

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 718/GT/2025

Coram:

Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member

Shri Harish Dudani, Member

Date of Order: 5th February, 2026

In the matter of

Petition for determination of generation tariff for the period 2025-29 for Parbati-II HE Project (800 MW).

And

In the matter of:

NHPC Limited,
NHPC Office Complex,
Sector-33, Faridabad – 121 003

.....Petitioner

Vs.

1. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited,
Shakti Bhawan, 14 Ashok Marg, Lucknow – 226001, Uttar Pradesh.
2. Haryana Power Purchase Centre
Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6, Panchkula-134109, Haryana.
3. Chandigarh Power Distribution Limited,
4th Floor, SCO 33 to 35, Sector-34A, Chandigarh-160022.
4. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited,
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place, New Delhi-110019.
5. BSES Yamuna Power Limited,
Shakti Kiran Building, Karkadooma, Delhi-110072.
6. Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.
Grid Sub-station Building, Hudson Lines, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-110009.
7. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board,
Vidyut Bhawan, Kumar House, Shimla-171004, Himachal Pradesh.
8. Uttaranchal Power Corporation Limited,
Urja Bhawan, Kanwali Road, Dehradun-248001, Uttarakhand.



9. Jaipur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Limited,
Vidyut Bhawan, Janpath, Jyoti Nagar, Jaipur-302005, Rajasthan.
 10. Ajmer Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Limited,
Old Power House, Hatthi Bhatta, Jaipur Road, Ajmer-305001, Rajasthan.
 11. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Limited,
New Power House, Industrial Area, Jodhpur-342003, Rajasthan.
 12. Power Development Department,
New Secretariat, Jammu (J&K)-180001.
 13. West Bengal State Electricity Distribution Company Limited,
Vidyut Bhavan, Sector-II, Block- DJ, Bidhannagar,
Kolkata, West Bengal -700091.
 14. Damodar Valley Corporation,
DVC Towers, VIP Road, Kolkata-700054, West Bengal.
 15. Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Limited,
Danganiya P.O. Sunder Nagar, Raipur -492013
-Respondents**

Parties Present:

Shri Ashutosh Kumar Srivastava, Advocate, NHPC
Shri Abhishek Nangia, Advocate, NHPC
Shri Kunal Veer Chopra, Advocate, NHPC
Shri Ravi Sharma, Advocate, CSPDCL
Shri Aryan Chanda, Advocate, CSPDCL
Shri Rohan Naik, Advocate, UPPCL
Shri Savyasachi Saumitra, Advocate, UPPCL
Shri Kaustub Narendran, Advocate, UPPCL
Shri Anand Shrivastava, Advocate, TPDDL
Shri Chetan Saxena, Advocate, TPDDL
Shri Mudassir, Advocate, TPDDL
Shri Adarsh Tripathi, Advocate, BYPL & BRPL
Shri Ajitesh Garg, Advocate, BYPL & BRPL

ORDER

The Petitioner, NHPC Limited, has filed this Petition for the determination of tariff of Parbati-II Hydro Electric Project (4 x 200 MW) (in short “generating station” or “project”) for the period from 1.4.2025 (COD of Unit-I, II & III) till 31.3.2029, in terms of the provisions of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms & Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2024 (in short 'the 2024 Tariff Regulations'). The Petitioner has also prayed



for the grant of an interim tariff under Regulations 9(1) and 10(3) of the 2024 Tariff Regulations.

Background

2. The Petitioner, NHPC Limited (in short “the Petitioner” or “NHPC”), is a Government of India Navratna Company and a generating company within the meaning of Section 2(28) of the Electricity Act, 2003 (in short “the Act”). The generating station is an 800 MW (4 x 200 MW) run-of-the-river with pondage hydro generating station located on river Parbati in Kullu District of Himachal Pradesh. The scheme comprises an 83.7 m high diversion dam at Pulga, a 31.557 km long concrete lined headrace tunnel and a surface power house on the right bank of Sainj river, a tributary of river Beas.

3. Central Electricity Authority (CEA) initially, accorded techno-economic clearance (TEC) for the generating station on 24.1.1995 to the erstwhile Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board and was subsequently handed over to the Petitioner on 20.11.1998 (TEC was subsequently transferred on 12.10.1999). The Investment Approval (the IA) for the Project was accorded by the Ministry of Power (MOP), Government of India (GOI) vide its letter dated 11.9.2002 at an estimated cost of Rs. 3919.59 crore (including IDC of Rs. 811.84 crore) at December 2001 price level, with scheduled completion within seven years, i.e. by 10.9.2009.

4. The Petitioner has submitted that the project has suffered substantial time overrun on account of difficult Himalayan geology along the HRT alignment, burial and refurbishment of TBM, multiple shear zones, natural calamities (cloud bursts, incessant rains), nationwide COVID-19 lockdown, strikes, and regulatory restrictions (ban on crushers), among others. The generating station has achieved commissioning on



16.4.2025, with the Commercial Operation Dates (COD) of the respective units as below:

Unit	COD	Installed Capacity (MW)
I, II & III	1.4.2025	600 (3 x 200)
IV	16.4.2025	200 (1 x 200)

Present Petition

5. The Petitioner, has filed this Petition in accordance with Regulations 9(1) and 10 of the 2024 Tariff Regulations, after serving the copy of the same on the Respondents. The annual fixed charges (AFC) claimed by the Petitioner, are as under:

	2025-26		2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
	(COD of Units - I, II & III i.e., 1.4.2025 to 15.4.2025)	(COD of the generating station i.e., 16.4.2025 to 31.3.2026)			
Depreciation	2242.38	54384.55	57398.96	57560.04	57600.98
Interest on Loan	2916.56	68677.06	67828.02	63959.34	59979.84
Return on Equity	3357.40	81425.72	85934.01	86171.57	86232.66
Interest on Working Capital	180.91	4367.26	4590.68	4601.22	4630.04
O & M Expenses	1134.42	27765.80	30495.75	32163.86	33923.23
Total AFC	9831.68	236620.38	246247.43	244456.03	242366.75

(Rs. in lakh)

Hearing dated 26.8.2025

6. During the first hearing, the Petitioner was directed to submit the latest approved Revised Cost Estimate (RCE)/Completion Cost and parties were given time to complete the pleadings.

7. The Respondents TPDDL and CSPDCL have filed their respective reply vide affidavit dated 7.11.2025, and the Petitioner has submitted its rejoinder on the same.

Hearing dated 11.12.2025

8. The Commission, after hearing the learned counsels for the parties, allowed the parties to complete the pleadings and reserved its order, with regard to the prayer of the



Petitioner for the grant of an interim tariff for the generating station, in terms of the 2024 Tariff Regulations.

Interim Tariff

9. The Petitioner has prayed for the grant of interim tariff, equivalent to 90% of the total tariff claimed for billing purposes based on presently approved design energy of 3124.60 MU till revision of design energy approved by CEA, subject to the final determination of tariff.

10. The Respondent, CSPDCL, has submitted that the Petitioner's request for the grant of 90% interim AFC under the 2024 Tariff Regulations ought to be rejected at this stage, as the claims forming the basis of such request remain unsubstantiated and have not undergone a prudence check. It has been further submitted that grant of an interim tariff without verification would expose consumers to the risk of over-recovery, and therefore, the request for interim AFC may be declined until all claims are duly examined by the Commission in accordance with the 2024 Tariff Regulations. It has been submitted that if any interim arrangement is considered, the same may be confined to the original sanction cost, without recognizing time and cost overrun, pending final determination of tariff, subject to prudence check.

11. The Respondent, UPPCL, has submitted that the grant of an interim tariff at 90% of AFC under the provisions of 2024 Tariff Regulations is not automatic and can be considered only after *prima facie* verification of a complete Petition. Since the present Petition involves serious issues of prudence relating to time overrun, cost escalation, IDC and IEDC, the grant of an interim tariff at this stage would risk burdening beneficiaries with costs that may ultimately be disallowed and therefore, deserves rejection.



12. In response, the Petitioner has clarified that the request for the grant of 90% interim AFC has been made strictly in accordance with Regulation 10(3) of the 2024 Tariff Regulations, which expressly permits the grant of an interim tariff pending final determination of tariff. The Petitioner has submitted that all four units of the generating station are commissioned, and power is being regularly scheduled and drawn by the beneficiaries. Denial of the interim tariff would result in serious cash-flow constraints, delayed billing, and avoidable carrying cost burden on consumers. It has been further submitted that the regulatory scheme mandates giving effect to interim tariff provisions once the Petition is compliant, a position consistently upheld in past orders of this Commission and recognized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in PTC India Ltd. v. CERC. Grant of interim tariff strikes the statutory balance under Section 61(d) of the Act, by ensuring reasonable cost recovery while safeguarding consumer interest. The Petitioner has further clarified that the allegations regarding non-imposition of liquidated damages are misconceived, as the 2024 Tariff Regulations do not make imposition of LD a precondition for tariff admissibility, and prudence check of time and cost overrun alone governs admissibility of capital cost.

13. The Petitioner, in the present Petition, has submitted that the RCE at completion cost as on COD/cut-off date was under finalisation and would be submitted after approval by its Board of Directors. Thereafter, on 29.12.2025, the Petitioner submitted the RCE for the generating station at Rs 13,325.50 crore (April 2025 price level), duly approved by its management, while expressly clarifying that the RCE was pending for approval of its Board of Directors. Thereafter, on 9.1.2026, the Petitioner has placed on record the copy of final RCE, duly approved by the Board of Directors on 8.1.2026, reflecting the project cost as on the sunset date 31.3.2029, along with other detailed documents. The Petitioner



has further submitted that, pursuant to the Office Memorandums dated 22.7.1997 and 5.8.2005, issued by the DPE, GOI, the Petitioner, being accorded Navratna status in 2024, the Board of Directors is the competent authority to approve such capital expenditure, and no further approval from any Administrative Ministry or external authority is required.

14. We have considered the submissions made by the parties. In order to enable the Petitioner to meet its ongoing financial obligations through a reasonable recovery of the cost of supply of electricity by the Petitioner to the Respondents and keeping in view that the interim tariff of the generating station will be subject to adjustment, based on the final tariff to be determined by the Commission, we, on prudence check, proceed to examine the prayer of the Petitioner for the grant of interim tariff in this Petition, as stated in the subsequent paragraphs.

15. Regulations 9(1) and 10(3) of the 2024 Tariff Regulations provide as under:

“9. Application for determination of tariff:

(1) The generating company or the transmission licensee may make an application for determination of tariff for a new generating station or unit thereof or transmission system or element thereof in accordance with these Regulations within 90 days from the actual date of commercial operation:

xxxx:

Provided further that the generating company or the transmission licensee, as the case may be, shall submit an Auditor Certificate and, in case of non-availability of an Auditor Certificate, a Management Certificate duly signed by an authorised person, not below the level of Director of the company indicating the estimated capital cost incurred as on the date of commercial operation and the projected additional capital expenditure for respective years of the tariff period 2024-29:

Provided that for a new generating station or unit thereof or transmission system or element thereof, the applicant, through a specific prayer in its application filed under Regulation 9(1) of these regulations, may plead for an interim tariff, and the Commission may consider granting interim tariff from the date of commercial operation after the first hearing of the application and where such interim tariff of the generating station or unit thereof and the transmission system or element thereof including communication system has been determined based on Management Certificate, the generating company or the transmission licensee shall submit the Auditor Certificate not later than 90 days from the date of Commercial Operation:

xxxx.”



10. Determination of tariff

XXXX

(3) If the information furnished in the petition is in accordance with these regulations, the Commission may consider granting an interim tariff of up to ninety per cent (90%) of the tariff claimed in the case of a new generating station or unit thereof or transmission system, or element thereof during the first hearing of the application for billing purposes till the final tariff is determined by the Commission:

Provided that in case the final tariff determined by the Commission is lower than the interim tariff by more than 10%, the generating company or transmission licensee shall return the excess amount recovered from the beneficiaries or long term customers, as the case may be, with simple interest at 1.20 times of the rate worked out on the basis of 1 year SBI MCLR plus 100 basis points prevailing as on 1st April of the financial year in which such excess recovery was made.

Xxx”

16. The Petitioner has submitted that it has placed on record the required information in the prescribed format, as per the provisions of the 2024 Tariff Regulations, including Form-5B (auditor certified) and accordingly, the same is considered. Since the generating station achieved COD on 16.4.2025 (Units-I, II & III on 1.4.2025 and Unit-IV on 16.4.2025) and is eligible for the grant of interim tariff, in this Petition, as stated above, we, based on the data/details available on record and on prudence check, proceed for the grant of interim tariff for the generating station from 1.4.2025 (i.e. COD of Units-I, II & III) till 31.3.2027 or till the determination of the final tariff of the generating station, whichever is earlier.

Commissioning Schedule

17. The scheduled COD of the units as per the Investment Approval dated 11.9.2002 and the actual/anticipated COD of the units, as submitted by the Petitioner, are as follows:

Unit	SCOD	COD	Time overrun
Unit-I	10.9.2009	1.4.2025	15 years, 6 months and 22 days / 5682 days
Unit -II	10.9.2009	1.4.2025	15 years, 6 months and 22 days / 5682 days
Unit -III	10.9.2009	1.4.2025	15 years, 6 months and 22 days / 5682 days
Unit-IV	10.9.2009	16.4.2025	15 years, 7 months and 6 days / 5697 days

Time and Cost Overrun

18. The Petitioner has submitted that as per MOP, GOI letter dated 11.9.2002, the



sanction cost of the project was Rs 3919.59 crore, including Interest during construction (IDC) of Rs 811.84 crore at the December' 2001 price level with a completion period of 7 years, i.e. up to 10.9.2009. However, there has been significant time overrun in the project on account of various reasons such as natural calamities, strike, uncertain & unpredictable adverse geological conditions in Himalayan terrain especially along the HRT alignment, due to which the COD was achieved on 16.4.2025 i.e., with a time overrun of 187.17 months and cost overrun of Rs 8656.57 crore as on COD of the generating station. The cost overrun is mainly on account of an increase in IDC and IEDC due to time overrun, along with a combination of other factors like increased land compensation, livelihood compensation in lieu of employment for land oustees, price escalation, LADF during construction, change in scope/inadequate provisions in DPR, exchange rate variation (ERV) and statutory levies, etc.

19. The Petitioner, in its additional submission dated 9.1.2026, has submitted that out of a total delay of 187.17 months (September 2009 to April 2025), delay up to December 2021 (147 months) already stands approved by MOP vide letter No 2/9/2018-NHPC dated 19.9.2019. Further, approval for delay of 171.67 months (upto December 2023) was submitted to CEA vide letter dated NH/PD/RCE/Parbati-II/286 dated 23.8.2022 and CEA vide letter dated 28.9.2022 intimated that the delays submitted by the Petitioner are in order. The total time overrun of 187.17 months as of 15.4.2025 is due to factors beyond the control of the Petitioner and has been approved by the competent authority.

20. The Respondent, CSPDCL, has submitted that the Petitioner has sought to justify substantial cost escalations across multiple heads merely on the ground of time overrun, without furnishing contemporaneous evidence or material particulars to establish that such delays were beyond its control, as per the 2024 Tariff Regulations. The claimed time



overrun of 187.17 months is excessive and has not been duly substantiated, thus, IDC and IEDC attributable to delays are liable to be disallowed after prudence check. Accordingly, the Respondent, CSPDCL, has requested that an interim tariff be rejected until all claims are duly examined by the Commission in accordance with the 2024 Tariff Regulations. The Respondent, UPPCL, has submitted that the hindrances cited by the Petitioner for time and cost overrun, including contract management issues, re-award of packages, changes in methodology, additional works, and slow progress, *prima facie* fall within the controllable factors under Regulation 22 of the 2024 Tariff Regulations and cannot be passed through without strict prudence scrutiny.

21. In response, the Petitioner, reiterating the various reasons for time overrun has submitted that the allegation that the cost escalation is due to poor project management is misconceived and contrary to the detailed hindrance analysis, Form-5, RCE documents and time–cost chronology already placed on record. The Petitioner has further submitted that it has exercised internal prudence by restricting the gross delay of 240.27 months to a net admissible delay of 202.45 months and further rationalising the period to 187.17 months for IDC/IEDC through parallel execution of works, while not claiming the IDC or IEDC for periods attributable to inefficiencies or contractor-related issues. The RCE approved in July 2022 transparently reflects these uncontrollable events, and the IDC/IEDC and capital cost claimed are strictly within the framework of Regulation 19 to Regulation 21 of the 2024 Tariff Regulations and expressly subject to prudence check. The Petitioner has submitted that the Respondent’s reliance on Regulation 21(5) of the 2024 Tariff Regulations is misplaced, as the delay is demonstrably attributable to uncontrollable factors recognised under Regulations 21(4) and 22(2) of the 2024 Tariff Regulations. The Petitioner has submitted that it has not sought automatic admission of



IDC/IEDC but has placed the complete time-overflow analysis on record for prudence check under Regulations 20 and 21 of the 2024 Tariff Regulations.

22. We have considered submissions of the parties. Since the question of time overrun and cost overrun involved in the project is required to be decided after a detailed hearing of the parties, at the time of determination of the final tariff of the generating station, the same is not considered in this order while determining the interim tariff of the generating station.

Capital Cost

23. The original sanctioned cost of the project is Rs. 391959.10 lakh at the December 2001 price level, including IDC of Rs. 81184.26 lakh. Accordingly, the hard cost of the project has been considered as Rs. 310774.84 lakh (about Rs. 388.47 lakh/MW). Subsequently, the project cost was revised to Rs. 1296118.41 lakh in Form 5B of the Petition, and Rs. 1332550.52 lakh as per the Board of Directors approved RCE submitted by the Petitioner in its additional submission dated 9.1.2026. The Petitioner has submitted the detailed tariff forms corresponding to the actual capital cost incurred as on COD of the generating station and its projected capital expenditure during the period till 31.3.2029.

24. Accordingly, the capital cost claimed by the Petitioner (as per auditor-certified forms) from the COD of Units-I, II & III (1.4.2025) till 31.3.2029, is as under:

	2025-26		2026-27	2027-28	(Rs. in lakh) 2028-29
	(COD of Units - I, II & III, i.e., 1.4.2025 to 15.4.2025)	(COD of the generating station, i.e., 16.4.2025 to 31.3.2026)			
Capital Cost Claimed	671588.18	693166.29			



	2025-26		2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
	(COD of Units - I, II & III, i.e., 1.4.2025 to 15.4.2025)	(COD of the generating station, i.e., 16.4.2025 to 31.3.2026)			
Add: IDC	547128.40	564449.33			
Add: Notional IDC	103108.83	103121.30			
Total Opening Capital Cost claimed	1321825.41	1360736.91	1387508.36	1393864.31	1395313.59
Add: Addition during the year/period	0.00	3267.00	4950.00	1428.00	523.00
Add: Discharges during the year/ period	376.77	23504.45	1405.94	21.29	11.40
Closing Capital Cost	1322202.18	1387508.36	1393864.31	1395313.59	1395847.99

25. The Respondents have submitted their replies regarding capital cost and components of AFC, on which the Petitioner has submitted its rejoinders. However, considering the fact that we are presently determining the interim tariff only, and these issues are required to be decided after detailed hearing of the parties, at the time of determination of final tariff of the generating station, the same is not being considered in this order.

26. For the purpose of working out the interim tariff, the capital cost, additional capital expenditure and discharge of liabilities as claimed by the Petitioner from 1.4.2025 to 31.3.2027 have been considered. Thus, on prudence check, the capital cost considered in the calculation for the grant of interim tariff for generating station from 1.4.2025 till 31.3.2027 is as under:

	2025-26		2026-27
	(COD of Units - I, II & III i.e., 1.4.2025 to 15.4.2025)	(COD of the generating station i.e., 16.4.2025 to 31.3.2026)	
Capital Cost	671588.18	693166.29	
Add: IDC	547128.40	564449.33	

(Rs in lakh)



	2025-26		2026-27
	(COD of Units - I, II & III i.e., 1.4.2025 to 15.4.2025)	(COD of the generating station i.e., 16.4.2025 to 31.3.2026)	
Add: Notional IDC	103108.83	103121.30	
Total Opening Capital Cost claimed	1321825.41	1360736.91	1387508.36
Add: Addition during the year / period	0.00	3267.00	4950.00
Add: Discharges during the year/ period	376.77	23504.45	1405.94
Closing Capital Cost	1322202.18	1387508.36	1393864.31
Average Capital cost	1322013.80	1374122.64	1390686.34

27. The AFC claimed by the Petitioner for the generating station for the period from the COD of Units-I, II & III (i.e. 1.4.2025) till 31.3.2027 is summarised below:

	(Rs. in lakh)		
	2025-26 (1.4.2025-15.4.2025)	2025-26 (16.4.2025-31.3.2026)	2026-27
Depreciation	2242.38	54384.55	57398.96
Interest on Loan	2916.56	68677.06	67828.02
Return on Equity	3357.40	81425.72	85934.01
Interest on Working Capital	180.91	4367.26	4590.68
O&M Expenses	1134.42	27765.80	30495.75
Total AFC Claimed	9831.68	236620.38	246247.43

28. While considering the interim AFC for the generating station, we observe that while the Project was completed with a delay of 187.17 months, around 147 months of delay has been approved by the MOP vide letter No 2/9/2018-NHPC dated 19.9.2019. Further, the approval for delay of 171.67 months (upto December 2023) was submitted to the CEA vide letter dated NH/PD/RCE/Parbati-II/286 dated 23.8.2022 and CEA vide letter dated 28.9.2022 intimated that the delays submitted by the Petitioner are in order. We further observe that out of the total capital cost claimed by the Petitioner as on COD amounting to Rs. 1360736.91 lakh, a substantial portion is attributable to IDC (including notional IDC) {amounting to Rs 667570.73 lakh (approx. 49% of the capital cost claimed by the Petitioner)} and IEDC {amounting to Rs. 274235.63 lakh (approx. 20% of the capital cost



claimed by the Petitioner}} components, which is subject to prudence check at the time of the determination of the tariff. Further, Regulation 10(3) of the 2024 Tariff Regulations provides that the Commission may consider granting an interim tariff up to ninety per cent (90%) of the tariff claimed in the case of a new generating station for billing purposes till the final tariff is determined. Considering the substantial delay in completion of the Project and corresponding high proportion of the IDC and IEDC components in the capital cost claimed, without going into the prudence check for time overrun at this stage, we decide to grant an interim tariff of seventy-five per cent (75%) of the AFC claimed from the COD of Units-I, II & III (i.e. 1.4.2025) till 31.3.2027, or till the determination of final tariff, whichever is earlier.

29. Accordingly, the AFC claimed by the Petitioner and the interim annual fixed charges allowed for the generating station for the period from the COD of Units-I, II & III (i.e. 1.4.2025) till 31.3.2027 is summarised below:

	(Rs. in lakh)		
	2025-26 (1.4.2025- 15.4.2025)	2025-26 (16.4.2025- 31.3.2026)	2026-27
Annual Fixed Charges claimed by the Petitioner	9831.68	236620.38	246247.43
Interim fixed charges allowed @ 75% of the annual fixed charges claimed by the Petitioner	7373.76	177465.28	184658.57

30. The interim tariff granted as above is subject to adjustment based on the determination of tariff, in terms of the provisions of the 2024 Tariff Regulations. Also, as stated earlier, the interim tariff granted for the generating station shall be in operation for the period from COD of Units-I, II & III (i.e. 1.4.2025) till 31.3.2027 or *till the determination of final tariff, whichever is earlier.*



Normative Annual Plant Availability Factor (NAPAF)

31. The NAPAF of the generating station is considered as 90% as per Regulation 71(A)(1)(a) of the 2024 Tariff Regulations.

Design Energy

32. CEA, while granting Techno-Economic Clearance for the Project in 2001, had approved the Design Energy (DE) of 3108.66 MU, which was subsequently revised to 3124.6 MU vide letter dated 21.8.2017, with 2003-04 as 90% dependable year and e-flow as 15% of the minimum flow in the lean season. It is observed that the Petitioner has again approached the CEA for approval of downward revision of the design energy from 3124.60 MU to 3071.19 MU on account of e-flow to be released should be 15% of average lean season inflow (as per the National Green Tribunal's order), and due to increase in length of tunnel by 31 m (i.e. 31.526 km to 31.557 km) resulting in head loss. We have considered the presently approved 3124.6 MU for the tariff purpose, till revision of the same by the CEA. The month-wise break-up of the design energy as per the Petitioner's submission is as follows:

Month	Ten days period of the Month	Design Energy (MUs)	
April	I	41.89	139.68
	II	49.01	
	III	48.78	
May	I	52.72	258.73
	II	95.24	
	III	110.77	
June	I	159.45	476.57
	II	151.61	
	III	165.51	
July	I	167.22	550.26
	II	182.40	
	III	200.64	
August	I	182.40	565.44
	II	182.40	



Month	Ten days period of the Month	Design Energy (MUs)	
	III	200.64	
September	I	157.64	391.30
	II	126.67	
	III	106.99	
October	I	88.89	240.05
	II	79.28	
	III	71.88	
November	I	60.83	151.25
	II	49.90	
	III	40.52	
December	I	36.60	99.25
	II	31.71	
	III	30.94	
January	I	26.26	80.77
	II	26.77	
	III	27.74	
February	I	24.83	72.04
	II	24.65	
	III	22.56	
March	I	27.56	99.26
	II	33.10	
	III	38.60	
Total		3124.60	3124.60

33. Accordingly, Petition No. 718/GT/2025 relating to the determination of tariff for the generating station for the period from COD of Units-I, II & III (i.e. 1.4.2025) till 31.3.2029, shall be listed for the hearing in due course, for which a separate notice will be issued to the parties.

Sd/-
(Harish Dudani)
Member

Sd/-
(Ramesh Babu V.)
Member