



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

No. F.11(1201)/DERC/2014-15/

**Petition No. 01 of 2010,**  
**Petition No. 02 of 2010**  
**and**  
**Petition No. 03 of 2010**

**In the matter of:      Refund of balance of consumer contribution (Remand back matter)**

1. Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.  
Through its: **Managing Director**  
Grid Sub Station Building  
Hudson Lines, Kingsway Camp,  
Delhi 110 009
2. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited  
Through its: **CEO**  
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,  
New Delhi-110019
3. BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.  
Through its: **CEO**  
Shakti Kiran Building,  
Karkardooma  
New Delhi – 110092

**....Petitioners**

**Coram: Sh. B. P. Singh, Member**

**Appearance:**

1. Mr. Sanjay Sen, Sr. Adv. BRPL & BYPL
2. Ms. Malvika Prasad, Adv., BRPL&BYPL
3. Mr. Hasan Murtaza, Adv., BRPL&BYPL
4. Mr. Ravi Shandilya, BRPL
5. Mr. Abhishek Mahapatra, BRPL
6. Mr. Mayank Ahlawat, BRPL
7. Mr. G.B. Swain, BYPL
8. Mr. Brajesh Kumar, BYPL
9. Ms. Prachi Jain, BYPL
10. Mr. Abhishek Srivastava, BYPL
11. Mr. Anurag Bansal, TPDDL
12. Mr. Bharat Bhadawat, TPDDL
13. Mr. Ritu Gupta, TPDDL
14. Mr. Deepak Jain, TPDDL
15. Ms. Aditi Sanghi, TPDDL
16. Mr. Abhishek Kumar, TPDDL
17. Mr. Aniket Prasoon , TPDDL

**INTERIM ORDER**

(Date of Hearing 08.06.2018)  
(Date of Order: 18.06.2018)

1. The Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity vide judgment dated 15.05.2017 has remanded back the matter to the Commission with the direction to examine the

submissions made by the petitioners and give an opportunity to the petitioners to place their case on merits. Hence, the present petitions are being heard.

2. Vide interim Order dated 24.10.2017 the petitioners were directed to provide the exact figure of the amount to be refunded to the respective consumers with the date from which it has to be refunded alongwith the provision of relevant Tariff Orders in which it was considered as means of finance.
3. The Counsel for TPDDL submitted that there are issues relating to the methodology of capitalization adopted by the Commission in different Financial Years and through a letter dated 21.12.2017 clarification was sought from the Commission regarding the methodology for capitalization.
4. The Counsel for the petitioners BRPL and BYPL submitted that the detail of the amount to be refunded is being filed during the course of hearing. Further, it was requested that the Commission may first allow the amount to be refunded in the ARR of the respected financial years, thereafter the DISCOMs would be able to refund the balance of consumer contribution.
5. After hearing the Counsels for the petitioners, it is made clear that the ARRs of previous years upto FY 2015-16 have already been trued up and it would not be desirable to recast the ARRs at this juncture. As much as it is related to the issue of arranging the finance for refund, it is for the DISCOMs to arrange the necessary finance. Once refund of the Consumer Contribution is made by the DISCOMs, the actual amount refunded shall be allowed in the subsequent true up of ARR.
6. The petitioners are directed to have a meeting with the officers of the Commission within four weeks to sort out the issues relating to the amount of refund etc.
7. The next date of hearing will be informed to the parities in due course.
8. Ordered accordingly.

**Sd/-**  
**(B.P. Singh)**  
**Member**