THE MATTER WAS HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCE.

2. The learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that the Commission while determining the transmission tariff for subject assets vide order dated 25.4.2019 in Petition No. 124/TT/2018, has erroneously considered the ‘Interest on Loan’ amount for a full year whereas it should have been computed on a pro-rata basis for the period 27.2.2018 (COD) to 31.3.2018. He further submitted that in case of working capital, the full year O&M Expenses have been considered for the purpose of calculating interest on working capital whereas it should have been considered on pro-rata basis from 27.2.2018 to 31.3.2018.

3. The learned counsel for the Review Petitioner prayed for considering IDC in place of transmission charges for the period of mismatch between the COD of the transmission assets of PGCIL and the commissioning of generation by the Review Petitioner from 27.2.2018 to 17.5.2018 in accordance with provision under Regulation 12(2) and Implementation Agreement between PGCIL and the Review Petitioner. He further submitted that levy of transmission charges has resulted in additional financial implication on the Review Petitioner. He further prayed to consider the submissions made in the Review Petition in support of considering IDC in place of transmission charges.
4. After hearing the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
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Dy. Chief (Law)