

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
New Delhi**

**Petition No. 361/TT/2018
(On remand)**

- Subject : Petition for approval under Regulation 86 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 and the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 for the determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2019 for **Asset-1**: LILO of 400 kV S/C Neelmangla-Hoody Transmission Line at new 400/220 kV GIS Sub-station at Yelahanka with 1X63 MVAr 420 kV Bus Reactor along with associated bays and equipment and **Asset-2**: 2X500 MVA, 400/220 kV ICTs along with associated bays and equipment at 400/220 kV Yelahanka Sub-station under "System Strengthening XII" in Southern Region.
- Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)
- Respondents : Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation and 15 Others

**Petition No. 93/TT/2020
(On remand)**

- Subject : Petition for truing up the transmission tariff for the 2014-19 period and determination of transmission tariff for the 2019-24 period for the transmission system associated with "System Strengthening -XII" in the Southern Region.
- Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)
- Respondents : Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation and 17 Others
- Date of Hearing : **28.8.2024**
- Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member
Shri Harish Dudani, Member
- Parties Present : (In Petition No. 361/TT/2018)
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate PGCIL
Shri Mohd. Mohsin, PGCIL



Shri Zafrul Hassan, PGCIL
Shri Angaru Naresh Kumar, PGCIL
Shri Arjun Malhotra, PGCIL

(In Petition No. 93/TT/2020)
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate PGCIL
Shri Mohd. Mohsin, PGCIL
Shri Zafrul Hassan, PGCIL
Shri Angaru Naresh Kumar, PGCIL
Shri Arjun Malhotra, PGCIL
Shri V. M. Kannan, Advocate, KPTCL
Shri Shahbaz Hussain, Advocate, KPTCL
Shri Stephania Pinto, Advocate, KPTCL
Shri Sumanth Gowga, Advocate, KPTCL
Shri Harimohana. N., Advocate, KPTCL
Shri Mayank Singh, Advocate, KPTCL
Shri Swapnil Verma, CTUIL
Shri Siddharth Sharma, CTUIL
Shri Kaurya Bhardwaj, CTUIL
Shri Lashit Sharma, CTUIL

Record of Proceedings

The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that 6 Nos. 220 kV bays at 400/220 kV Yelahanka Sub-station were constructed by it under ISTS associated with 220 kV lines to be constructed by KPTCL so that the power flow which would be there in the Petitioner's sub-station could be evacuated by KPTCL using its 3 Nos. 220 kV D/C circuit lines at three different locations. He further submitted that the Commission approved the COD of 6 Nos. bays as 1.4.2018, under proviso (ii) to Regulation 4(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. He submitted that KPTCL laid 2 Nos., underground cables instead of constructing 3 Nos. D/C lines owing to RoW issues by unilaterally changing the agreed scheme based on which the Petitioner constructed its transmission assets. He further submitted that 2 Nos. underground cables of KPTCL were connected to the 2 Nos. bays of the Petitioner wherein the power started flowing on 13.10.2018, and as such 4 Nos. bays constructed by the Petitioner remained unutilised. He submitted that the Commission fastened the liability for the payment of transmission charges of the transmission assets from their COD till the associated downstream transmission system is commissioned by KPTCL.

2. In response, the learned counsel for KPTCL submitted that owing to the RoW issues, KPTCL laid 2 Nos. underground cables, which are connected to the Petitioner's 2 Nos. bays, and the said two underground cables can evacuate all the power transmitted through the Petitioner's transmission assets. He also submitted that the fact of laying the underground cables was brought to the Petitioner's notice at the 32nd and 33rd SRPC meetings. He added that KPTCL could only be made liable for the payment of the transmission charges from 1.4.2018 to 13.10.2018, and thereafter, the transmission charges of the transmission assets may be socialised, including the four unutilised bays.



3. In response to the Commission's specific query, the learned counsel for KPTCL submitted that the total line length of the two underground cables is approximately 20 km and that they are capable of drawing 1200 amps of power. He, however, submitted that the said two cables are currently underutilized.

4. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties at length, the Commission directed KPTCL to submit on an affidavit within three weeks with a copy to the other side, whether the 1000 MVA transformer capacity can be transferred through the existing 2 nos. of underground cables? If so, submit a detailed justification of the same?

5. The Commission directed PGCIL to file the following information on an affidavit within three weeks with a copy to the other side:

(a) The purpose of construction of 6 nos. of 220 kV bays for 2X500 MVA ICTs at 400/220 kV Yelahanka sub-station and RPC/SCM approval for 6 nos. of 220 k bays at 400/220 kV Yelahanka Sub-station.

(b) The power transfer capability of each 220 kV bay at 400/220 kV Yelahanka Sub-station;

(c) Whether the unutilized 4 no. of 220 kV bays can be utilised by connecting with the existing 220 kV Bus so that all 6 no. of bays can be used for drawl of power from 2X500 MVA ICTs. If so submit the details of the same.

6. Based on the request of parties, the Commission directed KPTCL to file its written submissions within three weeks with an advance copy to the Petitioner, who may file its written submissions three weeks thereafter.

7. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T.D. Pant)

Joint Chief (Law)

