

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No.170/GT/2017**

Subject : Petition for approval of generation tariff for shared hydro projects of Rajasthan & Madhya Pradesh installed in Rajasthan namely Jawahar Sagar hydel Power Station for the financial year 2012-13 & 2013-14

Petitioner : Rajasthan Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited

Respondent : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Co. Ltd.

**Petition No. 171/GT/2017**

Subject : Petition for approval of generation tariff for shared hydro projects of Rajasthan & Madhya Pradesh installed in Rajasthan namely Rana Pratap Sagar hydel Power Station for the financial year 2012-13 & 2013-14

Petitioner : Rajasthan Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Co. Ltd.

Date of hearing : **11.10.2018**

Coram : Shri P.K.Pujari, Chairperson  
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Parties present : Shri Pradeep Misra, Advocate, RRVPNL  
Shri Satish Kumar Sharma, RRVPNL  
Shri Shashi Kumar Jain, RUVNL  
Shri Aditya Singh, Advocate, MPPMCL  
Shri Dileep Singh, MPPMCL  
Ms. Neha Garg, Rajasthan discoms

**Record of Proceedings**

These petitions were taken up for hearing today.

2. During the hearing, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the shared generation project between the States of Rajasthan and MP, called as Chambal Complex, comprises of three hydro generating station namely, Rana Pratap Sagar HEP & Jawahar Sagar HEP (in the State of Rajasthan) and Gandhi Sagar HEP (in the State of MP). He also submitted that the tariff petition filed in respect of Rana Pratap Sagar & Jawahar Sagar HEPs is based on the order dated 9.1.2014 of the Rajasthan Electricity Regulatory Commission and the judgment of APTEL in Appeal No. 83/2011 in BBMB case. The learned counsel further submitted that in Petition No. 234/MP/2017 (in respect of Gandhi Sagar HEP) filed by the



Respondent, MPPMCL, the Commission vide ROP dated 21.8.2018 had directed the Principal Secretaries (Energy) of both the States to call for a joint meeting and explore possibilities of amicable settlement of the disputes. Accordingly, the learned counsel prayed that similar directions may be issued in this petition.

3. The learned counsel for the Respondent, MPPMCL submitted that MPPGCL should be impleaded as party to the petitions. The learned counsel did not oppose the above submissions of the learned counsel for the Petitioner.

4. The Commission observed that these generating stations have a composite scheme for generation and sale of power to more than one state and hence tariff is to be determined by this Commission. However, the Commission, keeping in view the directions given in Petition No. 234/MP/2017 directed both the parties to explore possibilities for an amicable settlement of the issues in a joint meeting to be convened by the Secretary (Energy) of both the States and file a report within two months from the date of ROP.

5. Petitions shall be listed for hearing in due course for which separate notice shall be issued.

**By order of the Commission**

*Sd/-*  
**(B.Sreekumar)**  
**Dy. Chief (Law)**

