

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 288/GT/2020

Subject: Petition for truing up of annual fixed charges for 2014-19 tariff period in respect of the Dadri Gas Power Station (829.78 MW).

Petition No. 400/GT/2020

Subject: Petition for determination of tariff for 2019-24 tariff period in respect of the Dadri Gas Power Station (829.78 MW).

Petitioner: NTPC Ltd.

Respondents: UPPCL and 10 others

Date of Hearing: **29.6.2021**

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

Parties present: Shri Venkatesh, Advocate, NTPC
Shri Anant Singh, Advocate, NTPC
Shri Vikas Maini, Advocate, NTPC
Shri Suhael Buttan, Advocate, NTPC
Shri Abhishek Nangia, Advocate, NTPC
Shri S.P. Kesarwani, NTPC
Shri Buddy Ranganadhan, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Rahul Kinra, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Anupam Varma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Utkarsh Singh, Advocate, BRPL
Ms. Megha Bajpeyi, Advocate, BRPL
Shri. Gurmeet Deogen, BRPL
Shri Sameer Singh, BYPL
Shri Abhishek Srivastava, BYPL
Shri Anand Shrivastava, Advocate, TPDDL
Ms. Shruti Kanodia, Advocate, TPDDL
Ms. Priyansha Sharma, Advocate, TPDDL
Shri Manish Garg, UPPCL

Record of Proceedings

These Petitions were called out for virtual hearing.

2. During the hearing, the learned counsel for the Petitioner made submissions in the matter and pointed out that the additional information sought vide ROP of the hearing dated 17.3.2021 have been furnished and copies of the same have been served on the Respondents.



3. The representative of Respondent No. 5, UPPCL referred to the reply and made detailed submissions in these matters. With regard to the impact of wage revision claimed by the Petitioner, the representative of UPPCL circulated a document containing the computation of employee cost (normative versus actuals) in respect of the generating station and submitted that the impact claimed by the Petitioner may not be allowed. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Respondent UPPCL may be directed to serve a copy of the said computation of the employee cost, for the Petitioner to furnish its response.

4. The representative of the Respondent TPDDL submitted that the reply filed in the matter may be considered while disposing of these petitions. He, however, pointed out that the claim of the Petitioner for capitalization of expenditure towards installation of LED lighting may not be allowed, as the same is in the nature of revenue expenditure.

5. The learned counsel for the Respondent, BRPL submitted that the reply filed in these petitions may be considered while determining the tariff of the generating station.

6. The Commission after hearing the parties directed the Respondent, UPPCL to upload the document containing the computation of employee cost (normative versus actuals) and serve copy of the same to the Petitioner, if not done earlier, by 19.7.2021. The Petitioner shall file its response to the same, on or before 27.7.2021.

7. Subject to the above, orders in these Petitions were reserved.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

B. Sreekumar
Joint Chief (Law)

