

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 249/GT/2016**

Subject : Determination of tariff for the period 2014-19 in respect of 1200 MW Teesta III Hydroelectric Project.

Date of hearing : 25.7.2017

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

Petitioner : Teesta Urja Limited

Respondents : PTC India Limited and others

Parties present : Shri Jaideep Lakhtakia, TUL  
Shri Nikhlesh, TUL  
Ms. Raveena Dhamija, Advocate, PTC  
Ms. Catherine Ayallore, Advocate, PTC  
Shri M.G. Ramachandran, Advocate, Rajasthan Discoms  
Ms. Anushree Bardhan, Advocate, Rajasthan Discom  
Shri Manish Garg, UPPCL  
Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PSPCL & HPPC

**Record of Proceedings**

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, TeestaUrja Limited (TUL) for approval of tariff of Teesta III Hydro-electric Project (1200 MW) ('the generating station') for the period 2014-19 in terms of the provisions of the 2014 Tariff Regulations.

2. During the hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in terms of the interim order of the Commission dated 23.5.2017, the petitioner had approached the CEA for vetting of capital cost of the project, but no response has been received till date. He further submitted that the CAG audited accounts shall be furnished by the end of September, 2017. The learned counsel added that the DIA report has been filed as directed by the Commission after serving copies to the respondents.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent, Discoms of Rajasthan submitted that application has been filed by the discoms before the State Commission for approval of PPA/ procurement of power from the generating station of the petitioner and the State Commission in terms of Rule 8 of Electricity Rules, 2005 may determine whether the discoms in the state should enter into PPA or procurement process based on the tariff to be determined by the Central Commission. Accordingly, the learned counsel submitted that the tariff may be determined by this Commission subject to the decision of the State Commission. Similar submissions were made by the learned counsel appearing for Punjab and Haryana. The learned counsel also prayed to grant two weeks time to file reply to the petition.



4. In response, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that pendency of application before the State Commission cannot deter this Commission from determining the tariff of the generating station.

5. The representative of UPPCL submitted that the State Commission has approved the PPA for procurement of power by UPPCL from the generating station. On a further submission by the representative regarding the ceiling on the capital cost claimed by the petitioner, the Commission suggested that the CEA would be requested to submit the report on the cost of the project.

6. The Commission requested the CEA to expedite the vetting of capital cost of the project and submit the report within one month. Accordingly, the Commission adjourned the hearing with directions to the parties, including the objector AIPEF, to complete their pleadings prior to the next date of hearing.

7. Matter shall be listed for hearing on 4.10.2017.

By order of the Commission

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

