

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 255/TT/2018**

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff for 2014-19 period of ICTs at Mandola Sub-station and Ballabgarh Sub-station under NRSS-XXXII in Northern Region.
- Date of Hearing** : 19.2.2019
- Coram** : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member  
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL)
- Respondents** : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. (RRVPL) and 16 others
- Parties present** : Shri Ved Prakash Rustogi, PGCIL  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL  
Shri S.K. Venkatsan, PGCIL  
Shri B. Dash, PGCIL  
Shri Ansul Garg, PGCIL  
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL  
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL

**Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that six assets are covered in the instant petition which are ICTs at Mandola and Ballabgarh. The tariff in respect of these assets was earlier claimed in Petition No. 200/TT/2016 but the Commission did not allow the tariff for them observing that the same should be claimed in a fresh petition alongwith the details of de-capitalization after putting them into service and ensuring utilisation of the replaced ICTs. He submitted that tariff of these replaced ICTs, which were earlier part of the Rihand Transmission System, was allowed in Petition No. 133/TT/2015. He, however, requested the Commission to allow the petitioner to de-capitalize the above referred 6 no. of ICTs from the Rihand Transmission System and recapitalize them in the capital cost of new projects at the time of truing up of the tariff for the 2014-19 tariff period. He further submitted that the assets covered in the present



petition are new assets which achieved CODs during March, 2016 to October, 2016. He requested to allow the tariff for these new ICTs as prayed for in the petition.

2. Learned counsel for BRPL submitted that capitalization and de-capitalization of the assets should be strictly done in line with the procedure laid down in the Regulations. The petitioner has not filed the TSA as required under Regulation 3 (63) of 2014 Tariff Regulations. He submitted that IDC may be allowed only on the accrual basis. He further submitted that there is time over-run of 3-4 months for which no documents have been placed on record by the petitioner.

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit by 15.3.2019 with an advance copy to the respondents:-

(a) Statement of discharge of the Initial Spares, if any, during the period for all the assets.

(b) Details of IEDC incurred during the period of time over-run (i.e. from scheduled COD to the actual COD) alongwith the liquidated damages recovered or recoverable, if any.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to comply with the above directions within the specified timeline and observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

5. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-  
(T. Rout)  
Chief (Law)

