

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 308/GT/2014**

Subject : Approval of tariff of Dadri Gas Power Station (829.78 MW) for the period from 1.4.2014 to 31.3.2019.

Date of hearing : **14.6.2016**

Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson  
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member  
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member  
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Petitioner : NTPC

Respondents : UPPCL and 12 others

Parties present : Shri Ajay Dua, NTPC  
Shri S.K. Jain, NTPC  
Shri Nishant Gupta, NTPC  
Shri T. Vinod Kumar, NTPC  
Shri Bhupinder Kumar, NTPC  
Shri Rajeev Choudhary, NTPC  
Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Dhananjaya Mishra, Advocate, TPDDL  
Shri Varun Shankar, Advocate, TPDDL  
Shri Manish Garg, UPPCL & BYPL  
Shri Kanishk, BRPL

**Record of Proceedings**

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, NTPC for approval of tariff of Dadri Gas Power Station (829.78 MW) (generating station) for the period from 1.4.2014 to 31.3.2019 in terms of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

2. During the hearing, the representative for the petitioner made detailed submissions in the matter and submitted that the additional information sought for by the Commission has been filed and copies served on the respondents. The representative submitted that rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondent, UPPCL has been filed. He however prayed for grant of time to file its rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondent BRPL. Accordingly, he prayed that tariff of the generating station may be approved as claimed in the petition.

3. In response, the representative for the respondent, UPPCL mainly submitted as under:-

- (i) The claim towards expenditure on replacement of PGB coolers by PHE may not be allowed as there is a significant cost escalation. Moreover, no justification has been furnished by the petitioner.
- (ii) The petitioner may be directed to submit detailed comparative statement of amount approved vis-à-vis amount incurred on additional capital expenditure alongwith detailed justification.
- (iii) Relaxation of operating norms as per the actual scenario and PLF during the period from 1.4.2014 may not be permitted.



- (iv) Reply filed in the matter may be considered.
4. The learned counsel for the respondent, BRPL mainly submitted as under:
- (i) Petition No. 302/MP/2015 for termination of PPAs has been filed by this respondent and the same is pending before the Commission. Hence, the submission made in this matter is subject to the final decision in the said petition.
- (ii) The projected additional capital expenditure for ₹37.75 lakh in 2014-15 claimed under Regulation 14 (3) (iii) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations may not be allowed as no documentary evidence has been furnished by the petitioner.
- (iii) Reply filed in the petition may be considered.
5. The learned counsel for respondent, TPDDL prayed for grant of time to file its reply in the matter.
6. The Commission directed the parties to complete the pleadings in the matter with opy to the other on or before 6.7.2016.
7. Subject to above, order in the petition was reserved.

By Order of the Commission

**-Sd/-**  
(T. Rout)  
Chief (Legal)

