

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**NEW DELHI**

**Review Petition No. 41/RP/2022**

**in**

**Petition No. 159/TT/2021**

**Coram:**

**Shri I. S. Jha, Member  
Shri Arun Goyal, Member  
Shri P. K. Singh, Member**

**Date of Order: 06.12.2023**

**In the matter of:**

Petition seeking review of order dated 25.6.2022 passed in Petition No. 159/TT/2021.

**And in the matter of:**

Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited,  
Shakti Bhawan, Sector 6,  
Panchkula, Haryana-134109.

**.... Review Petitioner**

**Vs.**

1. Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,  
Saudamani, Plot No. 2,  
Sector 29, Gurgaon, Haryana-122001.
2. Himachal Pradesh Power Transmission Corporation Limited,  
HIMFED Bhawan, Pnajari,  
Shimla-171005.
3. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited,  
Vidyut Bhawan, Janpath,  
Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
4. Punjab State Transmission Corporation Limited,  
PSEB Head Office, The Mall,  
Patiala-147001.

**... Respondents**



**For Review Petitioner** : Ms. Nikita Choukse, Adovcate, HVPNL  
Shri Ankush Garg, HVPNL

**For Respondents** : None

### **ORDER**

The instant review petition is filed for review of the order dated 25.6.2022 in Petition No.159/TT/2021, wherein the Review Petitioner has sought approval of transmission tariff for the 2019-24 tariff period in respect of the following seven number of transmission lines:

<b>Asset</b>	<b>Particulars</b>	<b>COD</b>	<b>Length in km</b>	<b>Connecting States</b>
Asset-I	220 kV S/C Bhiwadi-Rewari (Ckt.-1)	7.2.2009	23.761	Rajasthan-Haryana
Asset- II	220 kV S/C Bhiwadi-Mau	18.6.2011	14.067	Rajasthan-Haryana
Asset- III	220 kV S/C Bhiwadi-Rewari (Ckt.-2)	18.1.2016	23.761	Rajasthan-Haryana
Asset- IV	220 kV S/C HSIIDC Bawal-Bhiwadi	16.9.2016	25.69	Rajasthan-Haryana
Asset- V	220 kV S/C Pinjore-Kunihar (Ckt.-1)	16.11.2017	49.5 (Haryana Portion 24.5 km)	HP-Haryana
Asset- VI	220 kV S/C Pinjore-Kunihar (Ckt.-2)	13.7.2018	49.5 (Haryana Portion 24.5 km)	HP-Haryana
Asset- VII	132 kV D/C Pinjore-Ropar	22.11.1971	55	Punjab-Haryana

2. The Commission in order dated 25.6.2022 in Petition No.159/TT/2021 granted tariff in respect of only Asset-I, i.e. 220 kV S/C Bhiwadi-Rewari (Ckt.-1) and rejected the Review Petitioner's prayer for approval of tariff in respect of Asset-II to Asset-VII. The relevant extracts of the order dated 25.6.2022 in Petition No.159/TT/2021 is as follows:

*"9. The Commission did not grant any tariff for Asset-II, Asset-III, Asset-IV and Asset- VII. The Petitioner had not filed any Petition of tariff determination of these assets during 2014-19 tariff period and submitted that the State Commission has already granted tariff in*



respect of these assets in the ARR for the State network for 2015-19 period. Therefore, we are not inclined to allow tariff for the Asset-II, Asset-III, Asset-IV and Asset-VII. The Petitioner is directed to continue its claim of tariff with respect to the transmission line under the ARR methodology of Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (“HERC”) as was done by for the 2015-19 period.”

“12. It is observed that the Petitioner initially made the LILO of the existing 220 kV Madanpur (Panchkula)- Kunihar (Himachal Pradesh) at Baddi Sub-station (in Himachal Pradesh). The Petitioner further made the LILO of 220 kV Madanpur (Panchkula)-Baddi line (Himachal Pradesh) and 220 kV Madanpur (Panchkula)-Kunihar line (Himachal Pradesh) at Pinjore Sub-station (Haryana). As such, multiple LILO of the existing transmission line has been done by the Petitioner, first at Baddi Sub-station (Himachal Pradesh) and later on at Pinjore Sub-station (Haryana). Therefore, basic nature of natural ISTS line (in terms of line length, both terminal end, power flow, etc.) which was earlier approved has changed. Further, the Petitioner has not submitted any RPC/SCM approval where the LILO of the existing transmission line is approved and the reasons for creating the LILO of the existing line and any agreement made between the two states regarding power exchange over this line and maintenance of the line to be carried out by the two states in respective portion. Therefore, we are not inclined to approve the tariff in respect of Asset-V and Asset-VI.”

3. Aggrieved with the order dated 25.6.2022, the Review Petitioner has filed the instant review petition and has made the following prayers:

- a) Review the Final Order dated 25.06.2022 passed in Petition No. 159/TT/2021 to the extent mentioned in the present petition and make appropriate determination of tariff for Asset I to VII for 2019-20 to 2023-24.
- b) Allow additions/ alterations/ changes/ modification to the Petition at a future date.
- c) Condone any inadvertent omissions/ errors/ differences/ shortcomings.
- d) Pass such other and/or further order or orders and/or direction or directions as, the Commission, may deem fit and proper.”

4. The Review Petitioner has filed the instant petition on the following three grounds:

- a. Disallowance of O&M Expenses for the bays associated with Asset-I.
- b. Disallowance of tariff for Asset-II, Asset-III, Asset-IV and Asset-VII.
- c. Disallowance of tariff for Asset-V and Asset-VI.

5. The Review Petitioner has submitted that no reason was given for disallowing O&M Expenses for the bays associated with Asset-I in order dated 25.6.2022. The



Commission's observation that Review Petitioner should continue to claim the transmission tariff for Asset-II, Asset-III, Asset-IV and Asset-VII from the State Commission for the 2019-24 tariff period as in the 2015-19 is an apparent error as these natural inter-State transmission lines are used by other beneficiaries across the country and hence the tariff of these lines should be determined by the Commission as provided in Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003. No opportunity was given to the Review Petitioner to present evidence to show that Asset-V and Asset-VI are ISTS despite the LILO. These are errors on the face of record which need to be rectified.

6. The review petition was admitted on 21.6.2023 and notice was issued to the Respondents. However, none of the Respondents have filed reply in the matter.

7. The review petition was heard on 30.8.2023 and order was reserved in the matter. Based on the submissions made by the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner and the documents on record, we proceed to dispose of the petition.

**Disallowance of O&M Expenses for the bays associated with Asset-I**

8. The Review Petitioner has submitted that the Review Petitioner's claim for O&M Expenses for the bays associated with Asset-I under Regulation 35 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations was disallowed without any reasoning.

9. We have considered the submissions of the Review Petitioner. In the instant case, the Review Petitioner has not claimed the capital cost of the 220 kV bays at Rewari Substation. The O&M Expenses for a transmission asset is allowed, as part of the transmission tariff, only if the capital cost of that asset is approved by the Commission. As the Review Petitioner did not claim the capital cost of the bays associated with Asset-

---



I, O&M Expenses were not allowed for the bays associated with Asset-I and O&M Expenses were allowed for the only the transmission line. As such, there is no error in order dated 25.6.2022 in this regard. Moreover, in response to a query of the Commission during the hearing on 30.8.2023, the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that they have no issues with the disallowance of the O&M Expenses for the bays associated with Asset-I.

**Disallowance of tariff for Asset-II, Asset-III, Asset-IV and Asset-VII**

10. The Commission in order dated 25.6.2022 in Petition No. 159/TT/2021, taking into consideration the fact that the tariff for these transmission assets was allowed for the 2015-19 tariff period by the State Commission, directed the Review Petitioner to continue to claim the tariff for the 2019-24 tariff period from the State Commission. The Review Petitioner has submitted that the Review Petitioner has inadvertently recovered tariff of these transmission assets from the State Commission for the period of 2015-19 in terms of the ARR orders passed for the respective years. However, the said inadvertent mistake will not confer jurisdiction upon the State Commission for determining tariff in relation ISTS lines. The Review Petitioner has submitted that this Commission has the sole regulatory jurisdiction for determining the tariff of these ISTS transmission assets. The jurisdiction for determining the tariff of these ISTS lines for future cannot be conferred upon the State Commission contrary to the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003. The Review Petitioner has further submitted that the Review Petitioner has simultaneously filed a separate Petition No. 1/TT/2023 seeking determination of tariff for Asset-II, Asset-III, Asset-IV and Asset-VII on similar grounds for the 2015-19 period.



11. The Review Petitioner, vide affidavit dated 5.10.2023, has further submitted that the lines covered in the instant petition are ISTS lines. The details of the transmission lines and purpose of construction of the line as submitted by the Review Petitioner is as follows:

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Lines</b>	<b>Whether it carries inter-state power</b>	<b>Purpose of construction of this line</b>
1	Asset-II: 220 kV S/C Bhiwadi-Mau  CoD: 18.6.2011	The asset carries power from Rajasthan-Haryana	220 kV Mau Sub-station was planned to provide relief to 66 kV sub-stations at Dharuhera, Pataudi and Tauro. As such, to feed 220 kV Mau Sub-station, LILO of Badshahpur-Bhiwadi line at 220 kV Mau was planned. The 220 kV Bhiwadi-Mau line has been mentioned in 36 <sup>th</sup> Standing Committee
2.	Asset-III: 220 kV S/C Bhiwadi-Rewari (Ckt-2)  CoD: 18.1.2016	The asset carries power from Rajasthan to Haryana	As such, 220 kV S/C Bhiwadi-Rewari (Ckt-2) was planned to utilize the remaining 2 no. bays to eliminate the possibility of other state claim on the same. Further, the power available from Bhiwadi Sub-station can be utilized towards Gurgaon area as numbers of sub-stations are being planned towards Gurgaon side. In 22 <sup>nd</sup> Standing Committee meeting of Northern region on 12.3.2007, the issue of non-utilization of 220 kV bays at 400 kV Bhiwadi Sub-station earmarked for Haryana came up for discussion.
3	Asset-IV: 220 kV S/C HSIIDC-Bawal -Bhiwadi  CoD: 16.9.2016	The asset carries power from Rajasthan to Haryana	220 kV HSIIDC Bawal was initially planned to be connected to 220 kV Mau. However, for direct access to 400 kV sub-station, LILO of one ckt of Mau-Bhiwadi at 220 kV Bawal was planned. As such, 220 kV Bawal will have two connectivity, i. From 400 kV Bhiwadi ii. From 220 kV Mau
4	Asset-VII: 132 kV D/C Pinjore-Ropar  CoD: 22.11.1971	The asset carries power from Punjab to Haryana & vice-versa.	The project of 132 kV Pinjore-Ropar D/C line was undertaken under Bhakra Right Bank Subsidiary Transmission Project. The Ropar-Pinjore was the only source of supply of power to Kalka, Pinjore, Panchkula and part of UT Chandigarh.



12. We have considered the submissions of the Review Petitioner. It is observed that Asset-II, Asset-III, Asset-IV and Asset-VII are owned by Haryana and connect Haryana with Rajasthan and Punjab and are used for carrying power inter-State. The jurisdiction to determine the tariff in case of the inter-State transmission of electricity lies with this Commission as per Section 79(1)(d) of the Electricity Act, 2003. However, the Commission in order dated 25.6.2022 in Petition No. 159/TT/2021 directed the Review Petitioner to continue to claim the tariff for the transmission assets from the State Commission, which we feel is an error on reconsideration, as contended by the Review Petitioner. Accordingly, we are of the view that the tariff for these lines owned by the Review Petitioner, which carry inter-State power has to be approved by this Commission. Therefore, we allow the Review Petitioner's prayer for determination of tariff for the 2019-24 tariff period for Asset-II, Asset-III, Asset-IV and Asset-VII.

**Disallowance of tariff for Asset-V and Asset-VI**

13. The Commission in order dated 25.6.2022 in Petition No. 159/TT/2021 observed that the basic nature of the Asset-V and Asset-VI has changed with the LILO of the line. As the Review Petitioner did not submit the RPC/SCM approval and reasons for creating the LILO and the agreement between the States regarding the power exchanged over this line and its maintenance, the tariff was not approved for Asset-V and Asset-VI. The relevant portion of the order dated 25.6.2022 is as follows:

*"12. It is observed that the Petitioner initially made the LILO of the existing 220 kV Madanpur (Panchkula)- Kunihar ( Himachal Pradesh) at Baddi Sub-station (in Himachal Pradesh). The Petitioner further made the LILO of 220 kV Madanpur (Panchkula)-Baddi line (Himachal Pradesh) and 220 kV Madanpur (Panchkula)-Kunihar line (Himachal Pradesh) at Pinjore Sub-station (Haryana). As such, multiple LILO of the existing transmission line has been done by the Petitioner, first*



at Baddi Sub-station (Himachal Pradesh) and later on at Pinjore Substation (Haryana). Therefore, basic nature of natural ISTS line (in terms of line length, terminal end, power flow, etc.) which was earlier approved has changed. Further, the Petitioner has not submitted any RPC/SCM approval where the LILO of the existing transmission line is approved and the reasons for creating the LILO of the existing line and any agreement made between the two states regarding power exchange over this line and maintenance of the line to be carried out by the two states in respective portion. Therefore, we are not inclined to approve the tariff in respect of Asset-V and Asset-VI”

14. The Review Petitioner in the instant review petition has submitted that the Review Petitioner was not given an opportunity to produce the documentary evidence to demonstrate that the said lines are still ISTS despite the LILOs and has submitted a copy of the SCM and NRPC approval in case of the Asset-V and Asset-VI. The Review Petitioner has further submitted that the assets are put into commercial operation and power is flowing through them. Further, the Review Petitioner vide affidavit dated 5.10.2023 has submitted purpose of construction of the line and the same is as follows:

S. No.	Lines	Whether it carries inter-State power	Purpose of construction of this line
1	Asset-V: 220 kV S/C Pinjore-Kunihar CKT-1 (LILO at Baddi)  CoD: 16.11.2017	These assets carry power from Haryana to Himachal Pradesh and vice-versa.	132 kV Pinjore Sub-station was upgraded to 220 kV level to feed the load of the area. As such, to feed 220 kV Pinjore Sub-station keeping in view the availability of RoW, LILO 220 kV, Madanpur-Kunihar D/C line at 220 kV Pinjore Sub-station was planned. The same has been agreed in 40 <sup>th</sup> Standing Committee Meeting.
2	Asset-VI: 220 kV S/C Pinjore-Kunihar CKT-II  CoD: 13.7.2018		

15. We have perused the minutes of the 40<sup>th</sup> SCPSPNR, the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Northern Region Standing Committee and the 1<sup>st</sup> NRPCTP submitted by the Review Petitioner, which are extracted hereunder. It is observed that in the 40<sup>th</sup> SCPSPNR, after





deliberations, the members agreed to the CEA's proposal to LILO both the circuits of Madanpur-Kunihar transmission line at Pinjore by the Review Petitioner and LILO of the 2<sup>nd</sup> circuit of Madanpur-Kunihar transmission line at Baddi by HPSEB/HPPTCL. The same was confirmed in the 1<sup>st</sup> NRSC wherein the nomenclature of the Kunihar-Madanpur transmission line was approved as "220 kV D/c Madanpur-Sector 32 Panchkula–PGCIL (Panchkula)-Pinjore– Baddi-Kunihar line with Baddi-Pinjore section as the interstate 220 kV D/C line."

16. The relevant portion of the Minutes of 40<sup>th</sup> meeting of SCPSPNR held on 22.6.2018 is as follows:

***"8.0 LILO of both circuits of Madanpur -Kunihar 220 kV D/c line at 220kV Pinjore (HVPNL) Substation***

*8.1 CEA stated HVPNL vide their letter no.CH-92/HSS-350 dated 9.10.2017 has informed that both circuits of Madanpur-Kunihar 220 kV D/c line were proposed to be LILO at three locations viz 220 kV Pinjore S/s, 400/220 kV Panchkula (PG) substation and 220 kV Panchkula Sec-32 S/s (as shown below). HVPNL had completed the LILO section at 220kV Pinjore S/s and for connecting of this LILO section, HVPNL had requested NRLDC to provide shut down of Madanpur-Kunihar 220 kV D/c line. However, NRLDC opined that 220kV Madanpur-Kunihar D/C line being an ISTS line, approval of the Standing Committee on Power System planning of Northern Region was required for the LILO of Madanpur-Kunihar 220 kV D/c line at Panchkula (PG), Pinjore and Panchkula Sec-32 sub-stations.*

*Accordingly, on request from HVPNL, a meeting was held on 16.10.2017 in CEA with representatives from CTU, HVPNL, HPSEBL, HPPTCL and NRLDC, wherein following proposals were agreed in principle:*

*i) HVPNL proposal of LILO of both circuits of 220kV D/C Madanpur-Kunihar line (one circuit already LILO at Baddi) at Panchkula (PG), Pinjore and Panchkula Sec-32.*

*ii) HPSEBL proposal of LILO of 2nd circuit 220kV D/C Madanpur-Kunihar line at Baddi (HP)*

*iii) HVPNL proposal of 220kV outlets for utilization of six nos. of 220 kV bays at Panchkula 400/22kV S/s as under:*

*a) Panchkula(PG) – Raiwali 220kV D/c line*



b) LILO of both circuits of Madanpur-Kunihar 220kV D/C line at Panchkula (PG) CEA vide letter no. 7/G/2015-PSPA-I dated 24.10.2017 had conveyed in-principle approval for LILO of both circuits of Madanpur-Kunihar 220kV D/c line (one circuit already LILO at Baddi) at 220kV Pinjore (HVPNL) substation.

8.2 CEA further stated that HPPTCL vide their letter no. HPPTCL/Planning/CEA\_Vol-V/2017-18/7058-59 dated 24.1.2018 had forwarded the proposal of HPSEBL for LILO of 2nd circuit 220 kV D/C Madanpur-Kunihar line at Baddi (HP). HPSEBL had informed that during winter they were drawing about 200-300 MW power from Baddi S/s through Madanpur-Kunihar 220 kV D/C line and during high hydro generations in summer, there were exporting power towards Madanpur. However, due to unbalanced loading (due to LILO of only one ckt at Baddi), the line was not getting utilized up to its full capacity and they were also incurring high losses. Therefore, HPSEBL had requested to allow LILO of 2nd circuit 220kV D/C Madanpur-Kunihar line at Baddi(HP)

8.3 After deliberation, members concurred the following proposals which were agreed in principle in a meeting held on in CEA on 16.10.2017:

i) LILO of both circuits of Madanpur-Kunihar 220kV D/c line (one circuit already LILO at Baddi) at 220kV Pinjore (HVPNL) substation (implementation by HVPNL)

ii) LILO of 2nd circuit 220kV D/C Madanpur-Kunihar line at Baddi (HP) (implementation by HPSEB/HPPTCL)

iii) 220kV outlets for utilization of six nos. of 220kV bays at Panchkula 400/22kV S/s (Implementation by HVPNL):

a) Panchkula (PG) – Raiwali 220kV D/c line

b) LILO of both circuits of Madanpur-Kunihar 220kV D/C line at Panchkula (PG)”

17. The relevant portion of the Minutes of 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of Northern Region Standing Committee on Transmission held on 11.9.2018 is as follows:

“1.1 Confirmation of the Minutes of the 40th meeting of the Standing Committee on Power System Planning of Northern Region held on 22 June 2018.

1.2 CEA stated that the minutes of the 40th meeting of the Standing Committee on Power System Planning of Northern Region (SCPSPNR) were issued vide CEA letter no. CEA-PS-11-21(19)/1/2018-PSPA-I/I/1590/2018 dated 30th July, 2018. HVPNL vide their letter CH-8/HSS-152/Vol-20 dated 4.9.2018 had suggested some addition in item no 8 of the minutes i.e. LILO of both circuits of Madanpur –Kunihar 220kV D/c line at 220kV Pinjore (HVPNL) S/s. HVPNL suggestion brings more clarity to the final configuration of the line. Therefore, following may be added as point no 8.4 of the minutes:



8.4 After execution of LILOs by HVPNL and HPSEB/HPPTCL, the nomenclature of 220kV Kunihar –Madanpur line may be read as under:

220 kV D/c Madanpur-Sector 32 Panchkula–PGCIL (Panchkula)-Pinjore– Baddi-Kunihar line with Baddi-Pinjore section as the interstate 220 kV D/C line.

1.3 CEA added that no further comments have been received from the constituents and requested the members to confirm the minutes of the 40th meeting of SCPSPNR along with addition of para 8.4 in item 8 of the minutes of the meeting.

1.4 Members confirmed the same.”

18. The relevant portion of the Minutes of Meeting of 1<sup>st</sup> NRPCTP held on 24.1.2020 is as follows:

**“3.0 Agenda by HVPNL: Creation of 132/66kV S/s at Nanakpura with LILO of Ropar – Pinjore 132 kV line at Nanakpura and LILO of Pinjore-Solan 66kV line at Kalka 66 kV S/s:**

3.1 CEA stated that HVPNL vide its letter no. Ch-7/HSS-391 dated 22.10.2019 has mentioned that they are intending to construct 132 kV cum 66 kV AIS substation at village Nanakpur near Kalka (Haryana) to cater the increasing load demand in that area and for ensuring reliability of supply to Kalka area by making LILO arrangement of 132 kV Ropar-Pinjore D/C line (Owned by Haryana). To provide alternate source to the existing 66 kV Kalka S/Stn, proposal has also been made by making LILO arrangement of 66 KV Pinjore-Solan S/C line (owned by HP) at Kalka. The details are as follows:

(i) Creation of 132 kV cum 66 KV AIS substation at village Nanakpur (Pinjore) in Kalka constituency with 1x10/16 MVA 132/11 kV and 1x12.5/16 MVA 66/11 kV transformers capacity (already approved by HVPNL vide R-1670 / Ch-9/406/K-280 dated 12.09.2019 for FY 2021-22) to cater the load growth in Nanakpur area. Considering the scarcity of ROW and utilization of existing ROW, the connectivity to said substation has been provided by LILO arrangement of 132 kV Ropar-Pinjore D/C line at 132 kV cum 66 kV AIS substation Nanakpur.

(ii) At present, 66 kV Kalka is being fed from 220 kV Pinjore through 66 kV PinjoreKalka S/C line. Further to provide reliability of supply to 66 kV Kalka substation and considering utilization of existing ROW, alternate connectivity to 66 kV substation Kalka is proposed through LILO arrangement of 66 kV Pinjore –Solan S/C line at 66 KV substation Kalka. Both 132 kV Ropar –Pinjore D/C line and 66 kV Pinjore –Solan line being interstate in nature, the approval of NRPCTP has been sought by HVPNL.

3.2 CEA also stated that to discuss the above proposals, a meeting was held in CEA on 3.12.2019, wherein HVPNL informed that 132kV cum 66kV AIS substation at Kalka with 1x10/16 MVA, 132/11kV and 1x12.5/16 MVA, 66/11 kV ICTs would be created by LILO of both circuits of existing 132kV Ropar – Pinjore line (0.15sr ACSR conductor) in following way:



(i) Ropar - Nanakpur D/C line to be charged at 132kV level from Ropar

(ii) Pinjore - Nanakpur D/C line to be charged at 66kV level from Pinjore HVPNL also informed, that for the above works that they would utilize 66/11kV spare transformer in Haryana's system. The existing 1x10/16 MVA, 132/11kV transformer at Pinjore would also be utilized at Nanakpur substation. Regarding the 2nd proposal, HVPNL informed that the LILO of Pinjore - Solan 66 kV S/C line at Kalka substation has been proposed to provide reliability of supply to 66kV Kalka substation. HVPNL added that the 66 kV Pinjore - Solan S/C line is a very old line and there is very small or no drawl by HP through this line. HVPNL stated that, the peak drawl of Kalka substation is around 25MVA. After the proposed LILO, length of Pinjore to Kalka portion of Pinjore- Kalka line would be around 7.45 kms and would provide alternate power supply to Kalka. After deliberations, following was agreed, subject to ratification from NRPCTP:

**I. LILO of Ropar – Pinjore 132kV D/C line at Nanakpur subject to confirmation from PSTCL. II. LILO of Pinjore – Parwanoo 66kV line at Kalka. However, the issues related to shifting of ISTS point, ownership and commercial issues may be sorted out mutually between HPPTCL and HVPNL.**

3.3 CEA further stated that subsequently, PSTCL vide its letter no. 1039/P-1/288 dated 9.12.2019 has forwarded its consent for implementation of Nanakpura S/s by HVPNL with LILO 132 kV Ropar-Pinjore D/C line. LILO of Ropar – Pinjore 132kV D/C line at Nanakpur

#### **LILO of Ropar – Pinjore 132kV D/C line at Nanakpur**

3.4 Regarding the 2nd proposal, HPPTCL informed that Pinjore-Solan is a dedicated line and is used only in case of emergency. He suggested to upgrade the existing Pinjore-Kalka S/c line to a D/c line, leaving their existing line as it is because it is used for contingency flow of around 15-20 MW.

3.5 In this regard, Haryana stated that it would be difficult to convert S/c line to D/c line. With the proposed LILO, Pinjore-Kalka is ultimately becoming a double circuit. Also, the power of around 20 MW under contingency condition can easily flow with the proposed system.

3.6 After detailed deliberations following was agreed:

(i) LILO of Ropar – Pinjore 132kV D/C line at Nanakpur wherein, Ropar - Nanakpur D/C line to be charged at 132kV level from Ropar and Pinjore - Nanakpur D/C line to be charged at 66kV level from Pinjore.

(ii) LILO of Pinjore – Parwanoo 66kV line at Kalka. A meeting to be scheduled between HPPTCL and HVPNL to sort out the issues related to shifting of ISTS point, maintenance, ownership and commercial issues for the LILO of Pinjore – Parwanoo 66 kV line at Kalka.



19. It is observed that Asset-V and Asset-VI connect Haryana and Himachal Pradesh and they are used to carry power from Haryana to Himachal Pradesh and vice-versa. Further, the LILO of the Madanpur-Kunihar transmission line in Pinjore by HVPNL and at Baddi by HPSEB/HPPTCL has been granted in-principle approval by CEA and has been agreed upon by the beneficiaries of Northern Region. It is noticed that creation of LILO at Pinjore Sub-station, and upgradation of Pinjore Sub-station from 132 kV level to 220 kV level is to feed the load of Haryana. With the creation of LILO of Madanpur-Kunihar transmission line in Pinjore by HVPNL and at Baddi by HPSEB/ HPPTCL, 220 kV Pinjore-Baddi/ Kunihar portion of the transmission line becomes the natural ISTS line between Haryana and Himachal Pradesh, and the same is approved as ISTS line. The length of the Haryana portion of the line i.e. from Pinjore to border of Haryana is considered as 24.5 km. Taking these facts into consideration and that this Commission is the appropriate authority to determine the tariff for the inter-State transmission lines under Section 79(1)(d) of the Electricity Act, 2003, we deem fit to approve the transmission tariff for Asset-V and Asset-VI for the 2019-24 tariff period.

20. Consequent to the above findings, the tariff for Asset-II, Asset-III, Asset-IV, Asset-V, Asset-VI and Asset-VII for the 2019-24 tariff period shall be allowed through a separate order.

21. Accordingly, the Review Petition No. 41/RP/2022 is disposed of.

**sd/-**  
**(P. K. Singh)**  
**Member**

**sd/-**  
**(Arun Goyal)**  
**Member**

**sd/-**  
**(I. S. Jha)**  
**Member**

