

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 437/TT/2025

- Subject** : Petition for determination of tariff for the 2024-29 tariff block under Section 62 read with Section 79 (1) (d) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and under the Regulation 15 (1) (a) and Regulation 23 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2023 read with the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Condition of Tariff) Regulations, 2024 for the assets under “Augmentation of ISTS for interconnection of HVPNL Transmission Schemes”.
- Date of Hearing** : **22.7.2025**
- Coram** : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member
Shri Harish Dudani, Member
Shri Ravinder Singh Dhillon, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited
- Respondents** : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited and 16 Others
- Parties Present** : Ms. Himangini Mehta, Advocate, HVPNL
Shri Raheel Kohli, Advocate, HVPNL
Shri Zafrul Hasan, PGCIL
Shri Vivek Kumar Singh, PGCIL
Shri Vishal Sagar, PGCIL
Ms. Supriya Singh, PGCIL
Shri Ranjeet Pandey, PGCIL
Shri Ashish Alankar, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The Petitioner’s representative submitted that the present Petition has been filed for the determination of transmission tariff from COD to 31.3.2029 for the assets implemented under “Augmentation of ISTS for Interconnection of HVPNL Transmission Schemes”. He further submitted that the transmission tariff be allowed as claimed in this Petition.

2. The Petitioner’s representative sought time to file a rejoinder to the reply received from UPPCL.



3. Learned counsel for the Respondent, Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited (HVPNL), sought two weeks to file a reply to the Petition.

4. After the hearing, the Commission directed the Petitioner to submit the following information on an affidavit within two weeks:

- i. To rectify the computational difference between the figures mentioned in the Excel submitted for revised calculations and in the Word/PDF of the reply submitted and clarify variations, if any. Further, if there is any variation in the capital cost from the audited value, provide the revised Auditor's Certificate for each of the assets.
- ii. The capital cost as on the COD and year-wise ACE additions for each of the assets within the 2024-29 tariff block in the following format:

Asset No	Approved Cost (FR)	Revised Expenditure Up to DOCO	Projected Expenditure for FY			Revised Estimated Completion Cost
			2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	
Asset-1						
Asset-2						
Asset-3						
Asset-4						
TOTAL						

- iii. The Petitioner has claimed the SCOD of Asset-4 (comprising 4 Nos. 220 kV line Bays for Kharkoda Pocket-B and METL at Bahadurgarh Sub-station) as 31.7.2024, whereas, as per the IA, the SCOD of 2 Nos. line bays for METL is in March 2024. Clarify the SCOD of Asset-4 and provide the reasons for this discrepancy.
- iv. According to the DPR, the FR cost for Asset-2 is Rs. 3,937.00 lakh, while the Petitioner has claimed an apportioned FR cost of Rs. 4,310.00 lakh. Submit the reasons for this variation.
- v. Provide the activity-wise reasons for delay for Assets-1 to 4 in the following format:

Asset Name	Activity	Original Schedule			Actual			Total time delay	Reasons
		From	To	Days	From	To	Days		



- vi. Excel calculations of notional IDC for each of the claimed assets.
 - vii. As per Form 9C, a single consolidated loan schedule for each source.
5. CTUIL is directed to submit the information, on an affidavit, within two weeks, whether the downstream transmission system connected with Assets-1 and 4, under the control of Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd., has been commissioned or not.
6. After the hearing, the Commission directed the Respondents to file their respective replies, if any, on an affidavit within two weeks, with a copy to the Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder within a week thereafter.
7. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved order in the matter.

By order of the Commission

sd/-

(T. D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)

