

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 27/RP/2017

Subject : Review of Commission's order dated 3.5.2017 in Petition No. 255/GT/2014 regarding approval of tariff of CFBC Technology based Barsingsar Thermal Power Plant (2 x 125 MW) of NLC Ltd for the period 2014-19

Petitioner : NLC India Limited

Respondent : JVVNL & ors

Date of hearing : **5.6.2018**

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Parties present : Shri M.G.Ramachandran, Advocate, NLC
Shri Pulkit Aggarwal, Advocate, NLC
Shri S.K.Agarwal, Advocate, Rajasthan discoms

Record of Proceedings

During the hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner, NLC pointed out that there is error apparent on the face of the order on issues like Target Availability norm, Station Heat Rate (SHR) and computation of Interest on working capital.

2. As regards Target Availability, the learned counsel of the petitioner submitted that the COD of the station is 20.1.2012 and accordingly the Commission while allowing the Target Availability norm of 75% for the first three years, had considered the period till 20.1.2012, instead of the same being considered till the end of the FY i.e. 31.3.2015.

3. As regards SHR, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Commission had allowed SHR of 2547.80 kcal/kwh as claimed in the original petition, instead the SHR of 2596.56 kcal/kwh allowed in order dated 10.7.2015 in Petition No. 197/GT/2013. He further submitted that since the original petition was filed prior to the Commission's order dated 10.7.2015, the petitioner could not revise the SHR. He accordingly prayed that the SHR allowed in order dated 10.7.2015 may be considered for the period 2014-19.

4. The learned counsel also submitted that the Commission, while working out the Interest on working capital had considered only base transfer price for lignite, instead of the landed price of primary fuel. Accordingly, he prayed that the above



errors in order dated 3.5.2017 may be corrected and the review petition may be allowed.

5. The learned counsel for the respondent, Rajasthan discoms prayed for grant of time to file reply in the matter.

6. The Commission after hearing the parties directed the respondent, Rajasthan discoms to file its reply, on affidavit, on or before **21.6.2018**, with advance copy to the petitioner who shall file its rejoinder, if any, by **28.6.2018**. The Commission directed the parties that due date of filing reply / response/ written submissions shall be strictly complied with. No extension of time shall be granted for any reason whatsoever.

7. Subject to the above, order in the Petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

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

