

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 71/GT/2013

Subject: Revision of tariff for the tariff period 2009-14 in respect of Salal Power station.

Date of hearing: 25.7.2013

Coram: Shri V.S.Verma, Member
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner: NHPC Limited,

Respondents: PSPCL & 13 others

Parties present: Shri Parag Saxena, NHPC
Shri S.K. Meena, NHPC
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
Shri Alok Shankar, Advocate, TPDDL

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, NHPC for revision of tariff for the Period 2009-14 in respect of Salal Power station (the generating station) based on the Provisions of Regulation 6 of the 2009 Tariff Regulations

2. During the hearing, the representative of the petitioner, NHPC made submissions in the matter and prayed that the tariff of the generating station be revised considering the claims in the petition. He also submitted that additional information as sought for by the Commission has been submitted. He further prayed for a week's time to file its rejoinder to the reply of the respondent, PSPCL.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent, BRPL referred to his reply and submitted as under:

- (i) The claims of the petitioner for additional capitalization could be categorized under the heads namely a) expenditure approved by the commission, b) expenditure incurred by the petitioner, & c) expenditure not to be claimed. The Commission may accordingly allow the capitalization of expenditure based on prudence check.

- (ii) The petitioner has not submitted the details of the additional capital expenditure incurred for the period 2009-10 to 2011-12 duly audited and certified by the auditors as per Regulation 6(3) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations.
- (iii) The commission may consider the fact that the petitioner was able to incur only 0.7% of the amount on works suggested by the petitioner and allowed by the Commission.

4. The representative of the respondent, PSPCL submitted that the variations in additional capital expenditure allowed by the Commission and actual capital expenditure incurred which shall be explained by the petitioner. He also submitted that the petitioner has not submitted the details/justification as to how the expenditure towards Tail Race Tunnel is being incurred.

5. The Commission after hearing the matter directed the petitioner to submit the details of the additional capital expenditure incurred for the period 2009-10 to 2011-12 duly audited and certified by the auditors in terms of the regulations. This was agreed to by the representatives of the petitioner.

6. The Commission further directed the petitioner to file its rejoinder with copy to the respondent PSPCL, on or before 12.8.2013.

7. Subject to above, the Commission reserved its order in the petition.

By order of the Commission

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