

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 475/TT/2019**

**Subject** : Petition for truing up of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of the 2019-24 period for 400 kV D/C Nabinagar - Sasaram Transmission Line and associated 400 kV line bays at Sasaram Sub-station under “Transmission System associated with immediate evacuation system for Nabinagar TPS” in Eastern Region

**Date of Hearing** : 10.8.2020

**Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Shri I. S. Jha, Member  
Shri Arun Goyal, Member

**Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

**Respondents** : Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Ltd.  
& 7 Others

**Parties present** : Shri Navin Prakash, Advocate, BSPHCL  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL  
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL

**Record of Proceedings**

The matter was heard through video conference.

2. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the instant petition has been filed for truing up of the tariff of the 2014-19 period and determination of tariff of the 2019-24 period in respect of 400 kV D/C Nabinagar -Sasaram Transmission Line and associated 400 kV line bays at Sasaram Sub-station under “Transmission System associated with immediate evacuation system for Nabinagar TPS” in Eastern Region. The instant asset was put into commercial operation on 1.7.2012.

3. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that tariff of the instant asset for the 2014-19 tariff period was approved by the Commission vide order dated 25.2.2016 in Petition No. 484/TT/2014. He submitted that there is a marginal variation between the



capital cost allowed in the said order and the actual capital cost claimed in the instant petition as on 31.3.2019. No Additional Capital Expenditure (ACE) has been projected beyond 2015-16 during the 2014-19 tariff period nor any ACE has been projected during the 2019-24 period. ACE claimed after the cut-off date i.e. 31.3.2015 is against undischarged liabilities for works already executed prior to cut-off date. The billing of the instant asset is being done in terms of order of the Commission dated 6.11.2018 in Petition No. 261/MP/2017, and out of 4 units of the generating station, 3 units have been put into commercial operation and 3/4<sup>th</sup> of the tariff is being billed as per the PoC mechanism, whereas, 1/4<sup>th</sup> of the tariff is being billed to BSPHCL. He also submitted that the Petitioner has submitted the information sought in the Technical Validation letter.

4. The learned counsel for BSPHCL submitted that ACE approved in the previous order was ₹106.07 lakh, whereas, the actual ACE was ₹12.20 lakh and ₹37.71 lakh during 2014-15 and 2015-16, respectively. He submitted that the Petitioner has not explained the reasons for ACE of ₹37.71 lakh after the cut-off date. He submitted that as regards ACE during 2014-15, BSPHCL is entitled for refund of the excess amount paid in accordance with Regulation 7(7)(iii) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

5. In response, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that ACE is on account of undischarged liabilities for works executed before the cut-off date and the same has been explained in the reply to the Technical Validation letter along with party-wise details.

6. After hearing the parties, the Commission directed the Petitioner to submit the reasons for reduction in ACE during the 2014-19 tariff period when compared to the ACE allowed vide order dated 25.2.2016 in Petition No. 484/TT/2014, on affidavit, by 2.9.2020 with an advance copy to the Respondents.

7. The Commission further directed the Petitioner to adhere to the above specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

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

**By order of the Commission**

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

