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Record of Proceedings

The matter was heard through video conference.

2. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that the instant petition is filed for revision of transmission tariff of the 2001-04, 2004-09 and 2009-14 tariff periods, truing up of the transmission tariff of the 2014-19 tariff period and determination of transmission tariff of the 2019-24 tariff period in respect of the following assets under “Transmission System associated with RAPP-B Project” in Northern Region:-

a) **Asset-a:** 220 kV D/C RAPP-B-Chittorgarh Transmission Line,
b) **Asset-b:** 220 kV S/C RAPP-B-Udaipur Transmission Line along with associated bays at Udaipur end and LILO of 220 kV D/C RAPP-KOTA Line at RAPP-B including PLCC system, and
c) **Asset-c:** 220 kV S/C RAPP-B-Anta Transmission Line with associated bays at Anta end.
3. The representative of the Petitioner submitted that Assets-a, b and c were put into commercial operation on 1.11.1998, 1.1.2000 and 1.8.2000, respectively. The tariff of the instant assets for 2014-19 period was allowed vide order dated 8.12.2015 in Petition No. 359/TT/2014. He further submitted that no Additional Capital Expenditure (ACE) is claimed for the instant assets during 2014-19 and 2019-24 tariff periods. He submitted that the revision of tariff for 2004-09 period is claimed on account of the judgment of the APTEL dated 22.1.2007 in Appeal No. 81/2005 and the judgement dated 13.6.2007 in Appeal No. 139/2006, and order of the Commission dated 18.1.2019 in Petition No. 121/2007. The representative of the Petitioner has further submitted that there is no decapitalization in the instant case. He further submitted reply to the TV (technical validation) letter and rejoinder to the reply of UPPCL has been submitted.

4. In response to a query of the Commission on whether the APTEL’s judgements would have impact on the capital cost of the instant assets, the representative of the Petitioner submitted that there is no impact of the APTEL’s judgements on capital cost and it only impacts the Interest on Loan and depreciation allowed for the 2001-04 and 2004-09 tariff periods and the consequential impact on the subsequent tariff periods.

5. After hearing the Petitioner, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

sd/-

(V. Sreenivas)
Deputy Chief (Law)