

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 238/TT/2018

Subject : Petition for true up of transmission tariff for 2009-14 tariff block and determination of tariff of 2014-19 tariff block of Asset I: Balance portion of 400 kV D/C Baripad Jamshedpur (DVC) Transmission Line alongwith bay at Jamshedpur and Asset II: Reconductoring of circuit-II of 400 kV Siliguri-Purnea D/C line under Eastern Region Strengthening Scheme-I for Eastern Region.

Date of Hearing : 24.5.2019

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member
Shri I.S Jha, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Limited

Parties present : Shri R.B Sharma, Advocate, BRPL, BYPL and BSPHCL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL, BYPL and BSPHCL
Ms. Sanya Sud, Advocate, BRPL, BYPL and BSPHCL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Amit Yadav, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the instant petition is in respect of true up of the transmission tariff of 2009-14 and determination of tariff for 2014-19 period in respect of two assets which are part of Eastern Region Strengthening Scheme-I. He submitted that Asset-II, i.e. re-conductoring of ckt-II of 400 kV D/C Siliguri-Purnea Transmission Line which was put into commercial operation on 1.6.2013 was covered under Petition No. 104/TT/2013. As per the directions in the order dated 12.4.2016 in the said petition, the capital cost has accordingly been reduced by ₹2377.98 and revised tariff forms have been furnished now.

2. Learned counsel for BSPHCL submitted that Asset-I, i.e. balance portion of 400 kV D/C Baripada-Jamshedpur (DVC) Transmission Line and the other portion of the line is somewhere else, therefore, the instant line is not complete and tariff cannot be determined



for an incomplete transmission line. He submitted that the reasons for changing the 'Invar Moose Conductor' to 'Gap Type Conductor' and the approval of the Competent Authority for the change has not been furnished by the petitioner. As regards Asset-II, he submitted that as per 2014 Tariff Regulations the decap and add cap of the asset has to be done in the same petition and not separately. He further submitted that the information provided by the petitioner to calculate the IDC is inadequate. He prayed that the tariff in this petition may not be approved.

3. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the asset was executed in two parts due to ROW issues and the same was done after due discussions in RPC. One part of the asset was covered in Petition No. 34/TT/2014 and the other part was covered in Petition No. 150/TT/2011 and COD of both parts of the transmission line was approved by the Commission. Regarding de cap and add cap of the asset as per 2014 Tariff Regulations, he submitted that the same would be done in single petition at the time of true up.

4. After hearing the parties, the Commission reserved order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(V. Sreenivas)

Dy. Chief (Law)

