

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 9/RP/2013**

**In  
Petition No. 1/MP/2013**

**Coram:**

**Shri V.S. Verma, Member**

**Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member**

**Date of Hearing: 13.8.2013**

**Date of order : 10.9.2013**

**In the matter of**

Review of order dated. 21.5.2013 in Petition No. 1/MP/2013 pertaining to reimbursement of additional expenditure incurred on deployment of Special Security Forces (SSF) at Bongaigaon and Salakati sub-station for the year 2011-12.

**And in the matter of**

Power Grid Corporation of India Limited, Gurgaon  
Vs

**.....Petitioner**

1. Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna
2. West Bengal State Electricity Board, Calcutta
3. Grid Corporation of Orissa Ltd., Bhubaneswar
4. Damodar Valley Corporation, Calcutta
5. Power Department, Govt. of Sikkim, Gangtok
6. Jharkhand State Electricity Board, Ranchi
7. Assam Power Distribution Company Ltd., Guwahati
8. Meghalaya State Electricity Board, Govt. of Meghalaya
9. Department of Power, Govt of Arunachal Pradesh
10. Power and Electricity Department, Govt. of Mizoram
11. Electricity Department, Govt. of Manipur
12. Department of Power Govt. of Nagaland
13. Department of Power, Government of Tripura, Agartala

**Respondents**

**Following were present:**

Shri Prashant Sharma, PGCIL

Shri S.S.Raju, PGCIL

Shri M.M.Mondal, PGCIL



## **ORDER**

Petition No. 1/MP/2013 was filed Power Grid Corporation of India Limited for reimbursement of additional expenditure incurred on deployment of Special Security Forces (SSF) at Bongaigaon and Salakati sub-station for the year 2011-12 under Regulation 44 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009. The Commission on the basis of the pleading and oral submissions of the parties during the hearing directed vide its order dated 21.5.2013 that the entire expenses of ₹206.48 lakh in respect of Salakati sub-station and 50% of the expenses of ₹204.38 lakh in case of Bongaigaon sub-station would be shared by the beneficiaries of Eastern Region.

2. The petitioner has filed this review petition seeking review of the order dated 21.5.2013 on the following grounds:

(a) The constituents of the North Eastern Region have not been shown as respondents in the order dated 21.5.2013.

(b) 50% of the expenses in case of Bongaigaon sub-station which works out to ₹204.34 lakh has been indicated as ₹204.38 lakh.

(c) The sharing of the charges may be done in accordance with the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Sharing of Inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulations, 2010 (Sharing Regulations).



3. We have heard the representative of the petitioner who submitted that apart from the clerical /arithmetical errors, the Commission may direct sharing of the security expenses as per the Sharing Regulations.

4. Regulation 103 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 as amended from time to time provides as under:

"103 (1). The Commission may at any time, on its own motion, or on an application of any of the persons or parties concerned, within 45 days of making such decision, direction or order, review such decision, directions or orders and pass such appropriate orders as the Commission deems fit:

Provided that power of review by the Commission on its own motion under this clause may be exercised only for correction of clerical or arithmetical mistakes arising from any accidental slip or omission.

(2) An application for such review shall be filed in the same manner as a petition under Chapter-II of these Regulations."

5. As per the above regulations, the clerical or arithmetical error can be rectified by the Commission suo-motu at any time.

6. The first ground is that the constituents of the North Eastern Region (NER) have not been shown as respondents in the order dated 21.5.2013. We notice that the Review Petitioner included the constituents of NER as respondents in the petition. However, the constituents of NER have not been inadvertently shown as respondents in the impugned order. This being clerical mistake, we direct that the constituents of NER should be included in the list of respondents.

7. The second ground of the Review Petitioner is that `204.34 lakh has been shown as `204.38 lakh in the impugned order. We find that the actual



expenditure shown in the impugned order, a copy of which has been annexed with the review petition, is ₹ 204.34 lakh and not ₹ 304.38 lakh. Hence, there is no error.

8. The Commission had not issued any direction with regard to sharing of security expenses, presumably because of the reasons that no prayer to that effect was made by the petitioner in Petition No. 1/MP/2013. The petitioner has requested that the security expenses should be shared as per the Sharing Regulations. In our view, the directions regarding sharing of security expenses was overlooked by the Commission while issuing the impugned order. We consider it appropriate to issue necessary directions regarding sharing so that the constituents can pay the security expenses to the petitioner. Prior to 1.7.2011, the security expenses were being shared by the beneficiaries in proportion to their share in the ISGS. With effect from 2011, the security expenses are shared in accordance with the Sharing Regulations. Accordingly, security expenses with regard to Bongaigaon sub-station associated with Bongaigaon-New Siliguri transmission line (inter-regional asset between ER and NER) under Kathalguri transmission system shall be shared by the constituents of ER and NER and security expenses with regard to Salakati sub-station associated with Chukha transmission line shall be shared by the constituents of the Eastern Region only in proportion to the transmission charges shared by the beneficiaries of Eastern Region in accordance with Regulation 33 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 from 1.4.2011 to 30.6.2011 and in accordance with Sharing Regulations from 1.7.2011 onwards.



9. Except the above, all other terms contained in the order dated 21.5.2013 remains unchanged.

10. Review Petition No. 9/2013 is disposed of with the above directions.

Sd/-

**(M. Deena Dayalan)**  
**Member**

sd/-

**(V.S. Verma)**  
**Member**

