

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Review Petition No. 46/RP/2018  
in Petition No. 192/TT/2017**

**Coram:**

**Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member**

**Date of Order : 07.02.2019**

**In the matter of:**

Review petition under Section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 103 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999, seeking review of order dated 9.10.2018 in Petition No. 192/TT/2017.

**And in the matter of:**

Power Grid Corporation of India Limited  
"Saudamini", Plot No. 2,  
Sector-29, Gurgaon -122 001

**.... Review Petitioner**

**Vs**

1. Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited,  
Shakti Bhawan, Rampur,  
Jabalpur-482 008
2. Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited,  
Prakashgad, 4th Floor, Andheri (East),  
Mumbai-400 052
3. Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited,  
Sardar Patel Vidyut Bhawan, Race Course Road,  
Vadodara-390 007
4. Electricity Department, Government of Goa,  
Vidyut Bhawan, Panaji, Near Mandvi Hotel,  
Goa-403 001
5. Electricity Department,  
Administration of Daman and Diu,  
Daman-396 210
6. Electricity Department,  
Administration of Dadra Nagar Haveli U.T.,



Silvassa-396 230

7. Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board,  
P.O. Sunder Nagar, Dangania, Raipur,  
Chhattisgarh-492 013
8. Madhya Pradesh Audyogik Kendra Vikas Nigam (Indore) Limited,  
3/54, Press Complex, Agra-Bombay Road,  
Indore-452 008

...Respondents

**For petitioner** : Shri Sitiesh Mukherjee, Advocate, PGCIL  
Shri Divyanshu Bhatt, Advocate, PGCIL  
Shri Deep Rao, Advocate, PGCIL  
Shri Abhay Choudhary, PGCIL  
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri Pankaj Sharma, PGCIL

**For respondents** : None

### **ORDER**

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "Review Petitioner") has filed the instant review petition seeking review and modification of the order dated 9.10.2018 in Petition No. 192/TT/2017. Tariff was allowed for Asset I: 400 kV D/C Aurangabad-Boisar TL {from Aurangabad Sub-station to location 313/0 on D/C Towers & from location 332/0 to Boisar Sub-station on Multi circuit towers} and Asset II: Part of 400 kV D/C Navsari-Boisar TL from location 332/0 to Boisar Sub-station on Multi circuit towers under IPPs generation projects in Chhattisgarh (IPP D) in Western Region. The COD of the instant assets was allowed as claimed by the Review Petitioner. However, the IDC was restricted as the details about the foreign loan component submitted by the Review Petitioner were not sufficient to calculate the IDC.



2. The Review Petitioner has submitted that IDC of ₹1869 lakh out of the total IDC of ₹17552.69 lakh was disallowed in the impugned order erroneously. The Review Petitioner has submitted that the basis for such disallowance appears to be a purported difference in calculation for which no basis was allegedly provided by the Review Petitioner. However, the details of the loans procured by the Review Petitioner for the construction of the transmission assets which included foreign loans availed by the Review Petitioner was not taken into cognizance in the impugned order. The details of all these loans were duly placed on record by the Review Petitioner in Form 9C of the tariff filing forms. The amount of IDC disallowed roughly comes out to be equal to the IDC for the foreign loan component of the total debt. The Review Petitioner has submitted that relevant documents and material facts placed on the record were not considered in the impugned order. The Review Petitioner further submitted that it was not provided with an adequate opportunity to explain this difference in computation. This constitutes an error apparent on the face of record and raises a valid ground for review and modification of the impugned order.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner and perused the record. Admit the Review Petition and issue notice to the Respondents.

4. The Review Petitioner is directed to serve a copy of the review petition on the respondents by 12.2.2019. The respondents shall file their reply by 28.2.2019, with advance copy to the Review Petitioner, who shall file its rejoinder, if any, by 11.3.2019. The parties shall ensure completion of pleadings within the due date as mentioned above.



5. Matter shall be listed for hearing in due course for which separate notices shall be issued to the parties.

**sd/  
(Dr. M.K. Iyer)  
Member**

**sd/-  
(P.K. Pujari)  
Chairperson**

