

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 321/GT/2014**

Subject : Revision of tariff of Feroze Gandhi Super Thermal Power Project, Stage-III (210 MW) for the period 2009-14 after truing up exercise.

Date of hearing : **3.3.2016**

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

Petitioner : NTPC

Respondents : UPPCL and 12 others

Parties present : Shri Ajay Dua, NTPC  
Shri Nishant Gupta, NTPC  
Shri Ajay Mehta, NTPC  
Shri Shankar Saran, NTPC  
Shri Neeraj Kumar, NTPC  
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Sanjay Srivastav, BRPL  
Shri Manish Garg UPPCL

**Record of Proceedings**

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, NTPC for approval of tariff of Feroze Gandhi Super Thermal Power Project, Stage-III (210 MW) (generating station) based on the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 ("the 2009 Tariff Regulations").

2. During the hearing, the representative of the petitioner made detailed submissions in the matter and submitted that the additional information as sought for by the Commission has been filed and copies served on the respondents. He however, prayed for grant of time to file in rejoinder to the replies filed by respondents BRPL and UPPCL. Accordingly, the representative prayed that tariff of the generating station may be determined in terms of the 2009 Tariff Regulations.

3. The representative for the respondent, UPPCL mainly submitted as under:

- (i) The claim towards capital spares may not be allowed as the same was disallowed by the Commission vide order dated 25.5.2012 in Petition No. 279/2009.
- (ii) Additional capitalization towards making of Settling Pits in Marshall Yard CHP area, Solar water heaters and X-ray baggage inspection under Regulation 9 (2) (ii) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations may not be allowed as the expenditure is not necessitated on account of 'Change in Law'.
- (iii) Reply filed in the matter may be considered.



4. The learned counsel for the respondent, BRPL submitted that the major item of additional capital expenditure claimed during the years 2010-11 and 2011-12 is on account of capital spares and the same is not admissible under Regulation 9 (2) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations. He further stated that the reply filed in the matter may be considered at the time of revision of tariff of the generating station.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to file its rejoinder to the replies of BRPL and UPPCL, if not already filed, on or before 28.3.2016. Subject to above, order in the petition was reserved.

By Order of the Commission

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

