

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 357/TT/2019

- Subject** : Petition for revision of transmission tariff of 2004-09 and 2009-14 tariff periods, truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period for the 2nd 400 kV D/C Kahalgaon-Biharshariff Transmission Line in Eastern Region.
- Date of Hearing** : 10.3.2021
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri Pravas Kumar Singh, Member
Shri P. S. Mhaske, Member (Ex-officio)
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
- Respondents** : Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Ltd.
& 5 Others
- Parties present** : Shri Arijit Maitra, Advocate, GRIDCO
Ms. Rohini Prasad, Advocate, BSPHCL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri A.K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL
Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. Instant petition has been filed for revision of transmission tariff of 2004-09 and 2009-14 tariff periods, truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period in respect of 2nd 400 kV D/C Kahalgaon-Biharshariff Transmission Line in Eastern Region. The subject asset was declared under commercial operation on 1.12.2004.



3. The Petitioner has sought revised transmission tariff for the 2004-09 and 2009-14 tariff periods on account of change in IOL (interest on loan) and IOWC (interest on working capital) to the extent of revision in IOL and Maintenance Spares as per the judgments of Appellate Tribunal for Electricity dated 22.1.2007 in Appeal No. 81 of 2005 & batch and dated 13.6.2007 in Appeal No. 139 of 2006 & batch. The Commission had allowed transmission tariff of the instant asset for 2014-19 period vide order dated 11.12.2015 in Petition No. 433/TT/2014. The Petitioner vide its affidavit dated 31.7.2020 has submitted the information sought through Technical Validation letter. The Petitioner has prayed that tariff may be revised, tried up and determined in terms of the submissions made in the petition.

4. Learned counsel for BSPHCL submitted that she has filed reply on behalf of BSPHCL vide affidavit dated 2.3.2021. The Petitioner vide affidavit dated 8.3.2021 has filed rejoinder to the reply of BSPHCL.

5. Shri Arijit Maitra, advocate appeared on behalf of GRIDCO and submitted that he was engaged recently and sought four weeks' time to file reply to the petition. The Commission observed as to why time should be granted to GRIDCO especially when the petition was served to the designated officer of GRIDCO automatically on being filed by the Petitioner on 23.8.2019 and a general notice was posted on the Commission's website on 14.1.2020, including the instant petition, directing the parties to complete the pleadings. Further, a e-hearing notice was issued on 4.3.2021 through the online portal of the Commission to the designated officer of GRIDCO. In response, DGM, GRIDCO informed that the erstwhile designated officer on the record of the Commission has retired over a year ago. The Commission expressed concern on not replacing the retired designated officer to represent GRIDCO's case in petitions for so long and, therefore, directed GRIDCO to nominate a responsible designated officer and update his/her details in the e-filing portal of the Commission.

6. The Commission allowed GRIDCO to file its reply before 26.3.2021 and rejoinder, if any, by Petitioner within 7 days from the date of filing reply by GRIDCO. The Commission further directed the parties to adhere to the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted. The Commission also directed the parties to complete the pleadings in all future cases well in time and observed that no indulgence would be allowed in this regard.

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

By order of the Commission

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

