



Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission
Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi – 17.

No. F.11(1319)/DERC/2015-16/5080
No. F.11(1320)/DERC/2015-16/5081

Petition No. 91/2015

In the matter of : Petition for adjudication of disputes between the Petitioner and respondent regarding terms of PPA and payment of dues.

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

....Petitioner

VERSUS

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.
Through its Managing Director
NDPL House,
Hudson Lines, Kingsway Camp
Delhi 110 009

.....Respondent

Petition No. 92/2015

In the matter of : Petition for adjudication of disputes between the Petitioner and respondent regarding terms of PPA and payment of dues.

Pragati Power Corporation Ltd.
Through its Director (T)
Rajghat Power House,
Office Complex,
New Delhi 110 002

....Petitioner

VERSUS

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.
Through its Managing Director
NDPL House,
Hudson Lines, Kingsway Camp
Delhi 110 009

.....Respondent

Coram:

**Sh. Krishna Saini, Chairperson &
Sh. B.P. Singh, Member**

Appearance:

1. Mr. Anand K Ganesan, Adv. IPGCL
2. Mr. Vishal Anand, Adv. TPDDL
3. Mr. Rahul Kinra, Adv. TPDDL
4. Mr. Rajesh Chattarwal, IPGCL
5. Mr. R.K. Nagpal, IPGCL
6. Mr. Amar Jyoti , IPGCL

7. Mr. Mithun Chakraborty, TPDDL
8. Mr. Sumit Sachdev, TPDDL
9. Ms. Nayantara, TPDDL
10. Mr. Yuganshu Pathak, TPDDL
11. Mr. Mr. Rakesh Kumar, TPDDL

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 31.05.2016)

(Date of Order: 17.06.2015)

1. The Counsel for the Petitioners submitted that with effect from 01.04.2007, they have been supplying electricity to the Respondent and raising the bills as per PPA. However, since the month of October 2015 the Respondent has completely stopped paying the monthly bills and an outstanding amount of Rs. 281 crores from October 2015 is pending payment. He further submitted that the financial crisis of the Respondent cannot be a plea for non-payment to the Petitioners as long as the bills are being raised as per the orders passed by the Commission.
2. The Counsel for the Respondent submitted that the Petitioners have over billed the Respondent by 37.88 crores by excess recovery in FY 2014-15 and by billing it for Rajghat Power Station of IPGCL despite the unwillingness of the Respondent to extend the expired PPA beyond May 2015.
3. The parties made their submissions in detail and the arguments were concluded from both the sides.
4. After hearing the submissions made by the parties the Commission reserved the Final Order and directed the parties to file their written submissions within two weeks.
5. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(B.P. Singh)
Member

Sd/-
(Krishna Saini)
Chairperson