

Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission
Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi – 110017

No. F. 11(1226)/DERC/2015-16/4798/

Petition No. 30/2015

In the matter of:

Petition under Section 86(1)(e) of the EA 2003, DERC (Renewable Purchase Obligation and Renewable Energy certificate Framework Implementation) Regulations, 2012 filed by BRPL

M/s BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.
Through its: CEO
BSES Bhawan
Nehru Place
New Delhi-110019

...Petitioner

Petition No. 31/2015

In the matter of:

Petition under Section 86(1)(e) of the EA 2003, DERC (Renewable Purchase Obligation and Renewable Energy certificate Framework Implementation) Regulations, 2012 filed by BYPL

M/s BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.
Through its : CEO
Shakti Kiran Building
Karkardooma
Delhi-110092

...Petitioner

Coram:

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

Appearance:

1. Mr. Hasan Murtaza, Advocate
2. Mr. Buddy A. Ranganadhan, Advocate
3. Ms. Malvika Prasad, Advocate
4. Mr. Shekhar Saklani, BYPL
5. Mr. Sameer Singh, BYPL
6. Mr. Rajeev Chowdhury, BRPL
7. Mr. Shashi Goyal, Manager BRPL
8. Mr. Kanishk, BRPL

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 07.07.2015)

(Date of Order: 13.07.2015)

1. The present petitions have been filed by BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (BRPL) & BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL) with respect to waiver off Renewable Power Obligation (RPO) targets for the Petitioners for the year 2013-14, 2014-15 &

2015-16 and deferment of the compliance thereof. A common order is being passed in both the petitions being identical in nature.

2. The matter came up for hearing on 07.07.2015. On the specific query of the Commission that despite earmarked amount for purchase of REC in order to meet the RPO, why the Petitioners failed to purchase REC, the counsel for the Petitioners relied on data relating is year-wise detail actual Power Purchase Cost vis -a- vis the amount approved/provisionally approved in the respective ARR. The same was submitted in tabular form. The Counsel for the Petitioners contended that the expenditure on actual Power Purchase cost was much higher than the approved/provisionally approved Power Purchase Cost and therefore, the amount earmarked for purchase of REC got utilized for the purchase of required power. The counsel further submitted that purchase of REC does not result in supply of equivalent power and for the power requirement the Petitioner had to purchase it from the non renewable energy sources which would result in double costing.
3. The Commission directed the Petitioners to submit the details of actual power purchase cost, vis-à-vis approved power purchase cost including recovery from PPAC allowed by the Commission during the year, FY 2013-14 & FY 2014-15.
4. The Petitioners sought two weeks time to furnish the detail. The Commission accepted the request of the Petitioner and allowed the Petitioner to submit the requisite detail within the two weeks.
5. The hearing was adjourned. The next date of hearing shall be intimated in due course.
6. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(B. P. Singh)
Member

Sd/-
(J. P. Singh)
Member

Sd/-
(P. D. Sudhakar)
Chairperson