



DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi- 110017.

F.11(1383)/DERC/2016-17/5253

PETITION NO. 24/2016

In the matter of : Seeking directions regarding the bills/invoices raised with respect to the expired Power Purchase Agreement with IPGCL

BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.
Through its: **CEO**
Shakti Kiran Building,
Karkardooma
New Delhi – 110092

....Petitioner

Vs.

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

State Load Despatch Centre
Delhi Transco Limited
33KV Sub Station Building,
Minto Road,
New Delhi 110 002

...Respondent

PETITION NO.28/2016

In the matter of : Seeking directions regarding the bills/invoices raised with respect to the expired Power Purchase Agreement with IPGCL

BSES Rajdhani Power Limited
Through its: **CEO**
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi-110019

....Petitioner

Vs.

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

State Load Despatch Centre
Delhi Transco Limited
33KV Sub Station Building,
Minto Road,
New Delhi 110 002

...Respondent

Coram:

Sh. B.P. Singh, Member

Appearance:

1. Mr. Buddy Ranganathan, Advocate, BRPL & BYPL
2. Mr. Hasan Murtza, Advocate, BRPL & BYPL
3. Ms. Malvika Prasad, Advocate, BRPL & BYPL
4. Mr. Nishant Grover, BYPL
5. Mr. Abhishek Srivastava, BYPL
6. Mr. R.K. Yadav, AGM (T)
7. Mr. Rajesh Chattarwal, IPGCL

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 25.05.2017)

(Date of Order: 31.05.2017)

1. The Counsel for the Petitioners submitted that the Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs) executed with the Respondent IPGCL for purchase of power from Rajghat Power House (RPH) of the IPGCL have already expired in the months of May, 2015 and July, 2015 for BRPL and BYPL, respectively and vide Tariff order dated 29.09.2015, the Commission has also disallowed fixed charges for RPH of the IPGCL. The Counsel for the Petitioner further argued that the Petitioner is neither purchasing nor scheduling any power from RPH however, the Respondent is continuously raising the bills on fixed charges against RPH whereas, Respondent is not entitled to recover any cost from the Petitioner.
2. The representative of the Respondent No. 1 viz. IPGCL submitted that a reply in the matter has already been filed on 03.09.2016 before the Commission. He further submitted that they have not raised any bill since February, 2017 rather credit notes in respect of energy consumed by RPH have been issued. The Counsel for Petitioners submitted that they have not received any reply from the Respondent.
3. The Respondent No. 1 is directed to handover a copy of the reply to the Petitioners within a week and the Petitioners may file rejoinder, if any, within two weeks thereafter.
4. Further, keeping in view, the submissions made by the Respondent in its reply that RPH is a part of the 'islanding scheme' for Delhi, which was decided by the Government of Delhi (GoNCTD) in consultation of Central Electricity Authority (CEA), directions are given to issue notice to GoNCTD and CEA.

5. The matter was adjourned.
6. The next date of hearing will be informed in due course.

Sd/-
(B.P. Singh)
Member