

Record of Proceedings dated 28.11.2016

I. A. NO. 14 of 2016.
in
O. P. No. 9 of 2016

M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited Vs TSSPDCL

Petition filed for determination of the capital and tariff of 2 X 600 MW Thermal Power Plant at Jaipur, Adilabad District.

Sri. P. Shiva Rao, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondents along with Smt. Priya Iyengar, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner explained in detail the need for passing interim order by explaining the per MW cost of the project, total cost of the project, GCV of the fuel and SHR of the fuel resulting in interim price per unit sought at Rs. 4.10. The breakup is put at Rs. 2.40 for fixed cost and Rs. 2.05 expected for variable cost, which includes royalty also. The petition is filed under section 94 (2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. The interim arrangement can at best be for three months only. The petitioner is seeking interim tariff at 90% of the fixed cost projected by it. The total fixed cost as per their estimate is Rs. 8,250/- crores only. The counsel for the respondent and the officers present on behalf of the coordination committee of the DISCOMs as well as CMDs of DISCOMs have stated that they are yet to make out the calculations and therefore, need time to present their figures. On specific question in respect of the present petition, it was replied that the Commission may consider a tariff less than Rs. 4/- only.

2. The Commission having heard the rival contentions on the interim application, reserved its orders in respect of interim prayer of the petition.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

R. P. (SR) No. 62 (a) of 2016
&
R.P. (SR) No. 62 (b) of 2016
in
O. P. No. 11 of 2016.

M/s. Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Ltd. Vs -Nil- M/s. Enrich Energy Private Ltd. (Added as respondent by the Commission)

Review Petition filed for review of the order dated 16.07.2016 passed in O. P. No. 11 of 2016 in the matter of according consent to the power purchase agreement by the petitioner in favour of the respondent.

I. A. filed for condoning the delay of 59 days in filing the review petition.

Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the petitioner along with Smt. Priya Iyengar Advocate and Smt. Dipali Sheth, Advocate for the respondent are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that a petition is filed as a review petition in pursuance of the directions in the order dated 16.07.2016 in O. P. No. 11 of 2016 in the matter of consent to power purchase agreement between the review petitioner and the respondent. The petition is filed under section 94 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for extending the period of COD upto 31.12.2016 from 31.03.2016. Several prayers are sought in the petition, which may or may not be relevant as per the directions of the Commission in the order or in the subsequent letter sent by the Commission Secretary conveying the decision of the Commission. The Commission may consider the communication of the government extending the time period by the letter issued in the month of July, 2016. The counsel for the respondent has no objection for the prayers in the petition. She, however, sought to plead for relief of paying incentives as are payable to the solar generators. Such incentives are being paid except the generators before the Commission. She also sought a prayer of fixing the tariff and non-payment of the dues.

2. The counsel for the petitioner opposed the idea of any relief to the respondent in a petition filed by the petitioner. He also stated that such an action is not known to law. At the stage the Commission pointed out that there is no petition insofar as the relief sought by the counsel for the respondent and she is free to file such petitions as may be desirable, which will be considered separately at the appropriated time.

3. With due regard to the discussion, the Commission reserved its orders on the petition.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman