

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 08/GT/2016

Subject : Revision of tariff for Nathpa Jhakri Hydro Electric Power Station (1500 MW) for the period 2004-09.

Petition No. 261/GT/2014

Subject : Approval of tariff for Nathpa Jhakri Hydro Electric Power Station (1500 MW) for the period 2014-19.

Petitioner : SJVNL

Respondents : Punjab State Power Corporation Limited & 9 Others

Date of hearing : **28.7.2016**

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

Parties present : Shri Rajeev Aggarwal, SJVNL
Shri Sanjay Kumar, SJVNL
Shri Romesh Kapur, SJVNL
Shri Naveen Yadav, SJVNL
Shri Atul Harkat, SJVNL
Shri R.B Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Ms. Ranjana Roy, Advocate, TPDDL
Ms. Vasudha Sen, Advocate, TPDDL
Ms. Arunima Gautam, Advocate, TPDDL
Shri Abhay Pratap, Advocate, TPDDL
Shri S.P Das, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms
Shri S.K Agarwal, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms
Shri Kuldeep Singh Pathania, HPSEB

Record of Proceedings

During the hearing the representative of the petitioner submitted that the additional information sought by the Commission vide ROP dated 12.1.2016 has been submitted. The representative also submitted that the Revised Cost Estimates (RCE)-IV is pending for approval before the Central Government.

2. The learned counsel for the respondent, BRPL submitted that the petitioner may be directed to serve copy of the petition (Petition No. 8/GT/2016), to enable it to file reply. He also submitted that tariff may be considered by the Commission based on the approved RCE-III and not as claimed by the petitioner. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that copies have been served on respondent and proof of service has also been filed before the Commission. He however, agreed to handover copy of the petition to the learned counsel for the respondent.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent, TPDDL prayed for grant of time to file reply in the matter.



4. On a specific query by the Commission as to the status of the approval of RCE, the representative of the petitioner clarified that RCE has been recommended by CEA and is pending before the MOP, Govt. of India and the same is being pursued by the petitioner. He also submitted that vide order dated 31.12.2008 in Petition No. 20/2008 the approved capital cost for the purpose of tariff as on 31.3.2007 is ₹7990.80 crore as against RCE III approved cost of ₹8187.71 crore. Accordingly, he prayed that the additional capital expenditure for the period 2007-09 may be considered and the difference of ₹196.91 crore between the approved capital cost as on 31.3.2007 and RCE III approved cost may be allowed.

5. The Commission after hearing the parties directed the petitioner to file the following additional information on affidavit, by 16.8.2016, with advance copy to the respondents as under:

- (i) The delegation of powers with regard to approval of additional capital expenditure stating the limit of the expenditure which Board of Directors can approve without going to MOP for its approval;
- (ii) Against the projected additional capital expenditure of ₹243.39 crore for the period 2014-19, Board of Directors has only approved ₹150.31 crore, in this regard furnish the revised list of assets/works along with the justifications, corresponding to the additional capital expenditure of ₹150.31 crore approved. Also submit the revised tariff forms after taking into account the revised projected additional capital expenditure of ₹150.31 crore;
- (iii) De-capitalisation value of the old assets as per Form 9(B)(i) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations which have been claimed under replacement .

6. The respondents shall file their replies, if any by 23.8.2016 with advance copy to the petitioner who shall file its rejoinder, if any, by 29.8.2016. No extension of time shall be granted for any reason whatsoever. In case the additional information/ reply/ rejoinder is not filed within the said date, the matter shall be decided as per the available records.

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

By Order of the Commission

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

