

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 335/GT/2014

Subject : Revision of tariff of Auriya Gas Power Station (663.36 MW) for the period 2009-14(after truing up exercise).

Date of hearing : **19.4.2016**

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 E. P. Rao, NTPC
Shri S.K. Jain, NTPC
Shri Bhupinder Kumar, NTPC
Shri Rajeev Choudhary, NTPC
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Rishabh Singh, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Manish Garg, UPPCL

Record of Proceedings

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, NTPC for approval of tariff of Auriya Gas Power Station (663.36 MW) based on the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 ("the 2009 Tariff Regulations").

2. During the hearing, the representative for the petitioner made detailed submissions in the matter and submitted that the additional information sought for by the Commission has been filed and copies served on the respondents. He however prayed for grant of time to file its rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondent BRPL.

3. In response, the learned counsel for the respondent, BRPL mainly submitted as under:

- (i) Petition No. 302/MP/2015 has been filed by this respondent and the reply in this matter is subject to the final decision in the said petition.
- (ii) The petitioner has not filed documentary evidence to support its claim under additional capital expenditure for the period 2012-14 in terms of the provisions of the 2009 Tariff Regulations.
- (iii) The petitioner has claimed higher additional capital expenditure towards DCP fire tender than those allowed in order dated 6.8.2013 in Petition No. 28/GT/2013 and hence, the claim may not be allowed.
- (iv) The claim for Disturbance Recorder for Switchyard Control Room for 2012-13 under Regulation 9(2) (vi) is not permissible since the same is not related to renovation of the gas turbine. Moreover this item is not permitted to be capitalised after the cut-off date.
- (v) Reply filed in the matter may be considered.



4. The representative for the respondent, UPPCL mainly submitted as under:
- (i) The claim towards Annual Maintenance Contract for Ambient Air Quality Monitoring System may not be permitted as it is in the nature of O&M expenses.
 - (ii) The expenditure for new/additional assets amounting to ₹ 205.91 lakh may not be allowed as the same do not fall within the scope of Regulation 9(2) (vi) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations.
 - (iii) Since major part of capitalization of expenditure towards furniture & fixtures, other office equipments has been done in 2013-14, the corresponding de-capitalization was also done in the same year. Accordingly, the Commission may direct the petitioner to submit the reasons for such de-capitalisation and capitalization during the same year.
 - (iv) Reply filed in the matter may be considered.

5. The Commission after hearing the parties directed the petitioner to file the following additional information on affidavit, by 16.5.2016, with advance copy to the respondents as under:

- (i) Gross Block of old disturbance recorders for switchyard control room along with year of put to use and depreciation recovered till the time taken out from service;
- (ii) Documentary evidence in support of the claim towards boundary wall for railway siding and CCTV system considered for capitalization under Change in Law (Regulation 14 (3) (ii) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations);
- (iii) Documentary evidence in support of the claim of ₹23.98 lakh towards connection of effluent water pipe line claimed under Change in Law (Regulation 9 (2) (ii) of the 2014 Tariff Regulations);
- (iv) Reasons for capitalization of MBOA items such as Furniture & Fixtures, other office equipment amounting to ₹0.58 lakh and de-capitalization during the same year i.e. 2013-14;
- (v) Form 13 in respect of weighted average rate of interest.

6. The respondents shall file their replies, if any by 26.5.2016 with advance copy to the petitioner who shall file its rejoinder, if any, by 3.6.2016. 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 above, order in the petition was reserved.

By Order of the Commission

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

