

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 305/TT/2019**

**Coram:**

**Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Shri I.S. Jha, Member**

**Date of Order: 24.02.2021**

**In the matter of:**

Corrigendum to order dated 30.7.2020 in Petition No. 305/TT/2019.

**In the matter of:**

Approval under Regulation 86 of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations 1999 and revision of transmission tariff for 2001-04, 2004-09, 2009-14 tariff periods and truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 period under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 and determination of transmission tariff for 2019-24 period under Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations 2019 of Combined Asset of (i) 1x500 MW HVDC back to back station at Sasaram and (ii) Associated AC Switchyard at Sasaram and Allahabad and auxiliary system including 400 kV Sarnath Allahabad line with associated bays etc. under Eastern Northern Inter-regional HVDC Transmission System in Eastern Region.

**And in the matter of:**

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.  
"Saudamini", Plot No.2,  
Sector-29, Gurgaon -122 001

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Ltd.  
Vidyut Bhavan, Bailey Road,  
Patna – 800 001
2. West Bengal State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd.  
Bidyut Bhawan, Bidhan Nagar Block DJ, Sector-II,  
Salt Lake City, Kolkata - 700 091
3. Grid Corporation of Orissa Ltd.  
Shahid Nagar,  
Bhubaneswar - 751 007



4. Jharkhand State Electricity Board  
In front of Main Secretariat, Doranda,  
Ranchi - 834002
5. Damodar Valley Corporation  
DVC Tower, Maniktala Civic Centre,  
VIP Road, Kolkata - 700 054
6. Power Department,  
Government of Sikkim, Gangtok - 737 101

...Respondents

### CORRIGENDUM

The Commission vide order dated 30.7.2020 in Petition No. 305/TT/2019 revised the transmission charges of 2001-04, 2004-09 and 2009-14 tariff periods, trued up the transmission tariff of the 2014-19 period and determined the transmission tariff of 2019-24 period in respect of Combined Asset (i) 1x500 MW HVDC back to back station at Sasaram and (ii) Associated AC Switchyard at Sasaram and Allahabad and Auxiliary System including 400 kV Sarnath Allahabad line with associated bays etc. under Eastern Northern Inter-regional HVDC Transmission System in Eastern Region.

2. The transmission charges for the subject assets for the period from 1.4.2004 to 31.3.2009 were allowed vide order dated 9.5.2006 in Petition No. 64 of 2005. The Commission in para 39 and 40 of the said order dated 9.5.2006, while allowing additional return on equity (RoE) of ₹35.98 lakh, observed as under:

*“Impact of Additional Capitalization*

*39. In the petitions filed by NTPC for approval of revised fixed charges for additional capitalization for the period 1.4.2001 to 31.3.2004, the Commission has decided that additional capital expenditure be added to the gross block as on 1.4.2001 to arrive at the gross block as on 1.4.2004 for the purpose of fixation of tariff for the period 2004-05 to 2008-09. The Commission has further ordered that NTPC would be entitled to earn return on equity @ 16% on equity portion of additional capitalization approved and interest on loan at the rate as applicable during 2001-02 to 2003-04. The return on equity and interest on loan are payable additional*



*capitalization from 1st April of the financial year following the financial year to which additional capital expenditure relates.*

*40. In the instant case, additional capitalization amounting to ₹711.78 lakh during the years 2002-03 and 2003-04 has been considered for tariff calculation. Loan on this additional capitalization are payable from 1st April of the following year. The petitioner is entitled to recover an additional amount of ₹35.98 lakh from the respondents on account of return on additional equity.”*

3. Accordingly, the Commission in order dated 30.7.2020 in the instant petition in the footnote to table at paragraph 16, referring to order dated 9.5.2006 in Petition No.64/2005, observed that the Petitioner was allowed to recover an additional amount of ₹35.98 lakh from the Respondents on account of additional RoE, over and above the RoE of ₹188.44 lakh. However, inadvertently in the footnote to table at paragraph 19 of the order, additional RoE (₹35.98 lakh) that was allowed vide the order dated 9.5.2006 was not considered along with tariff for 2004-09 period. As a result, the amount of ₹35.98 lakh recoverable by the Petitioner from the Respondents towards additional RoE corresponding to the year 2002-03 payable from 1<sup>st</sup> April of the following year (i.e. from 2003-04) was not considered while revising the tariff of the subject assets for the 2004-09 period.

4. In view of the above, the footnote to table at paragraph 19 of the order dated 30.7.2020 is revised as under:

“\*\*Return on additional equity of ₹35.98 lakh from the period 2003-04 allowed vide order dated 9.5.2006 in Petition No. 64 of 2005 may be claimed by the Petitioner separately.”

5. All other terms of the order dated 30.7.2020 remain unchanged.

sd/-  
**(I. S. Jha)**  
**Member**

sd/-  
**(P. K. Pujari)**  
**Chairperson**

