

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 162/MP/2024**

Subject : Petition under Sections 61, 62, 64 as read with Section 79(1)(a) of the Electricity Act, 2003, and the proviso to Regulation 3(73) as read with Regulation 27 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms And Conditions Of Tariff) Regulations, 2019, and Regulation 65 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2023 for approval of proposal for life extension beyond the useful life in respect of the 291 MW Assam Gas Based Power Station of North Eastern Electric Power Corporation.

Petitioner : NEEPCO

Respondents : Assam Power Distribution Company Ltd and 6 ors.

Date of Hearing : **22.4.2025**

Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson  
Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member  
Shri Harish Dudani, Member  
Shri Ravinder Singh Dhillon, Member

Parties Present : Ms. Poorva Saigal, Advocate, NEEPCO  
Ms. Pallavi Saigal, Advocate, NEEPCO  
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, NEEPCO  
Ms. Reeha Singh, Advocate, NEEPCO  
Shri Ripunjoy Bhuyan, NEEPCO  
Shri Jayanta Mazumdar, NEEPCO  
Ms. Navajyoti Gogoi, NEEPCO  
Shri Parag Jyoti Kalita, APDCL  
Shri Sanjib Kalita, APDCL

**Record of Proceedings**

During the hearing, the learned counsel for the Petitioner made oral submissions on the matter. The learned counsel also submitted that though the Respondents were granted time to file their replies vide Record of Proceedings of the hearing dated 23.10.2024, no replies have been filed. She, accordingly, submitted that the Commission may reserve its order in the matter.

2. On the specific query of the Commission as to whether the Petitioner has obtained the consent of the beneficiaries, the learned counsel clarified that though the beneficiaries have, in principle, agreed to the proposal for life extension in the NERPC subcommittee meeting, no written consent has been received from the Respondents. She, accordingly, submitted that the Petitioner has made a publication of the proposal in five vernacular newspapers with a stipulation that in case no objection is received within seven days, the same will amount to deemed consent.

3. However, the representative for the Respondent, APDCL, sought time to file its reply in the matter. In response, the learned counsel for the Petitioner sought time to file its rejoinder to the said reply.

4. The Commission, after hearing the parties, permitted the Respondents to file their replies on or before **13.5.2025**, after serving a copy to the Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder by **20.5.2025**.

5. Subject to the above and based on the consent of the parties, the Commission reserved its order in the Petition.

**By order of the Commission**

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