



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi- 110017.

F.11(1530)/DERC/2017-18/5965

REVIEW PETITION NO. 59/2017

**In the matter of : Review Petition filed against the Tariff Order dated 31.08.2017 in
Petition no. 26 of 2017 for True Up of expenditure for FY 2014-15 and
FY 2015-16 and Petition no. 15 of 2017 for deciding the ARR & tariff
for FY 2017-18**

Indraprastha Power Generation Co. Ltd.
Through its Director (T)
Rajghat Power House,
Office Complex,
New Delhi 110 002

....Review Petitioner

Vs.

1. BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.
Through its : CEO
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi 110 019
2. BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.
Through its : CEO
Shakti Kiran Building,
Karkardooma,
Delhi 110 092
3. Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.
Through its : Managing Director
Grid Sub Station Building
Hudson Lines, Kingsway Camp
Delhi 110 009
4. New Delhi Municipal Council
Palika Kendra, Parliament Street
New Delhi 110 001

....Respondents

Coram:

Sh. B.P. Singh, Member

Appearance:

1. Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Adv., IPGCL
2. Mr. Buddy A Ranganadhan, Adv., BRPL
3. Ms. Malvika Prasad, Adv., BRPL
4. Ms. Varaa Masood, Adv., BRPL
5. Mr. Rahul Kinra, Adv., TPDDL
6. Mr. Akshat Srivastava, Adv., TPDDL
7. Mr. R. K Yadav, IPGCL
8. Mr. Amit Kansal, IPGCL
9. Mr. Kanishk, BRPL

10. Mr. Sanjay Srivastav, BRPL
11. Ms. Jyoti Jagtani, TPDDL
12. Ms. Anukriti Jain, TPDDL

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 13.03.2018)

(Date of Order: 19.03.2018)

1. A review petition has been filed by IPGCL for review of the following issues as contained in the Commission's Tariff Order dated 31.08.2017 in the Tariff Petition filed by the review petitioner:
 - a. Auxiliary Power Consumption (APC) to be taken for computation of Declared Capacity & Energy Charges Rate (ECR);
 - b. Return on Capital employed (RoCE) for GTPS;
 - c. No finding given on the aspect of Prior Period Expenses claimed by the Petitioner of Rs. 40.92 Crores; and
 - d. Relaxation in NAPAF of GTPS from 85% to 80%.
2. The counsel for the review petitioner submitted that the details of the expenses pertaining to UP Transit fee as directed by the Commission vide order dated 28.12.2017 has been filed on an affidavit, with an advance copy to the respondents.
3. The counsel for respondent no. 3, TPDDL submitted that it has filed reply to the review petition. The counsel for respondent 1, BRPL and respondent 2, BYPL seeks time to file reply.
4. The respondents viz. BRPL, BYPL and NDMC are directed to file reply, within three weeks, with an advance copy to the review petitioner and the review petitioner may file rejoinder, if any, within two weeks thereafter.
5. The next date of hearing will be informed in due course.
6. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(B.P. Singh)
Member