

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 1/RP/2018

in

Petition No. 128/MP/2016

Subject : Petition seeking review of the order dated 12.10.2017 in Petition No. 128/MP/2016 regarding seeking direction to U.P. Jal Vidyut Nigam Limited for filing ARR and Petition for determination of O & M charges in respect of Rihand Hydel Power Station and Matatila Hydel Power Station from 1.4.2008

Petitioner : MPPMCL

Respondent : UPJVNL & ors

Date of hearing : **5.6.2018**

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member

Parties present : Shri G.Umapathy, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Aditya Singh, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Dilip Singh, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Sanjay Singh, Advocate, UPJVNL
Shri Rajiv Srivastava, Advocate, UPPCL
Ms. Garima Srivastava, Advocate, UPPCL

Record of Proceedings

The learned counsel for the Petitioner, MPPMCL submitted that the prayer of the Petitioner in the original Petition was for a direction on the respondent, UPJVNL to file tariff petition for determination of O & M expenses for the period from 1.4.2008 onwards. He referred to para 42 of the order dated 12.10.2017 and submitted that the Commission while recording the finding that the Petitioner is entitled to claim relief against the respondents from 1.4.2008 has however in para 43 of the said order directed the respondents to file the tariff petition from 1.4.2014, instead of 1.4.2008. This is an error apparent on the face of the order. He also submitted that the Commission is required to determine the cost of generation for supply of power to the Petitioner, including O & M expenses as claimed by the Petitioner. The learned counsel also prayed that it may be granted time to file its written submissions.

2. The learned counsel for the Respondent No. 1, UPJVNL submitted that it has filed its reply in the matter. He however clarified that UPJVNL will be filing the tariff petition in terms of the observations of the Commission in para 43 of the



order dated 12.10.2017. The learned counsel further submitted that the Commission by a conscious decision had directed the respondent to file the tariff petition for the period 2014-19 and hence there is no error apparent on the face of the order. As regards the cost of generation for supply of power to the Petitioner, he referred to para 49 of the said order and submitted that the Commission may consider the same at the time of determination of tariff of the generating station.

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

4. The Commission after hearing the parties directed the respondent, UPPCL to file its reply, on affidavit, on or before **22.6.2018**, with advance copy to the Petitioner / Respondent No. 1, who shall file its response along with the written submissions on or before **29.6.2018**. The Commission directed the parties that due date of filing reply / response/ written submissions shall be strictly complied with. No extension of time shall be granted for any reason whatsoever.

4. Subject to the above, order in the Petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

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

