

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
New Delhi

Petition No. 349/TT/2023

- Subject** : Petition for truing up of transmission tariff of 2014-19 tariff period and determination of transmission tariff for 2019-24 tariff period for assets under “Transmission System Associated with Parbati-III HEP” in the Northern Region.
- Date of Hearing** : **16.7.2024**
- Coram** : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited (AVVNL) and 16 Ors.
- Parties Present** : Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Utkarsh Singh, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Sneha, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL
Shri V. C. Sekhar, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Commission, vide orders dated 17.8.2020 and 20.8.2020 in Petition Nos. 107/TT/2017 and 136/TT/2017, did not condone the time over-run in respect of the combined Assets 1 to 4 and 5 to 8, respectively. Consequently, the Petitioner has filed appeals before the APTEL, which are currently pending adjudication. She submitted that the instant true-up Petition is as per the tariffs determined by the Commission in the previous Petitions and prayed for liberty to revive the Petitioner’s right in the instant Petition if appeals are allowed by the APTEL. She further submitted that the order may be reserved in the instant matter as none of the Respondents have filed their replies.

2. After hearing the learned counsel for the Petitioner, the Commission directed the Petitioner to file the following information on an affidavit within three weeks, with an advanced copy to the Respondents:

- (a) Status of the Appeals bearing DFR Nos. 223 of 2022 and 225 of 2022, filed before the APTEL challenging orders dated 17.8.2020 and 20.8.2020 in Petition Nos. 107/TT/2017 and 136/TT/2017, respectively.
- (b) With regard to the computation of Initial Spares claimed, submit Form-13 for the 2014-19 tariff period along with the Initial Spares discharged, including asset-wise and category-wise breakup.
- (c) Clarify why the opening capital cost for the 2014-19 period, submitted as per the Auditor’s Certificate, does not match with the approved closing cost for the 2009-14 period,



as specified in the order dated 17.8.2020 in Petition No. 107/TT/2017? Additionally, clarify why the Additional Capital Expenditure (ACE) claimed in the Auditor's Certificate does not correspond with the ACE stated in the Petition?

(d) Clarify why 1 no. GIS bay was not considered while claiming the O&M Expenses for Assets-5 and 6 each in Petition No. 136/TT/2017?

3. The Commission further directed the Respondents to file their respective written submissions, if any, within a week, with a copy to the other side.
4. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the Petition.

By order of the Commission

sd/-

(T. D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)

