

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 87/TT/2017**

**Coram:**

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

**Date of Order: 1.8.2019**

**In the matter of:**

Determination of transmission tariff for 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) line and 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chattisgarh) line in accordance with the directions in order dated 16.7.2018 in Petition No. 2/RP/2018.

**And in the matter of:**

Madhya Pradesh Power Transmission Company Limited  
Block No. 2, Shakti Bhawan  
Rampur, Jabalpur-482 008

.....**Petitioner**

**Vs**

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

.....**Respondent**

**For Petitioner** : Shri Vincent D'souza, MPPTCL  
Shri S. R. Sharma, Advocate, MPPTCL  
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, MPPTCL  
Shri Mukesh Kori, MPPTCL

**For Respondent** : Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL  
Shri S. K. Venkatesan, PGCIL  
Shri Amit Yadav, PGCIL  
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL



## **ORDER**

Madhya Pradesh Power Transmission Company Limited (MPPTCL) filed the instant petition for approval of transmission tariff of 400 kV transmission lines, namely, 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) and 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chhattisgarh) lines carrying inter-State power, for the period 2011-14, for inclusion in computation of point of connection transmission charges in accordance with the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as “the 2009 Tariff Regulations”) and the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Sharing of Inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulations, 2010 (hereinafter referred to as “the 2010 Sharing Regulations”).

### **Background**

2. MPPTCL is a company registered under Company Act, 1956 for the purpose of undertaking transmission activities in the State of Madhya Pradesh. It has been declared as the State Transmission Utility (STU) by the Government of Madhya Pradesh under Section 39(1) of the Electricity Act, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”) and is deemed transmission licensee under Section 14 of the Act.

3. MPPTCL filed Petition No.217/TT/2013, as per the directions in order dated 14.3.2012 in Petition No.15/SM/2012, for determination of tariff of 9 transmission lines owned by it and connecting Madhya Pradesh with other States in accordance with the 2009 Tariff Regulations for inclusion in the computation of PoC charges. The details of the said 9 transmission lines are as under:-



Srl. No.	Name of Line	Voltage Level	Connecting States	COD
1	220 kV Malanpur-Auraiya	220 kV	MP-UP	23.1.1993
2	220 kV Mehgaon-Auraiya	220 kV	MP-UP	23.1.1993
3	220 kV Badod-Kota	220 kV	MP-Rajasthan	12.8.1977
4	220 kV Badod-Modak	220 kV	MP-Rajasthan	27.12.1988
5	220 kV Kalmeshwar-Pandhurna	220 kV	MP-Maharashtra	1972
6	220 kV Kotmilkala-Amarkantak-Ck.I	220 kV	MP-Chhattisgarh	March,1975
7	220 kV Kotmilkala-Amarkantak-Ck.II	220 kV	MP-Chhattisgarh	July,1979
8	400 kV Sardar Sarovar-Rajgarh-Ck-I	400 kV	MP-Gujarat	20.10.2004
9	400 kV Sardar Sarovar-Rajgarh-Ck-II	400 kV	MP-Gujarat	20.10.2004

4. Subsequent to filing Petition No. 217/TT/2013, MPPTCL and Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited, Respondent No.2, requested the Commission to also consider and include 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) and 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chattisgarh) transmission lines in Petition No. 217/TT/2013 as these were considered as inter-State transmission lines between the State of Chhattisgarh and the State of Madhya Pradesh and the power flow was occurring in these two lines. However, the Commission vide order dated 15.10.2015 observed that the STU lines used for carrying inter-State power can be considered for inclusion in PoC only if it is certified by the RPC in terms of Para 2.1.3 of Annexure I to the 2010 Sharing Regulations. Accordingly, tariff only for 9 transmission lines, mentioned in the table above at paragraph 3 was allowed vide order dated 15.10.2015 and tariff for 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) and 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chattisgarh) transmission lines was not allowed.

5. Subsequently, the Western Regional Power Committee (WRPC) in its 31<sup>st</sup> meeting approved 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) as deemed ISTS line and 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chattisgarh) as natural ISTS line for the purpose of inclusion in the PoC computation and MPPTCL, thereafter, filed the present petition. The



Commission vide order dated 3.11.2017 in the present petition observed that MPPTCL claimed the tariff for the two transmission lines retrospectively and allowing tariff would require revision of PoC charges retrospectively and would also require adjustment of the ARR already allowed by MPERC and hence the Commission did not grant tariff for the two transmission lines. The relevant portion of the order dated 3.11.2017 is as follows:-

“8. We have considered the submissions made by MPPTCL. MPPTCL has claimed transmission tariff for two inter-State transmission lines retrospectively for the 2009-14 tariff period. As in the case of RRVPNL, the instant transmission lines are part of the State network. MPERC had already granted ARR for the State network for the 2009-14 period which is inclusive of the YTC of the transmission lines covered in the instant petition. As such, MPPTCL has already recovered tariff for these lines. Further, PoC charges for the 2011-14 period have been processed and recovered. Granting of tariff for these transmission lines afresh by this Commission and inclusion in the PoC charges would lead to revision of PoC charges retrospectively. It would also require revision/adjustment of the ARR already granted by MPERC for 2009-14 period. Hence, we are not inclined to allow YTC for these lines for the period 2011-14. MPPTCL has already filed the petition claiming tariff for the inter-State transmission lines owned by it for the 2014-19 tariff period under the 2014 Tariff Regulations and accordingly tariff will be allowed as per the relevant regulations.

9. In view of the above discussion, tariff is not allowed for the instant assets for the 2009-14 period. The filing fee deposited by MPPTCL in the instant case shall be adjusted in future.”

6. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid order, the petitioner preferred a Review Petition No. 2/RP/2018 seeking a review and modification of the order dated 3.11.2017. The main grounds raised therein for the review are as under: -

“...The Review Petitioner has submitted that the Commission’s decision that the transmission charges should not be revised after the expiry of the control period is erroneous as the tariff setting is a continuous and on-going process. The Review Petitioner has submitted that tariff applicable for any period is bound to be revised from time to time on account of various aspects including fresh determination of tariff or decision by the Appellate Authority after the control period is over. The Review Petitioner has submitted that the Commission has ignored the fact that the revenue recovered in terms of the tariff order issued by the MPERC treating the said lines as intra-State transmission lines would be adjusted in future under the Sharing Regulations and the Review Petitioner will not be recovering any extra amount. The Review Petitioner has further submitted that consumers of the State will suffer financial prejudice and loss if the transmission charges are not determined for the two lines for the control period 2011-14 and allowed to be recovered by the Review Petitioner.”



7. The Commission vide order dated 16.7.2018 observed that the rejection of Petition No. 87/TT/2017 needed to be revisited and withdrew the order dated 3.11.2017 rejecting the tariff petition. The relevant portions of the said order are reproduced below:-

“10. We have considered the submissions of the Review Petitioner. In order dated 15.10.2015 in Petition No. 217/TT/2013, the Commission had returned the following finding while disallowing the tariff in respect of 2 transmission lines:-

“5. Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Company Limited renamed as Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited (MPPMCL), Respondent No. 2 has submitted in its reply dated 9.7.2015 that the petitioner has not included Bhilai-Seoni and 400 kV Seoni-Sarni lines in the petition. MPPMCL has further submitted that these two lines were considered as inter-state transmission lines between the State of Chhattisgarh and the State of Madhya Pradesh in the Commissions’ order dated 20.2.2012 in Petition No. 193/MP/2012, which was upheld by the Hon’ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity vide order dated 18.2.2015 in Appeal No. 95/2014. As such, it is prudent to consider these two lines also, belonging to the petitioner, in the instant petition. The petitioner in its rejoinder dated 29.6.2015 has submitted that the Commission may also consider to direct the Regional Power Committee and implementing agency of PoC charges to include all such lines belonging to the petitioner.

6. We have considered the submissions of both the respondent and the petitioner. The STU lines used for carrying inter-State power can be considered for inclusion in the PoC charges only if it is certified by RPC in terms of para 2.1.3 of the Annexure-I to Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Sharing of inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulation, 2010, .....

11. However, after that Review Petitioner filed Petition No. 87/TT/2017 supported by WRPC certificate, the petition was rejected on the ground that the control period is over and it would require retrospective revision of the PoC charges. However, in the past, the Commission had determined the tariff even after the expiry of the control period. Since the transmission lines are used for conveying inter-state power, tariff needs to be included in the PoC charges. Otherwise, the Review Petitioner would be deprived of its legitimate charges for use of its transmission lines. Considering the above factors, we are of the view that rejection of the Petition No. 87/TT/2017 needs to be revisited. Accordingly, we withdraw our order rejecting the tariff petition of the Review Petitioner. The Petition No. 87/TT/2017 shall be listed for hearing and tariff of the assets covered would be determined.”

### **Analysis and Decision**

8. In view of the above order, the matter was reheard on 28.2.2019. After having heard the petitioner and perused the material on record, we proceed to determine the transmission charges for the two 400 kV lines, namely, Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP)



and Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chhattisgarh) Transmission lines for the period from 2011-12 to 2013-14, for inclusion in computation of point of connection transmission charges.

9. Section 2(36) of the Electricity Act, defines the inter-State transmission system, as under:-

“2(36) inter-State transmission system includes-

- (i) any system for the conveyance of electricity by means of main transmission line from the territory of one State to another State;
- (ii) the conveyance of electricity across the territory of any intervening State as well as conveyance within the State which is incidental to such inter-State transmission of electricity;
- (iii) the transmission of electricity within the territory of a State on a system built, owned, operated, maintained or controlled by a Central Transmission Utility;”

10. As per the above definition, the conveyance of electricity from territory of one State to another State is considered to be part of inter-State Transmission System. The petitioner has submitted that the instant two transmission lines qualify as inter-State lines as they are used for carrying inter-State power.

11. The STU lines used for carrying inter-State power can be considered for inclusion in the PoC charges only if it is certified by RPC in terms of para 2.1.3 of Annexure-I to the 2010 Sharing Regulations, as extracted hereunder:-

“The line-wise YTC of the entire network shall be provided by the Transmission Licensees. In case a line is likely to be commissioned during the Application Period, the data in respect of the same, along with the anticipated COD will be provided by the CTU/ Transmission Licensee to the Implementing Agency.

For the determination of the transmission charges based on Hybrid Methodology applicable in the next Application Period, all the above data shall be provided to the Implementing Agency as per the timelines specified by the Implementing Agency.

Overall charges to be allocated among nodes shall be computed by adopting the YTC of transmission assets of the ISTS licensees, deemed ISTS licensees and owners of the non-ISTS lines which have been certified by the respective Regional Power Committee (RPC) for carrying inter-State power. The Yearly Transmission Charge, computed for assets at each voltage level and conductor configuration in accordance with the provisions of these regulations shall be calculated for each ISTS transmission licensee based on indicative cost provided by the Central Transmission Utility for different voltage levels and conductor configurations. The YTC for the RPC certified non-ISTS lines which carry inter-State power shall be approved by the Appropriate Commission.



In case line-wise tariff for the RPC certified non-ISTS lines has not been specified by the Appropriate Commission, the tariff as computed for the relevant voltage level and conductor configuration shall be used. The methodology for computation of tariff of individual asset shall be similar to the methodology adopted for the ISTS transmission licensees and shall be based on ARR of the STU as approved by the respective State Commission.

Certification of non-ISTS lines carrying inter-State power, which were not approved by the RPCs on the date of notification of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Sharing of Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulations, 2009, shall be done on the basis of load flow studies. For this purpose, STU shall put up proposal to the respective RPC Secretariat for approval. RPC Secretariat, in consultation with RLDC, using Web Net Software would examine the proposal. The results of the load flow studies and participation factor indicating flow of Inter State power on these lines shall be used to compute the percentage of usage of these lines as inter State transmission. The software in the considered scenario will give percentage of usage of these lines by home State and other than home State. For testing the usage, tariff of similar ISTS line may be used. The tariff of the line will also be allocated by software to the home State and other than home State. Based on percentage usage of ISTS in base case, RPC will approve whether the particular State line is being used as ISTS or not. Concerned STU will submit asset-wise tariff. If asset wise tariff is not available, STU will file petition before the Commission for approval of tariff of such lines. The tariff in respect of these lines shall be computed based on Approved ARR and it shall be allocated to lines of different voltage levels and configurations on the basis of methodology which is being done for ISTS lines.”

12. MPPTCL has submitted that Western Regional Power Committee (WRPC) in its 31<sup>st</sup> meeting has certified the 400 kV Seoni (MP) – Bhilai (Chattisgarh) transmission lines as natural ISTS line and 400 kV Seoni (MP) – Sarni (MP) transmission line as deemed ISTS line for the purpose of PoC computation and the letter of WRPC dated 7.6.2016 to this effect has also been filed. The relevant extract of the said letter is reproduced below:-

“ ....In the 31<sup>st</sup> WRPC meeting, the 400kV Seoni (MP) – Sarni (MP) was recommended to be considered as deemed ISTS line for the purpose of PoC computation based on the above results. The 400kV Seoni (MP) – Bhilai (Chattisgarh) is Natural ISTS and so approved under PoC without certification of WRPC.”

13. As WRPC has certified the instant transmission lines as Natural/deemed inter-State transmission lines, we are of the view that they are to be considered for inclusion in PoC computations.





## Length of the lines

14. The details of the line length claimed by the petitioner are as under:-

Srl. No.	Assets	Name of Line	COD	Total Line length in Ckt. km.	Line length in Ckt.km claimed
1	Asset-1	400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP)	25.9.1985	375.00	145.83
2	Asset-2	400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chhattisgarh).	25.9.1985		150.90
<b>Total</b>					<b>296.73</b>

15. MPPTCL has submitted that the 400 kV DCSS Sarni-Bhilai line was put into commercial operation on 20.9.1985. On execution of LILO at Seoni by PGCIL, the same was bifurcated into 400 kV DCSS Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) and 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (CG) sections on 20.6.2007. The entire portion of the Seoni-Sarni portion and a part of the Sarni-Bhilai portion are within the geographical area and jurisdiction of Madhya Pradesh. Accordingly, tariff only for the portion of the line which is owned by MPPTCL is claimed in the instant petition. The LILO at Seoni Sub-station was constructed by PGCIL and has not been considered in total length.

16. We have considered the submissions of MPPTCL regarding line length and we consider only the portion of line that comes under jurisdiction of the petitioner for the purpose of calculation of Yearly Transmission Charges (YTC).

## Methodology for calculating YTC

17. MPPTCL has submitted that the instant assets were put into commercial operation long ago and hence their capital cost is not available. MPPTCL has submitted that the procedure adopted by the Commission for determination of the





YTC of 9 ISTS lines of MPPTCL in Petition No. 217/TT/2013 may be considered for claiming the YTC for the instant assets.

18. In order dated 15.10.2015 in Petition No.217/TT/2013, in the absence of capital cost of the assets, we have considered the indicative cost of lines of various configurations owned and operated by PGCIL for arriving at the capital cost of the transmission lines of MPPTCL. We adopt the same methodology for computation of capital cost as per assumptions as below:-

a) Indicative cost of 400 kV D/C Quad Moose transmission line has been taken as base and indicative cost of lines with configurations other than 400 kV D/C Quad Moose have been expressed with reference to the indicative cost of 400 kV D/C Quad Moose (i.e. by dividing indicative cost of the 400 kV D/C Quad Moose line by the indicative cost of line of other configurations).

b) The indicative data of PGCIL is for voltage level upto 132 kV, but in the case of lines of 66 kV level, it has been added to 132 kV level and considered such derived indicative cost of 132 kV level as indicative cost for all transmission lines having voltage level of 132 kV and below.

19. The yearly break-up of indicative cost of various configurations owned and operated by PGCIL is hereunder:-

**For 2013-14**

Srl. No.	LINE TYPE	COST (₹ lakh/km)	Cost per Circuit	Coefficient	Ratio w.r.t. f
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
1.	± 500 kV HVDC	0.00	0.00	a	0.00
2.	±800 kV HVDC	0.00	0.00	b	0.00
3.	765 kV D/C	412.00	206.00	c	0.56



Srl. No.	LINE TYPE	COST (₹ lakh/km)	Cost per Circuit	Coefficient	Ratio w.r.t. f
4.	765 kV S/C	179.80	179.80	d	0.65
6	400 kV D/C Twin-Moose	130.40	65.20	e	1.78
7	400 kV D/C Quad. Moose	232.60	116.30	f	1.00
8	400 kV S/C Twin-Moose	87.00	87.00	g	1.34
9	220 kV D/C	61.40	30.70	h	3.79
10	220 kV S/C	37.80	37.80	l	3.08
11	132 kV D/C	48.40	24.20	J	4.81
12	132 kV S/C	30.00	30.00	k	3.88

**For 2012-13**

Srl. No.	LINE TYPE	COST (₹ lakh/km)	Cost per Circuit	Coefficient	Ratio w.r.t. f
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
1.	+ 500 kV HVDC	0.00	0.00	a	0.00
2.	+800 kV HVDC	0.00	0.00	b	0.00
3.	765 kV D/C	357.00	178.50	c	0.63
4.	765 kV S/C	179.20	179.20	d	0.63
6	400 kV D/C Twin-Moose	122.60	61.30	e	1.83
7	400 kV D/C Quad. Moose	224.80	112.40	f	1.00
8	400 kV S/C Twin-Moose	84.20	84.20	g	1.33
9	220 kV D/C	67.80	33.90	h	3.32
10	220 kV S/C	41.40	41.40	l	2.71
11	132 kV D/C	53.00	26.50	J	4.24
12	132 kV S/C	32.40	32.40	k	3.47

**For 2011-12**

Srl. No.	LINE TYPE	Cost (₹ lakh/km)	Cost per Circuit	Coefficient	Ratio w.r.t. f
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
1.	+ 500 kV HVDC	0.00	0.00	a	0.00
2.	+800 kV HVDC	0.00	0.00	b	0.00
3.	765 kV D/C	315.25	157.63	c	0.64
4.	765 kV S/C	159.25	159.25	d	0.63
6	400 kV D/C Twin-Moose	109.50	54.75	e	1.84
7	400 kV D/C Quad. Moose	202.00	101.00	f	1.00
8	400 kV S/C Twin-Moose	74.25	74.25	g	1.36
9	220 kV D/C	59.50	29.75	h	3.39
10	220 kV S/C	37.00	37.00	l	2.73
11	132 kV D/C	46.75	23.38	J	4.32
12	132 kV S/C	28.50	28.50	k	3.54



20. After getting the ratio with respect to 400 kV D/C Quad Moose, YTC per ckt. km of 400 kV D/C Quad Moose transmission line has been calculated as follows:-

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ARR for FY.....in ₹} \\ & \text{.....} \\ \{YTC \text{ per ckt. km}\} = & [400 \text{ kV D/C Quad Moose (Length of 500 kV HVDC/a)+} \\ & (\text{Length of 800 kV HVDC/b}) + (\text{Length of 765 kV DC/c}) + \\ & (\text{Length of 765 kV SC/d}) + (\text{Length of 400 kV DC TM /e}) \\ & (\text{Length of 400 kV DC QM/f}) + (\text{Length of 400 kV SC TM /g}) + \\ & (\text{Length of 220 kV DC /h}) + (\text{Length of 220 kV SC /i}) + (\text{Length} \\ & \text{of 132 kV DC /j}) + (\text{Length of 132 kV SC /k})] \end{aligned}$$

\*value of a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i & j are as given in para 19 and length in ckt. km. as given in para 14 above.

DC- Double Circuit, SC- Single Circuit, QM- Quad Moose, TM- Twin Moose

21. We have not carried out any due diligence of the tariff of these lines (for consideration of PoC calculations) as the tariff of the lines owned by STU has already been determined by the State Electricity Regulatory Commission. We have considered the ARR of the STU as approved by the State Electricity Regulatory Commission and have adopted the methodology as discussed in Para 17 to 21 of this order for the purpose of calculation of PoC charges and apportionment of transmission lines and charges to the transmission system of different configurations of the STU. This methodology has been adopted uniformly (for the tariff period 2011-2014) for the lines owned by other STUs used for inter-State transmission of power duly certified by respective RPCs for the purpose of inclusion in the PoC mechanism.



22. The petitioner has submitted the voltage-wise length of line in Ckt. km. and has also submitted ARR approved by the MPERC for 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14. Details in respect of period claimed 2011-14 are as follows:-

Sr No.	Voltage	Configuration	Ckt. km		
			2013-14	2012-13	2011-12
1.	400 kV	DCDS	2193.76	1794.45	1689.33
		SCSS	653.30	653.68	653.68
		<b>Total</b>	<b>2847.06</b>	<b>2448.13</b>	<b>2343.01</b>
2.	220 kV	DCDS	10015.91	9909.60	9740.04
		SCSS	1444.05	1423.37	1345.37
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11459.954</b>	<b>11332.973</b>	<b>11085.409</b>
3.	132 kV	DCDS	6812.54	6695.07	5896.82
		DCSS	4911.62	4414.13	4766.16
		SCSS	2978.60	2970.25	3027.25
		<b>Total</b>	<b>14702.76</b>	<b>14079.444</b>	<b>13690.228</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>29009.77</b>	<b>27860.547</b>	<b>27118.65</b>

(₹ in crore)

Srl. No.	Year	Amount	Remarks
1.	2011-12	1550.23	As per true-up order dated 11.11.2013
2.	2012-13	1701.18	As per true-up order dated 21.8.2014
3.	2013-14	1923.92	As per true-up order dated 28.4.2015

#### YTC of two transmission lines

23. YTC per Ckt. km for 400 kV S/C line considered for MPPTCL lines is as under:-

(In Rs)

Voltage Level	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
400 kV S/C	1369442.00	1466750.93	1737193.92

24. YTC of the two transmission lines calculated as per the methodology discussed above is as follows:-

(in Rs )



Srl. No.	Line Name	Length (Ckt km)	2011-12* (1.7.2011 to 31.3.2012)	2012-13	2013-14
1	400 kV Seoni (MP) – Sarni (MP)	145.83	149779295.14	213896288.12	253334989.35
2	400 KV Seoni (MP) – Bhilai (Chattisgarh)	150.90	154986589.30	221332715.33	262142562.53
	<b>Total</b>	<b>296.73</b>	<b>304765884.44</b>	<b>435229003.45</b>	<b>515477551.88</b>

\*YTC for 9 months has been taken as per Sharing of Inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses Regulations, 2010 which came into force from 1.7.2011.

### Sharing of Transmission Charges

25. In response to the query of the Commission during the hearing on 03.08.2017 as to whether these lines were included in ARR granted by the State Commission, MPPTCL, vide affidavit dated 19.8.2017, has submitted that the ARR of MPPTCL approved by MPERC is for the whole transmission network and being a part of the network, ARR of these 2 lines, namely 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) and 400 KV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chattisgarh), are included in the ARR approved by MPERC over the period 2009-14. The petitioner has further submitted that the constituent of the WR viz. CSPTCL is utilizing these lines for inter-State flow of power and thus, the point of connection charges (PoC Charges) towards these two lines should be credited to the account of MPPTCL. Further, in compliance to directives of the Commission that the utilizing agency should bear the charges and the benefits should be passed on to the end consumer, MPPTCL has stated that the benefits arising out of the PoC Charges through these two lines will be passed on to the Long Term Open Access customers of Madhya Pradesh, thereby providing relief to the Long Term Open Access customers of the State.



26. We have considered the submissions made by MPPTCL. We are of the view that the annual transmission charges allowed for the assets covered in the instant petition shall be considered in the YTC as per the 2010 Sharing Regulations and shall be adjusted against the ARR of the petitioner as approved by the State Commission.

27. Accordingly, Petition No. 87/TT/2017 is disposed of.

Sd/-  
**(I.S. Jha)**  
**Member**

Sd/-  
**(Dr. M. K. Iyer)**  
**Member**

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

