

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

**Review Petition No. 19/RP/2021 in
Petition No. 312/TT/2020**

Subject	:	Petition for review of the order dated 2.2.2021 in Petition No. 312/TT/2020.
Date of Hearing	:	20.1.2022
Coram	:	Shri I.S. Jha, Member Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Petitioner	:	Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Respondents	:	Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Ltd. & 11 Others
Parties present	:	Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL Shri Aditya H. Dubey, Advocate, PGCIL Shri Manoj Dubey, Advocate, MPPMCL Shri Ravindra Khare, MPPMCL

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. Instant Review Petition arises out of the Commission's order dated 2.2.2021 in Petition No. 312/TT/2020 whereby the Commission tried up the transmission tariff of the 2014-19 tariff period and determined the tariff of 2019-24 tariff period in respect of Asset-I:400 kV D/C Lara STPS-I to Raigarh (Kotra) Pooling Station Transmission Line along with associated bays at Raigarh (Kotra) Pooling Station and Asset-II: 400 kV D/C (Quad) Lara STPS-I Champa Line along with associated bays at Champa Pooling Station (hereinafter referred to as "the transmission assets") under "Transmission System associated with Lara STPS-I (2x800 MW) Generation Project of NTPC" in Western Region.

3. Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner/ PGCIL submitted that while allowing the tariff for Asset-II from its COD to 31.3.2019 in order dated 20.7.2018 in Petition No. 125/TT/2017, the Commission disallowed IDC and IEDC on account of time over-run and reduced ₹275.81 lakh from capital cost as on the date of commercial operation. Subsequently, an LD of ₹393.25 lakh was recovered from the contractor and the same was adjusted in the Additional Capital Expenditure in the year 2018-19. The details of capital cost were provided in the Auditors' Certificate. These details were submitted in response to the query raised in RoP reply dated 17.8.2020. However, the Commission



in order dated 2.2.2021 observed that the LD recovered is more than IDC and IEDC disallowed on account of time over-run and erroneously failed to consider that the LD was deducted from the capital cost and was added back to the extent of disallowed IDC and IEDC. Therefore, when the Review Petitioner had already factored in the LD and the disallowed IDC and IEDC, any further deduction would amount to double deduction. The calculation is clear from both the original petition and the reply to queries in RoP dated 17.8.2020.

4. Learned counsel for MPPMCL prayed for time to file reply in the matter.
5. After hearing the learned counsel of the Petitioner, the Commission admitted the Review Petition and directed to issue notice to the Respondents.
6. The Commission directed the Review Petitioner to serve copy of the Review Petition on the Respondents at the earliest. The Respondents are directed to file their reply by 18.2.2022 with an advance copy to the Review Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, by 28.2.2022. The Commission directed that due date of filing the reply and rejoinder should be strictly adhered to and no extension of time shall be granted.
7. The Review Petition shall be listed for final hearing in due course for which a separate notice shall be issued.

By order of the Commission

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

