

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No.28/RP/2022**  
in  
**Petition No. 347/MP/2020**

Subject : Review of Commission's order dated 23.10.2021 in Petition No.347/MP/2020 regarding recovery of impact of wage revision of employees, impact of GST, Minimum Wages and Security Expenses (CISF) in respect of Tehri Hydro Power Project (1000 MW) during the period from 1.1.2016 to 31.3.2019.

Petitioner : THDC India Limited

Respondent : Punjab State Power Corporation Limited & 15 ors

Date of Hearing : **26.4.2022**

Coram : Shri P.K. Pujari, Chairperson  
Shri I.S. Jha, Member  
Shri Pravas Kumar Singh, Member

Parties Present : Ms Anushree Bardhan , Advocate, THDCIL  
Shri Rajesh Sharma , THDCIL  
Shri Mukesh Kumar Verma, THDCIL  
Shri Ajay Vaish, THDCIL  
Shri Rakesh Singh, THDCIL  
Shri Anindya Khare, MPPMCL  
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Mohit K. Mudgul, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Sachin Dubey, Advocate, BRPL  
Ms. Megha Bajpeyi, BRPL  
Shri Brijesh Kumar Saxena, UPPCL

**Record of Proceedings**

Case was called out for virtual hearing.

2. During the hearing, the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that though the matter has been admitted on issues namely (i) Impact of CISF wage revision and (ii) Impact of GST, the Review Petitioner is not pressing the issue on impact of GST. The learned counsel made detailed submissions regarding the error in the non-consideration of the impact of CISF wage revision and submitted that there is sufficient reason to review the order on this count.

3. The representative of the Respondent, MPPMCL submitted that the reply filed by the respondent may be considered while disposing of the review petition.

4. The representative for the Respondent, UPPCL referred to his reply and mainly submitted that there is no error apparent on the face of the order.



5. The learned counsel for the Respondent, BRPL submitted that though the Commission had sought additional information from the Review Petitioner, the same was not filed despite time being granted to the Review Petitioner. He also submitted that since the Review Petitioner had filed the relevant information, after the order was reserved, the review on this count may not be allowed. The learned counsel further submitted that the review petition is not maintainable, as the Review Petitioner has failed to exercise due diligence.

6. The Commission, after hearing the parties, reserved its order in the matter.

**By order of the Commission**

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

