

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
New Delhi**

Petition No. 219/TT/2020

- Subject** : Petition for truing up of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 tariff period under 2014 Tariff Regulations and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 tariff period under 2019 Tariff Regulations for the assets under Transmission System associated with Krishnapatnam UMPP – PART-B.
- Date of Hearing** : 17.8.2021
- Coram** : Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri Pravas Kumar Singh, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
- Respondents** : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Ltd. and 24 others
- Parties Present** : Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri D.K. Biswal, PGCIL
Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri A.K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri Anindya Khare, MPPMCL
Dr. R.Kathiravan, TANGEDCO
Ms. R. Ramalakshmi, TANGEDCO
Shri R.Srinivasan, TANGEDCO

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. The representative of the Petitioner made the following submissions:
- a. Instant petition is filed for truing up of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 tariff period and determination of transmission tariff of the 2019-24 tariff period in respect of the assets covered in (a) order dated 31.5.2016 in Petition No. 418/TT/2014 and (b) order dated 10.12.2018 in Petition No. 101/TT/2018 Transmission System associated with Krishnapatnam UMPP-PART B;
 - b. The Combined Asset-A covered in order dated 10.12.2018 in Petition No. 101/TT/2018 was put into commercial operation during 2009-14 tariff period. Asset-B and Asset-C covered in order dated 31.5.2016 in Petition No. 418/TT/2014 were put to commercial operation during 2014-19 tariff period;



- c. The time over-run in respect of Asset-B and Asset-C was decided in the order dated 31.5.2016 in the Petition No. 418/TT/2014;
- d. Capital Cost as on 31.3.2019 and as on 31.3.2024 for all the assets covered in the instant petition is within the approved cost, therefore, there is no cost over-run;
- e. In pursuance of the APTEL's judgement dated 14.9.2019 in Appeal No. 74 of 2017, initial spares have been calculated on total project basis;
- f. IDC discharge statement up to the date of commercial operation (COD) and on accrual basis has been submitted;
- g. The information sought in technical validation letter was filed vide affidavit dated 14.7.2021. The rejoinder to the reply filed by MPPMCL has been filed vide affidavit dated 16.8.2021.

3. The learned counsel for TANGEDCO prayed for 2 days' time to file reply in the matter and submitted that the APTEL's judgement dated 14.9.2019 in the Appeal No. 74 of 2017 is contradictory to the APTEL's judgement dated 28.11.2013 in the Appeal No. 165 of 2012, which is required to be clarified by a larger bench of APTEL and in the meanwhile initial spares may be allowed as per the APTEL's judgement in the Appeal No. 165 of 2012.

4. In response, the Petitioner submitted that APTEL in the judgement dated 14.9.2019 in the Appeal No. 74 of 2017 discussed about its judgement dated 28.11.2013 in the Appeal No. 165 of 2012 and clarified that initial spares are to be allowed as per the ceiling limits on the overall project cost basis at the time of true-up.

5. The Commission observed that initial spares are allowed initially on cost of individual elements and later allowed on the basis of the total project cost when all the assets are put into commercial operation and combined in terms of the APTEL's judgement dated 14.9.2019 in Appeal No. 74 of 2017.

6. The Commission directed the Respondents including TANGEDCO to file reply/ written submissions by 3.9.2021 and the Petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 14.9.2021. The Commission further directed the parties to comply with the directions within the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

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

By order of the Commission

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

