

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 100/TT/2020

Subject : Petition for truing up of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of the 2019-24 period for 08 nos. of assets under “Eastern Region Strengthening Scheme-VIII” in Eastern Region

Date of Hearing : 24.8.2020

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.
& 5 Others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri Venkatesh, Adv., BSPHCL
Shri Ashutosh K. Srivastava Adv., BSPHCL

Record of Proceedings

The matter was heard through video conference.

2. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for truing up of tariff of the 2014-19 period and determination of tariff for the 2019-24 period in respect of 08 nos. of assets under “Eastern Region Strengthening Scheme-VIII” in Eastern Region.

3. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that COD of 2 nos. of 220 kV bays at Subhashgram Sub-station was claimed in Petition No.206/TT/2016 as part of Asset-VI under proviso (ii) of Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations as the downstream asset under the scope of WBSETCL was not ready. However, the Commission vide order dated 29.9.2017 did not approve the COD nor granted tariff for 2 nos. of 220 kV bays at Subhashgram Sub-station and directed to file a fresh petition matching with the downstream network of WBSETCL. He submitted that the downstream network of



WBSETCL has not been put into commercial operation yet and, therefore, tariff for 2 nos. of 220 kV bays is not claimed in the instant petition.

4. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that tariff for Asset-VII, the 2x50 MVAR line reactors, was not allowed in order dated 29.9.2017 in Petition No. 206/TT/2016 and the Commission directed that tariff shall be determined after de-capitalization of the reactor from its original project (Kahalgaon Stage-II Phase-I) and actually capitalized under current project (ERSS VIII). Accordingly, the tariff for Asset-VII is claimed, after the reactor is de-capitalized in Patna and re-capitalised in Balia, in the current petition as per the directions of the Commission.

5. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that overall completion cost is within the RCE cost.

6. In response to Commission's observation that the date of de-capitalization and re-capitalization cannot be in a gap of one day, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that Asset-VII was de-capitalised in November, 2014 and re-capitalized on 10.2.2016. However, PGCIL has considered the gap of one day for continuity of tariff as per their understanding, since the shifting the asset was not the Petitioner's decision as it was in compliance of the direction of the Standing Committee and RPC.

7. Learned Counsel for BSPHCL, Respondent No.1, sought two weeks' time to file reply to the petition. The Commission, while granting time, directed BSPHCL to file reply in future in all petitions in time and observed that no extension of time will be granted in future.

8. The Commission further directed the Respondents, including BSPHCL, to file their reply by 7.9.2020 and the Petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, by 14.9.2020. The Commission further directed the Parties to adhere to the above-specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

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

By order of the Commission

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

