CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

Petition No. 269/TT/2020

	Petition for truing up of transmission tariff of the 2014- 19 period and determination of transmission tariff of the 2019-24 period for Chukka Transmission System in Eastern Region
:	19.8.2020
:	Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson Shri I.S. Jha, Member Shri Arun Goyal, Member
	Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
:	Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Ltd. & 6 Others
:	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 is filed for truing up of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 period and for determination of transmission tariff for the 2019-24 period in respect of Chukka Transmission System in Eastern Region. The assets covered in the said transmission system were put into commercial operation during 1.4.1986 and 1.4.1992. He submitted that as the loans in the instant case were repaid before 2001, there is no impact of the APTEL's judgments dated 22.1.2007 and 13.6.2007 in Appeal Nos. 81/2005 and 139/2006 on the tariff allowed for the instant transmission system after 2001. He also submitted that as no additional capital expenditure (ACE) is claimed during the 2001-04 and 2004-09 tariff periods, there is no impact of maintenance spares for working capital.

3. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the tariff for the 2014-19 period was allowed by the Commission *vide* order dated 8.1.2016 in Petition No. 60/TT/2015.



He submitted that there is marginal variation in ACE approved earlier and ACE due to variation in the awarded rates. He submitted that ACE claimed for the tariff period 2019-24 is towards replacement of old and obsolete machinery at six sub-stations under this project. The instant asset will complete its useful life in 2021-22. However, the proposed ACE will extend the useful life by five years. He requested the Commission to approve the tariff as prayed in the petition.

4. Learned Counsel for BSPHCL, Respondent No.1, sought time to file reply to the petition. The Commission observed that BSPHCL has not been filing reply in time and has been asking for extension of time to file reply on a regular basis in almost all petitions. The Commission while granting time in the instant matter directed BSPHCL to file reply in future in all petitions in time and observed that no extension of time will be granted in future.

5. In response to a query of the Commission regarding the Regulation under which the Petitioner has claimed the proposed ACE, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that it is claimed under Regulation 25(2)(c) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations, which allows replacement of assets deployed under the original scope of the project because of obsolescence of technology.

6. In response to another query of the Commission regarding the approval for the proposed replacement of equipment and civil work, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that the proposed ACE is for replacement of equipment and civil works at six sub-stations covered under the instant transmission scheme and the approval has been granted by the internal committee of the Petitioner. He submitted that there are no alterations or replacements in case of subject lines which are around 1600 km long. In response to other observation of the Commission, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that the tendering process for award of work is yet to commence.

7. The Commission further directed the Respondents, including BSPHCL, to file their reply by 4.9.2020 and the Petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, by 11.9.2020. The Commission further directed the Parties to adhere to the above-specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

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

By order of the Commission

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