Commission

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

