

Before
UTTARANCHAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

Re-determination of tariff for PIUs as per directions of Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity in their order dated 02.06.2006 in Appeal Nos. 124, 125, 177 of 2005 & 18 of 2006 read with order dated 13.10.2006 in Appeal No. 169 of 2006 & IA no. 120 of 2006 in Appeal No. 177 of 2005.

Coram

Sh. Divakar Dev	Chairman
Sh. V.K. Khanna	Member
Sh. V.J. Talwar	Member

Date of Order: 13th November 2006

These proceedings have been started for re-determination of tariff for PIUs for the period 1.9.2004 to 31.3.2005 and year 2005-06 on the basis of pooled average cost of power purchased as per the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity's order dated 02.06.2006 read with order dated 13.10.2006. Brief history of this matter is given below.

[A] History of the Case

2. The State of Uttaranchal was carved out of the undivided Uttar Pradesh (UP) on 9th November 2000, as a result of which the hydro generating stations falling within the new State got transferred to it. Most of these stations being fairly old, cost of electricity produced by them is substantially lower than the cost of electricity procured from other sources. Further, the total demand of the new State being modest, major part of this demand could be met from cheap power available from these stations within the State. As a result, the power purchase cost for the new State's distribution licensee namely Uttaranchal Power

Corporation Ltd. (UPCL) got reduced substantially from what it was in the undivided UP State. However, UPCL did not file its ARR and get its tariff determined from the Regulatory Commission and continued to charge the tariffs approved for the undivided UP State with some marginal adjustments. Therefore, on 4th June 2003, this Commission started proceedings for determination of consumer tariffs in the State. Thereafter, the Commission issued its first tariff order on 08.09.2003. On account of substantial reduction in power purchase cost, in this order, tariffs for most of the consumers were reduced and reduction for subsidizing categories like industrial and commercial consumers was significant. In this tariff order, the Commission clubbed together all HT industrial consumers, i.e. small industrial consumers, Heavy industrial consumers and power intensive industrial consumers like steel units. This tariff was implemented by UPCL sometime in December 2003 though w.e.f. 20.09.2003.

3. On 31.05.2004, UPCL filed a petition seeking amendment in the industrial tariff fixed in the order dated 08.09.2003. It was pointed out by UPCL that on account of very high load factor of steel units their effective tariff was working out to be very low. In fact, it was working out to be less than even the average cost of supply and the steel units had thus become subsidized consumers. The Commission examined the matter and after carefully considering all relevant aspects passed an order on 24.08.2004. In this order, all Steel Units whether Induction/Arc furnaces or Rolling Mills, Re-Rolling Mills, Mini Steel Plants, etc. were designated as Power Intensive Industrial Units (PIUs). Such Steel Units (PIUs) were segregated from other consumers of UPCL and their tariff was determined on the marginal cost basis. Such units were put in a separate category, and their power purchase cost, was worked out separately. Further, in view of the high cost of power purchased for such units, their provisional tariff was fixed without including either the licensee's overhead charges or the cross subsidy levied on other consumers. Of these, the licensee's overheads were to be added to the final power purchase cost when determined.

4. Commission's above order was challenged in Appeal Nos. 124, 125, 177 of 2005 & 18 of 2006 filed before the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity. In their order dated 02.06.2006, the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal directed that tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) should be determined not on the basis of marginal cost of power purchased for supply to them, as has been done by the Commission, but after pooling the entire power purchase cost and working out the average cost of power purchased. In this connection, the Hon'ble Tribunal has directed as given below:

- a) *"The Commission while carrying out the truing up exercise during the next tariff revision shall re-determine the tariff for PIUs on the basis of pooled average cost of power purchased from all sources for all categories of consumers for the period covered by the orders dated April 25, 2005 and October 4, 2005,*
- b) *The effect/benefit of the truing up exercise shall be given to the appellants in the next tariff revision.*
- c) *While re-determining the tariff the Commission shall ensure that no tariff shock is caused to any other category of consumers in consonance with the spirit of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the Tariff Policy."*

5. Thereafter, the Commission issued the Tariff order for 2006-07 on 12.07.2006 and, in the said order, tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) has been determined on the basis of the above directions. In its order dated 02.06.2006, the Hon'ble Tribunal had also directed UPCL as follows:

".....Before parting with the order, we would direct UPCL to furnish the requisite data in time to enable UERC to take decisions based on actual data."

6. Notwithstanding the above directions, UPCL failed to furnish up-to-date or reliable data for these years. In absence of UPCL's final accounts for the years 2004-05 and 2005-06, the Commission, while fixing tariffs for the year 2006-07, had to defer the truing up exercise for earlier years which as per prevailing

practice is done when final and reliable figures become available. The Commission dealt with this issue in para 6 at Page 70 of its order stating clearly the reasons for such deferment.

7. Commission's inability to carry out the truing up exercise in absence of final figures was misrepresented as deliberate non-compliance of Hon'ble Tribunal's directions. Unfortunately, efforts made on behalf of the Commission to clarify the position and place correct facts before the Hon'ble Tribunal were not successful. Commission's written submissions in this regard also had to be withdrawn and the Hon'ble Tribunal was pleased to pass the following order in this regard.

".....With reference to the contents of the Reply Affidavit, we expressed our displeasure and we also expressed that we are unable to appreciate the stand taken by the Regulatory Commission.

Mr. P.S. Bhullar, advocate, represents on instructions, that he is withdrawing the contents as well as the Reply Affidavit itself. There could be no objections for such a stand and Mr. Lahoty, advocate, is fair enough to state that he has no objection for the Commission withdrawing the Reply Affidavit.

On our indicating the position, Mr. P.S. Bhullar, advocate, on instructions from Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Director (Finance) of the respondent, Commission, represents that within 4 weeks from this date they undertake to pass appropriate orders by way of implementation of the orders passed in Appeal no. 177 of 2005....."

8. The Commission accordingly initiated these proceedings as per Regulation 10(2) of Uttaranchal Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004.

[B] Procedure followed

9. The Commission issued a public notice on 19.10.2006 & 20.10.2006 in leading local newspapers listing out the options available to it for implementation of the Hon'ble Tribunal's orders and invited suggestions on these options from various stakeholders. The Commission also consulted the Advisory Committee constituted under Section 87 of the Electricity Act, 2003 on 27.10.2006. In absence of any response from UPCL and the State Government, the Commission invited their representatives to ascertain the licensee's and the State Government's views and suggestions in this matter. After taking into account all the suggestions received in this regard, the Commission has re-determined the tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) in the State in the following paragraphs as required by the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal.

10. As stated earlier, the Commission could not take up the truing up exercise for the years 2004-05 and 2005-06 for want of reliable data. Such data was not furnished even after Hon'ble Tribunal's direction given to UPCL on 02.06.2006. The present exercise is, therefore, being carried out on the basis of whatever data relating to 2004-05 and 2005-06 is presently available and only in order to implement the Hon'ble Tribunal's directions. Further refinement in the same may have to be done after prudence check as and when final and reliable data is made available by UPCL.

[C] Responses from Stakeholders

11. A total of 79 responses to the Commission's public notice have been received, of which 25 are from out side the State through e-mail. All these 25 responses are exactly same raising questions about their authenticity. List of all respondents including these 25 is given in Annexure-I. The Commission had invited suggestions from stakeholders on the three options listed out in the Public Notice. However, most of the responses do not do that and are on the need and desirability of revision in tariffs. Many suggestions/comments have

been repeated by number of respondents and these have been grouped together issue-wise and are given below.

(a) General Consumers' response

- (i) Most of the consumer respondents have said that if on account of the order of the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity, tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) is re-determined, the same should not jeopardize interest of domestic consumers and the tariff for domestic, agriculture and small industries etc should not be increased on this account.
- (ii) It has been pointed out by a large number of respondents that the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal's directions also require that while re-determining the tariff for Steel Units (PIUs), the Commission shall ensure that no tariff shock is caused to any other category of consumers. Therefore, while re-determining the tariff for Steel Units (PIUs), differential tariff structure should be so adopted that it obviates the need for increase in tariff for other categories of consumers.
- (iii) In absence of audited data which the UPCL has failed to furnish so far, any exercise for re-determining the tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) will have to be repeated again as and when the final figures are furnished by UPCL. This would lead to frequent revisions of tariffs and resultant tariff uncertainty for consumers, which should be avoided.
- (iv) Tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) in Uttaranchal is much lower than that in neighbouring States of Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Punjab and HP. Therefore, while re-determining the same should be made comparable to tariffs in neighbouring States.
- (v) It has also been suggested by some respondents that UPCL's revenue gap, due to re-determining the tariff for Steel Units (PIUs), if any, should be met from the surplus revenue already realized by it from consumers as per the investigation conducted by the Commission.

- (vi) The Hon'ble Tribunal's orders are for re-determination of tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) and not for reduction in tariff for such consumers

(b) Steel Units' (PIUs') Response

Steel Units (PIUs) have reiterated the directions contained in the order of the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal, and have asserted that no increase in tariff of other consumers is warranted as sufficient surplus is available with UPCL as revealed in the investigation done by independent auditors. In this connection, Hon'ble Tribunal's directions against causing tariff shock to other consumers has been quoted and interpreted to mean that there should be no increase in tariffs of other consumers.

(c) Recommendations of the State Electricity Advisory Committee

- (i) The Advisory Committee was of the view that the Hon'ble Tribunal's direction is to re-determine the tariff for Steel Units (PIUs), which does not necessarily mean reduction in their tariff. While re-determining this tariff on pooled power purchased cost basis, the Commission should treat these units at par with other consumers not only for meeting the cost of energy but also for recovery of losses and cross subsidies etc., which had not been done by the Commission in its order dated 24.08.2004.
- (ii) While determining the tariff structure for these consumers, the load factor of this consumer category should be kept in mind and the Fixed and Energy Charges should be so determined so as to ensure full recovery of the pooled average power purchase cost as well as the cross-subsidy and overhead expenses.
- (iii) Increasing tariffs for domestic consumers consequent to re-determination of tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) would not be fair. The burden, if any, arising on account of revision of Steel Units (PIUs) tariff should be borne by the State Government rather than by other comparatively weaker consumers.

- (iv) Steel Units (PIUs) have already recovered the price of their products from the respective buyers taking into account their input costs including the electricity charge paid by them during these past years. Hence, if any concession or refund for the past years is now given to them, the same will not be passed on to their own consumers and would only add to profits of such units.
- (v) Truing up exercise and consequential re-determination of tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) based on provisional data will have to be followed by a similar exercise when the final figures become available. Frequent revision of tariffs creates situation of tariff uncertainty and put the consumers to avoidable difficulties.
- (vi) Keeping in view their load factor etc., Steel Units (PIUs) should be categorized in a separate category and their tariff determined after averaging out not only the power purchase cost but also the losses of the distribution system and the cross subsidy being charged from subsidizing consumers.

(d) UPCL's Response

UPCL, the licensee, did not file any response. Nevertheless, the Commission invited UPCL's CMD and Director (Finance) to ascertain the licensee's views in the matter. Their view as conveyed in their interaction with the Commission was that the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal's directions do not necessarily require reduction in tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) since the Hon'ble Tribunal has also directed that there should be no tariff shock to other consumers. However, if this re-determination does result in a revenue gap for UPCL, the same should be converted into Regulatory Assets, to be amortised in the next three to four years.

(e) State Government's response

To ascertain the views of the State Government on the matter, the Commission invited the Principal Secretary (Energy) and the Secretary

(Industry), Govt. of Uttaranchal for a meeting on 28th October 2006 at 12.00 noon in UERC's office. Principal Secretary (Energy), who attended the meeting, conveyed that the Government's view is that no increase in tariff for other consumers should be made, particularly when the new tariff filing by the licensees is scheduled in another few weeks. Further, in view of Hon'ble Tribunal's direction to pool the power purchase cost, similar approach towards other issues like losses and cross subsidy would be logical.

12. The Commission has taken note of the above views and will be dealing with them appropriately later in this order.

[D] Present Proceedings

13. As stated earlier, the present exercise is being done on the basis of the available data and is confined to re-determination of tariffs for Steel Units (PIUs) determined earlier by the Commission in its order dated 25.04.2005 and 04.10.2005, on the basis of pooled average cost of power purchased from all sources for all categories of consumers as directed by the Hon'ble Tribunal. For this purpose, the data available with the Commission is as listed below:

- (i) UPCL's Provisional Accounts for 2004-05
- (ii) UPCL's Revised Estimates for 2005-06
- (iii) Power purchase details for the periods 01.09.2004-31.05.2005 and 01.04.2005 to 30.09.2005 as certified by a chartered accountant.

14. Given the above incomplete and infirm data, the Commission has to update only the power purchase cost based on the certificates referred to at (iii) above and the revised estimates for 2005-06 furnished by UPCL along with ARR for 2006-07, and re-determine the tariff for Steel Units (PIUs). Truing up, updating or fresh estimation of the other elements of retail tariffs is not being attempted in these proceedings and the same shall be done as and when UPCL's final accounts are available. Accordingly, in this exercise the Commission has relied only on the figures relating to other cost elements as given in the

concerned tariff orders. Since UPCL had not filed any ARR for 2004-05, Tariff order given for 2003-04 continued to be applicable and, therefore, the figures given there have been used for 2004-05 also.

[E] Retail Tariffs

15. Tariff per kWh for any consumer category comprises of three cost elements namely power purchase cost (including losses), the distribution company's overheads and the cross-subsidy. The power purchase cost and the overheads together form the cost of supply. When these are pooled and averaged out, as in the present case, the average cost of supply for all categories of consumers becomes the same. Variations in the retail tariffs for different consumers categories are then on account of different values of the third cost element, namely, the cross-subsidy. If this is negative, the retail tariff becomes less than the average cost of supply and such consumers become subsidized consumers. Similarly, if this value is positive, the retail tariff becomes more than the cost of supply and consumers paying such tariffs are subsidizing consumers.

16. For determining the revised effective tariff to be charged from Steel Units (PIUs), these three cost elements have to be calculated in accordance with Hon'ble Tribunal's directions and the Commission's relevant Regulations. This is attempted hereafter.

(a) Power Purchase Cost

17. Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal, in order dated 02.06.2006, had concluded that the approach adopted by the Commission in its order dated 24.08.2004 was not sustainable and had directed that

".....to determine tariff for PIU category using average pooled cost of purchase....."

18. Accordingly, the weighted average rate of power purchased from all sources and for all categories of consumers has been calculated and the same

works out to Rs. 1.19 per kWh for 01.09.2004 to 31.03.2005 and Rs. 1.25 per kWh for 2005-06. This would reflect as a component of the retail tariff after factoring in the losses of the system. While segregating Steel Units (PIUs) and treating them separately from other consumers and allocating the costly power to them on standalone basis, the Commission in its order dated 24.08.2004 had assumed only 20% losses for them. Such segregation has now been done away with and the rate of power purchased for all categories of consumers has been averaged and is uniform. Therefore, in absence of information on voltage-wise losses, Steel Units (PIUs) have to be treated at par with other consumers for allocating the losses of the system and the same have to be recovered from all categories of consumers at a uniform average rate. This would also be in accordance with the recommendations of the State Advisory Committee and the State Government and also the responses received from consumers. This approach is also validated by the Hon'ble Tribunal's observation in their order dated 02.06.2006, which is reproduced below:

"..... In our view, appellant's contention that loss level is just 1% is not sustainable at all. The loss level in the system from the point of purchase to the consumer premises, is what is relevant and not only loss in the 33 kV feeder. UPCL has to pay for the energy purchases at the point of purchase and all system, including 400 kV, 220 kV, 132 kV, 33 kV lines, transformation losses have to be taken into account and paid for by UPCL. To enable the Commission to use category-wise loss data for determining cost of supply for the concerned category, UPCL must furnish the data to the Commission in its future filings of ARR."

19. It may be recalled that the Commission in its order dated 08.09.2003 had directed UPCL to reduce its losses over a five year period. While UPCL has been claiming actual losses to be higher than stipulated, the Commission has been adhering to this five year trajectory and allowing losses based on it. As per this trajectory, the admissible loss levels for 2004-05 and 2005-06 are 38.17% and

34.17% respectively. Accordingly, the incidence of power purchase cost in the retail tariff of all consumers, including Steel Units (PIUs), works out to Rs. 1.93 per kWh for 2004-05 and Rs. 1.90 per kWh for 2005-06.

(b) UPCL's overheads

20. It may be recalled that while fixing the provisional power purchase cost of Rs. 3.25 p/kWh the Commission in its Order dated 24.08.2004 had clearly stipulated that the other charges, which were over and above the power purchase cost, were to be added to this amount. The relevant portion of the said order is reproduced below:

"4.2.2(3) Licensee's other costs have already been distributed on the sales projected for existing consumers and are, therefore, not being charged to PIUs. There is no reason why proportionate share of the same should not be borne by them. Necessary corrections in this regard will be made when licensee's ARR is available and is examined."

21. All expenses of UPCL, other than the power purchase cost, together constitute what has been referred to as UPCL's overheads. For calculating this, the expenditure allowed under these heads in the relevant tariff order has been divided by the projected sale to work out the overhead expenses of UPCL as reflected in the retail tariff. Since these have been worked out on the entire projected sale to all categories of consumers, this value is again uniform. For the year 2004-05, this works out to Rs. 0.64/kWh and for 2005-06 it works out to Rs. 0.60/kWh. As stated earlier, these proceedings are restricted to updating of only the power purchase cost on pooled average basis as directed by the Hon'ble Tribunal. Truing up, revision or updating of other expenses or for that matter of the revenue is not being attempted for want of final figures. This exercise will have to await finalization of UPCL's accounts. The Commission is aware that these figures given in the relevant tariff orders may have changed but their correct position would be known only from the final accounts. As and when that happens, consequential corrections in this element of tariff may have to be done

for all consumers including Steel Units (PIUs). However, in the Commission's Order dated 04.10.2005, the reduced value of overheads i.e. Rs. 0.37/kWh as intimated by UPCL was accepted without scrutiny for 2004-05. The Commission does not propose to alter this value at this stage and the same will be done, if required, when final true up of these expenses is taken up. Accordingly, overheads of only Rs. 0.37/kWh instead of Rs 0.64/kWh for 2004-05 and Rs. 0.60/kWh for 2005-06 are to be added to the average power purchase cost discussed above. The average power purchase cost and the average overheads together constitute the average cost of supply, which is uniform for all categories of consumers and the same works out to Rs. 2.30 per kWh for 2004-05 and Rs. 2.50 per kWh for 2005-06.

(c) Cross-subsidy

22. Historically, charges realized from economically weaker consumer groups like farmers, BPL consumers, domestic consumers etc. have been lower than the average cost of supply. To compensate for the loss so incurred by the licensee, tariffs of other better off consumer groups like Industries, Non-domestic consumers etc. have been fixed higher than the average cost of supply resulting in such consumers cross-subsidizing the economically weaker consumers. The Electricity Act, 2003 and the National Tariff Policy issued thereunder by the Government of India require the State Commissions to phase out the cross-subsidy. For this purpose, the National Tariff Policy stipulates that by the year 2010-11 cross-subsidy should be within 20% of the average cost of supply. The Commission, while determining tariffs, has been reducing the levels of cross-subsidy, even though the total cross-subsidy prevailing in the State is nominal as compared to other States.

23. During the relevant period, Non-domestic consumers, Industrial consumers, Government Irrigation Systems and Public Lamps have been the subsidizing other consumers in the State. In 2003-04, the average cross-subsidy for all subsidizing consumers, other than Steel Units (PIUs), as per the tariff

order figures was Rs. 0.85/kWh and the same continued to be charged in 2004-05 also. During 2005-06, the cross-subsidy came down to Rs. 0.70/kWh. However, apportionment of cross-subsidy was different for different categories of consumers, the highest being on Non-domestic consumers and the lowest being on Public Lamps. The levels of cross-subsidies prevailing during 2004-05 and 2005-06 have to be taken note of and built in the tariff for Steel Units (PIUs). In this context, it may be recalled that in its order dated 02.06.2006, the Hon'ble Tribunal has stated that

*“and so devise the tariff as to ensure that it does not steeply increase and cause tariff shock to the other categories and **transparently brings out the level of subsidy provided.**... ..”*

and that

*“.....We therefore, direct the Commission to review and revise its tariff orders dated October 04, 2005 and April 25, 2005 adopting the approach of using pooled average cost of power purchased from all sources for all categories of consumers. Simultaneously, it should also ensure that no tariff shock is caused to any consumer in line with the spirit of the Electricity Act, 2003. **Subsidy element needs to be succinctly brought out in a transparent manner.**”*

(Emphasis added)

24. The State Advisory Committee and the State Government have also not only recognized the need for such cross subsidy but have specifically recommended that the same should also be realized from Steel Units (PIUs). In the order dated 24.08.2004, the Commission had not built in the element of cross subsidy as the same was being realized indirectly from Steel Units (PIUs) by earmarking costlier power to them. This approach having been abandoned and the cost of supply for all categories of consumers having been averaged out, now there is no justification for cross-subsidy not being realized from these consumers also. Since power purchase rate, losses and overheads have all been

allocated on average basis, similar approach is being adopted for determining the extent of cross-subsidy to be realized from PIU consumers. As per the relevant tariff orders, the weighted average cross-subsidy paid by subsidizing consumers, other than Steel Units (PIUs) in 2004-05 was Rs. 0.87/kWh and during 2005-06 was Rs. 0.70/kWh. Adding this to the average cost of supply the retail effective tariff for PIU consumers for these years works out to Rs. 3.17/kWh for 2004-05 and Rs. 3.20/kWh for 2005-06. Accordingly, the provisional per kWh tariff for Steel Units (PIUs) which was working out to Rs. 3.89/3.62 (Rs. 3.25 power purchase cost + Rs. 0.64*/0.37 towards overheads) from 01.09.2004 to 31.03.2005 and Rs. 3.85 (Rs. 3.25 power purchase cost + Rs. 0.60* towards overheads) for 2005-06 stands reduced by Rs. 0.72/0.45 per kWh for 2004-05 and by Rs. 0.65 per kWh for 2005-06.

**As per the relevant tariff orders.*

25. It would not be out of place to point out here that the these rates for Steel Units (PIUs) of Uttaranchal are the lowest compared to the rates for such units in the adjoining States which were as given below:

Effective Tariff (Rs. / kWh)

States	2004-05	2005-06
U.P.	~3.81	~3.81
Rajasthan	4.41	4.41
Delhi	*4.52	*4.52
Haryana	3.97	4.09
Punjab	3.66	3.72
Uttaranchal	3.17	3.20

~After accounting for Load factor rebate

**After accounting for high voltage rebate*

26. The above effective tariffs are to be realized through a mix of fixed charges and energy charges. In this context, it needs to be recalled that the Hon'ble Tribunal in its order dated 02.06.2006 has ruled that the Steel Units can be separated from other HT industries and placed in a separate category as had been done by the Commission in the order dated 24.08.2004. Therefore, without

disturbing the tariff structure earlier prescribed for these units, the above effective tariff is proposed to be realized by making requisite changes in the energy charges. Accordingly, the fixed charge and the minimum charges prescribed for these years are not being disturbed and after making the corrections in the energy charges, the tariffs for these two years work out as given below:

Particulars	Approved in Order dated 24.08.2004	Now Approved		
		2004-05	2005-06	
Demand Charges (Rs./kVA of Billing Demand/month)	350	350	350	
Energy Charge (Rs. per kVAh)	If Load Factor is upto 33%	1.90	1.82	1.85
	If Load Factor is above 33% and upto 50%	2.20	2.12	2.15
	If Load Factor is above 50%	2.50	2.42	2.45
Minimum Charges (Rs./kVA of Contracted Demand/month)	650	650	650	

Note: For tariff purposes, Load Factor (%) would deemed to be =
$$\frac{\text{Consumption during the billing period}}{\text{Maximum Demand or Contracted Demand whichever is less} \times \text{No. of hours in the billing period}} \times 100$$

27. The above rates for 2004-05 will be applicable from 01-09-2004 and for 2005-06 from 01-04-2005. UPCL will take action forthwith to recast the bills for Steel Units (PIUs) for the above period in accordance with the above rates.

28. The net effect of such adjustments is not known at this stage. When this exercise has been completed and its effect on UPCL's revenue calculated, the Commission will take view on treatment to be given to its outcome. Since UPCL is required to file its ARR and tariff proposals for 2007-08 in couple of weeks, the impact of the current revision in tariffs for Steel Units (PIUs) should be worked out and reflected in UPCL's ARR and tariff proposals.

Sd/-
(V.J. Talwar)
Member

Sd/-
(V.K. Khanna)
Member

Sd/-
(Divakar Dev)
Chairman

Annexure-I**List of respondents**

Sl. No.	Name	Designation & Organization	Address
1.	Shri R.K. Sharma	Vice President (E&I), Century Pulp and Paper	
2.	Shri V.P. Misra		12 Raj Vihar, New Forest, P.O.-Dehradun - 248006 Ph. No. (0135) 2760649
3.	Shri S.S. Rawat	Chairman, Uttarakhand Graam Avam Nagar Vikas Samiti	SahastraDhara Road, Dehradun, Ph. No. (0135) 2788352, 2787566
4.	Er. Ranvir Singh Saini	Ex-Technical Adviser, Minor Irrigation	182, Nehru Nagar, Roorkee, Ph. No. (01332) 264747
5.	Shri Darbara Singh	President, KGCCI	
6.	Shri G.S. Manchanda	Secretary Mussoorie Hotel Association, Hotel India, Mussoorie	Hotel Association, Hotel India, Mussoorie
7.	Shri Yogesh Kumar Jindal	Shivangee Crafts Ltd.	5 th Km. Stone, Ramnagar Road, Kashipur-244713, Uttaranchal. Ph. No. (05947) 278606, 270609
8.	Shri Ajit Singh		Gokul Appartment, Near Stadium, Ramnagar Road, Kashipur - 244713 Mob. No. 9359906403
9.	Shri Dinesh Kumar	M/s Kissan Industries	Patrampur Road, Jaspur- 244712, Ph. No. (05947) 222122
10.		Director, Moti Ram Rolling Mills Ltd.	159 Village, Lehar Resturant, Bhagwanpur, Roorkee
11.	Shri Rajkumar Arora		Vishal Enclave, Girital Road, Kashipur - 244713 Ph. No. 9358585431
12.	Shri Pankaj Gupta	President, Indian Industries Association	Satya Industries, Mohebewala Industrial Area, Dehradun, Ph. No. (0135) 2640530
13.	Shri R.N. Mathur	Secretary General, Prince Hotel Mussoorie	
14.	Shri Arvind Kumar Sexena		
15.		President, Kumaun Steel Manufactures Association	C/o Kashi Vishwanath Steels Ltd. Narain Nagar, Industrial Estate, Bazpur Road, Kashipur-244713 Ph.No. (05947) 262138

Sl. No.	Name	Designation & Organization	Address
16.	Shri Deepak Verma	Secretary, Prantiye Udhyog Vayapar Pratinidhi Mandal	Dhran Jewellers and Ratan Kentra, Park Road, Kashipur - 244718 Mob. No. 9412906401
17.		Director, Shri Tribhuvan Ispat Pvt. Ltd.	Industrial Estate Vikrampur, Ramraj Road, Bazpur, Distt. Udham Singh Nagar (U.A)
18.	Shri S.P. Kochhar	President, Hotels and Restaurants Associations of Uttaranchal	97, Rajpur Road, Dehradun-248001 Ph. No. (0135) 2749990
19.		Manokamna Steel Pvt. Ltd.	Station Road, Kashipur-244713, U.S. Nagar Ph. No. (0594) 275829
20.	Shri Lakhi Ram Singh Sajwaan	Maha-Mantri, Jila Udhyog Sangh, Uttarkashi	Jila Udhyog Sangh, Uttarkashi, Gram-Birpur, Dunda, Uttarkashi
21.	Shri Jagdish Gupta	Mukhya Sanyojak, Jan Kalyaan Upbhokta Prishad, Haridwar	
22.	Shri Ravi Prakash Agarwal		
23.	Shri Manmohan Agarwal	Chairman, Dev Bhoomi Uttaranchal Udhyog Vayapar Mandal, Ramnagar	Naga Baba Mandir Marg, Ramnagar, Nainital
24.	Shri Arjun Verma	Chartered Accountant	C-56, 3 rd Floor, Sarita Vihar, Delhi. Ph. No. (011) 2217407
25.	Shri K.N. Gutgutia	Chartered Accountant	11-K Gopala Tower, Rajinder Palace, New Delhi
26.	Shri Ashwani Agarwal	Chartered Accountant	106, Daynand Vihar, Delhi. Ph. No. (011) 22216646
27.	Shri Hariomji	Chartered Accountant	2/21, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi-110 002, Ph. No. (011)2360785
28.	Shri Manoj Jain		RU-198, Vaishakha Enclave, Pitampura, New Delhi, Ph. No. (011) 27246329
29.	Shri Surender Singh Pangti	Chairman, Uttarakhand Jan Vikas Party	25 Gari Cantt, Dehradun Ph. No. (0135)2753971, 9412052338
30.	Shri Kamal Sharma, S/o Shri Devender Kumar		Manpur Road, Near Sub-station, Kashipur, Uttaranchal
31.	Shri Ramjas Arora		Ram Jas Arora, Bazpur
32.	Shri Gagan Agarwal		Sultanpur Patti

Sl. No.	Name	Designation & Organization	Address
33.	Shri Ved Prakash, S/o Shri Puran Chand		442, Aawas Vikas Colony, Kashipur, Uttaranchal
34.	Shri Ramkumar, S/o Shri Bhudhiram		Village: Hariyala, Dunda, Kashipur, Udham Singh Nagar
35.	Shri Rahul Khanna		
36.	Shri Nitin Verma		Kanuun Goyaan, Kashipur, Udham Singh Nagar
37.	Shri Mukesh Kumar		Muradabad Road, Kashipur, Uttaranchal
38.	Shri Ambar Agarwal		Mohalla-Ganj, Kashipur
39.	Shri Ramesh Sharma		Kanuun Goyaan, Kashipur
40.	Shri Harender Singh Chaudhary		Village:- Hariyawala, Kashipur, Udham Singh Nagar, Uttaranchal
41.	Unknown		
42.		Wings Commercial Co Ltd.	C-1 & C-2, U.P.S.I.D.C., Bazpur Industrial Area - 1 st Pipalla, Kashipur Road, Udham Singh Nagar, Uttaranchal
43.	Director	Umashakti Steels Pvt. Ltd.	Village: Vikrampur, Banna Khera Road, P.O.-Bazpur (USNagar) Uttaranchal Ph. No. 05949-237583
44.	Shri J.S. Narula	Media Incharge	Kashipur Vidhan Sabha Chetra, B.J.P., 178, Muradabad Road, Kashipur, USN, Uttaranchal Ph. No. 05947-275379 Mob. No. 98976-39949
45.	Shri Rajeev Agarwal	Ex-MLA, Bhartiya Janta Party Uttaranchal	Ph. No. 05947-274204 Mobile: 9837046006
46.	Shri Pramod Singh Tomar		Prabhu Sadan, Giritaal Road, Kashipur - 244713
47.	Shri S.K. Nemani	Chartered Accountant	Ch. NO. 5, Kamadgini Towers, Kaushambi, Ghaziabad Ph. No. 0120-55282934
48.	Shri Pradeep Jain	NGO Social Worker	11/801, Vasundhara, Ghaziabad, Mob. No. 9899881047
49.	Shri Arvind Jain	NGO Social Worker	251 Shanti Kunj, Alwar (Raj) Mob. No. 9811055430

Sl. No.	Name	Designation & Organization	Address
50.	Dr. Satish Chabra		Santosh Kidney Centre, 6-LSC Suraj Mal Vihar, A Block, Delhi-92 Ph. No. 011-22167222
51.	Shri R.K. Alagh	Advocate	Chamber NO. 409, Western Wing, Tis Hazari courts, Delhi -110054 Ph. No. 011-23951120, 55366177
52.	Shri Ajay Gupta	Advocate	G-37, Shanti Nagar, Kanpur-208004 Ph. No. 0512-2323598
53.	Shri Lalit Gupta	Social Worker, NGO	288, Kucha Sanjogiram, Naya Bans, Delhi-110 006 Ph. No. 011-23936133
54.	Shri Bhrigu Nath	Social Worker, NGO	B257 B/F2, Ramprastha Colony, Ghaziabad Mob. 9350183537
55.	Shri S.R. Chaudhary	Social Worker, NGO	26/122, West Patel Nagar, New Delhi-110008 Ph. No. 011-25882545
56.	Shri Ashok Kalra	Social Worker, NGO	G-77, Nehru Nagar III, Ghaziabad Mob. No. 09910338696
57.	Shri Vijay Kher		F-582, Sarita Vihar, New Delhi Ph. No. 011-26925858
58.	Dr. Vinay Goel		619, Resident Doctors Hostel, AIIMS, Masjid Moth, South Extn. New Delhi Ph. No. 011-26251089
59.	Dr. Umesh Sahni		413/3, Tilak Nagar, Delhi Ph. No. 011-2555304
60.	Dr. Yatander Khaarbada		Apollo Hospital, Delhi Ph. No. 011-26465665
61.	Shri Shalab Singhal	Advocate	S-1, MSNISH Chamber, Mayur Vihar, Phase-II, Delhi Ph. No. 011-22472666
62.	Shri Saurabh Agarwal	Advocate	R-9/302, Raj Nagar, Ghaziabad Ph. No. 0120-2718473
63.	Shri Anil Singhal	Advocate	46, Bank Enclave, Laxmi Nagar, Delhi
64.	Shri Rakesh Diwan	Chartered Accountant	R5/20, 1 st Floor, Rajnagar, Ghaziabad.

Sl. No.	Name	Designation & Organization	Address
65.	Shri Ajay Mittal	Chartered Accountant	217/218, B-Block, Chankya Complex, Laxmi Nagar, Delhi Ph. No. 011-2048362/64
66.	Shri Sunil Rastogi	Chartered Accountant	Ph. No. 011-22455437
67.	Shri V.K. Bindal	Chartered Accountant	D-219, Vivek Vihar, Phase-I, Delhi - 110 095 Ph. No. 011-22140980
68.	Shri Peyush Gupta,	Chartered Accountant	Chawla Complex, Laxmi Nagar, Delhi Ph. No. 011-22021735/22025127
69.	Shri Pratap Rastogi	Chartered Accountant	D-248, Gali No. 10, Lakshmi Nagar, Delhi-92 Ph. No. 011-22048661-62
70.	Shri Naveen Goyal	Chartered Accountant	I-129-A, Laxmi Nagar Extn., Delhi Ph. No. 011-22249449
71.	Shri K.K. Mishra		10, Raj Vihar, Dehradun
72.	Shri Kulbhushan Agarwal		32, Darshani Gate, Dehradun
73.	Shri Sardar Darshan Singh		62, Gandhi Road, Dehradun
74.	Shri Dillip Agarwal		Lane No. 2, Drone Puri, Dehradun
75.	Shri Pradeep Datta		11. Chander Road, Dalanwala, Dehradun
76.	Shri Fateh Bahadur Singh		Dehradun Cantt., Near Tapkeshwar Mandir, Dehradun
77.	Shri Digambar Singh		Raghav Vihar, Smith Nagar, Prem Nagar, Dehradun
78.	Shri S.M. Jain	Advocate	Gandhi Road, Near Commercial Motors, Dehradun
79.	Shri K.G.Behl	President, All India Consumers Council (AICC) Uttaranchal, Dehradun	8-A, Nemi Road, Dehradun-248001 Ph. No. (0135) 2656663