

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 23/RP/2021 in
Petition No. 132/TT/2020**

Subject	:	Petition for review of the order dated 2.6.2021 in Petition No. 132/TT/2020.
Date of Hearing	:	20.1.2022
Coram	:	Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson Shri I.S. Jha, Member Shri Arun Goyal, Member Shri P.K. Singh, Member
Petitioner	:	Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Respondents	:	Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & 6 Others
Parties present	:	Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL Shri Aditya H. Dubey, Advocate, PGCIL Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL Shri D.K. Biswal, PGCIL Shri Ved Prakash Rastogi, PGCIL Shri A.K. Verma, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. Instant Review Petition has been filed by Powergrid Corporation of India Limited seeking review of the Commission's order dated 2.6.2021 in Petition No. 132/TT/2020 whereby the Commission tried up transmission tariff of 2014-19 period and determined tariff of 2019-24 period in respect of the following assets:

- (i) Asset-I: 400/220 kV, 315 MVA, ICT-1 along with associated bays, 400 kV 80 MVAR Bus Reactor along with associated bays, LILO of one circuit of 400 kV D/C Parbati-Amritsar Transmission Line at Hamirpur along with associated bays and Line reactor at Hamirpur GIS sub-station, and
- (ii) Asset-II: 1 number of 400/220 kV, 315 MVA ICT-II along with associated bays at Hamirpur Sub-station under NRSSS-XX in Northern Region



3. Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that review of order dated 2.6.2021 is sought on the issue of restriction of initial spares in case of Asset-I and IDC in case of Asset-II. She made the following submissions in support of contentions of the Review Petitioner:

- (a) In Petition No.132/TT/2020, the Review Petitioner in case of Asset-I had claimed Initial Spares of ₹606.37 @3.50% on the capital cost of ₹16184.69 lakh against allowable ceiling of ₹565 lakh along with balance Initial Spares of ₹41.97 lakh. In the impugned order at paragraph 34, the Commission considered Initial Spares on the capital cost/ plant and machinery cost of Asset-I as on cut-off date as ₹16184.69 lakh and allowed as ₹565 lakh @ 3.50% in terms of 2009/2014 Tariff Regulations.
- (b) However, the Commission in the impugned order at paragraph 35 taking note of Auditor's Certificate, considered the capital cost of Asset-I as on 31.3.2014 as ₹13939.42 lakh and disallowed excess Initial Spares of ₹41.97 lakh and undischarged Initial Spares of ₹163.41 lakh as a result of which capital cost on cash basis as on 31.3.2014 was considered as ₹13734.04 lakh (i.e. ₹13939.42 lakh - ₹41.97 lakh - ₹163.41 lakh).
- (c) The Commission in the impugned order considered the capital cost of Asset-I as on 31.3.2014 as ₹13734.04 lakh and after taking into consideration ACE, the capital cost as on 31.3.2019 of Asset-I was considered as ₹17248.47 lakh.
- (d) The deduction of ₹41.97 lakh towards excess Initial Spares and ₹163.41 lakh towards undischarged Initial Spares from the capital cost as on COD of Asset-I is an error apparent in the impugned order.
- (e) The Commission in order dated 29.4.2016 in Petition No. 99/TT/2014 disallowed time over-run of 3 months and 14 days with respect to Asset-II and accordingly disallowed IDC of ₹25.38 lakh and IEDC of ₹6.90. Accordingly, the Review Petitioner deducted the disallowed IDC of ₹25.38 lakh while claiming truing up of tariff of 2014-19 period of Asset-II. However, the Commission in the impugned order has deducted ₹62.48 towards IDC of Asset-II. The deduction of ₹62.48 lakh instead of Rs. 25.38 lakh in the impugned order is an error apparent on record and needs to be modified.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the Petitioner, the Commission admitted the Review Petition and directed to issue notice to the Respondents. The Commission further directed the Review Petitioner to serve copy of the Review Petition on the Respondents by 31.1.2022, if not already served, and the Respondents to file their reply, if any, by 20.2.2022 with an advance copy to the Review Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, by 28.2.2022. The Commission also directed that due date of filing reply and rejoinder may be strictly adhered to by the parties and no extension of time shall be permitted.



5. The Review Petition shall be listed for final hearing in due course for which a separate notice shall be issued to the parties.

By order of the Commission

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

