



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

No. F. 11(1021)/DERC/2013-14/4037

Petition No. 39/2013

In the matter of: Review Petition for reconsideration/modification of specific observations and findings of the Commission's Order dated 31.07.2013 passed by the Hon'ble Commission in Petition for True Up of FY 2011-12, and determination Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Distribution Tariff (Retail and Wheeling) for FY 2013-14.

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.
Through its **Managing Director**
Grid Sub Station Building
Hudson Lines, Kingsway Camp,
Delhi 110 009

....**Petitioner**

Coram: **Sh. P. D. Sudhakar, Chairperson**
Sh. J. P. Singh, Member &
Sh. B. P. Singh, Member

Appearance:

1. Mr. Vishal Anand, Advocate, TPDDL
2. Mr. Rahul Kinra, Advocate, TPDDL
3. Mr. Ajay Kapoor, TPDDL
4. Mr. Anurag Bansal, TPDDL
5. Ms. Ritu Gupta , TPDDL
6. Ms. Sarika Mehta, TPDDL
7. Ms. Nayantara , TPDDL
8. Mr. Mukesh Dagal, DTL
9. Mr. Mohan Das, DTL

ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 09.12.2014)

(Date of Order: 29.12.2014)

1. Mr. Vishal Anand, Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that it has made a provision of (-)8.05 MU and Rs. 26.32 crore in FY 2010-11 in the quantum and Power Purchase Cost respectively against the expected bills.
2. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the Commission approved the total power purchase cost for FY 2010-11 at Rs. 3070.91 crore after verification of power purchase bills for FY 2010-11.
3. Ld. Counsel further submitted that Commission at Para 3.79 of the Impugned Order has allowed a sum of Rs. 26.32 crore which was earlier disallowed by the Commission in the impugned order dated 13.07.2012.
4. Ld. Counsel further submitted that although the Commission has allowed the said amount of Rs. 26.32 crore but it has inadvertently omitted to consider the same during final computation of the Petitioner's ARR for FY 2011-12.
5. Ld. Counsel further submitted that during truing up for the period FY 2009, the Commission in its Order dated 26.08.2011 had allowed the DTL's claim amounting

to Rs. 62.63 crore as a part of ARR for FY 2009-10 though the Petitioner had paid the same in FY 2011-12. In view of the same the Petitioner in the present Petition has claimed Rs. 62.63 crore in truing up of FY 2011-12 instead of FY 2009-10. However, Petitioner instead of removing the claim of DTL from FY 2009-10 inadvertently removed the same from FY 2008-09. Due to the inadvertent and bona fide mistake of the Petitioner, the incorrect year was also mentioned at Para 3.209 of the Impugned Order.

6. Ld. Counsel further submitted that due to inadvertent mistake on the part of the Petitioner the Commission has wrongly referred in the Impugned Order that arrears of Rs. 62.63 crore pertaining to DTL which relates to FY 2008-09 instead of FY 2009-10.
7. The Commission considered the arguments advanced by the Petitioner along with the entire record placed before it. The Commission is of the view that the above mentioned issues will be considered by the Commission at the time of the determination of ARR for FY 2015-16 of the petitioner. The Commission also directs the Petitioner to raise these issues at the time of determination of the ARR for FY 2015-16.
8. In view of the above the Review Petition is disposed off.
9. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(B.P. Singh)
Member

Sd/-
(J. P. Singh)
Member

Sd/-
(P. D. Sudhakar)
Chairperson