CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Review Petition No. 18/RP/2024 along with
IA No. 52/2024
in
Petition No. 10/TT/2019

Coram:

Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member
Shri Harish Dudani, Member

Date of Order: 22.10.2026

In the matter of:

Petition for review of the order dated 21.6.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 to the extent of line length and commercial operation date of Asset -XXIV as declared by APTRANSCO.

And

In the matter of:

Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Limited,
Kaveri Bhavan, Kempegowda Road,
Bengaluru-560009. **…Review Petitioner**

Versus

1. **Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Limited,**
   Vidyut Soudha, Gunadala,
   Eluru Road, Vijaywada- 520004
   Andhra Pradesh.

2. **Transmission Corporation of Telangana Limited,**
   6-3-572, Vidyut Soudha,
   Khairtabad, Hyderabad- 500082,
   Telangana

3. **Tamil Nadu Transmission Corporation Limited**
   No. 144, Anna Salai- 600002,
   Chennai

4. Chief Engineer (Commercial), APPCC
451 A Block, 4h Floor, Vidyut Soudha,
Khairathabad,
Hyderabad -500082

5. Electricity Department
Government of Pondicherry,
Pondicherry -605001. **…Respondent(s)**

Parties Present

Shri Mr. V. M. Kannan, Advocate, KPTCL
Shri Shahbaaz Hussain, Advocate, KPTCL
Ms. Stephania Pinto, Advocate, KPTCL
Ms. Diksha Pherwani, Advocate, KPTCL
Ms. Sindhu G Koushik, Advocate, KPTCL
Ms. Harimohana N., Advocate, KPTCL
Shri Mayank Singh, Advocate, KPTCL
Ms. Rumela Biswas, Advocate, KPTCL
Shri Om Batra, Advocate, APTRANSCO

ORDER

The Review Petitioner, Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Limited (KPTCL), has filed this Review Petition seeking a review of order dated 21.6.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019, whereby the Commission had re-considered the order dated 5.2.2020 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 and the order dated 11.8.2021 in Review Petition No. 18/RP/2020 pursuant to the directions of the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity in its judgment dated 8.7.2022 in DFR No. 378 of 2021 and the Commission determined the transmission charges for 2014-15 and 2015-16 for the forty (40) inter-State transmission lines connecting two States, owned by Respondent No. 1, i.e., Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Limited (APTRANSCO) (hereinafter referred to as ' the Transmission Project'). The details of forty (40) transmission lines are as follows:

S No	Asset	Connecting States	COD	Asset name
1	Asset-I:400kV VTPS–Malkaram line	AP-Telangana	2.4.2013	
2	Asset-II:400kV VTPS-Suryapet line			**Asset-I and II**
3	Asset-III:400kV Srisailam-Sattenapalli CKT I	AP-Telangana	12.2.2014	
4	Asset-IV:400kV Srisailam-Sattenapalli CKT II			**Asset-III and IV**
5	Asset-V:400kV Srisailam-Kurnool (SC) feeder	AP-Telangana	6.3.2001	**Asset-V**
6	Asset-VI:400kV Kalpaka-Khammam-I feeder	AP-Telangana	10.5.2002	
7	Asset-VII:400kV Kalpaka-Khammam-II feeder			**Asset-VI and VII**
8	Asset-X:220kV Nunna-KTPSSCLine	AP-Telangana	21.1.1992	**Asset-X**
9	Asset-XI:220kV Tallapalli –Nagarjuna sagar-I & II feeder	AP-Telangana	5.8.1985	
10	Asset-XII:220kV Tallapalli-Nagarjuna sagar-IIfeeder			**Asset-XI and XII**
11	Asset-XIII:220kV Tallapalli-Nagarjuna sagar-IIIfeeder	AP-Telangana	27.1.1985	**Asset- XIII**
12	Asset-XIV:220kV Tallapalli-Chalakurthy feeder	AP-Telangana	21.7.2007	**Asset- XIV**
13	Asset-XV:220kV Chillakallu-Narketpalli I feeder	AP-Telangana	10.3.2010	
14	Asset-XVI:220 kV Chillakullu-Narketpalli II feeder			**Asset-XV and XVI**
15	Asset-XVII:220kV Brahmanakotkur-Wanaparthy Line (LIS)	AP-Telangana	29.10.2009	**Asset- XVII**
16	Asset-XVIII:220kV Srisailam-Dindi-I feeder	AP-Telangana	12.9.1982	
17	Asset-XIX:220kV Srisailam-Dindi-II feeder			**Asset- XVIII and XIX**
18	Asset-XX:220 kV Nagarjuna Sagar Receiving station-Srisailam SC line	AP-Telangana	7.2.1989	**Asset-XX**
19	Asset-XXI:220kV LSR-KTPS-I feeder	AP-Telangana	31.3.1967	**Asset-XXI**
20	Asset-XXII:220kV LSR-KTPS-II feeder	AP-Telangana	31.3.1979	**Asset- XXII**
21	Asset-XXIII:220kV Chitoor-Tiruvalam	AP-Tamil Nadu	17.3.2013	**Asset- XXIII**
22	Asset-XXIV:220kV Raghulapadu-Alipura line	AP-Karnataka	17.10.2012	**Asset- XXIV**
23	Asset-XXV:220kV Sulurupeta-Gummadipundi	AP-Tamil Nadu	31.10.2012	**Asset- XXV**
24	Asset-XXVI:132kV Nagarjuna sagar-RACPH feeder	AP-Telangana	25.2.1983	**Asset- XXVI**
25	Asset-XXVII:132kV Piduguralla-Wadapalli	AP-Telangana	22.2.2014	**Asset- XXVII**
26	Asset-XXVIII:132kV Tangeda-Wadapalli line	AP-Telangana	26.8.2010	**Asset- XXVIII**
27	Asset-XXIX:132kV Chillakullu-Kodada line	AP-Telangana	10.6.2004	**Asset- XXIX**

28	Asset-XXX:132kV Chillakallu-Ramapuram line	AP-Telangana	21.10.1982	**Asset- XXX**
29	Asset-XXXI:132kV Chillakallu-Sitapuram line	AP-Telangana	6.4.2004	**Asset- XXXI**
30	Asset-XXXII:132kV Chillakallu-Khammam line	AP-Telangana	2.12.2001	**Asset- XXXII**
31	Asset-XXXIII:132kV Chillakallu-Kusumanchi line	AP-Telangana	24.12.1985	**Asset- XXXIII**
32	Asset-XXXIV:132kV Chillakallu-Madhira line	AP-Telangana	27.10.2001	**Asset- XXXIV**
33	Asset-XXXV:132kV Sitapuram-KCPline	AP-Telangana	10.5.2010	**Asset- XXXV**
34	Asset-XXXVI:132kV Chillakallu-Bonakallu-I feeder	AP-Telangana	20.1.1987	**Asset- XXXVI and XXXVII**
35	Asset-XXXVII:132kV Chillakallu-Bonakallu-II feeder			
36	Asset-XXXVIII:132kV A.P.Carbiders-Alampur	AP-Telangana	20.1.1987	**Asset-XXXVIII**
37	Asset-XXXIX:132 kVA.P.Carbides-Gadwal	AP-Telangana	13.1.2000	**Asset- XXXIX**
38	Asset-XXXX:132kVK. Kota-Aswaraopet-I feeder	AP-Telangana	9.6.1982	**Asset- XXXX and XXXXI**
39	Asset-XXXXI:132kV. Kota-Aswaraopet-II feeder			
40	Asset-XXXXII:132kV Pratap Nagar-Yanam Feeder	AP-Telangana	21.11.2013	**Asset- XXXXII**

Background

2. Respondent No. 1, i.e., Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Limited (APTRANSCO) had filed Petition No. 10/TT/2019 for re-consideration of the order dated 5.2.2020 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 and the order dated 11.8.2021 in Review Petition No. 18/RP/2020 pursuant to the directions of the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (APTEL) in its judgment dated 8.7.2022 in DFR No. 378 of 2021. Accordingly, in compliance with APTEL's judgment in Appeal being DFR No. 378 of 2021 dated 8.7.2022, the Commission, vide order dated 21.6.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 had considered the prayer and re-determined the transmission charges for Financial Years 2014-15, 2015-16, 2017-18, and 2018-19 in respect of forty (40) lines. The relevant extract of the order is as follows:

> ***"****28. In view of the above discussions and findings and also in the light of observations of the APTEL in judgement in Appeal being DFR No. 378 of 2021 dated 8.7.2022 regarding fresh consideration of the SRPC Certificates dated 31.10.2016 and 23.11.2016 and*

subsequent SRPC Certificates dated 11.9.2019 and 20.4.2020, we consider the tariff of the forty (40) lines for the 2014-16 period.

29. Accordingly, we now proceed to determine the transmission charges of the forty (40) lines in question for the 2014-16 period. In this connection, since the bifurcation of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana is effective from 2.6.2014, the tariff of 2014-15 shall be calculated between 2.6.2014 to 31.3.2015 on pro-rata basis. We have already determined the tariff of 2016-17 and 2017-19 periods in orders dated 21.6.2018 and 5.2.2020 in Petition Nos. 237/TT/2016 and 10/TT/2019 respectively in the case of forty (40) lines. Further, the Commission vide order dated 5.2.2020 in the instant petition has considered the following parameters for arriving at the tariff for 2017-19 period and the same shall be considered for determination of transmission charges for the 2014- 16 period also:

xxxxx"
xxxxx"

30. The Commission vide order dated 5.2.2020 in the instant petition has elaborated the methodology for arriving at the transmission charges in respect of natural ISTS lines and held as follows:

> *"22. Similar issue was considered by the Commission in its order dated 22.6.2018 in Petition No. 155/TT/2017 wherein the transmission charges in respect of natural ISTS lines were determined on the basis of methodology already adopted by the Commission. The relevant portion of the said order is extracted as under:*
> *xxxxx"*

31. The same methodology is adopted for calculating the tariff for aforesaid 40 assets owned by APTRANSCO. Asset-XI and Asset-XII, Asset-XIII, Asset-XVIII and Asset- XIX, Asset-XX, Asset-XXI, Asset-XXII, Asset-XXVI, Asset-XXX, Asset-XXXIII, Asset- XXXVI and Asset-XXXVII, Asset-XXXVIII and Asset-XXXX and Asset-XXXXI have already completed twenty-five years as on 1.4.2014. Therefore, as per the above methodology, only "Interest on Working Capital" and "O&M Expenses" components of tariff shall be allowable for these 16 assets. The remaining 24 assets (Asset-I to Asset- VII, Asset-X, Asset-XIV to Asset-XVII, Asset-XXIII to Asset-XXV, Asset-XXVII to Asset- XXIX, Asset-XXXI, Asset-XXXII, Asset-XXXIV, Asset-XXXV, Asset-XXXIX and Asset- XXXXII) have not completed 25 years as on 1.4.2014. Thus, in line with the aforesaid methodology, all tariff components are being allowed.

32. Accordingly, we modify the paragraph 21, 23 and 24 of the order dated 5.2.2020 by way of determination of transmission charges for 2014-15 and 2015-16 and incorporating the same with the transmission charges already allowed for 2017-18 and 2018-19 in respect of forty (40) lines, in our earlier order dated 5.2.2020 in the instant petition, as follows:

xxxxx"
xxxxx"

3. The Review Petitioner has filed the instant Review Petition seeking review of the order dated 21.6.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 to the extent of line length and commercial operation date of Asset XXIV "*220kV Ragulapadu - Alipura transmission line*" as declared by APTRANSCO with the following prayers:

a) *"Admit the present Review Petition;*
b) *Review the Order dated 21.06.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 to the extent of determination of transmission tariff for Asset XXIV.*
c) *Hold that the Asset XXIV comprises of 220kV Ragulapadu-Alipura Line with a line length of 18.58km, commissioned on 25.09.1975 and LILO of 220kV Ragulapadu-Alipura line with line length of 20km and commissioned on 06.06.2011 and revise the ARR accordingly.*
d) *Pass an interim order for stay of the recovery of transmission charges by APTRANSCO for Asset XXIV at the rates determined in the Order dated 21.06.2023 and Order dated 05.02.2020 pending disposal of the present review petition.*
e) *Hold that APTRANSCO is liable to refund any excess amount paid by the Karnataka ESCOMs towards transmission charges of Asset XXIV, with interest at 18%per annum.*
f) *Pass such other further order(s) as the Hon'ble Commission may deem just in the facts of the present case."*

4. The Review Petitioner has also filed the IA No. 52/2024 for condonation of delay of 87 days in filing of the instant Review Petition.The IA, along with the Review Petition, was admitted on 25.7.2024, and the notice was issued to the Respondents. The Respondent, Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Limited (APTRANSCO), filed its reply and written submissions r vide affidavit dated 27.8.2024, 13.9.2024, and 17.5.2026. The Review Petitioner also filed a rejoinder to the reply of APTRANSCO. vide affidavit dated 10.12.2024. The Review Petitioner also filed additional affidavit and written submissions vide affidavit dated 21.3.2025 and 14.5.2026, respectively. Subsequently, the Commission heard the matter on 8.8.2024, 28.11.2024, 20.2.2025, & 30.4.2026, and reserved it for orders.

5. This order is being passed based on the affidavits of the Review Petitioner dated 19.9.2023, 3.10.2023, 21.3.2025, and 14.5.2026, APTRANSCO's reply and written submissions filed vide affidavits dated 27.8.2024, 13.9.2024, and 17.5.2026 and the rejoinder filed by the Review Petitioner vide affidavit dated 10.12.2024.

Submissions by the Review Petitioner

6. The Review Petitioner has submitted that Respondent No. 1, APTRANSCO, had filed the Petition No. 10/TT/2019 before the Commission for determination of tariff of 40 numbers

of inter-State transmission lines for Financial years 2014-15, 2015-16, 2017-18, and 2018-19. Respondent No.1, during the course of the proceedings in Petition No. 10/TT/2019, had erroneously submitted that the line length and commercial operation of Asset XXIV are 71.32 Km and 17.10.2012, respectively. This Commission accordingly relied on the data provided by Respondent No.1 and determined the tariff for Asset XXIV.

7. The Review Petitioner has further contended that the Commission, vide order dated 5.2.2020 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019, had approved the tariff for 40 transmission lines for the period Financial Year (FY) 2016-17 based on the Southern Regional Power Committee (SRPC)'s Certificates issued on 31.10.2016 and 23.11.2016. The Commission disallowed the tariff for FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 because the certificates were not retrospectively applicable. Thereafter, the Commission rejected APTRANSCO's Review Petition No. 18/RP/2020 vide order dated 11.8.2021. Subsequently, pursuant to APTEL's judgment dated 8.7.2022 in DFR N. 378/2021, the Commission, vide Order dated 21.6.2023, determined the transmission charges for FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 retrospectively applying the SRPC's Certificates.

8. The Review Petitioner has further submitted that during the course of hearing in Petition No. 265/TT/2019 filed by Respondent No. 1, APTRANSCO, for determination of tariff for the subject transmission lines for the 2019-24 tariff period, APTRANSCO, in its rejoinder, admitted that it had inadvertently calculated the line length and COD and filed its revised calculation as under:

Line Length	**Commercial Operation**
(i). 220kV S/C Ragulapadu-Alipura Line (18.58km)	25.09.1975
(ii). LILO of 220kV S/C Ragulapadu-Alipura line (20km)	06.06.2011

9. The Review Petitioner has submitted that the Commission has considered the revised details provided by the APTRANSCO for computation of tariff in the order dated 7.11.2021 in

Petition No. 265/TT/2019. Accordingly, the Review Petitioner has sought review in light of the erroneous determination of transmission charges for Asset XXIV arising due to the misconception and wrongful declaration of line length and COD by APTRANSCO.

Reply submitted by the Respondent No. 1, APTRANSCO.

10. Respondent No. 1, i.e., APTRANSCO, vide affidavit dated 13.9.2024, has submitted that the Review Petitioner has belatedly filed this Review Petition. This Review Petition, along with IA No. 52/IA/2024, merits dismissal on the following grounds:

I. The Review Petition is barred by limitation;

II. A party which chose not to appear during the proceedings cannot assail the order in a review under Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (the "Code");

III. No grounds for review are made out in the case as there is:

a) No error apparent on the face of the record;

b) No new or additional material that was not within the knowledge of the Review Petitioner has been placed on record;

IV. The length and commercial operation date of Asset XXIV is undisputed and admitted.

I. The Review Petition is Barred by Limitation

a. As per Regulation 103 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 ("COB Regulations"), an aggrieved party is required to file a Review Petition within 45 days from the date the impugned order is passed. The Review Petition has been filed beyond the 45-day period.

b. Regulation 87 (3) of the COB Regulations requires a Review Petitioner to cure defects within 20 days from the date on which the deficiencies are communicated. The deficiencies in the Review Petition were communicated to the Petitioner on 21 November, 2023. However, these deficiencies were only cured by the Petitioner on 11 January 2024, with a delay of 48 days after the deficiencies were first

communicated. In accordance with Regulation 87(4) of the COB Regulations, this Review Petition is liable to be dismissed on this ground as well, as the Petitioner failed to rectify the defects within the prescribed time.

c. Without prejudice to the above, a delay of 86 days as pleaded by the Petitioner in IA No. 52/IA/2024 cannot be condoned for the reason that the Petitioner has failed to plead even a single sufficient reason to explain such inordinate delay.

d. This Review Petition is liable to be dismissed for being barred by limitation

II. A party which chose not to appear during the proceedings cannot assail the order in a review under Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (the "Code")

a. The Review Petitioner has failed to appear or to file any pleadings in the proceedings before this Commission pursuant to the Remand Order, culminating in the Impugned Order.

b. The Review Petitioner consciously elected not to appear or file pleadings before this Commission despite multiple opportunities. The finality of litigation is a cardinal principle of law which the Petitioner seeks to militate against. Consequently, now to seek to assail the Impugned Order by way of review is a clear abuse of the process of law. In these circumstances, the Petition is disentitled to institute proceedings for review of the Impugned Order.

III. No grounds for review are made out in the case, as there is -

a. There is no error apparent on the face of the record. The Review Petitioner has not pointed out any material or documents or fact from the record of this Commission that has not been considered in the Impugned Order. The averments in the Petition and the documents filed in support were never a part of the record of this

Commission. Accordingly, there is no error apparent on the face of the record in this case.

- **No new or additional material was placed on record which was not within the knowledge of the Petitioner.**

a. Order 47, Rule 1 requires that additional or new evidence can be taken into consideration in review only when such evidence was not within the knowledge of the Petitioner or could not be discovered by ordinary due diligence in the original proceedings. The Petitioner has only relied on the order dated 7 November 2021 passed by this Commission in Petition No. 265/TT/2019. The Petitioner was a party before this Commission in those proceedings and was well aware of its existence prior to the passing of the Impugned Order.

IV. The length and commercial operation date of Asset XXIV are undisputed and admitted

a. The Impugned Order records the length and commercial operation date of Asset XXIV as 71.32Km and 17 October 2012, respectively. These facts were duly pleaded in the Original Petition and in the Appeal before APTEL. Similarly, the commercial operation date of Asset XXIV was duly set out in the Appeal.

b. Order dated 27 April 2022 in the DFR No. 378 of 2021 & IA No. 1682 of 2021 records that the Review Petitioner did not wish to dispute any factual averments in the Appeal since it relinquished the right to file a reply to the Appeal. Consequently, the Review Petitioner expressly admits the averments in the Appeal, including the facts set out above. The Review Petitioner, therefore, cannot contend to the contrary in any proceeding.

Rejoinder to the Reply of APTRANSCO, submitted by the Review Petitioner

11. In response to the reply filed by Respondent No. 1, the Review Petitioner, in its rejoinder dated 10.12.2024, has filed issue-wise submissions as under:

(a) As regards limitations, the Review Petitioner has submitted that there has been a delay of mere 87 days in filing the said Review Petition, as the date of filing as mentioned on the CERC's portal is 30.10.2023. The duration from 30.10.2023 to 18.06.2024 is attributable to administrative delay caused by extension of the scrutiny period of the Petition, which is not the Petitioner's fault. As a government company, the Petitioner has various levels of departmental scrutiny to undertake, which cannot be overlooked before the concerned person signs any document. After multiple rounds of discussion within various departments and coordination with the legal counsels present in Delhi, the decision was taken to file a Review Petition, which inadvertently consumed a lot of time and caused an unintentional delay. In support, reliance has been placed on the Hon'ble Supreme Court order in G. Ramegowda v. Spl. Land Acquisition Officer [(1988) 2 SCC 142]. The provisions regarding filing of a Review Petition as mentioned in Rule 1 of Order 47 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908 do not preclude any party who did not appear during the proceedings that led to the Impugned Order from challenging such an order in review. No party is excluded from filing an application for review of an Order, let alone a party who was inadvertently absent from the proceedings leading to the said Order.

(b) As regards the grounds for review, the Review Petitioner has highlighted that the Impugned Order dated 21.06.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 has erroneously mentioned the line length and the commercial operation date of Asset XXIV to be 71.32km and 17.10.2012, respectively. The error apparent is a fact which is

acknowledged by this Commission in the Order dated 07.11.2021 in Petition No. 265/TT/2019 for Asset-XIV (220kV Ragulapadu – Alipura Line and LILO of 220kV Ragulapadu – Alipura Line) filed by Respondent No. 1 for determination of tariff for 40 transmission lines for the control period of FY 2019-2024. In the present case, the error in line length as well as the commercial operation date need not be fished out as it is manifestly and patently clear.

Written Submission by the Review Petitioner and Respondent No. 1, APTRANSCO.

12. The Review Petitioner and Respondent No. 1, APTRANSCO, both have filed the written submissions vide affidavit dated 14.5.2026 and 17.5.2026 respectively and reiterated the submissions made earlier in the instant Review Petition and replies. For brevity, the same are not repeated.

Interlocutory Application - IA No. 52/2024

13. The Review Petitioner has filed this IA for condonation of delay of 87 days in filing the Review Petition and has submitted that, being a Government company, the decision to file the Review Petition needs multiple rounds of discussions among various departments and approvals from the management. It further submitted that, after preparing the Review Petition, it also took time for approvals at various levels and for management signatures.

14. The Respondent No.1, APTRANSCO, has submitted that as per Regulation 103 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 (“COB Regulations”), an aggrieved party is required to file a Review Petition within 45 days from the date on which the impugned order is passed. Therefore, the 86-day delay pleaded by the Review Petitioner cannot be condoned, as the Review Petitioner has failed to plead sufficient reasons to explain such inordinate delay.

15. We have considered the submission of the Review Petitioner and Respondent-1, AOTRANSCO. As the reasons for the delay in filing the Review Petition, as submitted by the Review Petitioner, are found to be justifiable, the delay of 87 days in filing the Review Petition is condoned. Accordingly, IA No. 52/2024 is disposed of in terms of the above.

Analysis and Decision

16. Before examining the issue raised in the present proceedings, it is necessary to examine the scope of review jurisdiction. The Commission derives power of review under Section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 52 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2023 (the 2023 COB Regulations). Regulation 52 (2) of the 2023 COB Regulations provides as follows:

"

(2) "Any person aggrieved by a direction, decision or order of the Commission, from which no appeal has been preferred, may file a review petition on following grounds within 40 days of the making of such decision, direction, or order:

(a) Upon the discovery of new and important matter or evidence, that after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the direction, decision, or order was passed or;

(b) On account of some mistake or error apparent from the face of the record or;

(c) If there is any other sufficient reason to review the matter."

17. It can be inferred from the aforementioned Regulation that the scope of review jurisdiction is limited and can be exercised only where there exists an error apparent on the face of the record, discovery of new and important matter which, despite exercise of due diligence, was not within the knowledge of the party seeking review, or any other sufficient reason within the meaning of the said provisions.

18. The case of the Review Petitioner rests on the pleas that there are errors apparent on the face of the record that require modification of the impugned order. Accordingly, we proceed to examine the issue.

19. After careful perusal of the pleadings of the parties and material on record, the issue that emerges for our consideration is whether the Commission, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, erred in the impugned order dated 21.6.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019, in considering the length and COD of Asset-XXIV, i.e. 220 kV Raghulapadu-Alipura transmission line?

Issue: Whether the Commission, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, erred in the impugned order dated 21.6.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019, in considering the length and COD of Asset-XXIV, i.e. 220 kV Raghulapadu-Alipura transmission line?

20. The Review Petitioner has contended that the Commission has erred in the impugned order in considering the length and COD of Asset-XXIV, i.e. 220 kV Raghulapadu-Alipura transmission line owned by Respondent No. 1, APTRANSCO, for determination of tariff for the F.Y. 2014-15, FY 2015-16, FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19. The Review Petitioner has also contended that Respondent No. 1, APTRANSCO, admitted the error through the rejoinder filed vide affidavit dated 18.8.2020 during the hearing in Petition No. 265/TT/2019. Accordingly, the revised line length and COD as submitted by APTRANSCO have been considered by the Commission for determination of tariff in respect of said Asset-XXIV for the 2019-24 Tariff Period in the order dated 7.11.2021 in Petition No. 265/TT/2019.

21. Respondent No. 1, APTRANSCO, has contended that the Review Petitioner had not raised any contention regarding the length and COD of the Asset-XXIV during the course of hearing before the Commission in Petition No. 10/TT/2019, even in Review Petition No. 18/RP/2020 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 and also before APTEL during hearing in DFR No. 378 of 2021.

22. We have considered the submissions of the Review Petitioner and Respondent No.1, APTRANSCO. With regard to the contentions raised by Respondent No. 1, we are of the view that Regulation 52 (2) of the 2023 COB Regulations, quoted above, does not bar the parties from filing the Review Petition merely on account of its non-submission of pleadings or non-participation during the course of hearing of the main Petition. Therefore, the contention of Respondent No.1, APTRANSCO, does not hold good and deserves to be rejected.

23. Considering the submissions of the Review Petitioner, we deem it fit to review the order dated 5.2.2020 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019, impugned order, and the order dated 7.11.2021 in Petition No. 265/TT/2019, before examining the issue. The relevant extracts of the aforesaid orders are as follows:

A. Order dated 5.2.2020 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019

The Commission had observed as under:

"21. The SRPC vide letter dated 31.10.2016 and 23.11.2016 has certified that total forty two (42) transmission lines are inter-State lines connecting the two States. However, certificate of SRPC cannot be considered as applicable from the retrospective period from 2014 i.e. various dates of 2014 from which the tariff is claimed in respect of assets covered in the instant petition. Accordingly, after excluding Asset-VIII and Asset-IX for the reasons as discussed in Para 15 and 16 above, following 40 assets have been considered for determination of transmission charges:

S No	***Asset***	***Name of Line***	***Type of Conductor***	***Line Length considered (in Km)***	***COD***
----	*--*	*-----*	*---*	*----*	
22	*Asset-XXIV*	*220kV Raghulapadu-Alipura line*	*S/C ACSR -ZEBRA Moose*	*71.32*	***17.10.2012***
---	*-----*	*-----*	*-----*	*----*	*----*

22. Similar issue was considered by the Commission in its order dated 22.6.2018 in Petition No. 155/TT/2017 wherein the transmission charges in respect of natural ISTS lines were determined on the basis of methodology already adopted by the Commission.
Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

xxxxxxxxxxxx

23. The same methodology is adopted for calculating the tariff for aforesaid 40 assets owned by APTRANSCO. Asset-XI & Asset-XII, Asset-XIII, Asset-XVIII & Asset-XIX, Asset-XX, Asset-XXI, Asset-XXII, Asset-XXVI, Asset-XXX, Asset-XXXIII, Asset-XXXVI & Asset-XXXVII, Asset-XXXVIII and Asset-XXXX & Asset-XXXXI have already completed twenty five years as on 1.4.2014. Therefore, as per the above methodology, only "Interest on Working Capital" and "O&M Expenses" components of tariff shall be allowable for these 16 assets. Remaining 24 assets (Asset-I to Asset-VII, Asset-X, Asset-XIV to Asset-XVII, Asset-XXIII to Asset-XXV, Asset-XXVII to Asset-XXIX, Asset-XXXI, Asset-XXXII, Asset-XXXIV, Asset-XXXV, Asset-XXXIX and Asset-XXXXII) have not completed have not completed 25 years as on 1.4.2014. Thus, in line with the aforesaid methodology, all tariff components are being allowed. However, on completion of 25 years of life in case of Asset-X, only 2 components namely "Interest on working Capital" and "O & M Expenses" are being allowed for the year 2017-18 and 2018-19

Transmission charges

24. The Petitioner has claimed transmission tariff for the year 2014-15, 2015-16, 2017-18 and 2018-19. As discussed in para 21, the certificate of SRPC have been issued vide letters dated 31.10.2016 and 23.11.2016 in respect of these lines and therefore cannot be given effect from the retrospective period. Accordingly, transmission tariff for the year(s) 2014-15 and 2015-16 are not allowed and not being considered in the instant Petition. Transmission charges allowed for the instant assets for the year 2017-18 and 2018-19 are summarized in the following tables.
Xxxxxxx
Xxxxxx

(₹ in Lakh)

Particulars	***Asset-XXIV***	
	2017-18	***2018-19***
Depreciation	*89.03*	*89.03*
Interest of Loan	*58.01*	*53.70*
Return on Equity	*78.40*	*78.40*
Interest on working Capital	*6.95*	*6.91*
O&M expenses	*31.81*	*32.88*
Total	***264.20***	***260.92***

B. ***Impugned Order dated 21.6.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019***

The Commission had observed as under:

"28. In view of the above discussions and findings and also in the light of observations of the APTEL in judgement in Appeal being DFR No. 378 of 2021 dated 8.7.2022 regarding fresh consideration of the SRPC Certificates dated 31.10.2016 and 23.11.2016 and subsequent SRPC Certificates dated 11.9.2019 and 20.4.2020, we consider the tariff of the forty (40) lines for the 2014-16 period.

29. Accordingly, we now proceed to determine the transmission charges of the forty (40) lines in question for the 2014-16 period. In this connection, since the bifurcation of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana is effective from 2.6.2014, the tariff of 2014-15 shall be calculated between 2.6.2014 to 31.3.2015 on pro-rata basis. We have already determined the tariff of 2016-17 and 2017-19 periods in orders dated 21.6.2018 and 5.2.2020 in Petition Nos. 237/TT/2016 and 10/TT/2019 respectively in the case of forty (40) lines. Further, the Commission vide order dated 5.2.2020 in the instant petition has considered the following parameters for arriving at the tariff for 2017-19 period and the same shall be considered for determination of transmission charges for the 2014-16 period also:

S No	***Asset***	***Name of Line***	***Type of Conductor***	***Line Length considered (in Km)***	***COD***
----	*--*	*-----*	*---*	*----*	
22	*Asset-XXIV*	*220kV Raghulapadu-Alipura line*	*S/C ACSR -ZEBRA Moose*	*71.32*	***17.10.2012***
---	*-----*	*-----*	*-----*	*----*	*----*

30. The Commission vide order dated 5.2.2020 in the instant petition has elaborated the methodology for arriving at the transmission charges in respect of natural ISTS lines and held as follows:

> *"22. Similar issue was considered by the Commission in its order dated 22.6.2018 in Petition No. 155/TT/2017 wherein the transmission charges in respect of natural ISTS lines were determined on the basis of methodology already adopted by the Commission. The relevant portion of the said order is extracted as under:*
> *xxxxx"*

31. The same methodology is adopted for calculating the tariff for aforesaid 40 assets owned by APTRANSCO. Asset-XI and Asset-XII, Asset-XIII, Asset-XVIII and Asset-XIX, Asset-XX, Asset-XXI, Asset-XXII, Asset-XXVI, Asset-XXX, Asset-XXXIII, Asset-XXXVI and Asset-XXXVII, Asset-XXXVIII and Asset-XXXX and Asset-XXXXI have already completed twenty-five years as on 1.4.2014. Therefore, as per the above methodology, only "Interest on Working Capital" and "O&M Expenses" components of tariff shall be allowable for these 16 assets. The remaining 24 assets (Asset-I to Asset- VII, Asset-X, Asset-XIV to Asset-XVII, Asset-XXIII to Asset-XXV, Asset-XXVII to Asset- XXIX, Asset-XXXI, Asset-XXXII, Asset-XXXIV, Asset-XXXV, Asset-XXXIX and Asset- XXXXII) have not completed 25 years as on 1.4.2014. Thus, in line with the aforesaid methodology, all tariff components are being allowed.

32. Accordingly, we modify the paragraph 21, 23 and 24 of the order dated 5.2.2020 by way of determination of transmission charges for 2014-15 and 2015-16 and incorporating the same with the transmission charges already allowed for 2017-18 and 2018-19 in respect of forty (40) lines, in our earlier order dated 5.2.2020 in the instant petition, as follows:

Xxxxxxxxxx

Xxxxxxxxx

(₹ in Lakh)

Particulars	***Asset-XXIV***			
	2014-15 (Pro-rata)*	***2015-16***	***2017-18***	***2018-19***
Depreciation	*73.90*	*89.03*	*89.03*	*89.03*
Interest of Loan	*62.26*	*69.73*	*58.01*	*53.70*
Return on Equity	*65.09*	*78.40*	*78.40*	*78.40*
Interest on working Capital	*5.95*	*7.11*	*6.95*	*6.91*
O&M expenses	*23.92*	*29.81*	*31.81*	*32.88*
Total	***231.12***	***274.08***	***264.20***	***260.92***

**Pro-rata has been considered from 2.6.2014 to 31.3.2015 =303 days"*

C. Order dated 7.11.2021 in Petition No. 265/TT/2019

The Commission had observed as under:

"

13. The Respondent No. 2, KPTCL, vide reply dated 8.8.2020 has submitted with regard to line length and capital cost of Asset-XIV, as under:

(a) Asset-XIV (Ragalapadu-Allipura line): The line length of 220 kV Ragalapadu-Allipura line is 71.32 km out of which 64 km is in Karnataka and 38.58 km in AP against which APTRANSCO has claimed the length of 71.32 Km in AP portion. Also, capital cost of ₹1686.09 lakh claimed by APTRANSCO for 71.32 km against KPTCL's book value of ₹37.74 lakh for line length of 64 km falling in Karnataka portion is much on higher side.
(b) Therefore, the cost should be restricted to ₹22.75 lakh for line length of 38.58 km falling in AP portion and YTC tariff to be limited to ₹135.55 lakh (considering the KPTCL book value of capital cost of ₹37.74 lakh/YTC claimed by the KPTCL of ₹224.86 lakh).

14. In response, the Petitioner vide rejoinder dated 18.8.2020 has submitted as under:

(a) 220 kV S/C Gooty - Lingapura line existed with line length- 151 km and COD-25.9.1975. Subsequently, LILO arrangement was done in the year 1997 for Alipura S/S and again LILO arrangement was done on 6.6.2011 for 220 kV Ragulapadu. While calculating YTC, the Petitioner considered COD of 17.10.2012 and line length of 71.32 km, inadvertently.
(b) Hence, revised calculations have been submitted herein with revised section wise details, as under:

Asset Name	Line Length	COD considered
Asset-XIV	(i). 220kV Ragulapadu-Alipura Line (18.58km)	25.09.1975
	(ii). LILO of 220kV Ragulapadu-Alipura line (20km)	06.06.2011

15. We have considered the submissions of the Petitioner and KPTCL. The Petitioner has already accepted the error as pointed out by KPTCL in respect of line length and COD of Asset-XIV and submitted the revised calculation sheet. Accordingly, the revised COD of Asset-XIV is considered as under:

Asset Name	Line Length	COD considered
Asset-XIV	(i). 220kV Ragulapadu-Alipura Line (18.58km)	25.09.1975
	(ii). LILO of 220kV Ragulapadu-Alipura line (20km)	06.06.2011

16. Accordingly, the details of 40 assets of the Petitioner identified for determination of tariff for 2019-24 tariff period is summarised as under:

S No	Asset	Asset name	Connecting State	Line Length considered (in Km)	COD
----	--	-----	---	----	
10	Asset-XIV (**)	220 kV Ragulapadu-Alipura	AP-Karnataka	18.58	25.09.1975
		LILO of 220 kV Ragulapadu-Alipura line at Ragulapadu		20.00	06.06.2011
---	-----	-----	-----	----	----

***Revised Affidavit dated 18.8.2020 by APTRANSCO*

Xxxxxxxxx

Xxxxxxx

21. *The Commission vide order dated 21.6.2018 in Petition No. 237/TT/2016 and order dated 5.2.2020 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 has already approved the transmission charges up to 31.3.2019 in respect of the forty (40) transmission lines covered under the instant petition based on SRPC certificates. SRPC had identified 44 lines and issued certificates dated 31.10.2016, 23.11.2016, 22.3.2019 and 2.5.2019 out of which only 40 assets have been considered for determination of transmission charges for the reasons already explained in earlier paragraphs.*

22. The Commission in its order dated 4.5.2018 in Petition No. 112/TT/2017 has adopted a methodology for determination of transmission charges in respect of natural/ deemed ISTS lines.

Xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Xxxxxxxxx

24. A total of 41 assets {number of assets has increased to 41 since Asset-XIV has been split into Asset-XIV(a) and Asset-XIV(b)} are being considered for determination of tariff of 2019-24 tariff period out of which 18 assets namely, Asset-XIV(a), Asset-XV, Asset-XVI, Asset-XVII, Asset-XIX, Asset-XX, Asset-XXI, Asset-XXII, Asset-XXIII, Asset-XXIV, Asset-XXVIII, Asset-XXXIII, Asset- XXXIV, Asset-XXXV, Asset-XXXIX, Asset-XL, Asset-XLI and Asset-XLII have already completed twenty five years as on 1.4.2019. Therefore, as per the methodology adopted in Petition No. 112/TT/2017, only "Interest on Working Capital" and "O&M Expenses" components of tariff shall be allowable for these 18 assets. Remaining 23 assets, namely Asset-I, Asset-II, Asset III, Asset-IV, Asset-V, Asset-VI, Asset-VII, Asset-XII, Asset-XIII, Asset-XIV(b), Asset-XVIII, Asset-XXV, Asset-XXVI, Asset-XXVII, Asset-XXIX, Asset-XXX, Asset-XXXI, Asset-XXXII, Asset-XXXVI, Asset-XXXVII, Asset-XXXVIII, Asset-XLIII and Asset-XLIV have not completed 25 years as on 1.4.2019. Thus, in line with the aforesaid methodology, all tariff components are being allowed under the provisions of the 2019 Tariff Regulations.

Xxxxxxxxxxx

Xxxxxxxxxx

32. The normative O&M Expenses for the 2019-24 period is specified in Regulation 35(3) of 2019 Tariff Regulations. The O&M expenses has been calculated by multiplying line length (in km) with the applicable norms for the O&M expenses per km of respective line.

33. The Petitioner has submitted the technical parameters of instant lines, considered for the purpose of working out O&M expenses as under:

S No	***Asset***	***Asset name***	***Voltage***	***Line Type (S/C or D/C)***	***Number of Conductor***	***COD***	***Line Length (Km)***
----	--	-----		----			
10	*Asset-XIV (a) & Asset-XIV (b)*	*Ragulapadu -Alipura*	*220 kV*	*S/C*	*1*	*25.09.1975*	*18.58*
		LILO of Ragulapadu -Alipura line	*220 kV*	*S/C*	*1*	*06.06.2011*	*20.00*
---	-----	-----		----		----	

34. We have considered the technical parameters submitted by the Petitioner, subsequent modifications as per objections of the Respondents, TSTRANSCO and KPTCL and revised Form-2 submitted by the Petitioner submitted vide affidavit dated 7.7.2021. Accordingly, the details of the O&M Expenses worked out for instant transmission lines as per provisions of Regulation 35(3)(a) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations are as under:

(₹ in Lakh)

S No	***Asset***	***Asset name***	***2019-20***	***2020-21***	***2021-22***	***2022-23***	***2023-24***
----	*--*						
10	*Asset-XIV (a) & Asset-XIV (b)*	*Ragulapadu -Alipura (COD : 25.9.1975)*	*4.682*	*4.831*	*5.017*	*5.184*	*5.370*
		LILO of Ragulapadu -Alipura line (COD: 6.6.2011)	*5.040*	*5.200*	*5.400*	*5.580*	*5.780*
---	*-----*	*-----*		*----*		*----*	

”

24. In view of the above, it is evident that Respondent No. 1, APTRANSCO, had incorrectly disclosed the length and COD of “*220 kV Ragulapadu-Alipura transmission line*” in Petition No. 10/TT/2019, which was subsequently acknowledged and corrected by Respondent in its rejoinder dated 18.8.2020 filed during the proceedings in Petition No. 265/TT/2019. Accordingly, the Commission considered the corrected length and COD of the said transmission line for determining the tariff for the 2019-24 Tariff period. Therefore, the inadvertent error needs to be corrected to the extent prayed for in the instant Review Petition.

25. Accordingly, the relevant para(s) of the order dated 5.2.2020 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 and the order dated 21.6.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 stand corrected as follows:

A. <u>Order dated 5.2.2020 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019</u>

(i) Serial No. 24 of Table under Para 10 is revised as follows:

S No	***Asset***	***Connecting States***	***COD***	***Asset Name***
----	*--*	*-----*		*----*
24	*Asset-XXIV (a) 220 kV Ragulapadu-Alipura line, and Asset-XXIV (b) LILO of Ragulapadu-Alipura line at Ragulapadu*	*AP-Karnataka*	*25.9.1975*	*Asset-XXIV (a)*
			06.06.2011	*Asset-XXIV (b)*

---	-----	-----		----

(ii) Serial No. 22 of Table under Para 21 is revised as follows:

S. No.	***Asset Name***	***Name of Line***	***Type of conductor***	***Line Length (in Km)***	***Date of Commercial Operation***
----		--	-----	---	----
22	*Asset-XXIV (a)*	*220 kV Ragulapadu-Alipura line*	*S/C ACSR-ZEBRA-Moose*	*18.58*	*25.9.1975*
	Asset-XXIV (b)	*LILO of Ragulapadu-Alipura line at Ragulapadu*	*S/C ACSR-ZEBRA-Moose*	*20.00*	*06.06.2011*
---		-----	-----		----

(iii) Accordingly, Para 23 is revised as follows:

"23. The same methodology is adopted for calculating the tariff for aforesaid 40 assets owned by APTRANSCO. Asset-XI & Asset-XII, Asset-XIII, Asset-XVIII & Asset-XIX, Asset-XX, Asset-XXI, Asset-XXII, ***Asset-XXIV(a),*** *Asset-XXVI, Asset-XXX, Asset-XXXIII, Asset-XXXVI & Asset-XXXVII, Asset-XXXVIII and Asset-XXXX & Asset-XXXXI have already completed twenty-five years as on 1.4.2014. Therefore, as per the above methodology, only "Interest on Working Capital" and "O&M Expenses" components of tariff shall be allowable for these 16 assets. Remaining 24 assets (Asset-I to Asset-VII, Asset-X, Asset-XIV to Asset-XVII, Asset-XXIII,* ***Asset-XXIV(b)*** *, Asset-XXV, Asset-XXVII to Asset-XXIX, Asset-XXXI, Asset-XXXII, Asset-XXXIV, Asset-XXXV, Asset-XXXIX and Asset-XXXXII) have not completed have not completed 25 years as on 1.4.2014. Thus, in line with the aforesaid methodology, all tariff components are being allowed. However, on completion of 25 years of life in case of Asset-X, only 2 components namely "Interest on working Capital" and "O & M Expenses" are being allowed for the year 2017-18 and 2018-19."*

(iv) The Table for Asset-XXIV under Para 24 is substituted as follows:

(₹ in Lakh)

Particulars	***Asset-XXIV (a)***	
	2017-18	***2018-19***
Depreciation	0.00	0.00
Interest of Loan	0.00	0.00
Return on Equity	0.00	0.00
Interest on working Capital	0.23	0.24
O&M expenses	4.14	4.27
Total	**4.37**	**4.51**

(₹ in Lakh)

Particulars	***Asset-XXIV (b))***	
	2017-18	***2018-19***
Depreciation	20.76	20.76
Interest of Loan	11.98	10.85
Return on Equity	18.28	18.28
Interest on working Capital	1.42	1.40
O&M expenses	4.46	4.60
Total	**56.90**	**55.90**

B. <u>Order dated 21.6.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019</u>

(i) The Serial No. 24 of Table under sub para (e) of Para 2 is revised as follows:

S No	***Asset***	***Connecting States***	***COD***	***Asset***
----	*--*	*-----*		*----*
24	*Asset-XXIV (a) 220 kV Ragulapadu-Alipura line, and Asset-XXIV (b) LILO of Ragulapadu-Alipura line at Ragulapadu*	*AP-Karnataka*	*25.9.1975*	*Asset-XXIV (a)*
			06.06.2011	*Asset-XXIV (b)*
---	*-----*	*-----*		*----*

(ii) The Serial No. 22 of Table under Para 29 is revised as follows:

S No	***Asset***	***Name of Line***	***Type of conductor***	***Line Length considered (in Km)***	***COD***
----		*--*	*-----*	*---*	*----*
22	*Asset-XXIV (a)*	*220 kV Ragulapadu-Alipura line*	*S/C ACSR-ZEBRA-Moose*	*18.58*	*25.9.1975*
	Asset-XXIV (b)	*LILO of Ragulapadu-Alipura line at Ragulapadu*	*S/C ACSR-ZEBRA-Moose*	*20.00*	*06.06.2011*
---		*-----*	*-----*		*----*

(iii) Para 31 is revised as follows:

31.. The same methodology is adopted for calculating the tariff for aforesaid 40 assets owned by APTRANSCO. Asset-XI & Asset-XII, Asset-XIII, Asset-XVIII & Asset-XIX, Asset-XX, Asset-XXI, Asset-XXII, ***Asset-XXIV(a),*** *Asset-XXVI, Asset-*

*XXX, Asset-XXXIII, Asset-XXXVI & Asset-XXXVII, Asset-XXXVIII and Asset-XXXX & Asset-XXXXI have already completed twenty-five years as on 1.4.2014. Therefore, as per the above methodology, only "Interest on Working Capital" and "O&M Expenses" components of tariff shall be allowable for these 16 assets. Remaining 24 assets (Asset-I to Asset-VII, Asset-X, Asset-XIV to Asset-XVII, Asset-XXIII, **Asset-XXIV(b)** , Asset-XXV, Asset-XXVII to Asset-XXIX, Asset-XXXI, Asset-XXXII, Asset-XXXIV, Asset-XXXV, Asset-XXXIX and Asset-XXXXII) have not completed have not completed 25 years as on 1.4.2014. Thus, in line with the aforesaid methodology, all tariff components are being allowed.*

(iv) The Serial No. 22 of Table under Para 32 is revised as follows:

S No	***Asset***	***Name of Line***	***Type of conductor***	***Line Length considered (in Km)***	***COD***
----		*--*	*-----*	*---*	*----*
22	*Asset-XXIV (a)*	*220 kV Ragulapadu-Alipura line*	*S/C ACSR-ZEBRA-Moose*	*18.58*	*25.9.1975*
	Asset-XXIV (b)	*LILO of Ragulapadu-Alipura line at Ragulapadu*	*S/C ACSR-ZEBRA-Moose*	*20.00*	*06.06.2011*
---		*-----*	*-----*		*----*

(v) Sub para (23) of Para 32 is revised as follows:

*23. The same methodology is adopted for calculating the tariff for aforesaid 40 assets owned by APTRANSCO. Asset-XI & Asset-XII, Asset-XIII, Asset-XVIII & Asset-XIX, Asset-XX, Asset-XXI, Asset-XXII, **Asset-XXIV(a),** Asset-XXVI, Asset-XXX, Asset-XXXIII, Asset-XXXVI & Asset-XXXVII, Asset-XXXVIII and Asset-XXXX & Asset-XXXXI have already completed twenty five years as on 1.4.2014. Therefore, as per the above methodology, only "Interest on Working Capital" and "O&M Expenses" components of tariff shall be allowable for these 17 assets. Remaining 24 assets (Asset-I to Asset-VII, Asset-X, Asset-XIV to Asset-XVII, Asset-XXIII, **Asset-XXIV(b)** , Asset-XXV, Asset-XXVII to Asset-XXIX, Asset-XXXI, Asset-XXXII, Asset-XXXIV, Asset-XXXV, Asset-XXXIX and Asset-XXXXII) have not completed have not completed 25 years as on 1.4.2014. Thus, in line with the aforesaid methodology, all tariff components are being allowed. However, on completion of 25 years of life in case of Asset-X, only 2 components namely "Interest on working Capital" and "O & M Expenses" are being allowed for the year 2017-18 and 2018-19.*

(vi) The Table for Asset-XXIV under Para 32 is substituted as follows:

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	***Asset-XXIV (a)***			
	2014-15 (Pro-rata)*	***2015-16***	***2017-18***	***2018-19***
Depreciation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Interest of Loan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Return on Equity	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Interest on working Capital	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.24
O&M expenses	3.75	3.88	4.14	4.27
Total	**3.96**	**4.09**	**4.37**	**4.51**

**Pro-rata has been considered from 2.6.2014 to 31.3.2015=303 days*

(₹ in lakh)

Particulars	***Asset-XXIV (b)***			
	2014-15 (Pro-rata)*	***2015-16***	***2017-18***	***2018-19***
Depreciation	17.23	20.76	20.76	20.76
Interest of Loan	13.29	14.77	11.98	10.85
Return on Equity	15.18	18.28	18.28	18.28
Interest on working Capital	1.28	1.47	1.42	1.40
O&M expenses	4.04	4.18	4.46	4.60
Total	**51.02**	**59.47**	**56.90**	**55.90**

**Pro-rata has been considered from 2.6.2014 to 31.3.2015=303 days*

26. Except for the above, all other terms contained in the orders dated 5.2.2020 and 21.6.2023 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 shall remain unaltered.

27. Accordingly, Review Petition No. 18/RP/2024 along with IA No. 52/2024 in Petition No. 10/TT/2019 stands disposed of.

sd/-	**sd/-**	**sd/-**
(Harish Dudani)	**(Ramesh Babu V.)**	**(Jishnu Barua)**
Member	**Member**	**Chairperson**

CERC Website S. No. 527/2026