

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 455/TT/2020**

- Subject** : Petition for truing up of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period for four assets under “Creation of 400/220 kV Sub-station in NCT of Delhi during 12<sup>th</sup> plan period (Part-B1)” in Northern Region.
- Date of Hearing** : 20.4.2021
- 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** : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd.  
& 17 Others
- Parties present** : Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri A. K. Verma, PGCIL  
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL  
Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL  
Shri D. K. Biswal, PGCIL  
Ms. Megha Bajpeyi, BRPL

**Record of Proceedings**

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. The representative of the Petitioner made the following submissions:
  - a. The instant petition has been filed for truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff of 2019-24 period in respect of the following assets under “Creation of 400/220 kV Sub-station in NCT of Delhi during 12<sup>th</sup> plan period (Part-B1)” in Northern Region:  
  
Asset-1: LILO of both circuits of Bamnauli-Samaypur 400 kV line at Tughlakabad along with associated bays;



Asset-2: 400/220 kV, 2x500 MVA ICT-I and II at 400/220 kV GIS at Tughlakabad Sub-station along with associated bays & 400 kV, 125 MVAR Bus reactor at GIS Tughlakabad Sub-station along with associated bays;

Asset-3: 400/220 kV, 500 MVA ICT- III at 400/220 kV at Tughlakabad Sub-station along with associated bays; and

Asset-4: 400/220 kV, 500 MVA ICT-IV at 400/220 kV GIS at Tughlakabad Sub-station along with associated bays.

b. Assets-1 and 2 were put into commercial operation on 14.10.2018. Assets-3 and 4 were put into commercial operation on 28.11.2018 and 20.10.2018 respectively. The transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 in respect of the transmission assets was allowed by the Commission vide order dated 31.10.2019 in Petition No. 338/TT/2018.

c. In Petition No. 338/TT/2018, Assets-1 and 2 were referred to as Combined Asset-I and Assets-3 and 4 were referred to as Assets-II(a) and II(b) respectively. However, in the instant petition, Assets-1 and 2 have been segregated as the Commission in order dated 31.10.2019 in Petition No. 338/TT/2018 observed that additional RoE of 0.5% is not admissible for Asset-1, i.e. transmission line since its length is less than 50 km and all other assets including the sub-station portion of Asset-I qualifies for additional RoE @ 0.5% and granted liberty to the Petitioner to claim tariff for the transmission line and sub-station separately at the time of truing up. Accordingly, the cost of the LILO and the sub-station has been segregated and tariff is claimed separately. He requested to grant additional RoE for the sub-station portion, i.e. Asset-II in the instant petition.

d. There is no cost over-run with respect of the transmission assets.

e. Details of compensation towards forest included in the capital cost, complete loan details including rate of interest applicable for SBI and HDFC loans, details of discharge of Initial Spares as per the directions of the Commission vide order dated 31.10.2019 in Petition No. 338/TT/2018 has been submitted.

f. In Petition No. 338/TT/2018, there was an inadvertent error in Form-2, wherein the O&M Expenses were claimed for double circuit line instead of multi-circuit. The said error has been rectified in the instant truing up petition and it is requested to allow O&M Expenses accordingly.

3. In response to a query of the Commission, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that the claim with regard to double-circuit line was limited to the O&M Expenses only.

4. Learned counsel for BRPL prayed for grant of time to file written reply to the instant petition and orally made the following submissions:



- a. The Petitioner has claimed ACE including accrual IDC, which deserves to be rejected as there is no provision regarding the same in the 2014 Tariff Regulations.
  - b. The claim of additional RoE of 0.5% may be rejected as the same is not in line with Regulation 24 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations as no certificate of Regional Power Committee or the National Power Committee has been furnished certifying that the commissioning of elements in this project will benefit the system operation in the regional/national grid.
  - c. The Petitioner has furnished erroneous information on affidavit before the Commission and presented a multi-circuit line as double-circuit.
  - d. The Petitioner has not paid any tax on the transmission business.
  - e. The Petitioner said there is no cost over-run and as such ACE may be approved. It is clear case of over estimation.
5. In response to the submissions of BRPL, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that in the present case, the entire project was completed with the timeline and additional RoE has been claimed as per Regulation 24(2)(i) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations, whereas, BRPL is referring to Regulation 24(2)(iii), which envisages additional RoE for a particular element of a transmission project to be completed within specific timeline.
6. In response, learned counsel for BRPL clarified that in the present case only element-wise RoE has been claimed and hence the certificate from the Regional Power Committee or the National Power Committee is required.
7. The Commission allowed the request of learned counsel for BRPL to file his reply, by 24.4.2021 and the Petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 3.5.2021. The Commission further directed the parties to adhere to the 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)

