

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 92/MP/2013

Subject : Petition for recovery of additional cost incurred consequent to pay/wage revision of employees , Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) and Delhi Public School Staff in respect of Nathpa Jhakri Station w.ef. 1.1.2006 to 31.3.2009.

Date of Hearing : 11.6.2013

Coram : Shri V.S.Verma, Member
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.S.Bakshi, Member (EO)

Petitioner : SJVNL Limited

Respondents : Engineering Deptt. Union Territory of Chandigarh, Chandigarh and others

Parties present : Shri Romesh Kapoor, SJVNL
Shri Alok Shankar, Advocate, TPDDL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that this petition has been filed for recovery of additional O & M cost due to increase in employee cost on account of wage revision of its employees from 1.1.2007 and pay revision of the employees on deputation and Delhi Public School Staff and Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) deployed at Nathpa Jhakri Station from 1.1.2006 under Regulations 12 and 13 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2004 (Tariff Regulations, 2004).

2. Learned counsel for TPDDL submitted that the petition for recovery of additional expenses for wage and pay revision pertaining to the period 2006-09 has been filed in 2013, though the information regarding wage revision of SJVNL employees and pay revision of the CISF personal and employees of DPS were available with the petitioner in 2011 when the arrears were paid. The petition suffers from delay and laches and is therefore not maintainable.

3. The Commission observed that on comparison of the employee cost data indicated at Form 18 under O&M expenditure during the period 2004-09 submitted by

ROP in Petition No. 92/MP/2013

the petitioner in Petition No. 27/2011 and in the present petition, it is noticed that the figures pertaining to Productivity Related Pay (PRP) are at variance for the years 2005-06 and 2007-08. The Commission directed the petitioner to reconcile/explain the difference and file the same on affidavit, with an advance copy to the respondents by 12.7.2013.

4. After hearing the representative of the petitioner and learned counsel for the TPDDL, the Commission directed to admit the petition and issue notices to the respondents.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner was directed to serve copy of the petition on the respondents by 21.6.2013 who may file their responses by 12.7.2013 and the petitioner may file its rejoinder, if any, 31.7.2013.

6. The petitions shall be listed for hearing on 13.8.2013.

By order of the Commission,

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