

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Coram:**

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

**Petition No.151/2006**

**In the matter of**

Petition under Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 12 and 13 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2004.

**And in the matter of**

Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board

.... **Petitioner**

**Vs**

1. Satluj Jal Vidyut Nigam Limited, Shimla
2. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
3. Haryana Power Generation Corporation Limited, Panchkula
4. Delhi Transco Ltd., New Delhi
5. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd., Jaipur
6. Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd., Jaipur
7. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd., Jaipur
8. Power Development Department, Govt.of J&K, Jammu
9. Engineering Department, Chandigarh Administration, Chandigarh
10. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow
11. Principal Secretary (Power), Govt of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla...**Respondents**

**The following were present:**

1. Shri M.G. Ramachandran, Advocate, HPSEB
2. Er. Deepak Uppal, HPSEB
3. Shri J.P. Kalra, HPSEB
4. Shri R.K.Bansal, SJVNL
5. Shri Suresh Kumar, SJVNL
6. Shri N.C.Dhingra, SJVNL
7. Shri Padmjit Singh, SJVNL
8. Shri D.Chandra, NRPC
9. Shri T.P.S.Bawa, OSD, PSEB
10. Shri Padamjit Singh, PSEB
11. Shri V.K.Gupta, PSEB
12. Shri R.K.Arora, HPGCL
13. Shri Jayant Verma, UPPCL

**ORDER**  
**(DATE OF HEARING: 29.5.2007)**

Heard Shri M. G. Ramchandran, Advocate for the petitioner and the representatives of the respondents present.

2. The matter was earlier listed for hearing on 1.5.2007 when it was adjourned to enable the petitioner to file its rejoinder to the reply filed on behalf of some of the respondents. Shri Ramchandran has stated that the petitioner does not propose to file the rejoinder.

3. Shri Ramchandran has requested for two week's time to place on record the calculations to establish the disparity between per unit capacity charge levied on the petitioner and the respondent beneficiaries during the period in question. He has also proposed to file detailed written submissions within that time. Let the written submissions be filed within the time prayed for with advance copy to the respondents who may, if so advised, file their further submissions in response to the written submissions proposed to be filed by the petitioner.

4. The petition be listed for further hearing on 17.7.2007.

sd-/  
**(R.KRISHNAMOORTHY)**  
**MEMBER**

sd-/  
**(BHANU BHUSHAN)**  
**MEMBER**

**New Delhi dated the 29<sup>th</sup> May, 2007**