

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 125/GT/2013

Subject: Revision of tariff for the tariff period 2009-14 in respect of Chamera-I 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

Record of Proceedings

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, NHPC for revision of tariff for the Period 2009-14 in respect of Chamera-I 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 submitted as under:
 - a) Commission by its order dated 12.7.2011 in Petition No. 80/2012 had determined the tariff of the generating station for the period 2009-14 which was revised subsequently by order dated 10.12.2012 in Review Petition No. 18/201.
 - b) There is significant difference between the additional capital expenditure allowed and the actual capital expenditure incurred for the period 2009-10 to 2011-12 and some of the addition/deletion allowed by the Commission is not to be incurred.
 - c) Certain works which were not claimed/allowed by the Commission in petition No.84/2010 and which have become necessary have been undertaken as per requirement and the capital expenditure along with detailed justification have been included in the claim.
 - d) The tariff of the generating station may be revised accordingly based on the claims made in the petition.

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 28.5% 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 prayed that one week's time may be granted for the respondent to file its detailed reply to the petition.

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 accepted the prayer of the respondent PSPCL and directed it to file its reply, on or before 12.8.2013 with copy to the petitioner, who may file its rejoinder with copy to the respondent PSPCL on or before 19.8.2013

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

By order of the Commission

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