

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram:

- 1. Shri Bhanu Bhushan, Member**
- 2. Shri R.Krishnamoorthy, Member**

Petition No. 22/2007

In the matter of

Approval of revised fixed charges after considering the impact of additional capital expenditure incurred during 2004-05 and 2005-06 for Rihand Super Thermal Power Station,(1000MW), Stage-I.

And in the matter of

NTPC Limited, New Delhi

..Petitioner

Vs

1. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd, Lucknow
2. Jaipur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd,Jaipur
3. Ajmer Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd., Ajmer
4. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd, Jodhpur
5. Delhi Transco Ltd, New Delhi
6. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Panchkula
7. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
8. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
9. Power Development Department, Govt. of J&K, Jammu
10. Power Deptt., Union Territory of Chandigarh , Chandigarh
11. Uttaranchal Power Corporation Ltd, Dehradun

..Respondents

Petition No. 23/2007

And in the matter of

Approval of revised fixed charges after considering the impact of additional capital expenditure incurred during 2004-05 and 2005-06 for Faridabad Gas Power Station.

And in the matter of

NTPC Limited, New Delhi

..Petitioner

Vs

Haryana Power Generation Corporation Ltd, Panchkula

.... Respondent

And in the matter of

Approval of revised fixed charges after considering the impact of additional capital expenditure incurred during 2004-05 and 2005-06 for Simhadri Thermal Power Station (1000MW).

And in the matter of

NTPC Limited, New Delhi

..Petitioner

Vs

1. Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad
2. A.P. Eastern Power Distribution Company Ltd., Visakhapatnam
3. A.P. Southern Power Distribution Company Ltd., Tirupathi
4. A. P. Northern Power Distribution Company Ltd., Warangal
5. A.P Central Power Distribution Company Ltd., Hyderabad

Respondents

And in the matter of

Approval of revised fixed charges after considering the impact of additional capital expenditure incurred during 2004-05 and 2005-06 for Ramagundam Super Thermal Power Station, Stage-I & II (2100MW).

And in the matter of

NTPC Limited, New Delhi

..Petitioner

Vs

1. Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad
2. A. P. Eastern Power Distribution Company Ltd., Visakhapatnam
3. A..P. Southern Power Distribution Company Ltd., Tirupathi
4. A. P. Northern Power Distribution Company Ltd., Warangal
5. A.P Central Power Distribution Company Ltd., Hyderabad
6. Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Chennai
7. Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd, Bangalore
8. Bangalore Electricity Supply Company Ltd., Bangalore
9. Mangalore Electricity Supply Company Ltd, Mangalore
10. Chamundeshwari Electricity Supply Cor. Ltd., Mysore
11. Gulbarga Electricity Supply Company Ltd., Gulbarga
12. Hubli Electric Supply Company Ltd., Hubli

.Respondents

And in the matter of

Approval of revised fixed charges after considering the impact of additional capital expenditure incurred during 2004-05 and 2005-06 for Farraka Super Thermal Power Station (1600 MW).

And in the matter of

NTPC Limited, New Delhi

..Petitioner

Vs

1. West Bengal State Electricity Board, Kolkata
2. Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna
3. Jharkhand State Electricity Board, Ranchi
4. Grid Corporation of Orissa Ltd., Bhubaneswar
5. Damodar Valley Corporation, Kolkata
6. Power Department, Govt. of Sikkim, Gangtok
7. Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Chennai
8. Union Territory of Pondicherry, Electricity Deptt, Pondicherry
9. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd, Lucknow
10. Power Development Department, Govt. of J&K, Jammu
11. Power Deptt., Union Territory of Chandigarh , Chandigarh
12. Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Ltd., Jabalpur
13. Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited, Baroda
14. Electricity Deptt., Administration of Daman & Diu, Daman
15. Electricity Deptt., Administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Silvassa
16. Delhi Transco Limited, New Delhi
17. Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd., Mumbai

Respondents

And in the matter of

Approval of revised fixed charges after considering the impact of additional capital expenditure incurred during 2004-05 and 2005-06 for National Capital Thermal Power Station, Dadri (840MW).

And in the matter of

NTPC Limited, New Delhi

..Petitioner

Vs

1. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow
2. Delhi Transco Limited, New Delhi

.....Respondents

And in the matter of

Approval of revised fixed charges after considering the impact of additional capital expenditure incurred during 2004-05 and 2005-06 for Singrauli Super Thermal Power Station.

And in the matter of

NTPC Limited, New Delhi

..Petitioner

Vs

1. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd, Lucknow
2. Jaipur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd, Jaipur
3. Ajmer Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd., Ajmer
4. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd, Jodhpur
5. Delhi Transco Ltd, New Delhi
6. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Panchkula
7. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
8. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
9. Power Development Department, Govt. of J&K, Jammu
10. Power Deptt., Union Territory of Chandigarh , Chandigarh
11. Uttaranchal Power Corporation Ltd, Dehradun

.Respondents

And in the matter of

Approval of revised fixed charges after considering the impact of additional capital expenditure incurred during 2004-05 and 2005-06 for Tanda Thermal Power Station (440MW).

And in the matter of

NTPC Limited, New Delhi

..Petitioner

Vs

Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow

.....Respondent

And in the matter of

Approval of revised fixed charges after considering the impact of additional capital expenditure incurred during 2004-05 and 2005-06 for Korba Super Thermal Power Station (2100MW).

And in the matter of

NTPC Limited, New Delhi

..Petitioner

Vs

1. Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Ltd., Jabalpur
2. Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd., Mumbai
3. Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited, Baroda
4. Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Raipur
5. Electricity Deptt., Govt. of Goa, Vidyut Bhawan, Panaji
6. Electricity Deptt., Administration of Daman & Diu, Daman
7. Electricity Deptt., Administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Silvassa

.....Respondents

The following were present:

1. Shri S.N.Goel, NTPC
2. Shri A.S.Pandey, NTPC
3. Shri A.K.Juneja, NTPC
4. Shri S.K.Johar, NTPC
5. Ms. Pranav Kapoor, NTPC
6. Shri S.K.Agarwal, NTPC
7. Shri S.S.Reddey, NTPC
8. Shri Vivake Kumar, NTPC
9. Shri D.Kar, NTPC
10. Shri Ajay Dua, NTPC
11. Shri N.N.Sadasuvan, NTPC
12. Shri D.G.Salpekar, NTPC
13. Shri S.D.Jha, NTPC
14. Shri S.Saran, NTPC
15. Shri T.P.S.Bawa, OSD, PSEB
16. Shri Deepak Srivastava, MPPTCL
17. Shri A.K.Garg, MPPTCL
18. Ms. Yognaya Agnihotri, CSEB
19. Shri Harsh Gautam, CSEB
20. Shri R.Krishnaswami, TNEB
21. Shri R.K.Arora, HPGCL
22. Shri Brahampal Singh, JSEB
23. Shri Gopal Prasad, JSEB
24. Shri Mithun Balaji, BSES
25. Shri Vineet Jaiswal, BSES

ORDER

(DATE OF HEARING: 23.10.2007)

The petitioner, NTPC Limited has made these applications for approval of revised fixed charges after considering the impact of additional capital expenditure incurred during 2004-05 and 2005-06 based on the Central Electricity Regulatory

Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2004 (hereinafter referred to as `the 2004 regulations`).

2. Heard the representatives of petitioner and the respondents present. In the light of the replies filed and the oral submissions made at the hearing, additional information is still required from the petitioner. The petitioner is accordingly directed to submit the following information as per succeeding paras latest by 30.11.2007 with an advance copy to the respondents, separately in each petition. While furnishing the information being called for, the petitioner shall also submit soft copies.

Petition No. 22/2007

The petitioner is directed to segregate and consolidate the additional capital expenditure under the different categories of clauses (2) and (3) of Regulation 18 of the 2004 regulations at one place, with proper justification.

Petition No. 23/2007

The petitioner is directed to segregate and consolidate the additional capital expenditure under the different categories of clauses (2) and (3) of Regulation 18 of the 2004 regulations at one place, with proper justification and fully explain the details of partially decapitalised assets along with details of their gross block and the year in which decapitalised.

Petition No. 27/2007

Details of the unserviceable assets which were not allowed to be capitalized, with reference to the earlier proceeding.

Petition No. 29/2007

(i) Details regarding gross block of unserviceable assets (as indicated in Annexure-4 of the affidavit dated 27.9.2007) which were part of the capital cost for the purpose of tariff along with details of dates on which these were put in service, cumulative depreciation recovered.

(ii) Details of the unserviceable assets which were not allowed to be capitalized, with reference to the earlier proceeding.

(iii) Gross value of old motor operated actuator (S.No. 27 of 2005-06) replaced.

Petition No. 34/2007

(i) Gross block of assets under the category of exclusions which have been de-capitalized in the books of accounts (Annexures- IV and V of the petition) which were part of capital cost for the purpose of tariff along with cumulative depreciation recovered on these assets.

(ii) Gross block of unserviceable assets (as indicated in Annexure-II of the submissions dated 23.8.2007) which were part of capital cost for the purpose of tariff along with details of dates on which these were put in service, cumulative depreciation recovered etc., and the date on which the replaced relay was put in service and the cumulative depreciation recovered on it.

(iii) Details of the arbitration award of Rs. 103.50 lakh in respect of cooling tower package, and whether or not the disputed amount has been the part of capital cost prior to 1.4.2004.

Petition No. 46/2007

- (i) The petitioner shall direct to segregate and consolidate the additional capital expenditure under the different categories of clauses (2) and (3) of Regulation 18 of the 2004 regulations at one place with proper justification.
- (ii) Date on which the replaced assets were put in service.
- (iii) Details of the arbitration award of Rs. 19.17 lakh in respect of main plant package and whether or not the disputed amount has been the part of capital cost prior to 1.4.2004.

Petition No. 47/2007

- (i) After examination of expenditure on R&M works it is found that decapitalisation of assets like online micro processor (S. No. 76 of 2004-05), switchyard air compressor kit (S. No. 87 of 2004-05), jacking oil pump (S. No. 172 of 2004-05), volt meters (S. No 178-79 of 2004-05), Loco (S. No 182 of 2004-05), three phase relay (S. No. 184 of 2004-05), tipper (S.No.188 of 2004-05), permanent O&M building (sr.no.9 of 2005-06), generator rotor (S. No 50 of 2005-06) protective relay (S. No. 51 of 2005-06), online Ph meter & analyzer (S. No. 77,78 of 2005-06), silica analyzer (163 of 2005-06), turbovisory system (S. No 164-65 of 2005-06) etc. has not been done. The petitioner is directed to furnish the gross value of assets to be decapitalised along with details of dates on which these were put in service and cumulative depreciation recovered for all these assets.
- (ii) The petitioner vide affidavit dated 23.8.2007 has furnished the date on which replaced assets were put in service and cumulative depreciation recovered on the assets replaced (Annexure- II). The petitioner shall furnish reference no. of the same to the main petition as it has not been mentioned.

Petition No. 48/2007

(i) The petitioner is directed to segregate and consolidate the additional capital expenditure under the different categories of clauses (2) and (3) of Regulation 18 of the 2004 regulations at one place with proper justification.

(ii) Certificate to the effect that all assets as per gross block were in use, including the assets now sought to be capitalized, as on 1.4.2005 and 1.4.2006 and in case any of the assets was not in use or was unserviceable, other than assets mentioned in the petition, the list of these assets along with the capital cost, date on which assets were put in service and cumulative depreciation recovered.

(iii) Reasons for delay in payment on the assets capitalized in the year 1991-92 (S.No.19 of 2004-05).

3. The petitioner is also directed to file details of undischarged liability as on 1.4.2004, 1.4.2005 and 1.4.2006 in each petition.

4. The respondents are directed to file their response, if any, on the information to be filed the petitioner, latest by 15.12.2007 in each petition. Thereafter, a view shall be taken in each petition on their own merits.

Sd/-
(R.KRISHNAMOORTHY)
MEMBER
New Delhi dated the 6th November 2007

sd/-
(BHANU BHUSHAN)
MEMBER