

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 15/RP/2018

in

Petition No. 98/TT/2016

Coram:

**Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson
Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member**

Date of Order : 04.04.2019

In the matter of:

Petition for review and modification of the order dated 30.8.2016 in Petition No. 98/TT/2016 under section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003

And in the matter of:

Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,
"Saudamini", Plot No.2,
Sector-29, Gurgaon -122 001.

... Review Petitioner

Vs

1. Karnataka Power Transmission Corporation Ltd. (KPTCL),
Kaveri Bhavan,
Bangalore -560 009
2. Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Ltd. (APTRANSCO),
Vidyut Soudha, Hyderabad- 500082
3. Kerala State Electricity Board (KSEB),
Vaidyuthi Bhavanam, Pattom,
Thiruvananthapuram- 695 004
4. Tami Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Ltd.,
NPKRR Maaligai, 800, Anna Salai,
Chennai- 600 002
5. Electricity Department
Government of Pondicherry,
Pondicherry- 605 001



6. Eastern Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Limited (APEPDCL),
P&T Colony, Seethmmadhara,
Vishakhapatnam
7. Southern Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Limited (APSPDCL),
Tirupati- 517 501,
Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh
8. Central Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Limited (APCPDCL),
Corporate Office, Mint Compound,
Hyderabad- 500 063
9. Northern Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Limited (APNPDCL),
Opp. NIT Petrol Pump,
Chaitanyapuri, Warangal- 506 004
10. Bangalore Electricity Supply Company Limited (BESCOM)
Corporate Office, K.R Circle,
Bangalore- 560 001, Karnataka
11. Gulbarga Electricity Supply Company Limited (GESCOM)
Station Road,
Gulbarga, Karnataka
12. Hubli Electricity Supply Company Limited (HESCOM)
Navanagar, PB Road,
Hubli, Karnataka
13. MESCOM Corporate Office Paradigm Plaza,
AB Shetty Circle,
Mangalore- 575 001
14. Chamundeswari Electricity Supply Corporation Limited (CESC)
927, L J Avenue, Ground Floor,
Saraswatipuram, Mysore- 570 009
15. Electricity Department
Government of Goa, Vidyuti Bhawan,
Panaji, Goa- 403001
16. Transmission Corporation of Telangana Limited,
Vidhyut Sudha, Khairatabad,
Hyderabad-500082.

.....Respondents



For Review Petitioner: Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Rhea Luthra, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Shri Aryaman Saxena, PGCIL

For respondents: Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO

ORDER

Instant review petition has been filed by Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL) seeking review and modification of the order dated 30.8.2016 in Petition No. 98/TT/2016.

Background of the case

2. The Review Petitioner filed Petition No. 165/TT/2013 for determination of tariff for LILO of Bangalore-Salem 400 kV S/C line at Hosur under System Strengthening XVIII in Southern Regional Grid (hereinafter referred to as “transmission asset”) for 2009-14 period which was allowed vide order dated 29.1.2015 in accordance with Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as “2009 Tariff Regulations”). In order dated 29.1.2015, the capital cost of the transmission assets was restricted to the approved apportioned cost and the additional capital expenditure was not allowed and the Review Petitioner was directed to submit the RCE at the time of truing up alongwith justification for cost overrun.

3. The Review Petitioner filed Petition No. 147/TT/2015 in respect of the subject asset for truing up of the actual capital expenditure for the period from 1.2.2014 to 31.3.2014 and determination of tariff for 2014-19 period Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as “2014



Tariff Regulations”). As the Review Petitioner failed to produce the RCE as directed in order dated 29.1.2015 in Petition No. 165/TT/2013, the Commission in its order dated 24.2.2016 had no other option but to restrict the completion cost of the subject assets to the approved apportioned cost.

4. Thereafter, the Review Petitioner filed Petition No. 98/TT/2016 for revision of the trued up capital expenditure of the transmission asset on the basis of the RCE dated 11.3.2016. The Commission vide its order dated 30.8.2016 while disposing of Petition No. 98/TT/2016 took note of the fact that the RCE was approved after disposal of the truing up petition and as such observed that the same cannot be re-opened on the basis of the developments subsequent to the disposal of the petition. Accordingly, the Review Petitioner’s prayer for revision of the trued up petition was rejected. The Review Petitioner is before us against our order dated 30.8.2016.

5. Prior to filing the instant Review Petition, the Review Petitioner challenged the impugned order dated 30.8.2016 of the Commission before the Hon’ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity in Appeal No. 147 of 2017 and subsequently withdrew the said Appeal vide order dated 19.2.2018 which was allowed by the Appellate Tribunal with permission to file a Review Petition against the Commission’s order dated 30.8.2016 in Petition No. 98/TT/2016.

Submissions of the Review Petitioner

6. The Review Petitioner has submitted the following in support of review of the impugned order:-



- a. The Commission at the time of determining tariff of the subject asset in Petition No. 165/TT/2013 for 2009-14 tariff block did not allow the additional capital expenditure despite categorical pleading and seeking tariff from COD i.e. 1.2.2014 to 31.3.2014 as well as having submitted the actual capital expenditure incurred by it till COD and additional capital expenditure from COD till 31.3.2014 by way of vide affidavit dated 14.8.2014.
- b. The Commission in its order dated 24.2.2016 in Petition No.147/TT/2015 did not take note of the submission of the Review Petitioner made vide affidavit dated 5.2.2016 that RCE duly approved by its Board of Directors would be submitted shortly. Instead of waiting for RCE, the Commission proceeded to determine the tariff based on the apportioned approved cost.
- c. The RCE of the subject transmission asset was approved by the Review Petitioner's Board on 11.3.2016 after disposal of Petition No. 147/TT/2015 vide order dated 24.2.2016. As such Petition No. 98/TT/2016 was filed by the Review Petitioner on 21.6.2016 praying therein to entertain its RCE and revise the trued up tariff for 2009-14 period taking into consideration the facts enumerated in its affidavit dated 17.8.2016 due to which the RCE could not be submitted by it.
- d. Impugned order is erroneous inasmuch as it was passed in isolation without consideration of RCE which could not be produced at the time of passing of the order dated 24.2.2016 being under approval of the Board of the Review Petitioner's company.



- e. As per Regulation 6(1) of 2009 Tariff Regulations, the capital expenditure is required to be admitted after prudence check at the time of truing up. The Commission at the time of truing up did not take note of the Auditor's certificate for examining the capital expenditure as claimed by the Review Petitioner and restricted the capital cost to the approved apportioned cost on the ground of non-production of the RCE.
- f. The Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (hereinafter referred to as "APTEL") in its judgment dated 15.3.2017 in Appeal No. 127 of 2015 in the matter of Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. vs. Central Electricity Regulatory Commission & Ors. observed that in case the Review Petitioner has failed to place on record any documents before the Commission, then it must be given a chance to put up its case with complete facts and supporting documents.
- g. Non-consideration of the expenditure incurred by the Review Petitioner in implementation of the project has caused grave injustice to it. The apportioned approved cost for the subject transmission asset is ₹1974 lakh while the total capital expenditure as on 31.3.2014 was ₹3007 lakh. This has led to a loss of tariff to the Review Petitioner.
- h. The straightjacket formula of furnishing the RCE at the time of truing up should not defeat the ends of justice and it is fair and reasonable for the Commission to consider the said additional cost incurred by the Review Petitioner.



- i. The Review Petitioner withdrew Appeal No. 147 of 2017 filed against the impugned order before the APTEL pursuant to the Commission's common order dated 28.9.2017 in Review Petition Nos. 30/RP/2017 and 31/RP/2017, wherein it was observed that the RCE containing the expenditure legitimately incurred after inclusion of the payments settled by the Review Petitioner need to be considered so as to recover the actual cost incurred in tariff since the beneficiaries have enjoyed the benefits of the assets.

7. The Review Petition was admitted vide order dated 31.5.2018. The respondents were directed to file their respective replies and the Review Petitioner to file rejoinder thereto.

Submissions of TANGEDCO, Respondent No.4

8. TANGEDCO in its reply filed vide affidavit dated 24.7.2018 has submitted that instant Review Petition is filed primarily for review of the order dated 30.8.2016 in Petition No. 98/TT/2016 on the direction of APTEL in IA No. 123 of 2018 in Appeal No. 147 of 2017 dated 19.2.2018. The Respondent has submitted that Petition No. 98/TT/2016 was filed for revision of the amounts allowed with respect to the tariff parameters concerning the capital cost. The Petition No. 98/TT/2016 is an independent petition inasmuch as the Review Petitioner is claiming capital cost of a transmission element which has already been refused by the Commission recording specific reasons in its orders passed in the tariff petition as well as in the true up petition. Neither any appeal nor any review petition was preferred by the Review Petitioner against the final tariff order as well as the true up order and they have thus become final. The



Respondent has submitted that 2014 Tariff Regulations do not contain any provision wherein any independent tariff petition can be filed permitting the capital cost of an element already refused to be granted in the final tariff petition as well as true up petition. A prayer which was sought and was rejected by the Commission cannot be sought repeatedly being barred by principles of res-judicata. The orders dated 29.1.2015 in Petition No. 165/TT/2013 and dated 24.2.2016 in Petition No. 147/TT/2015 cannot be reopened by filing a fresh tariff petition. Such a course under the garb of the present tariff petition is legally not maintainable. The tariff sought to be revised in the present tariff petition pertain to tariff period 2009-14 which cannot be recovered in 2014-19 tariff block in view of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of UPPCL Vs. NTPC & Ors [(2009) 6 SCC 235].

9. The respondent has submitted that review is sought of the order dated 30.8.2016 in Petition No. 98/TT/2016 for which the Review Petitioner is taking resort to an order of the year 2017 that approach is wrong and unsustainable. The Respondent has, however, submitted that LILO of exiting Bangalore-Salem 400 kV S/C line at Hosur alongwith other lines was agreed to be implemented as Regional System Strengthening Scheme in the 32nd meeting of the Standing Committee on Power System Planning of Southern Region. This line underwent frequent changes such as "Additional ISTS In-feed for Bangalore", later it was decided to be multi circuit towers and eventually it was informed by the Review Petitioner in 20th, 21st and 22nd SRPC meetings held on 28.9.2012, 2.2.2013 and 18.5.2013 that due to ROW issues, the Hosur-Electronics City 400 kV D/C would be dropped. The Investment Approval for the subject asset alongwith other assets covered under System Strengthening-XVIII in the



Southern Regional grid was approved by the Board of the Review Petitioner on 29.5.2012 for an estimated cost of ₹126326 lakh including IDC of ₹7556 lakh but it did not reveal whether the cost of the multi-circuit portion was stated to be covered under System Strengthening XVI was included or excluded from System Strengthening XVIII. The respondent has prayed for dismissal of the present Review Petition with exemplary costs as it is not maintainable and is devoid of merits.

Analysis and Decision

10. We have considered the submissions of the Review Petitioner and TANGEDCO and have also gone through documents on record. Record shows that the Commission in its order dated 29.1.2015 in Petition No. 165/TT/2013, while allowing tariff for 2009-14 tariff period restricted the capital cost of the instant transmission asset to the approved apportioned cost and did not allow the additional capital expenditure from COD i.e. 1.2.2014 to 31.3.2014. The Commission in its order regarding the capital cost incurred observed as under:-

“17. We have considered the submissions made by the petitioner regarding the increase in cost. It has been observed that the cost over-run for assets in the instant petition has substantial variation as compared to the approved apportioned cost estimates. Therefore, the petitioner is required to submit the revised cost estimate (RCE) duly approved by its Board. The petitioner has not furnished the RCE for assets covered in the instant case. Accordingly, the capital cost of these assets is restricted to the apportioned approved cost. However, the capital cost in case of these assets shall be reviewed at the time of truing up, subject to the petitioner’s filing the RCE and justification for cost over-run.”

11. As is apparent from the above order, the Commission found that there is huge variation in the capital cost as compared to the approved apportioned cost. In the absence of RCE, the Commission restricted the capital cost to the apportioned approved cost with liberty to the Review Petitioner to revisit the capital cost at the time



of trueing up subject to the filing of RCE and justification for cost over-run.

12. The Review Petitioner filed Petition No.147/TT/2016 in respect of the subject assets for true up of actual capital expenditure for the period 1.2.2014 to 31.3.2014 and determination of tariff for 2014-19 period. The Review Petitioner in its affidavit dated 5.2.2016 in Petition No. 147/TT/2016 submitted that the RCE would be placed on record shortly after approval of its Board as it was then under consideration of its Board. The relevant portion of the said order is extracted as under:-

“16. It is observed that total completion cost of ₹2538.16 lakh as on 31.3.2014 claimed by the petitioner exceeds the approved cost of ₹1974.00 lakh. In this regard, the petitioner was directed to submit approval for RCE. In response, the petitioner vide affidavit dated 5.2.2016 submitted that the management approval for the same has already been obtained and is put upto the board for approval and will be submitted shortly. However, the petitioner has not filed the RCE. Therefore, we have restricted the completion cost to approved appportioned cost. Accordingly, the true up of the transmission tariff is being worked out to the extent of variation in floating rate of interest and MAT rate by restricting capital cost to the ₹1917.34 lakh after deducting excess initial spares of ₹43.29 lakh from actual cost as on COD.”

13. The Review Petitioner filed Petition No.98/TT/2016 for revision of the tariff of the subject assets based on the RCE approved by its Board on 11.3.2016. The Commission, however, rejected the claim of the Review Petitioner for revision of tariff vide order dated 30.8.2016 with the following observations:-

“12. As regards the delay in submission of the RCE, the petitioner has submitted that usually the RCE is approved only after commissioning of all assets covered in the transmission scheme or project. The petitioner has submitted that the RCE is initiated only after substantial amount of expenditure has been incurred in the project so that the RCE is based on the anticipated expenditure of the project. The petitioner has submitted that the trueing up petition, Petition No.147/TT/2015, was filed before the commissioning of all the assets covered in the scheme and hence the RCE was not submitted. We have considered the submissions of the petitioner. On perusal of the RCE approved vide order dated 11.3.2016, it is observed that all the elements of the project were commissioned by 8.8.2015 and the petitioner took more than six months after commissioning of all the assets covered in the scheme for approval of the RCE. We feel that the petitioner should have started the process of approval of RCE immediately after the completion of the



scheme and six months is too long a period for approval of the RCE and there was laxity on the part of the petitioner in getting the RCE approved. As the petitioner has not submitted that RCE even after commissioning all the assets covered in the scheme, the Commission took the conscious decision of not granting the liberty to the petitioner for revising the trued up tariff after approval of RCE.”

14. The Commission in the impugned order further observed that a petition cannot be reopened on the basis of the developments after disposal of the petition. The relevant portion of the order is as under:-

“17. Further, the RCE was approved after disposal of the truing up petition on 24.2.2016, we are of the view that a petition cannot be re-opened on the basis of the developments after disposal of the petition. Accordingly, the instant petition seeking revision of the trued petition is rejected and the capital cost of the instant assets is restricted to its approved apportioned cost as held by APTEL in its judgment dated in 28.11.2013 in Appeal No.165 of 2012.”

15. Learned counsel for the Review Petitioner contended that the Commission while determining tariff for the subject asset in Petition No. 165/TT/2013 for 2009-14 tariff block should have taken into consideration affidavit dated 14.8.2014, wherein actual capital expenditure incurred by the Review Petitioner till COD of the subject assets and additional capital expenditure from COD till 31.3.2014 was reflected. She further contended that in view of categorical deposition of the Review Petitioner in its affidavit dated 5.2.2015 that RCE would be submitted shortly, the Commission should have given a reasonable time to the Review Petitioner and should have waited for filing the RCE in Petition No. 147/TT/2015. She further contended that the Commission in the absence of RCE should have entertained the Auditor's certificate for examining the capital expenditure. She contended that non-consideration of expenditure incurred by the Review Petitioner has caused loss of tariff to the Review Petitioner. She also contended that the Review Petitioner withdrew Appeal No. 147 of 2017 sensing that the



Commission vide order dated 28.9.2017 in Review Petition Nos. 30/RP/2017 and 31/RP/2017 has given a dispensation to entertain the RCE for legitimately incurred expenditure after inclusion of the payments settled by it in view of the fact that beneficiaries have enjoyed the benefits of the assets.

16. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Respondent, TANGEDCO has contended that Petition No. 98/TT/2016 was filed for revision of the amounts allowed with respect to the tariff parameters concerning the capital cost. Petition No. 98/TT/2016 is an independent petition wherein the Review Petitioner claimed the capital cost of a transmission element which was refused by the Commission recording specific reasons in its orders passed in the tariff petition as well as in the true up petition. Besides this, he contended that the final tariff order as well as the true up order have attained finality, and that 2014 Tariff Regulations do not have any provision for filing of any independent tariff petition permitting the capital cost of an element which was refused to be granted in the final tariff petition as well as in the true up petition. The instant petition is barred by principles of res judicata. He contended that in view of the judgment of Hon'ble apex Court in the case of UPPCL Vs. NTPC & Ors [(2009) 6 SCC 235], there is legal bar in entertaining the revision of tariff for the subject asset for 2009-14 period and its recovery in 2014-19 tariff block.

17. We have considered the rival submissions of the parties and have gone through the impugned order and record carefully. From the perusal of order dated 29.1.2015 in Petition No. 165/TT/2013 it is apparent that at the time of determination of final tariff in respect of the subject assets for 2009-14 tariff period, the Commission returned a



categorical finding that there was substantial cost over-run in case of the subject assets vis-à-vis approved apportioned cost and as such RCE duly approved by the Review Petitioner's Board was required to be produced at the time of true up. Thus, the Commission granted an opportunity to the Review Petitioner to produce RCE at the time of true up. Despite knowing full well that the Commission has specifically directed in its order dated 29.1.2015 to submit the RCE in respect of the subject assets at the time of true up, the Review Petitioner filed Petition No. 147/TT/2015 without RCE for true up. On specific direction of the Commission, the Review Petitioner vide its affidavit dated 5.2.2016 submitted that RCE was under consideration of its Board and would be submitted shortly. The Commission, however, issued order dated 24.2.2016 on the basis of the information on record. Record also suggests that no specific time was indicated by the Review Petitioner for filing of the RCE. In the present case, RCE was approved by the Board of Review Petitioner on 11.3.2016, after 13 days of passing the tariff order in Petition No. 147/TT/2015. The RCE was placed for the first time on record in Petition No.98/TT/2017 but the Commission rejected the same on the ground that the petition cannot be reopened on the basis of subsequent developments. The Review Petitioner challenged the impugned order dated 30.8.2016 before the Appellate Tribunal in Appeal No. 147 of 2017, but subsequently withdrew the said Appeal vide Appellate Tribunal's order dated 19.2.2018 with permission to file a Review Petition against the Commission's order in Petition No. 98/TT/2016. The Review Petitioner has contended that as the Commission, in its order dated 28.9.2017 in Review Petition Nos. 30/RP/2017 and 31/RP/2017, has observed that in the RCE, the expenditure legitimately incurred is included after the payments are settled by the Review Petitioner,



therefore, the same needs to be considered to recover the actual cost incurred in tariff since the beneficiaries have enjoyed the benefits of the assets.

18. Thus, the sum and substance of the contentions of the Review Petitioner is that it wants the Commission consider its RCE dated 11.3.2016 placed in Petition No. 98/TT/2017 for revision of the trued up tariff of the subject transmission assets for the period from COD i.e. 1.2.2014 to 31.3.2014 as well as the actual capital expenditure incurred by it till COD and additional capital expenditure from COD till 31.3.2014.

19. We have also given our thoughtful considerations to the contentions of the TANGEDCO. As regards the contention of the TANGEDCO that Petition No. 98/TT/2017 is an independent petition, we find that the Review Petitioner had no other option to but to file a fresh petition for consideration of RCE dated 11.3.2016, as the RCE was not in existence when the Commission passed the order dated 24.2.2016 in Petition No.147/TT/2015. Petition No. 98/TT/2017 cannot be said to be an independent petition as it has a direct nexus with Petition No. 147/TT/2015. Had the Commission or the Review Petitioner indicated a date for submission of RCE in its proceedings in Petition No. 147/TT/2015, Petition No. 98/TT/2017 would not have been filed by the Review Petitioner for the same cause of action. In our opinion, the Review Petitioner, in order to protect its commercial interests, was constrained to file Petition No. 98/TT/2017. Thus, we are of the opinion that though Petition No. 98/TT/2017 is a separate petition, it is an offshoot of Petition Nos. 165/TT/2013 and 147/TT/2015 as these petitions were filed for tariff determination and true up of tariff in terms of 2009 and 2014 Tariff Regulations. Thus, we do not consider Petition No. 98/TT/2017 as in



independent petition. The contention of TANGEDCO is also that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, as detailed above in the foregoing paragraphs, res judicata comes into play. We have considered the submission of TANGEDCO on this issue. We do not agree here with the contention of TANGEDCO. In our opinion, the process of determination of tariff is a continuous and on-going process and is somewhat different from the rigid judicial process adopted by the judicial Courts while dealing with the civil disputes, wherein all the claims pertaining to a particular suit are required to be settled in one go, not in isolation. Thus, we are not in agreement with the contention of TANGEDCO that principles of res judicata apply to the facts of the present case. The next contention of the respondent is that no appeal or review petition was preferred by the Review Petitioner against the Commission's orders dated 29.1.2015 in Petition No. 165/TT/2013 and dated 24.2.2016 in Petition No.147/TT/2015. Admittedly, there is no direct appeal or review petition preferred by the Review Petitioner against the said orders dated 29.1.2015 in Petition No. 165/TT/2013 and dated 24.2.2016 in Petition No.147/TT/2015. However, in our opinion, due to the peculiar circumstances of this case, the RCE not being on record, Petition No. 98/TT/2017 was filed by the Review Petitioner to bring in the RCE for revision of the tariff. As the Petition No. 98/TT/2017 was rejected by the Commission vide order 30.8.2016, no option was available to the Review Petitioner except to file appeal, which was filed by it before the APTEL. We have already observed that Petition No. 98/TT/2017 is an offshoot of the Petition No.165/TT/2013 and Petition No. 147/TT/2015 and not an independent petition. Further, Appeal No. 147 of 2017 was preferred by the Review Petitioner against the impugned order and the present Review



Petition has been filed on the direction of APTEL in IA No. 123 of 2018 in Appeal No. 147 of 2017 dated 19.2.2018. As regards the contention of the respondent that there is no provision in 2014 Tariff Regulations for entertaining any independent tariff petition permitting the capital cost of an element already refused to be granted in the final tariff petition as well as true up petition, we have already observed that Petition No. 98/TT/2017, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, cannot be said to be an independent petition and it has a direct nexus with Petition No. 147/TT/2015. Thus, we are unable to agree with this contention of the Review Petitioner.

20. Another contention of TANGEDCO is that in view of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of UPPCL Vs. NTPC & Ors [(2009) 6 SCC 235], there is bar in entertaining the revision of tariff for the subject asset for 2009-14 period and its recovery in 2014-19 tariff block.

21. We have given our thoughtful consideration to this contention of the respondent. As we have already observed, tariff determination is a continuous process and it cannot be restricted to a particular period of time. Further, detailed submissions on record show that for filing of RCE in Petition No 147/TT/2015, no deadline was fixed in the proceedings by the Commission. The Petition No. 147/TT/2015 was disposed of vide order dated 24.2.2016. We are in agreement with the Review Petitioner's contention that in view of the APTEL's judgment dated 15.3.2017 in Appeal No. 127 of 2015, in cases where the Review Petitioner has failed to place on record any documents before the Commission, it must be given a chance to put up its case with complete facts and supporting documents. In our view, in the present case, the Review Petitioner should



be given opportunity to place on record the documents alongwith supporting documents. Accordingly, we take on record the RCE submitted by the Review Petitioner and the same will be considered at the time of truing up of the 2014-19 tariff.

22. We would also like to make it clear that in all future cases, the Review Petitioner must submit all the information and documents required for determination of tariff in time or categorically state a date by which it will be able to file all the pertinent documents, so that multiplicity of petitions can be avoided and the tariff determination can be undertaken in one go.

23. In view of above discussions, Review Petition No. 15/RP/2018 is disposed of.

sd/-
(Dr. M.K. Iyer)
Member

sd/-
(P.K. Pujari)
Chairperson

