

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 265/TT/2019**

- Subject** : Petition for determination of tariff of the Inter-State transmission lines connecting two States along with the bays for the APTRANSCO owned transmission lines/system for the 2019-24 tariff period for inclusion in POC mechanism.
- Date of Hearing** : 15.6.2021
- Coram** : Shri P. K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Shri I. S. Jha, Member  
Shri Pravas Kumar Singh, Member
- Petitioner** : Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Ltd.
- Respondents** : Transmission Corporation of Telangana Ltd. & Ors.
- Parties present** : Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, APTRANSCO  
Ms. Swapna Sheshadari, Advocate, Telangana TRANSCO & KPTCL  
Shri Damodar Solanki, Advocate, Telangana TRANSCO & KPTCL  
Shri P. Suryachandram, APTRANSCO  
Ms. P. Jyotsna Rani, APTRANSCO

**Record of Proceedings**

The case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. The matter was earlier heard on 13.7.2020 through virtual hearing.
3. Learned counsel of the Petitioner made the following submissions:
  - a) Instant petition is filed for determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 tariff period in accordance with 2019 Tariff Regulations of the 45 inter-State transmission lines along with the bays connecting Andhra Pradesh with Telangana, owned by APTRANSCO, for inclusion in POC charges.
  - b) Certain objections were raised by Telangana State TRANSCO with regard to the line length and COD. On scrutiny of the record, the same was found to be true. Accordingly, the errors have now been corrected vide affidavit dated 12.8.2020. The Petitioner had earlier considered the entire line length instead of LILO of the line which was constructed during that particular period. Further, while calculating YTC for 400 kV Sattenapalli-Srisailam TMDC line (AP) Portion, the latest date of commissioning of the



emanating line from APTRANSCO Sub-station is considered as reference for the entire line instead of individual sections. Wherever section was required to be included against a particular commercial operation date, the Petitioner has included it and now there is no anomaly.

- c) Response to the Technical Validation letter has also been submitted vide affidavit dated 16.11.2020.

4. Learned counsel for Telangana State TRANSCO (TSTRANSCO) and KPTCL has made the following submissions:

#### **Submissions for TSTRANSCO**

- a) 200 kV Chillakallu-Pulichintala and 220 kV Chilakallu-Suryapeta feeders are formed by making LILO to 220 kV Chillakallu-Narketpally I and II lines which were originally declared under commercial operation on 29.3.1999. Out of the total length of the line, only 12 km falls within the state of AP. APTRANSCO is claiming excess tariff for 11 years by taking COD as 10.3.2010 instead of taking original COD of this line as 29.3.1999.
- b) In the earlier proceedings in Petition No. 10/TT/2019, the Commission vide order dated 5.2.2020 has accepted in the case of TSTRANSCO that there is a computational error in table at paragraph 21 wherein the COD of Srisailam-Satenapally line has been mentioned as 23.10.2010 instead of 23.10.2000. By way of Interlocutory Application No. 42 of 2020 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019, TSTRANSCO has sought to revise the tariff computations by invoking the provision of Regulation 103A of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business Regulations), 1999 for correction of arithmetical errors.

#### **Submissions for KPTCL**

- a) In the case of KPTCL, learned counsel submitted that the lines are very old and the Petitioner in many cases has added LILO in the lines after 10 or 12 years. However, COD of the transmission line is considered as COD of LILO. This issue has been pointed out in the case of 4 lines.
- b) Alipura-Ragalapadu transmission line runs in the States of Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. 64 km of the line falls in Karnataka and 38.58 km line length falls in the State of AP. The Petitioner has claimed the line length of 71.32 km which is incorrect. The Petitioner is claiming highly inflated capital cost by taking advantage of the fact that the Commission in the case of old ISTS lines owned and operated by STUs has been applying normative values as per PGCIL rates since the cost is not available in most of the cases.
- c) The replies filed by TSTRANSCO and KPTCL may considered before allowing tariff to the Petitioner.

5. The Commission observed that the Petitioner has claimed O&M Expenses for its assets but has not submitted Form-2 in respect of many assets and directed the Petitioner to submit Form of O&M Expenses as per the 2019 Tariff Regulations in



respect of all the assets on affidavit by 12.7.2021, with an advance copy to all the Respondents. The Commission further directed the parties to comply with the timeline specified and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

6. After hearing the parties, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

**By order of the Commission**

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

