

Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission

Ranchi

Form of Proceedings

Case No. 5 of 2019

Jharkhand Urja Sancharan Nigam Limited Petitioner

Versus

Jharkhand Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited Respondent

For the petitioner : Mr. Sanjay K. Sinha, GM (CRA), Mr. R.K. Agarwal, GM (F)

For the respondent : Mr. Amitabh and Mr. Amit Sinha, Advocates & .
Mr. Kaushikeya Jeta, Representative

Sl.No	Date of Proceeding	Proceeding of the Commission with signature	Office action taken with date
1	2	3	4
04	17.06.2019	<p>The petitioner argued, in part, in this case.</p> <p>The petitioner submitted that this Commission in its order dated 01st February, 2019 has not allowed any capital expenditure and capitalization of assets while Truing-up of FY 2013-14 (6th January, 2014 to 31st March, 2014) and FY 2014-15 which led to GFA at the end of FY 2014-15 being the same as it were at the start of FY 2013-14.</p> <p>The petitioner further submitted that opening CWIP as on 6th January, 2014 as per JUSNL's account is Rs. 482.01 Cr which is at variance with the figure of Rs. 779.21 Cr. as per the Transfer Scheme. He also submitted that these schemes were transferred to it as part of CWIP for the FY 2013-14 by the Transfer Scheme and then he in the immediate ensuing year i.e. FY 2014-15 Capitalised the same in its Audited accounts and submitted to this Commission in the True-up</p>	

Petition for FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15.

The petitioner also submitted that a divergent view cannot be taken on assets lying under "GFA" and "CWIP" as on 6th January, 2014. and just because an asset was lying under CWIP as per the Transfer Scheme and capitalised later cannot be treated differently on the pretext of a certain process being not followed.

The petitioner submitted that there is a typographical error in O & M cost component. He also submitted that the schemes were finalized at the time of JSEB being STU.

Learned Counsel for the respondent and the representative of the respondent vehemently opposed the submission of the petitioner particularly since the projects were not approved under relevant MYT of the period from April, 2013 to March, 2016, so additional fixed cost cannot be approved for such projects. They also raised the issue on which the Commission can review its order

The respondents are directed to file above submission on affidavit on or before the next date.

Put up on 02.07.2019 at 2.30 PM.

Sd/-
Member(L)

Sd/-
Member (E)

Sd/-
Chairperson