

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

**Review Petition No. 41/RP/2018
In Petition No. 165/GT/2017**

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

Date of Hearing: 12.2.2019
Date of Order: 16.4.2019

In the matter of:

Petition seeking review of order dated 5.9.2018 in Petition No. 165/GT/2017 regarding approval of tariff of Koteshwar Hydroelectric project (400 MW) for the period from 1.4.2011 to 31.3.2014.

And

In the matter of

THDC India Limited,
(A Joint Venture of Govt. of India & Govt. of U.P),
Pragatipuram, Bypass Road,
Rishikesh -110003 (Uttarakhand)Petitioner

Versus

1. Punjab State Power Corporation Limited
The Mall, Patiala-147 001
2. Haryana Power Utilities (DHBVNL & UHBVNL)
Shakti Bhawan,
Sector-VI, Panchkula,
Haryana-134109
3. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited
Shakti Bhawan,
14 Ashok Marg, Lucknow-226001,



4. BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi- 110019
5. BSES Yamuna Power Ltd
Shakti Kiran Building, Karkardooma, Delhi- 110092
6. Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd
33 kV Substation, Hudson Line, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-110009
7. Engineering Department
Chandigarh Administration, 1st Floor,
UT Secretariat, Sector 9-D, Chandigarh-160009
8. Uttrakhand Power Corporation Ltd.,
Urja Bhawan, Kanwali Road,
Dehradun -248 001
9. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board,
Vidyut Bhawan, Kumar House Complex Building II,
Shimla-171004
10. Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd
Vidyut Bhawan, Janpath,
Joytinagar, Jaipur- 302005
11. Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd
Old Power House, Hathi Bhata,
Jaipur Road, Ajmer- 305001
12. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd
New Power House,
Industrial Area, Jodhpur-342003
13. Power Development Department,
Govt. of Jammu and Kashmir,
Civil Secretariat, Jammu- 180001Respondents

Parties present:

For Petitioner: Shri M.G. Ramachandran, Advocate, THDCIL
 Ms. Anushree Bardhan, Advocate, THDCIL
 Shri Mukesh Kumar Verma, THDCIL
 Ms. Poorva Saigal, Advocate, THDC



For Respondent: Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Mohit Mudgal, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Varun Shankar, Advocate, TPDDL
Shri Abhishek Upadhyay, Advocate, TPDDL
Ms. Shefali Sobti, TPDDL

ORDER

The Petitioner, THDC India Ltd. has filed this Review Petition against the Commission's order dated 5.9.2018 in Petition No. 165/GT/2017, wherein the Commission had determined the tariff of Koteshwar Hydroelectric Power Project (4 x 100 MW) (hereinafter 'the generating station') for the period from 1.4.2011 (COD of Unit -I) to 31.3.2014 in terms of the CERC (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 2009 Tariff Regulations').

2. Aggrieved by the said order dated 5.9.2018, the Petitioner has sought review on the ground that there are errors apparent on the face of record on the following:

- i) O&M expenses not computed in terms of Regulation 19(f)(v) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations;*
- ii) Non-consideration of additional capital expenditure funded through internal resources of the company after the COD towards the equity component (21.7%) and instead considering the debt equity ratio of 70:30 for the additional capitalization expenditure; and*
- iii) Computational error in total IDC allowed.*

3. By interim order dated 21.12.2018, the Commission admitted the Review Petition on the above issues and notice was issued to the Respondents with directions to complete pleadings in the matter. Replies to the petition have been filed by the Respondents, BRPL (affidavit dated 7.12.2018) and TPDDL (affidavit dated 28.1.2019) and the petitioner vide affidavits dated 4.2.2019 has filed its rejoinder to the replies of TPDDL.



4. Thereafter, the matter was heard on 12.2.2019 and the Commission, after hearing the Petitioner reserved its order in the Petition. Based on the submissions of the parties and the documents available on record, we proceed to examine the reliefs prayed for by the Petitioner as stated in the subsequent paragraphs.

Submission of the parties

5. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited vide its reply affidavit dated 7.12.2018, has made the following submissions:-

a) It may be noted that the Commission has correctly calculated the O&M expenses in accordance with the 2009 Tariff Regulations. The contention of the Review Petitioner that by dividing the capital cost to one fourth and not taking into account the cost of common assets is causing prejudice, is flawed and in contravention to the 2009 Tariff Regulations. The first proviso to Regulation 4(2) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations states that where the break-up of the capital cost is not available, as is the case here, the common facilities shall be apportioned on the basis of the installed capacity of the unit(s). Having decided the apportionment issue of the capital cost of the first unit in accordance with the first proviso to Regulation 4(2) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations, the O&M expenses, which is norm based viz. @ 2% of the capital cost and thus, the contention raised by the Review Petitioner is without any basis. This issue has already been decided by the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal in Appeal No. 103 of 2014 vide its judgment dated 29.05.2015.

b) The second issue as raised by the Review Petitioner is non-consideration of



additional capital expenditure funded through internal resources of the company after the COD towards equity component (21.7%) and instead considering the debt equity ratio of 70:30 for the additional capitalization expenditure. The contention of the Petitioner is flawed as the debt equity ratio on COD is in accordance with the first proviso to Regulation 12(1) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations. The contention of the Review Petitioner that the equity component of the total capital cost should be in the debt-equity ratio of 70:30 is against the 2009 Tariff Regulations and the same is with the sole purpose of attaining double benefits and thus liable to be rejected by the Commission. The Review Petitioner is simply trying to indicate error in the judgment which cannot be cured in a review petition.

- c) It is also noted from the information submitted by the Review Petitioner that the petitioner has earned quite a lot of interest from the bank deposits, which presumably are debts taken from PFC and REC. It is understood that the Commission has taken into consideration this aspect as the interest payment on loan amount is much more than the interest received from the bank when this loan capital is kept in bank. The Loan capital is required to be managed judiciously.

6. M/s Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited vide its reply affidavit dated 28.1.2019, has made the following submissions:-

- a) There are definitive limits to the exercise of the power of review. In this regard, it has submitted that the grounds raised by the Petitioner in support of the present petition do not fall within the parameters of Order 47 Rule 1 of



CPC, as interpreted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Kamlesh Verma Vs. Mayawati [(2013) 8 SCC 320]. Hence, it is submitted that the instant petition is not maintainable in law and ought to be rejected/ dismissed on this ground alone.

- b) On the issue of O&M expenses, as raised in the instant petition, it is submitted that this Commission, by way of the Impugned Order, has calculated the O&M expenses in consonance with the 2009 Tariff Regulations. The Petitioner's contention that by dividing the capital cost to one fourth and not taking into account the cost of common assets, financial prejudice is being caused to it is meritless and flies in the face of Regulation 4(2) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations.
- c) Petitioner's contention that this Commission may exercise its power to relax under Regulation 44 of the 2009 Tariff Regulation is also highly misplaced and can be termed as nothing more than a misadventure and an attempt to re-argue its case in a review petition. The power of relaxation is exercisable in exceptional circumstances on case-to-case basis. It cannot be exercised in a manner so as to nullify the relevant provisions of the 2009 Tariff Regulations and render them otiose or completely redundant.
- d) With regard to the issue of non-consideration of additional capital expenditure, as alleged in the instant petition, it is submitted that this Commission has by way of the Impugned Order determined the debt equity ratio on COD in accordance with Regulation 12(1) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations. Further, the debt equity ratio for the purpose of additional



capitalization has been considered as 70:30 and is in line with Regulation 12(3) of the 2009 Tariff Regulation. Hence, the Petitioner's contentions are dehors the 2009 Tariff Regulations and are liable to be rejected, as such.

7. In Rejoinder against Reply of M/s Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited, the Review Petitioner, vide its submissions dated 4.2.2019, has submitted as under:

- a) It is denied that grounds raised by the review petitioner don't fall within the parameters of Order 47 Rule 1 of the CPC. It has also denied that the review petition filed is in the form of an appeal.
- b) It is reiterated that the Operation & Maintenance expenses are required to be incurred in maintaining the common assets of the Review Petitioner irrespective of the capitalization of only one fourth of the value of such common assets at the time of COD of the first unit. The Review Petitioner has to necessarily incur the entire Operation & Maintenance Expenses on the common assets from the date of the declaration of the COD of the first unit itself. The Review Petitioner cannot defer any such cost to a later date. In view of the above, restricting the above expenses in terms of Regulation 19(v) (f) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations by dividing the original cost excluding cost of rehabilitation & resettlement works to one fourth and not taking into account the cost of the common assets is causing serious financial prejudice to the Review Petitioner. The Review petitioner has prayed that in the facts and circumstances of the case, this Commission may exercise its power to relax under Regulation 44 of the 2009 Tariff Regulations.
- c) It is submitted that the additional capitalization incurred by the Review

Page 7



Petitioner is the capital cost within the original scope of work to be undertaken. Accordingly such capital cost should be considered together with the capital cost as on the date of the COD and the over-all debt equity ratio of 70:30 should be worked out with reference to such overall cost i.e. equity after the capital work undertaken does not exceed 30%. Such capital cost incurred after the date of the COD could have been incurred even before the date of the COD except that it would not have been in public interest to defer the COD till the incurring of all the capital cost (within the original scope of work). Accordingly the COD had been declared even prior to the incurring of such cost in public interest and in the interest of consumer at large. In view of the above, it will be appropriate that the Commission allows the additional capitalization through equity so long as the aggregate of additional capitalization funded through equity and capital cost as on the COD to the extent funded through equity doesn't exceed the normative 30%.

Analysis and Decision

I. Issue regarding computational error in total IDC allowed

8. The Petitioner has submitted that due to some inadvertent error, the Commission has wrongly computed the IDC amount to ₹39879.73 lakhs, as in terms of the forms and data submitted by THDC to the Commission, the IDC works out to be ₹40020.55 lakh as on the date of the COD of the generating station.

9. We have examined the matter. We notice that there is an error apparent on the face of the record as regards IDC and the same is required to be corrected. IDC has been calculated and revised to ₹40012.27 lakh based on the information



available on record as against the claim of the petitioner of ₹40020.55 lakh on the date of the COD of the generating station and accordingly, the table for the capital cost considered for the purpose of tariff for the period 2011-14 at para 43 of order dated 5.9.2018 in Petition No. 165/GT/2017 has been revised as follows:

(₹ in lakh)						
		Unit-1 (1.4.11- 25.10.11)	Unit-1 & 2 (26.10.11 -12.2.12)	Unit-1,2 & 3 (13.2.12- 31.3.12)	2012-13 (all 4 units)	2013-14
Capital Cost claimed	238907.46					
IDC claimed	38586.47					
Hard Cost claimed/allowed	200320.99	50080.25	100160.50	150240.74	200320.99	
IDC allowed		6963.04	16696.77	28009.92	40012.27	
Opening capital cost		57043.29	116857.26	178250.66	240333.26	251949.26
Additional capital expenditure		0.00	0.00	0.00	11616.00	10291.00
Closing capital cost		57043.29	116857.26	178250.66	251949.26	262240.26

II. Issue regarding Non-consideration of additional capital expenditure funded through internal resources of the company after the commercial operation towards the equity component.

10. The Petitioner has submitted that in the order dated 5.9.2018 in Petition no.165/GT/2017 , the issue of debt equity ratio has been dealt with as under:-

45. The petitioner has submitted that the debt- equity ratio is 78.30:21.70. Since the equity is less than 30% of the capital cost, the actual debt equity ratio of 78.30:21.70 has been considered in terms of the 2009 Tariff Regulations. However, the debt equity ratio for the purpose of additional capitalization has been considered as 70:30.

11. The Commission at paras 40 to 42 allowed an amount of ₹11616 lakhs for the year 2012-13 and ₹10291 lakhs for the years 2013-14 towards additional capital expenditure.

12. For the purpose of computation of the equity component of the total capital cost, the Commission has proceeded to consider additional capitalization at the debt



equity ratio of 70:30. Thus the Commission has held that out of the ₹11616 lakhs for the year 2012 -13 and ₹10291 lakhs for the years 2013 -14 towards additional capitalization; ₹3484 lakhs for the year 2012 -13 and ₹3087.30 lakhs for the years 2013 -14 is the equity component (30% of the total expenditure).

13. The Review Petitioner has stated that the additional capitalization incurred by the THDC is the capital cost within the original scope of work to be undertaken. Accordingly such capital cost should be considered together with the capital cost as on the date of the COD and the over-all debt equity ratio of 70:30 should be worked out with reference to such overall cost i.e. equity after the capital work undertaken does not exceed 30%. It has further stated that such capital cost incurred after the date of the COD could have been incurred even before the date of the COD except that it would not have been in public interest to defer the COD till the incurring of all the capital cost (within the original scope of work). Accordingly the COD had been declared even prior to the incurring of such cost in public interest and in the interest of consumer at large. In view of the above, Review Petitioner has prayed that it will be appropriate that the Commission allows the funding of additional capitalization only through equity till the time equity reaches the normative 30%.

14. We have considered the submission of the petitioner. According to Regulation 12 (3) of 2009 Tariff Regulations, the debt equity ratio of 70:30 shall be applied for the purpose of additional capitalization. The Commission has consistently followed this while handling add cap. Accordingly, we do not find any error apparent on the face of record. Hence, the review on this ground is rejected.

III. Issue regarding Operation and maintenance expenses



15. The petitioner has submitted that the cut-off date for the present case is 31.3.2015. In the present case as noted by the Commission, the capital expenditure and the expenditure on Rehabilitation & Resettlement works till 31.3.2015 is ₹265207.70 lakh and ₹4344.56 lakh respectively. Thus, in terms of the Regulation 3 (29), 19(f)(v) and the data for the original cost and rehabilitation & resettlement work, the operation and maintenance expenses (which is 2% of the original project cost excluding cost of rehabilitation & resettlement works and thereafter escalated at 5.72% per annum), even if, apportioned works out as under:-

(₹ in lakhs)

Unit-I (1.4.2011 to 25.10.2011)	Unit-I & II (26.10.2011 to 12.2.2012)	Unit-I,II&III (13.2.2012 to 31.3.2012)	2012-13 (all 4 units)	2013-14
741.14	784.01	513.17	5217.26	5515.69

16. The Commission however, has noted the following in its Order as regards the Operation and maintenance expenses to:-

57..... Accordingly, the annualized O & M Expenses have been allowed @ 2% of the opening capital cost as on COD of the individual units and @ 2% of original project cost for the first year of operation of the generating station (all units) beginning from 1.4.2012 till 31.3.2013. For the year 2013-14, the annualized O&M expenses have been calculated after escalating the annualized O&M expenses for the year 2012-13 by 5.72% in terms of the above regulation. Accordingly, based on the reapportionment of the capital cost, the O & M Expenses have been worked out and allowed as under:

lakhs

Unit-I (1.4.2011 to 25.10.2011)	Unit-I & II (26.10.2011 to 12.2.2012)	Unit-I,II&III (13.2.2012 to 31.3.2012)	2012-13 (all 4 units)	2013-14
633.51	686.71	457.26	5217.26	5515.69

17. The Review Petitioner has claimed that the Commission has wrongly proceeded to compute the Operation & Maintenance Expenses at 2% of the opening



capital cost as on COD of the individual units; further at 2% of original project cost for the first year of operation of the generating station i.e. 1.4.2012 to 31.3.2013 and thereafter for the year 2013-14, such Operation & Maintenance expenses has been escalated by 5.72%.

18. The Review Petitioner has submitted that restricting the Operation & Maintenance in the order dated 5.9.2018 is contrary to the Regulation 3 (29) and 19(f)(v) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations which provides that the operations and maintenance expenses will be fixed at 2% of the original project cost and thereafter be escalated at 5.72%.

19. Further, the Review Petitioner has submitted that the Commission has not recognized the capitalization costs of the assets incurred to be considered for the purpose of tariff from the COD of the first unit, as claimed by THDC and the Commission has apportioned the capital cost including some of the basic costs of the common assets without the completion of which the first unit cannot operate, the commission has also not considered the admissible Operation & Maintenance expenses for the entire such common assets. The Operation & Maintenance expenses are required to be incurred in maintaining such common assets irrespective of the capitalization of only one fourth of the value of such common assets at the time of COD of the first unit.

20. The Review Petitioner has further submitted that THDC has necessarily to incur the entire Operation & Maintenance Expenses on the common assets from the date of the declaration of the COD of the first unit itself. THDC cannot defer any such cost for a later date.



21. In view of the above, the Review Petitioner has argued that restricting the above expenses in terms of Regulation 19(v) (f) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations by dividing the original cost excluding cost of rehabilitation & resettlement works to one fourth and not taking into account the cost of the common assets is causing serious financial prejudice to THDC. The operation and maintenance expenses if permitted to be recovered by the Commission in terms of the above, works out as under:-

(₹ in lakh)

2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
5217.26	5515.69	5831.18

22. The Review Petitioner has requested that in any event in the facts and circumstances of the case the Commission in exercise of its power to relax under Regulation 44 of the 2009 Tariff Regulations should have allowed the Operation & Maintenance Expenses on the common assets from the declaration of the COD of the first unit.

23. As per Regulation 19(f) (v) of the 2009 Tariff Regulations, O&M expense for the first year of operation post COD of the station has to be calculated based on the capital expenditure as on cutoff date. However, before the COD of the station (last unit COD), when the units are being capitalized on individual dates, the apportioned capital cost as admitted on individual Unit CODs only qualifies for the calculation of O&M expenses. With regard to the submission of the petitioner to allow operation & maintenance expenses on the common assets from the declaration of the COD of the first unit, it is to mention that petitioner has been allowed additional IDC in lieu of apportioning the project cost equally between the units. Accordingly, the submission of the petitioner in this regard is not acceptable. Thus the review on this ground is



rejected.

24. However, in view of the fact that the cost as on cutoff date i.e. the original project cost of the project has been revised subsequently due to revision in IDC in the instant order, the O&M allowed to the generating station vide order dated 5.9.2018 in petition no. 165/GT/2017 is being revised as under:

(₹ in lakh)

O&M expenses	Unit-I	Unit-I & II	Unit-I,II&III	2012-13 (all four units)	2013-14
	(1.4.2011 to 25.10.2011)	(26.10.2011 to 12.2.2012)	(13.2.2012 to 31.3.2012)	(first year of operation post COD of station)	
Capital cost considered as on COD of Units/station (a)	57043.29	116857.26	178250.66	266634.29*	
Less: pro-rata R&R expenses (b)	1273.73	2547.46	3821.18	4344.56	
capital cost for the purpose of O&M © =(a)-(b)	55769.56	114309.80	174429.48	262289.73	
Annualized O&M (2% of ©)	1115.39	2286.20	3488.59	5245.79	
No. of days	208	110	48	365	
pro-rata O&M expenses for the no. of days	633.88	687.11	457.52	5245.79	5545.85

*Cut-off date cost= Capital cost as on 31.3.2015= Capital cost as on 31.3.2014 allowed in the instant order + Additional capitalization allowed during 2014-15 vide order dated 9.10.2018 in petition no. 117/GT/2018

25. Based on the above discussions, the tariff of the generating station determined by order dated 5.9.2018 stands revised as stated in the subsequent paragraphs.

IV. Return on Equity

26. Return on Equity allowed in para 48 of order dated 5.9.2018 is revised as under:



(₹ in lakh)

	Unit-1 (1.4.11- 25.10.11)	Unit-1 & 2 (26.10.11 -12.2.12)	Unit-1,2 & 3 (13.2.12- 31.3.12)	2012-13 (all 4 units)	2013-14
Gross Notional Equity	12378.39	25358.03	38680.39	52152.32	55637.12
Addition due to Additional Capitalization	0.00	0.00	0.00	3484.80	3087.30
Closing Equity	12378.39	25358.03	38680.39	55637.12	58724.42
Average Equity	12378.39	25358.03	38680.39	53894.72	57180.77
Return on Equity (Base Rate)	15.500%	15.500%	15.500%	15.750%	16.500%
Tax rate for the period	20.008%	20.008%	20.008%	20.008%	20.961%
Rate of Return on Equity	19.377%	19.377%	19.377%	19.689%	20.876%
Return on Equity	1363.12	1476.77	982.96	10611.33	11937.06

V. Interest on loan

27. Interest on loan worked out and allowed in para 51 of order dated 5.9.2018 is revised as under:

(₹ in lakh)

	Unit-1 (1.4.11- 25.10.11)	Unit-1 & 2 (26.10.11 -12.2.12)	Unit-1,2 & 3 (13.2.12- 31.3.12)	2012-13 (all 4 units)	2013-14
Gross Normative Loan	44664.90	91499.24	139570.27	188180.94	196312.14
Cumulative Repayment	0.00	1528.61	3184.67	4286.97	16107.73
Net Loan-Opening	44664.90	89970.63	136385.60	183893.97	180204.41
Repayment during the year	1528.61	1656.06	1102.30	11820.76	12527.17
Addition due to Additional Capitalization	0.00	0.00	0.00	8131.20	7203.70
Net Loan-Closing	43136.29	88314.57	135283.30	180204.41	174880.94
Average Loan	43900.59	89142.60	135834.45	182049.19	177542.67
Weighted Average Rate of Interest	11.54%	11.54%	11.54%	12.00%	12.19%
Interest on Loan	2879.56	3092.22	2056.09	21842.77	21636.42

VI. Depreciation

28. Depreciation allowed in para 53 of order dated 5.9.2018 is also revised as under:



(₹ in lakh)

	Unit-1 (1.4.11- 25.10.11)	Unit-1 & 2 (26.10.11 -12.2.12)	Unit-1,2 & 3 (13.2.12- 31.3.12)	2012-13 (all 4 units)	2013-14
Opening Gross Block	57043.29	116857.26	178250.66	240333.26	251949.26
Additional capital expenditure during the period	0.00	0.00	0.00	11616.00	10291.00
Closing gross block	57043.29	116857.26	178250.66	251949.26	262240.26
Average gross block	57043.29	116857.26	178250.66	246141.26	257094.76
Rate of Depreciation	4.72%	4.72%	4.72%	4.80%	4.87%
Depreciable Value	51235.06	104963.74	160113.89	221111.53	230969.68
Remaining Depreciable Value	51235.06	103435.13	156929.22	216824.55	214861.94
Depreciation	1528.61	1656.06	1102.30	11820.76	12527.17

VII. Interest on Working Capital

29. Consequent on the above, the Interest on Working Capital allowed in para 61

of order is revised as under:

(₹ in lakh)

	Unit-1 (1.4.11- 25.10.11)	Unit-1 & 2 (26.10.11 - 12.2.12)	Unit-1,2 & 3 (13.2.12- 31.3.12)	2012-13 (all 4 units)	2013-14
Maintenance Spares	95.08	103.07	68.63	786.87	831.88
O & M expenses	52.82	57.26	38.13	437.15	462.15
Receivables	1091.81	1178.24	783.92	8471.59	8835.67
Total	1239.71	1338.57	890.68	9695.61	10129.70
Rate of IWC	11.75%	11.75%	11.75%	13.50%	13.50%
Interest on Working Capital	145.67	157.28	104.65	1308.91	1367.51

30. Based on the above discussions, the annual fixed charges as approved in para 62 of the order dated 5.9.2018 stands revised as under:

(₹ in lakh)

	Unit-1 (1.4.11- 25.10.11)	Unit-1 & 2 (26.10.11 -12.2.12)	Unit-1,2 & 3 (13.2.12- 31.3.12)	2012-13 (all 4 units)	2013-14
Return on Equity	1363.12	1476.77	982.96	10611.33	11937.06
Interest on Loan	2879.56	3092.22	2056.09	21842.77	21636.42
Depreciation	1528.61	1656.06	1102.30	11820.76	12527.17
Interest on Working Capital	145.67	157.28	104.65	1308.91	1367.51
O & M Expenses	633.88	687.11	457.52	5245.79	5545.85
Total	6550.83	7069.44	4703.53	50829.56	53014.01



31. Petition No. 41/RP/2018 is disposed of in terms of the above.

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

Sd/-
(P.K.Pujari)
Chairperson

