

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 295/TT/2022

Coram:

**Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri P. K. Singh, Member**

Date of order: 08.05.2024

In the matter of:

Approval under Regulation 86 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 for truing up of transmission tariff of 2014- 19 period under the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 and determination of transmission tariff for the 2019-24 period under the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019 for Series Compensation on Panki-Muradnagar 400 kV S/C line of UPPCL in the Northern Region; and approval under Regulation 76 and Regulation 77 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations 2019, "Power to Relax" and "Power to Remove Difficulty" for one-time reimbursement of unrecovered depreciation for Series Compensation on Panki-Muradnagar 400 kV S/C line of UPPCL in the Northern Region.

And in the matter of:

Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,
SAUDAMINI, Plot No-2,
Sector-29, Gurgaon-122 001 (Haryana).

.....Petitioner

Vs

1. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited,
Vidyut Bhawan, Vidyut Marg,
Jaipur-302005.
2. Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited,
132 kV, GSS RVPNL Sub-station Building,
Caligiri Road, Malviya Nagar,
Jaipur-302017.
3. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited,
132 kV, GSS RVPNL Sub-station Building,
Caligiri Road, Malviya Nagar,
Jaipur-302017.



4. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited,
132 kV, GSS RVPNL Sub-station Building,
Caligiri Road, Malviya Nagar,
Jaipur-302017.
5. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board,
Vidyut Bhawan, Kumar Complex Building II,
Shimla-171004.
6. Punjab State Electricity Board,
The Mall,
Patiala-147001.
7. Haryana Power Purchase Centre,
Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6,
Panchkula-134109.
8. Power Development Department,
Government of Jammu & Kashmir,
Mini Secretariat, Jammu.
9. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited,
Shakti Bhawan, 14, Ashok Marg,
Lucknow-226001.
10. BSES Yamuna Power Limited,
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi.
11. BSES Radjdhani Power Limited,
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi.
12. Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited,
33 kV Sub-station Building,
Hudson Lane, Kingsway Camp,
New Delhi-110009.
13. Chandigarh Administration,
Sector-9, Chandigarh.
14. Uttarakhand Power Corporation Limited,
Urja Bhawan, Kanwali Road,
Dehradun.
15. North Central Railway,
Allahabad.



16. New Delhi Municipal Council,
Palika Kendra, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi-110002.
17. Central Transmission Utility of India Limited,
First Floor, SAUDAMINI, Plot No-2,
Sector-29, Near IFFCO Chowk Metro Station,
Gurgaon-122 001 (Haryana).

...Respondent(s)

For Petitioner : Ms. Swapana Seshadhari, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Utkarsh Singh, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Sneha, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Supriya Singh, PGCIL
Shri Bipin Bihari Rath, PGCIL
Shri Vivek Singh, PGCIL
Shri Amit Yadav, PGCIL

For Respondents : Shri Sandeep Kumawat, CTUIL
Shri Siddharth Sharma, CTUIL
Shri Akshayvat Kislay, CTUIL

ORDER

The instant petition has been filed by Power Grid Corporation of India Limited for truing up of transmission tariff of the 2014-19 tariff period under the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as “the 2014 Tariff Regulations”) and the determination of tariff under the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as “the 2019 Tariff Regulations”) for the period from 1.4.2019 to 31.3.2024 and approval under Regulation 76 and Regulation 77 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations for “Power to Relax” and “Power to Remove Difficulty” for one-time reimbursement of unrecovered depreciation in respect of the Series Compensation on Panki-Muradnagar 400 kV S/C line of UPPCL in the Northern Region (hereinafter to be referred to as ‘transmission asset’).



2. The Petitioner has made the following prayers in this petition:

“1) Approve the trued up Transmission Tariff for 2014-19 block and transmission tariff for 2019-24 block for the assets covered under this petition.

2) Allow the petitioner to recover the shortfall or refund the excess Annual Fixed Charges, on account of Return on Equity due to change in applicable Minimum Alternate/Corporate Income Tax rate as per the Income Tax Act, 1961 (as amended from time to time) of the respective financial year directly without making any application before the Commission as provided in Tariff Regulation 2014 and Tariff regulations 2019 as per para 8 and 9 above for respective block.

3) Approve the reimbursement of expenditure by the beneficiaries towards petition filing fee, and expenditure on publishing of notices in newspapers in terms of Regulation 70 (1) Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019, and other expenditure (if any) in relation to the filing of petition.

4) Allow the petitioner to bill and recover Licensee fee and RLDC fees and charges, separately from the respondents in terms of Regulation 70 (3) and (4) Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019.

5) Allow the petitioner to bill and adjust impact on Interest on Loan due to change in Interest rate on account of floating rate of interest applicable during 2019-24 period, if any, from the respondents.

6) Allow the Petitioner to claim the overall security expenses and consequential IOWC on that security expenses separately.

7) Allow unrecovered depreciation under Regulation 76 and Regulation 77 of CERC (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2019, “Power to Relax” and “Power to Remove Difficulty”.

8) Allow the Petitioner to bill and recover GST on Transmission Charges separately from the respondents, if GST on transmission is levied at any rate in future. Further, any taxes including GST and duties including cess etc. imposed by any statutory/Govt./municipal authorities shall be allowed to be recovered from the beneficiaries.

and pass such other relief as Hon’ble Commission deems fit and appropriate under the circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice.”

Background

3. The brief facts of the case are as follows:

- a) The Investment Approval (IA) for the transmission asset was accorded by the Board of Directors of the Petitioner’s company as per the Memorandum dated



30.8.2001 at an estimated cost of ₹2588.00 lakh, including IDC of ₹149.00 lakh (4th quarter 2000 price level).

- b) The Petitioner installed a Fixed Series Compensation (FSC) of 40% in 400 kV Panki (UPPTCL)-Muradnagar S/C Line (396 km Twin Moose) at the Muradnagar Sub-station end, which achieved the commercial operation on 1.2.2004.
- c) Subsequently, LILO (Looped in Looped Out) of the Panki-Muradnagar transmission line at Aligarh (UPPTCL) was approved in the 26th Standing Committee on Power System Planning of Northern Region (SCPSPNR) meeting held on 13.10.2008, as part of "Evacuation System for Parichha TPS Extension". The LILO was subsequently put into commercial operation in October 2015 by UPPTCL.
- d) After LILO, the length of the transmission lines is as follows:
- Panki-Aligarh 400 kV Single circuit line (285 km)
 - Aligarh-Muradnagar 400 kV Single circuit line (177 km)
- e) After LILO, the % of compensation of FSC increased to 90% due to a reduction in the length of the transmission line.
- f) In view of the system reconfiguration and increased compensation level, FSC at Muradnagar has been kept out of service by the System Operator since 9.10.2015. However, the same is in healthy condition.

4. The Commission, in an order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No.358/TT/2019, gave liberty to the Petitioner to approach the concerned RPC and CTUIL to study the feasibility of shifting/ using the transmission asset and approach the Commission on the basis of the decision of RPC and CTUIL. The Petitioner has consulted the RPC and CTUIL and has submitted the details of the consultation made with the RPC and CTUIL.



The Petitioner has made the following submissions in this regard:

a) The Petitioner in Petition No. 358/TT/2019 submitted that based on system condition, the transmission asset has been kept out of service by the System Operator and can be taken into service as per requirement, and the transmission asset is in healthy condition. However, the Commission, in an order dated 6.7.2021, in Petition No. 358/TT/2019, in paragraph 35, observed as follows:

“It is clear that the System Operator is not the appropriate body to decide to keep transmission asset out of service.”

b) The responsibility of the System Operator, as defined in The Indian Electricity Grid Code (IEGC), 2010, is as follows:

“2.3.1.

(b) monitor grid operation;

(4) The Regional Load Despatch Centre may give such directions and exercise such supervision and control as may be required for ensuring stability of grid operations and for achieving the maximum economy and efficiency in the operation of the power system in the region under its control.

(6) All directions issued by the Regional Load Despatch Centers to any transmission licensee of State transmission lines or any other licensee of the State or generating company (other than those connected to inter-State transmission system) or substation in the State shall be issued through the State Load Despatch Centre and the State Load Despatch Centers shall ensure that such directions are duly complied with by the licensee or generating company or sub-station.”

c) The system operator has to monitor the grid and issue instructions for ensuring grid operation, which are binding in nature. In the instant case, although the transmission asset was healthy and connected to the grid, it was kept out of service by the System Operator due to the asset's non-requirement for grid operation. However, the Commission, vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019, excluded the transmission asset from the capital cost as provided under Regulation 9(6)(a) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations as it is not put to use and allowed the tariff for the transmission asset only up to 31.10.2015 quoting Regulation 9(6)(a) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations as follows:



“9(6) The following shall be excluded or removed from the capital cost of the existing and new project:

(a) The assets forming part of the project, but not in use;....”

- d) The transmission asset is in use but in switch-off condition instead of “asset not in use.” The Commission granted liberty to the petitioner to approach the concerned RPC and CTUIL regarding the feasibility of shifting/ using the transmission asset and to approach the Commission based on the decision of RPC and CTUIL.
- e) The matter was taken up with CTUIL for the feasibility of utilization of the FSC in the Muradnagar-Aligarh transmission line or shifting of the above-mentioned FSC to any other location, and a meeting was held on 3.8.2021 with stakeholders under the chairmanship of Chief Engineer (PSPA-1), CEA, to discuss the issue. The relevant portion of the Minutes of the above meeting is as follows:

“After deliberations, following was agreed:

(a) FSC installed at Muradnagar substation (UPPTCL) in 400 kV Panki-Muradnagar line (UPPTCL) has no utilization in the present scenario. However, views of NRPC also needs to be taken in this regard.

(b) As directed by CERC, POWERGRID to approach the concerned RPC and CTU for feasibility of shifting/using the transmission asset and based on the decision of RPC and CTU, the petitioner may approach the Commission.”

- f) The matter was taken up in the 49th NRPC held on 27.9.2021 and 47th TCC held on 23.9.2021 and 24.9.2021. The relevant portion of the Minutes of the above meeting is as follows:

“C.7.5..... During the meeting, CTUIL stated that in case of shifting the FSC to any new location, short circuit level of new substation where FSC would be shifted should match with design short circuit level of Panki /Muradnagar substation at the time of FSC planning and the length of line where the FSC would be shifted should approximately match with the original length of the line where FSC is to be installed. After deliberations, following was agreed:

i) FSC installed at Muradnagar substation (UPPTCL) in 400 kV Panki-Muradnagar line (UPPTCL) has no utilization in the present scenario. However, views of NRPC also need to be taken in this regard.



ii) POWERGRID to carry out cost benefit analysis, comparing the remaining life of the FSC along with the cost of shifting the FSC and installation of the same at any new location versus cost of installation of a new FSC at the new location. In case, relocation of the FSC is not feasible or is not found to be economically viable, POWERGRID is to approach CERC regarding tariff issues for remaining life of the asset.

C.7.6 Representative of CTU highlighted that cost benefit analysis (comparing the cost involved with shifting existing FSC: remaining life of FSC + cost of shifting the existing FSC & installing the same at any new location V/s cost of installation of a new FSC at the new location) is to be done by POWERGRID.

C.7.7 Representative of POWERGRID mentioned that cost of relocation would be much higher and may be equivalent to installation of new FSC, hence balance unrecovered depreciation, which works out to Rs. 4.66 Cr, may be reimbursed.

C.7.8 TCC advised POWERGRID to do the cost benefit analysis and present the same before upcoming CEA's NRPCTP. CTU may provide locations where FSC is required for this purpose. In case, relocation of the FSC is not feasible or is not found to be economically viable, POWERGRID may act as per upcoming CEA's NRPCTP meeting.

NRPC deliberations:

C.7.9 NRPC concurred with the TCC deliberations.”

g) The matter was discussed in the 4th meeting of NRPC-TP held on 5.10.2021 and 12.10.2021, wherein CTUIL stated that relocation of FSC is a challenging task as FSCs are designed for a particular line with specific line parameters like Short Circuit MVA. As such, it is difficult to find the exact match for the FSC to fit in after relocation. Therefore, it cannot be relocated.

h) The Short Circuit MVA of most of the lines has now been increased, therefore, it would be difficult to relocate the FSC. However, some parts of the FSC could be utilized. The relevant portion of the Minutes of the above meeting is as follows:

“10.9 After Deliberation following was decided:

....FSC installed at Muradnagar substation (UPPTCL) in 400 kV Panki-Muradnagar line (UPPTCL) has no utilization in present scenario”

i) As per the discussions with CEA, TCC/NRPC, and NRPC-TP, the requirement of the transmission asset has no utilization in the present scenario, and also, it cannot be reallocated to another location as FSC is being designed for a



particular line with specific line parameters and the Short Circuit MVA of most of the lines has now been increased.

- j) Thus, the transmission asset was de-capitalized on 3.8.2021, i.e., from the date when the first meeting was held with stakeholders, wherein it was decided that there is no utilization of the transmission asset in the present scenario. The asset was connected to the grid but was under the switch-off condition as per the direction of the System Operator.
- k) There was a substantial investment made in the transmission asset and de-capitalisation of the transmission asset before the completion of the useful life of the transmission asset will lead to financial loss to the Petitioner. The de-capitalizing of transmission assets on account of non-utilization based on system requirements is beyond the control of the Petitioner; therefore, the Commission may allow one-time reimbursement of unrecovered depreciation of ₹269.39 lakh under Regulation 76 and Regulation 77 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations “Power to Relax” and “Power to Remove Difficulty”.
- l) The details of unrecovered depreciation are as follows:

(₹ in lakh)

Gross block of asset excluding land	Depreciable value	Depreciation recovered up to 3.8.2021	Unrecovered depreciation
1270.75	1143.68	874.29	269.39

5. The Commission, vide RoP dated 12.1.2023, directed the Petitioner to implead CTUIL and directed CTUIL to file its reply in the matter. Accordingly, CTUIL, vide affidavit dated 10.3.2023, had made the following submissions. Further, the CTUIL reiterated these submissions in its affidavit dated 27.10.2023.



a) There are no specific averments/pleadings against the CTUIL in the petition filed by the Petitioner.

b) The Fixed Series Compensation ("FSC") of 40% was installed by the Petitioner in the 400 kV Panki (UPPTCL)-Muradnagar S/C Line (396 km Twin Moose) at the Muradnagar Sub-station end and it was put into commercial operation on 1.2.2004. After the loop-in loop-out (LILO) of the above line at the Aligarh (UPPTCL) Sub-station in October 2015, the length of the 400 kV Muradnagar-Aligarh 400 kV line was reduced to 177 km from the earlier length of 396 km.

c) The matter regarding utilization of FSC installed at the Muradnagar Sub-station was discussed in the meeting held on 3.8.2021 amongst CEA, the Petitioner, CTUIL, Grid-India, and POSOCO (to discuss the issue of requirement of reactors and FSCs installed at various locations in the Northern Region), wherein UPPTCL suggested that there is no utilization of FSC at Muradnagar Sub-station and, therefore, it was advisable to shift it to any suitable location where it could be utilized. It was also deliberated that in case of shifting the FSC to any new location, the short circuit level of the new sub-station where the FSC would be shifted should match with the design short circuit level of the Panki-Muradnagar Sub-station at the time of FSC planning, and the length of the line where the FSC would be shifted should approximately match with the original length of the line where FSC is installed. In case relocation of the FSC is not feasible or is not found to be economically viable, the Petitioner may approach the Commission regarding tariff issues for the remaining life of the transmission asset. After detailed deliberation, it was agreed that the FSC installed at the Muradnagar Sub-station (UPPTCL)



in the 400 kV Panki-Muradnagar line (UPPTCL) has no utilization in the present scenario. However, views of NRPC need to be taken in this regard.

d) The matter was discussed in the 49th meeting of the Northern Regional Power Committee (NRPC) held on 27.9.2021 (“49th NRPC meeting”), wherein the Petitioner mentioned that the cost of relocation would be much higher and may be equivalent to installation of new FSC. The Petitioner was advised to do the cost-benefit analysis and present the same before the upcoming CEA’s NRPC-TP meeting. In case relocation of the FSC is not feasible or is not found to be economically viable, the Petitioner may act as per decision in the upcoming CEA’s NRPCTP meeting.

e) The matter was again discussed in the 4th meeting of the Northern Regional Power Committee (Transmission Planning) (“4th NRPC (TP) meeting”) held on 5.10.2021 and 12.10.2021 wherein it was decided that FSC is not required in the long run. Further, relocation of FSC is a challenging task as FSCs are designed for a particular line with specific line parameters like Short Circuit MVA, and it is difficult to find the exact match for the FSC to fit in after relocation. Further, the Petitioner also informed that as the Short Circuit MVA of most of the lines has now been increased, it would be difficult to relocate the FSC. After detailed deliberations, it was agreed that the FSC installed at Muradnagar Sub-station has no utilization in the present scenario.

6. We have considered the Petitioner’s submissions and the CTUIL’s submissions. The Commission, in an order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019, held that the Series Compensation on the Panki-Muradnagar 400 kV S/C Line of UPPCL in the Northern Region was not in use since 31.10.2015. Therefore, the Commission approved



tariff for the transmission asset only up to 31.10.2015 and directed the Petitioner to find ways to utilise the transmission asset in other locations in consultation with NRPC and CTUIL. The relevant portion of the order is as follows:

“33. Confirmation from the Petitioner was sought through Technical Validation letter that whether the asset (Series Compensation on Panki-Muradnagar 400 kV S/C Line of UPPCL in the Northern Region) is currently in use and to furnish information in respect of de-capitalisation, if any. In response, the Petitioner has submitted that the Fixed Series Capacitor (FSC) unit (76.5 MVAR) was installed in 400 kV MuradnagarPanki Transmission Line at 400/220 kV UPPTCL Muradnagar Sub-station on 1.2.2004. After loop-in loop-out (LILO) of the transmission line at Aligarh (UPPTCL) Sub-station in October 2015, the length of 400 kV Muradnagar-Aligarh Transmission Line has got reduced to 177 km from the earlier length of 396 km. FSC is currently in healthy condition. However, based on system condition, it has been kept out of service by System Operator and can be taken into service as per requirement. The Petitioner has requested to allow the transmission tariff as the transmission asset is out of service due to system requirement and its useful life is still remaining.

34. During the hearing on 24.3.2021, in response to a specific query of the Commission regarding the feasibility of shifting/ using the asset, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that they will be able to clarify the same after discussion with CTU.

35. We have considered the submission made by the Petitioner. The Petitioner has submitted that the transmission asset has been kept out of service as per the decision of the system operator. It is clear that the system operator is not the appropriate body to decide to keep transmission assets out of service. UPPCL has constructed LILO of the transmission line (instant transmission asset) and the reasons for LILO are not clear from the submissions of the Petitioner. It is also noted that the Petitioner has not discussed issue of keeping the transmission asset out of service in any RPC meeting and rather this is the Petitioner's decision.

36. Regulation 9(6)(a) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations provides as follows:

“9(6) The following shall be excluded or removed from the capital cost of the existing and new project: (a) The assets forming part of the project, but not in use;”

37. Therefore, we are not inclined to allow the tariff from the day the transmission asset is not in use, i.e., from 31.10.2015. The Petitioner is at liberty to approach the concerned RPC and CTU for feasibility of shifting/ using the transmission asset and based on the decision of RPC and CTU, the Petitioner may approach the Commission.”

7. The Petitioner, in the instant Petition, has proposed to de-capitalize the transmission asset from 3.8.2021 instead of 31.10.2015.

8. As per the directions of the Commission, the Petitioner has deliberated the issue of the feasibility of shifting/using the transmission asset in a meeting under the Chairmanship of CEA held on 3.8.2021, 49th NRPC meeting and 47th TCC meeting held



on 27.9.2021 and 4th meeting of NRPC (TP) held on 5.10.2021 and 12.10.2021. We have perused the Minutes of these meetings. The relevant extract of the minutes of the meeting dated 3.8.2021 under the Chairmanship of CEA is as follows:

“II. Utilization of FSC installed at Muradnagar Sub-station (UPPTCL) in 400 kV Panki-Muradnagar line (UPPTCL) or feasibility of shifting at any other location.

- (i) CTUIL gave the following briefs and observations on the issue:
 - (a) Fixed Series Compensation of 40% was installed by Powergrid in 400 kV Panki(UPPTCL)-Muradnagar S/C Line (396 km Twin Moose) at Muradnagar station end and the same was commissioned on 1.2.2004.
 - (b) Subsequently, LILO of Panki-Muradnagar line at Aligarh (UPPTCL) was approved in 26th SCPSNR meeting held on 13.10.2008 as part of “Evacuation System for Parichha TPS Extn”. The LILO was subsequently commissioned in October, 2015 by UPPTCL.
 - (c) After LILO the length of lines are as follows:
 - Panki-Aligarh 400 kV S/C Line (285 km)
 - Aligarh-Muradnagar 400 kV S/C line (177 km) with FSC (due to reduction in line length the % compensation increases to 90%)
 - (d) Based on the system condition, FSC was kept out of service by System Operator.
 - (e) The Petitioner has approached the Commission vide Petition No. 358/TT/2019 for determination of transmission tariff in respect of FSC at Muradnagar Sub-station for the 2019-24 tariff period for which the Commission had directed the Petitioner to approach concerned RPC and CTUIL for feasibility of shifting/using the FSC.
- (ii) POSOCO stated that as the line length has reduced considerably after LILO and FSC is out of service since 9.10.2015, therefore, the FSC may not be required and same has been highlighted in the operational feedback also.
- (iii) UPPTCL suggested that there is no utilization of FSC at Muradnagar Sub-station, therefore, it is advisable to shift it to any suitable location where it could be utilized.
- (iv) The Petitioner stated that relocation of FSC would also involve shifting and installation cost. As this is an old equipment, it needs to be checked whether shifting it at a new location would be economically beneficial.
- (v) Chief Engineer (PSPA-I), CEA, stated that as per directions of the Commission, the Petitioner needs to discuss the matter with NRPC. The Petitioner informed that subsequently they would be discussing the matter with NRPC. The Chief Engineer suggested the Petitioner to carry out cost benefit analysis, comparing the remaining life of the FSC along with the cost of shifting the FSC and installation of the same at any new location versus cost of installation of a new FSC at the new location.
- (vi) CTUIL stated that in case of shifting the FSC to any new location, short circuit level of new sub-station where FSC would be shifted should match with the design short circuit level of Pank-Muradnagar Sub-station at the time of FSC planning and the length of line where the FSC would be shifted should approximately match with the original length of the line where FSC is installed. In case, relocation of the FSC is not feasible or is not found to be economically viable, the Petitioner may approach the Commission regarding tariff issues for remaining life of the transmission asset.
- (vii) After deliberations, following was agreed:
 - “a) FSC installed at Muradnagar substation (UPPTCL) in 400 kV PankiMuradnagar line (UPPTCL) has no utilization in present scenario However, views of NRPC also needs to be taken in this regard.



(b)As directed by CERC, POWERGRID to approach the concerned RPC and CTU for feasibility of shifting/using the transmission asset and based on the decision of RPC and CTU, the petitioner may approach the Commission”

9. The matter was taken up in the 49th NRPC held on 27.9.2021 and 47th TCC held on 23.9.2021 and 24.9.2021, respectively, and the Technical Co-ordination Committee (TCC) resolved that the Petitioner may approach the Commission based on the decision from CEA's upcoming NRPCTP meeting regarding the utility of FSC. The relevant extract of the minutes of the meetings is as follows:

“C.7 Utilization of FSC installed at Muradnagar substation (UPPTCL) in 400 kV Panki-Muradnagar line (UPPTCL) or feasibility of shifting at any other location (Agenda by POWERGRID)

TCC Deliberations

.....
.....

C.7.5 As per the direction of CERC, POWERGRID approached CTU vide letter dated 09-07-2021. CEA, CTU and other stakeholders had a meeting on 03-08-2021 on the issue (Copy attached). During the meeting, CTUIL stated that in case of shifting the FSC to any new location, short circuit level of new substation where FSC would be shifted should match with design short circuit level of Panki /Muradnagar substation at the time of FSC planning and the length of line where the FSC would be shifted should approximately match with the original length of the line where FSC is to be installed. After deliberations, following was agreed:

- i) FSC installed at Muradnagar substation (UPPTCL) in 400 kV PankiMuradnagar line (UPPTCL) has no utilization in the present scenario. However, views of NRPC also need to be taken in this regard.*
- ii) POWERGRID to carry out cost benefit analysis, comparing the remaining life of the FSC alongwith the cost of shifting the FSC and installation of the same at any new location versus cost of installation of a new FSC at the new location. In case, relocation of the FSC is not feasible or is not found to be economically viable, POWERGRID is to approach CERC regarding tariff issues for remaining life of the asset.*

C.7.6 Representative of CTU highlighted that cost benefit analysis (comparing the cost involved with shifting existing FSC: remaining life of FSC + cost of shifting the existing FSC & installing the same at any new location V/s cost of installation of a new FSC at the new location) is to be done by POWERGRID.

C.7.7 Representative of POWERGRID mentioned that cost of relocation would be much higher and may be equivalent to installation of new FSC, hence balance unrecovered depreciation, which works out to Rs. 4.66 Cr, may be reimbursed.

C.7.8 TCC advised POWERGRID to do the cost benefit analysis and present the same before upcoming CEA's NRPCTP. CTU may provide locations where FSC is required for this purpose. In case, relocation of the FSC is not feasible or is not found to be economically viable, POWERGRID may act as per upcoming CEA's NRPCTP meeting.



NRPC Deliberations

C.7.9 NRPC concurred with the TCC deliberations.”

10. The matter was further taken up for discussion in the 4th meeting of NRPC-TP held on 5.10.2021 and 12.10.2021, wherein it was decided that there is no utilisation of FSC installed at Muradnagar for the present. The relevant extract of the minutes of the meetings is as follows:

“10.2 Utilization of FSC installed at Muradnagar substation (UPPTCL) in 400 kV PankiMuradnagar line (UPPTCL) or feasibility of shifting at any other location.

.....

.....

.....

(vii) After deliberations, following was agreed:

(a) FSC installed at Muradnagar substation (UPPTCL) in 400 kV PankiMuradnagar line (UPPTCL) has no utilization in present scenario. However, views of NRPC also needs to be taken in this regard.

(b) As directed by CERC, POWERGRID to approach the concerned RPC and CTU for feasibility of shifting/using the transmission asset and based on the decision of RPC and CTU, the petitioner may approach the Commission.”

11. The CEA, TCC/NRPC, and NRPC-TP have opined that the transmission asset “has no utilization in the present scenario.” As per Regulation 9(6)(a) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations, the transmission assets forming part of the project but not in use shall be excluded or removed from the capital cost of the project. Accordingly, as the transmission asset was out of service from 31.10.2015, the Commission, in an order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No.358/TT/2019, allowed tariff only up to 31.10.2015. However, the Petitioner, in the instant petition, has proposed to de-capitalize the transmission asset from 3.8.2021 instead of 31.10.2015. As NRPC and CTUIL have stated that the transmission asset has no utilization now, we reiterate our decision in an order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No.358/TT/2019. Accordingly, the Petitioner’s proposal to de-capitalize the transmission asset from 3.8.2021 is rejected, and no tariff is allowed for the transmission asset beyond 31.10.2015.



12. Having heard the representatives of the Petitioner and having perused the material on record, we proceed to dispose of the Petition.

13. The Respondents, mainly the beneficiaries of the Northern Region, are distribution licensees and power departments that are procuring transmission services from the Petitioner.

14. The Petitioner has served the petition on the Respondents and notice regarding filing of this petition has been published in the newspapers in accordance with Section 64 of the Electricity Act, 2003. No comments/ objections have been received from the general public in response to the aforesaid notice published in the newspapers by the Petitioner. CTUIL, Respondent No. 17, *vide* affidavit dated 10.3.2023, has filed its reply as per the directions of the Commission in the hearing dated 12.1.2023.

15. The hearing in this matter was held on 27.9.2023, and the Commission reserved the order.

16. This order is issued considering the submissions made by the Petitioner, *vide* affidavits dated 2.2.2022, 5.8.2022, 29.9.2022, 17.2.2023, and 20.9.2023, and the reply submitted by CTUIL *vide* affidavits dated 10.3.2023 and 27.10.2023.

Truing up of Annual Fixed Charges of the 2014-19 Period

17. The details of the trued-up transmission charges claimed by the Petitioner in respect of the transmission asset are as follows:

	(₹ in lakh)				
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Depreciation	67.10	67.10	33.67	33.67	33.67
Interest on Loan	25.13	20.05	16.21	13.60	11.05
Return on Equity	72.31	72.66	72.66	72.66	72.85
Interest on Working Capital	7.12	7.12	6.38	6.44	6.50
O&M Expenses	60.30	62.30	64.37	66.51	68.71
Total	231.96	229.23	193.29	192.88	192.78



18. The details of the trued-up Interest on Working Capital (IWC) claimed by the Petitioner in respect of the transmission asset is as follows:

Particulars	(₹ in lakh)				
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
O&M Expenses	5.03	5.19	5.36	5.54	5.73
Maintenance Spares	9.05	9.35	9.66	9.98	10.31
Receivables	38.66	38.21	32.22	32.15	32.13
Total Working Capital	52.74	52.75	47.24	47.67	48.17
Rate of Interest (in %)	13.50	13.50	13.50	13.50	13.50
Interest on Working Capital	7.12	7.12	6.38	6.44	6.50

Capital Cost as on 1.4.2014

19. The capital cost of the transmission asset has been calculated in accordance with Regulation 9(3) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The capital cost approved as on 1.4.2014 is ₹1273.22 lakh, and the same is considered for truing up the transmission tariff for the 2014-15 period.

Debt-Equity ratio

20. The Petitioner has claimed a debt-equity ratio of 71.04:28.96 as on 1.4.2014 of the transmission asset. Debt-Equity ratio of 71.04:28.96 is considered as provided under Regulation 19 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The details of the debt and equity as on the COD and as on 31.10.2015 for the transmission asset considered for the purpose of the 2014-19 tariff period are as follows:

Funding	Capital cost as on 1.4.2014 (₹ in lakh)	(in %)	Capital cost as on 31.10.2015 (₹ in lakh)	(in %)
Debt	904.51	71.04	904.51	71.04
Equity	368.71	28.96	368.71	28.96
Total	1273.22	100.00	1273.22	100.00

Depreciation

21. The Petitioner has submitted that unrecovered depreciation of ₹269.39 lakh in respect of the transmission assets needs to be ordered for recovery from the



beneficiaries since the transmission asset has been taken out of service before the completion of its full useful life. The Petitioner has submitted that the Petitioner is not claiming IoL, RoE, O&M Expenses, and IWC for the transmission asset beyond 31.10.2015. However, depreciation has to be paid and cannot remain unrecovered since all the Tariff Regulations from 2001 onwards clearly contemplate the recovery of depreciation up to 90% of the capital cost. The Petitioner has further submitted that normally, the tariff of the transmission asset should continue till 2028-29. In the instant petition, the tariff has been claimed up to 3.8.2021; the tariff from 4.8.2022 to 2028-29 should be approximately ₹1087 lakh. Against the remaining tariff of ₹1087 lakh, an unrecovered depreciation of ₹269.39 lakh has been claimed. The Petitioner has also prayed that the unrecovered depreciation under Regulation 76, “Power to Relax,” and Regulation 77, “Power to Remove Difficulty” of the 2019 Tariff Regulations.

22. We have considered the Petitioner’s submissions. . It is observed that there is no provision in the 2019 Tariff Regulations to recover the unrecovered depreciation on account of de-capitalization.

23. It is further observed that the Petitioner has filed a Petition No. 61/MP/2022 seeking recovery of unrecovered depreciation on decapitalisation of the transmission assets. As this issue of “unrecovered depreciation on decapitalisation of the transmission assets” is being dealt with in Petition no 61/MP/2022 in a comprehensive manner, we are not inclined to allow the Petitioner’s prayer for recovery of the unrecovered depreciation due to decapitalization of the instant transmission asset under the “Power to Relax” in this order. The Petitioner is at liberty to make appropriate claims on the basis of the order in Petition No.61/MP/2022, if required, at the time of truing up.



24. The Gross Block has been depreciated at the weighted average rate of depreciation (WAROD) during 2014-15 and 2015-16. WAROD at Annexure has been worked out considering the depreciation rates of the transmission asset prescribed in the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The transmission asset has been de-capitalized as on 31.10.2015. Accordingly, the depreciation allowed for the 2014-16 tariff period is as follows:

		(₹ in lakh)	
	Particulars	2014-15	2015-16 (pro-rata for 214 days)
	Depreciation		
A	Opening Gross Block	1273.22	1273.22
B	Additional Capitalisation	0.00	0.00
C	Closing Gross Block (A+B)	1273.22	1273.22
D	Average Gross Block (A+C)/2	1273.22	1273.22
E	Freehold land	2.47	2.47
F	Weighted Average Rate of Depreciation (in %)	5.27	5.27
G	Balance useful life of the asset	15	14
H	Elapsed life at the beginning of the year	10	11
I	Aggregate Depreciable Value	1143.68	1143.68
J	Depreciation during the year	67.10	39.23
K	Aggregate Cumulative Depreciation	638.84	678.07
L	Remaining Depreciable Value (I-K)	504.84	465.61

25. The details of depreciation approved, vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014 for the transmission asset, approved vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and trued up in the instant order is as follows:

						(₹ in lakh)
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	
Allowed vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014	67.10	67.10	31.06	31.06	31.06	
Allowed vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019	67.10	39.23 (pro-rata 214 days)				
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	67.10	67.10	33.67	33.67	33.67	



Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Allowed after true-up in this order	67.10	39.23 (pro-rata for 214 days)			

Interest on Loan (“IoL”)

26. The Petitioner has claimed the weighted average rate of IoL based on its actual loan portfolio and rate of interest. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner. IoL has been calculated based on the actual interest rate submitted by the Petitioner in accordance with Regulation 26 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The trued-up IoL allowed in respect of the transmission asset is as follows:

		(₹ in lakh)	
	Particulars	2014-15	2015-16 (pro-rata for 214 days)
	Interest on Loan		
A	Gross Normative Loan	904.51	904.51
B	Cumulative Repayments upto Previous Year	520.69	587.79
C	Net Loan-Opening (A-B)	383.82	316.72
D	Additions	0.00	0.00
E	Repayment during the year	67.10	39.23
F	Net Loan-Closing (C+D-E)	316.72	277.49
G	Average Loan (C+F)/2	350.27	297.11
H	Weighted Average Rate of Interest on Loan (in %)	7.1748	7.0783
I	Interest on Loan (G*H)	25.13	12.30

27. The details of IoL approved vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014 for the transmission asset, approved vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and trued up in the instant order is as follows:

		(₹ in lakh)			
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Allowed vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014	19.03	14.03	10.38	8.07	5.81
Allowed vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019	25.13	12.30 (pro-rata for 214 days)			



Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	25.13	20.05	16.21	13.60	11.05
Allowed after true-up in this order	25.13	12.30 (pro-rata for 214 days)			

Return on Equity (“RoE”)

28. The Petitioner has claimed RoE for the transmission asset in terms of Regulation 24 and Regulation 25 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations. The Petitioner has submitted that it is liable to pay income tax at MAT rates and has claimed the following effective tax rates for the 2014-19 tariff period:

Year	Claimed effective tax rate (in %)	Grossed up RoE [(Base Rate)/(1-t)] (in %)
2014-15	21.018	19.624
2015-16	21.382	19.716
2016-17	21.338	19.705
2017-18	21.337	19.704
2018-19	21.549	19.758

29. The Commission, vide order dated 27.4.2020 in Petition No.274/TT/2019, had arrived at the effective tax rate for the Petitioner based on the notified MAT rates, and the same is as follows:

Year	Notified MAT rates (inclusive of surcharge & cess)	Effective tax (in %)
2014-15	20.961	20.961
2015-16	21.342	21.342
2016-17	21.342	21.342
2017-18	21.342	21.342
2018-19	21.549	21.549

30. The same MAT rates considered in the above-mentioned order in Petition No. 274/TT/2019 are considered for the purpose of grossing up the rate of RoE for trueing up of the tariff of the 2014-19 period in terms of the provisions of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.



Year	Notified MAT rates (in %) (inclusive of surcharge & cess)	Base rate of RoE (in %)	Grossed up RoE [(Base Rate)/(1-t)] (in %)
2014-15	20.961	15.50	19.610
2015-16	21.342	15.50	19.705
2016-17	21.342	15.50	19.705
2017-18	21.342	15.50	19.705
2018-19	21.549	15.50	19.758

31. The Petitioner has claimed RoE for the 2014-19 tariff period after grossing up the RoE@15.50% with effective tax rates (based on MAT rates) each year. Accordingly, RoE is trued up based on MAT rates applicable in the respective years and is allowed for the transmission asset as follows:

(₹ in lakh)			
	Particular	2014-15	2015-16 (pro-rata for 214 days)
A	Opening Equity	368.71	368.71
B	Additions	0.00	0.00
C	Closing Equity (A+B)	368.71	368.71
D	Average Equity (A+C)/2	368.71	368.71
E	Return on Equity (Base Rate) (in %)	15.50	15.50
F	MAT Rate for the respective year (in %)	20.961	21.342
G	Rate of Return on Equity (in %)	19.610	19.705
H	Return on Equity (D*G)	72.30	42.48

32. The details of RoE approved vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014 for the transmission asset, approved vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and trued up in the instant order is as follows:

(₹ in lakh)					
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Allowed vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014	72.30	72.30	72.30	72.30	72.30
Allowed vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019	72.30	42.48 (pro-rata for 214 days)			



Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	72.31	72.66	72.66	72.66	72.85
Allowed after true-up in this order	72.30	42.48 (pro-rata for 214 days)			

Operation & Maintenance Expenses (O&M Expenses)

33. The O&M Expenses claimed by the Petitioner for the transmission asset are as follows:

Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Sub-station					
(i) Series Compensation on Panki-Muradnagar					
400 kV Bays	1	1	1	1	1
Norms (₹ lakh/Bay)	60.30	62.30	64.37	66.51	68.71
Total O&M Expense (₹ in lakh)	60.30	62.30	64.37	66.51	68.71

34. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner. The O&M Expenses allowed for the transmission asset as per norms specified in the 2014 Tariff Regulations are as follows:

Particulars	2014-15	2015-16 (pro-rata for 214 days)
Sub-station		
(i) Series Compensation on Panki-Muradnagar		
400 kV Bays	1	1
Norms (₹ lakh/Bay)	60.30	62.30
Total O&M Expense (₹ in lakh)	60.30	36.43

35. The details of O&M Expenses approved vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014 for the transmission asset, approved vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and trued up in the instant order are as follows:



(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Allowed vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014	60.30	62.30	64.37	66.51	68.71
Allowed vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019	60.30	36.43 (pro-rata for 214 days)			
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	60.30	62.30	64.37	66.51	68.71
Allowed after true-up in this order	60.30	36.43 (pro-rata for 214 days)			

Interest on Working Capital (IWC)

36. IWC has been worked out as per the methodology provided in Regulation 28 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations and is allowed for the transmission asset as follows:

		(₹ in lakh)	
	Particulars	2014-15	2015-16 (pro-rata for 214 days)
A	Working Capital for O&M Expenses (one month of O&M Expenses)	5.03	5.19
B	Working Capital for Maintenance Spares (Maintenance Spares @15% of O&M Expenses)	9.05	9.35
C	Working Capital for Receivables (Receivable equivalent to two months of fixed cost)	38.66	38.37
D	Total Working Capital (A+B+C)	52.73	52.91
E	Rate of Interest (in %)	13.50	13.50
F	Interest of working capital (D*E)	7.12	4.18

37. The details of IWC approved vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014 for the transmission asset, approved vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and trued up in the instant order is as follows:

		(₹ in lakh)			
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Allowed vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014	6.98	6.97	6.17	6.24	6.31
Allowed vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019	7.12	4.18 (pro-rata for 214 days)			



Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	7.12	7.12	6.38	6.44	6.50
Allowed after true-up in this order	7.12	4.18 (pro-rata for 214 days)			

Approved Annual Fixed Charges for 2014-19 Tariff Period

38. The trued-up AFC approved for the transmission asset for the 2014-19 tariff period is as follows:

		(₹ in lakh)	
Particulars		Asset-1	
		2014-15	2015-16 (pro-rata for 214 days)
Annual Transmission Charges			
A	Depreciation	67.10	39.23
B	Interest on Loan	25.13	12.30
C	Return on Equity	72.30	42.48
D	O & M Expenses	60.30	36.43
E	Interest on Working Capital	7.12	4.18
F	Total (A+B+C+D+E)	231.95	134.62

39. The details of Annual Fixed Charges approved vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014 for the transmission asset, approved vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019, claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition and trued up in the instant order are as follows:

		(₹ in lakh)			
Particulars	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Allowed vide order dated 14.3.2016 in Petition No. 191/TT/2014	225.71	222.70	184.29	184.18	184.20
Allowed vide order dated 6.7.2021 in Petition No. 358/TT/2019	231.95	134.61 (pro-rata for 214 days)			
Claimed by the Petitioner in the instant petition	231.96	229.23	193.29	192.88	192.78
Allowed after true-up in this order	231.95	134.62 (pro-rata for 214 days)			



Filing Fee and Publication Expenses

40. The Petitioner has prayed reimbursement of the fee paid by it for filing the Petition and publication expenses.

41. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner. The Petitioner shall be entitled to reimbursement of the filing fees and publication expenses in connection with the present Petition directly from the beneficiaries on a pro-rata basis in accordance with Regulation 70(1) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations.

License Fee and Publication Expenses

42. The Petitioner has sought reimbursement of the licensee fee in accordance with Regulation 70(4) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations for the 2019-24 tariff period. The Petitioner shall be entitled to reimbursement of the licence fee in accordance with Regulation 70(4) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations for the 2019-24 tariff period. The Petitioner shall also be entitled to recovery of RLDC fees and charges in accordance with Regulations 70(3) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations for the 2019-24 tariff period.

Goods and Services Tax

43. The Petitioner has submitted that if GST is levied at any rate and at any point in the future on charges of transmission of electricity, the same shall be borne and additionally paid by the Respondent(s) to the Petitioner and the same shall be charged and billed separately by the Petitioner. Further additional taxes, if any, are to be paid by the Petitioner on account of demand from Government/ Statutory authorities, and the same may be allowed to be recovered from the beneficiaries.



44. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and MPPMCL. Since GST is not levied on transmission service at present, we are of the view that the Petitioner's prayer is premature.

Security Expenses

45. The Petitioner has submitted that security expenses for the transmission assets are not claimed in the instant petition, and it would file a separate petition to claim the overall security expenses and consequential IWC.

46. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner. The Petitioner has claimed consolidated security expenses on a projected basis for the 2019-24 tariff period on the basis of actual security expenses incurred in 2018-19 in Petition No. 260/MP/2020. The Commission vide order dated 3.8.2021 in Petition No. 260/MP/2020 approved security expenses from 1.4.2019 to 31.3.2024. Therefore, security expenses will be shared in terms of the order dated 3.8.2021 in Petition No. 260/MP/2020. Therefore, the Petitioner's prayer in the instant petition for allowing it to file a separate petition for claiming the overall security expenses and consequential IWC has become infructuous.

Sharing of Transmission Charges

47. The transmission charges approved for the transmission in this order shall be recovered on a monthly basis in accordance with Regulation 43 of the 2014 Tariff Regulations and as per the 2010 Sharing Regulations and as amended from time to time. The transmission charges, if any, recovered from the beneficiaries for the period beyond 31.10.2015 shall be adjusted as per the provisions of the 2014 Tariff Regulations and the 2010 Sharing Regulations.



48. To summarise:

a. The trued-up Annual Fixed Charges (AFC) allowed for 2014-19 tariff period are:

Particulars	2014-15	(₹ in lakh)
		2015-16 (pro-rata for 214 days)
AFC	231.95	134.62

49. The Annexure given hereinafter forms part of the instant order.

50. This order disposes of Petition No. 295/TT/2022 in terms of the above discussions and findings.

sd/-
(P. K. Singh)
Member

sd/-
(Arun Goyal)
Member

sd/-
(Jishnu Barua)
Chairperson



Annexure

2014-19 Capital Expenditure	Admitted Capital Cost as on 1.4.2014/COD (₹ in lakh)	Admitted Capital Cost as on 31.3.2019 (₹ in lakh)	Rate of Depreciation as per Regulations	Annual Depreciation as per Regulations (₹ in lakh)	
				2014-15	2015-16
Land - Freehold	2.47	2.47	-	-	-
Sub Station	1270.75	1270.75	5.28%	67.10	67.10
Total	1273.22	1273.22		67.10	67.10
Average Gross Block (₹ in lakh)				1273.22	1273.22
Weighted Average Rate of Depreciation				5.27%	5.27%

