

**JOINT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR  
THE STATE OF GOA AND UNION TERRITORIES  
GURGAON**

Coram  
Dr. V. K. Garg, Chairperson  
Shri R. K. Sharma, FIE Member

Petition No.....20/ 2010

**In the matter of**

Petition for approval of Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) for FY 2010-11 for Determination of Tariff (for Distribution and Retail sale of Electricity) of Electricity Department, Chandigarh in terms of Section 62 read with Section 86 (e) of Electricity Act, 2003.

**And in the matter of:**

Electricity Department, Chandigarh

: Petitioner

Present

1. Shri M.P.Singh, Superintending Engineer, ED Chandigarh
2. Shri Manan Thapar, Consultant for ED Chandigarh
3. Shri Amit Goel Consultant for ED Chandigarh

**ORDER**

**24/01/2011**

The petitioner filed the present petition for approval of Annual Revenue Requirement (A.R.R) and tariff proposal for FY 2010-11 for Union Territory of Chandigarh under section 61,62 and 64 of the Electricity Act, 2003. They have also filed ARR for 2011-12, requesting that the ARR for 2010-11 / 2011-12 may be considered by the Commission alongwith a request for condonation of delay.

2. The Commission enquired from the petitioner as to how the petition for Annual Revenue Requirement (ARR) and Tariff Proposal for FY 2010-11 is maintainable when in terms of Regulation No.28 (IV) Chapter IV, Tariff Regulations of JERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations 2009, (hereinafter Regulations), is not in time as the same should have been filed at a time, so that after completion of the process of fixation of Tariff under section 61,62,64 of Electricity Act 2003, there is still time to make the order effective & Bill accordingly. Commission observed that the petitioner is late even in filing the ARR for the year 2011-12 as it should have been done so by 30.11.2010.

3. The ARR approval for FY 2011-12 will either increase steeply the tariff as it will have to be realised in the balance part of the year, an extra burden on the consumer or shall have to be passed on to next year, which is not desirable. Coupled with the same if ARR for 2010-11 is also considered, the above problem shall be further compounded and therefore not acceptable.
4. In reply the petitioner while agreeing to the extra burden as mentioned above submitted that since it is the first petition of the petitioner before the Commission, the same could not be filed in time as contemplated in the regulations and the Act.
5. The petition is admitted to the extent that ARR for 2011-12 shall only be considered.
6. The matter shall be heard on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2011.

sd/-  
(R. K. SHARMA)  
MEMBER

sd/-  
(DR. V.K.GARG)  
CHAIRPERSON

Certified Copy

sd/-  
(J. S. Sehrawat)  
Secretary