



TELANGANA STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
5th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdi-ka-pul, Hyderabad 500 004

R. P. (SR) No. 28 of 2017
in
O. P. No. 26 of 2016

Dated 07.10.2021

Present

Sri T. Sriranga Rao, Chairman
Sri M. D. Manohar Raju, Member (Technical)
Sri Bandaru Krishnaiah, Member (Finance)

Between

Telangana State Power Generation Corporation Limited,
Vidyut Soudha, Khairatabad, Hyderabad.

Review Petitioner

AND

1. Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Limited,
H.No.6-1-50, 5th Floor, Mint Compound,
Hyderabad-500 063.
2. Northern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Limited,
H.No.2-5-31/2, Corporate Office, Vidyut Bhavan,
Nakkalgutta, Hanamkonda, Warangal-506 001.
3. Southern Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Limited,
Tiruchanoor Road, Kesvayana Gunta, Tirupathi-517 501.
4. Eastern Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Limited,
Seethammadhara, Visakhapatnam-530 020.
5. ESCOMs of Karnataka State,
PCKL & KPTCL Room No.501,
5th Floor, KPTCL Building,
Kaveri Bhavan, Bangalore-560 009.

... Respondents

The review petition came up for hearing on 15.09.2021 and 27.09.2021. Sri. T. S. N. Murthy, CE (Coal & Comml.) for review petitioner has appeared through video conference on 15.09.2021. Dr. T. R. K. Rao, Director (Coal & Fuel) for review petitioner

has appeared through video conference on 27.09.2021. The matter having been heard and having stood over for consideration to this day, the Commission passed the following:

ORDER

This petition is filed under sec 94 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 (Act, 2003) by Telangana State Power Generation Corporation Limited (TSGenco) (review petitioner) seeking review of the order dated 05.06.2017 passed in O. P. No. 26 of 2016. The review petitioner sought the following prayer in the petition:

“... .. that the Hon’ble Commission may be pleased to:

- i) To allow the O&M charges of existing and new hydel stations as per CERC regulations 2014 to maintain parity with O&M charges allowed to thermal stations on par with thermal stations.
- ii) To consider and allow depreciation rates as per MoP 1994 notified in respect of thermal and hydel stations as per filings.
- iii) To consider the penalties which has been released to the contractors in respect of KTPS VI of Rs. 114.47 crore and KTPP Stage I of Rs.134.59 crore.
- iv) To consider the IDC, establishment charges and other expenditure of new thermal and hydel stations as per filings.
- v) To consider the RoCE computation for new projects as net assets arrived by deduct accumulated depreciation up to the previous financial year from capital cost of the projects.
- vi) To adopt the operating norms of KTPP Stage-II (1x600 MW) on par with APERC regulations 1 of 2008 since the operating norms of 500 MW capacity adopted to the 600 MW capacity till issuance of new regulations.”

2. The record of proceedings for the dates of hearing are extracted below:

Record of proceedings dated 15.09.2021:

... .. The representative of the review petitioner stated that the concerned personnel are otherwise engaged in a meeting in the Board of Directors of the company and as such, the matter may be adjourned by a short date. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Record of proceedings dated 27.09.2021:

“... .. The representative of the review petitioner stated that the issues raised in the review petition relate to determination of tariff for the control period FY 2014-2019. The review is sought in respect of depreciation, return on capital employed, interest, O&M expenses of hydel stations etc. It is stated that the Commission has not considered the submissions and relied on the parameters of the CERC regulation of the years 2004 and 2014. The review petitioner relied on the Hon’ble APTEL judgment in the matter of MERC decision relating to Maharashtra State Power Generation Company Limited. He also pointed out about the IDC in hydel stations. It is his case that ROCE was not considered based on net fixed assets at the beginning of FY in respect of new stations of TSGenco as per TSERC regulation. A detailed power point presentation is also made during the hearing.”

3. The Commission has perused the material placed for consideration of review petition and heard the representative of the review petitioner. The Commission is of the considered view that, the review petitioner has made out a case for reviewing the order passed by the Commission. That apart, the several aspects raised in the review petition need a detailed review and it is also necessary to take views of all the stakeholders, who raised objections in the original petition, on the contentions raised by the review petitioner.

4. In view of the above, the Commission is inclined to admit the review petition. The office is directed to number the review petition and issue notice to all the respondents 1 to 5 and to all the stakeholders, who raised objections in the original petition.

This order is corrected and signed on this the 07th day of October, 2021.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
(BANDARU KRISHNAIAH)	(M.D.MANO HAR RAJU)	(T.SRIRANGA RAO)
MEMBER	MEMBER	CHAIRMAN

//CERTIFIED COPY//