

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission  
New Delhi**

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Petition No. 225/2009**

Subject: Petition for approval of tariff of Singrauli Super Thermal Power Station (2000 MW) for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014

Date of Hearing: 25.8.2011

Coram: Shri S.Jayaraman, Member  
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner: NTPC Limited

Respondents: UPPCL, JVVN, AVVN, JdVVN, NDPL, BRPL, BYPL, HPPC, PSEB, HPSEB, Power Development Department (J&K), Power Department (Chandigarh), UPCL

Parties present: Ms. Alka Saigal, NTPC Ltd.  
Shri V.K.Padha, NTPC Ltd.  
Shri Manish Garg, UPPCL

The petitioner, NTPC Ltd., has filed this petition for determination of tariff of Singrauli Super Thermal Power Station (hereinafter called "the generating station") for the period 2009-14.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:
  - (a) Since RLDC charges are payable by the petitioner, the same may be allowed to be recovered from the beneficiaries.
  - (b) The cost incurred towards development of infrastructure for implementation of the scheme based on the Government of India notification dated 27.4.2010, which require the generating stations to supply power to rural households within the radius of 5 Km from the existing/ upcoming projects, may be allowed.
  - (c) The cost incurred on account of the increase in water charges over and above that allowed for O&M expenditure may be allowed to be recovered from the beneficiaries.

3. The representative of the Respondent No. 1, UPPCL, submitted as under:
  - (a) The special allowance claimed by the petitioner under Regulation 10 of the CERC (Terms and conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 cannot be allowed to the petitioner in terms of second proviso to Regulation 10 of the said Regulations, since the Commission had already allowed expenditure towards Renovation and Modernization during the period 2006-09 vide its order dated 21.1.2011 in Petition No. 189/ 2009.
  - (b) Tariff being a composite package, increase in water charges should not be considered in isolation.
4. The learned counsel for respondent, BYPL, prayed for time to file the reply in the matter. The respondent was directed to file reply, on affidavit, on or before 15.9.2011, with advance copy to the petitioner, who may file rejoinder, if any, by 22.9.2011.
5. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit on affidavit, by 22.9.2011, the details in respect of gross block and liabilities (assets/ works wise) as sought vide letter dated 10.8.2011.
6. Subject to the above, order in the Petition was reserved.

Sd/-  
(T.Rout)  
Joint Chief (Law)