RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FOR REVIEW:

BVQI had performed the validation of the CDM Project 0355 “Bagasse based cogeneration power project at Rana Sugars Limited, Amritsar District, Punjab” in India. The project was under review from 6th May to 4th June 2006. Subsequently, there have been four requests for review.

We are thankful to the CDM executive board and the secretariat for giving us the opportunity to clarify our considerations in view of the four requests for review received for the said CDM project.

We find that the four requests made against the following requirements derived from paragraph 37 of the CDM modalities and procedures, viz.

i) The project activity is expected to result in a reduction in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity, in accordance with paragraphs 43 to 52 of the CDM modalities and procedures.
ii) The baseline and monitoring methodologies complying with the requirements pertaining to methodologies previously approved by the Executive Board.

We wish to submit our clarification for each of these requests as given below:

i) The project activity has purpose of utilizing locally available surplus biomass for use as fuel for generating electricity. Bagasse is considered neutral fuel as the GHG emission generation is consumed by the plant species, which is a cyclic process of carbon sequestration. Additionally the bagasse contains negligible quantities of other elements like Nitrogen, Sulphur *etc*. hence, releases of other GHGs are considered as negligible. This is also evident in website of UNFCCC related to GHG. Hence, validation team after discussions with project proponents and observations made on project activity site concluded that project activity of energy generation from biomass does not lead to net GHG emissions.

The energy supplied by project activity to the state grid would reduce anthropogenic GHG emissions as per the combined margin carbon intensity of the relevant Northern Region grid, which is mainly dominated by fossil fuel based power plants as given below.

ii) The project activity involves implementation and operation of new extraction cum condensing steam turbine of12.00 MW capacity. The project activity falls under small-scale CDM project Type1- Renewable Energy Project and Category 1.D. – ‘Grid connected renewable electricity generation’ as mentioned in section A.4.2 of the PDD.

We confirm that project has used the approved base line and monitoring methodology Appendix B of the simplified M&P for small-scale CDM project activities-Version 08 (3rd March 2006) above and the project activity conforms to the requirements of the mentioned valid version of the approved methodology.

Response to requests for review received in the first week of June 2006:

BVQI has received four requests for review in the CDM project activity registration form (F-CDM-RR) including the reasons for review in response to their request for registration for CDM project 0355 “Bagasse based cogeneration power project at Rana Sugars Limited, Amritsar District, Punjab” in India.
We have studied all requests for review and would like to clarify our opinion for these requests separately as indicated in the matrix given below:

Request for review no. 1:

Reasons and background for Request for Review	BVQI response
1. The explanation (of the additionality) demonstrates the existence of prevailing practice barrier, institutional barrier, changes in policy risks and increased fuel prices, and other barriers adequately. Even though this might be correct, the DOE still needs to qualitatively address the additionality.	We confirm that we had validated the additionality requirements as stated in the PDD during our validation process but failed to detail them in the previous validation report. We apologize for the same. Hence we revised the validation report. We have now addressed the issue of additionality in detail in the revised validation report no. BVQI/IND/14.49 Rev02 dated 26.06.2006 in Section 3.2 Baseline at page no.12-13. The revised report is attached for perusal. All barriers indicated in PDD have been evaluated and concluded in the revised Validation report. Some of the key issues addressed in section 3.2 of the revised report are summarised as: 1- Prevailing common practice barrier is evident as approximately 3% of the power plants in the region are using biomass for power generation. This is in spite of the announcement of new policies by Government of India encouraging the use of non-emissive technology. 2- Institutional barrier is evaluated considering the PSEB interaction with RSL, the issues and concerns include delay in signing of PPA, billing and recovery of parallel operating cost as TG set charges to the tune of approximately INR 1.36 Lac per month (@Rs.10/-per KVA), and allowing the increase in power tariff for only first five years of contract. The evidence indicating the TG set charges has been included in the list of documents at Sr.No.16. 3- Policy barriers such as New Electricity Act

	are discussed in the light of proposed tendering processes for the lowest power tariff without recognising the use of non-emissive technology. This will encourage coal or lignite based power plants and discourage use of non-emissive technology such as Biomass based power plants. 4- Increase in fuel prices is a global issue and Rice Husk and bagasse procured from nearby region have shown similar increasing trends in the region. 5- Evidence of Parallel operating charges, Bills indicating increase in fuel prices, IRR of RSL& order from Central Electricity Regulation Cmmission, New Delhi are included for justifying the conclusion. Kindly refer Section 3.2 Baseline of revised Validation report for detailed evaluation. The barriers discussed in separate heads are concluded to be evident.
2. On p.16 of the PDD, it is described that in order to calculate the Build margin, the 20% of the most recent plants will be taken in to consideration. On p.30 (step10) it is indicated that the build margin is calculated using the recent 5 plants built. Hence, the calculation of the build margin is not made in a transparent manner. This is not addressed by the DOE.	This was a typing mistake and has since been corrected. Revised version 5 of PDD dated 24.06.2006 is attached with the report. It has been ensured and verified that the build margin calculations and subsequent CER calculations are based on 20% of the most recent plants. We would like to submit that except the typing mistake the calculations are done using the data of 20% of the most recent plants. Information on page 30 in Step 10 has been accordingly corrected. This was a miss and we recognize and apologize for the mistake.

Request for review no. 2:

Reasons and background for Request for Review	BVQI response
1. The additionality analysis studied several existing barriers associated to project implementation. The main arguments, financial in nature, do not have adequate support in the	This is discussed in our response to point number 1 of Request for Review 1 mentioned above. The documentation supporting the existence of financial barriers have been now included

documentation provided and were not well investigated by the DOE. The validation report should better reflect this lack of supporting evidence.	and referred in the validation report. We confirm that we had actually investigated and evaluated these barriers. These barriers have now been qualitatively addressed in the said report and are discussed in detail in Section3.2 of the revised Validation report BVQI/IND/14.49, Version 2. At page 12-13
2- Page 16 of the PDD describes the build margin as being calculated using 20% of most recent plants but page 30 states that the build margin is calculated using the 5 recent plants built, which contradicts the methodology and leads to a build margin calculation that is not transparent.	Please refer our response for Point no.2 of Review for Request 1 This was a typing mistake and has since been corrected. Revised version 5 of PDD dated 24.06.2006 is attached with the report. We regret the mistake. There is no change in the calculation of build margin and the CER as these have been done using the data of 20% of the most recent plants. Information on page 30 in Step 10 has been accordingly corrected.

Request for review no. 3

Reasons and background for Request for Review	BVQI response
"The explanation (of the additionality) demonstrates the existing of prevailing practice barrier, institutional barrier, changes in policy risks and increased fuel prices risks and other barriers adequately." Even though this might be correct, the DOE still needs to qualitatively address the additionality.	Please refer our response for Point no.1 of Review for Request 1 We have addressed the issue in detail in validation report in section 3.2 Baseline. The validation report has been revised and the revised report is attached for clarification. Existence for Barriers, changes in policy risks and conclusions have been discussed and evaluated in the validation report no. BVQI/IND/14.49 Rev02: in Section 3.2 at page 12-13
2. On p.16 of the PDD, it is described that in order to calculate the build margin, the 20% of the most recent plants will be taken in to consideration. On p. 30 (step 10) it is indicated that the build margin is calculated using the recent 5 plants built. Hence, the calculation of the build margin is not made in a transparent manner. This is not addressed by the DOE.	Please refer our response for Point no.2 of Review for Request 1 This was a typing mistake and has since been corrected. Revised version 5 of PDD dated 24.06.2006 is attached with the report. PDD has been now revised and the step 10 on page 30 has been corrected. The calculation of build margin and CER has remained same as it was based on the 20% of the most recent plants only. This was a miss and we recognise and appologise for the mistake.

Request for review no.4

Reasons and background for request for review	BVQI Response
1-The additionality analysis studied several existing barriers associated to project implementation. The main arguments, financial in nature, do not have adequate support in the documentation provided and were not well investigated by the DOE.	Please refer our response for Point no.1 of Review for Request 1 We have addressed the issue in detail in validation report in section 3.2 Baseline. Arguments mainly financial in nature have been discussed and evaluated in the validation report no.BVQI/IND/14.49 Rev02: in Section 3.2 at page 12-13. The list of documents has also been revised and the other relevant documentation in support of the financial barrier has been included. Barriers have been detailed for discussion and addressed for conclusion in the revised Validation report.
2- Page 16 of the PDD describes the build margin as being calculated using 20% of most recent plants but page 30 states that the build margin is calculated using the 5 recent plants built, which contradicts the methodology and leads to a build margin calculation that is not transparent.	Please refer our response for Point no.2 of Review for Request 1 This was a typing mistake and has since been corrected. Revised version 5 of PDD dated 24.06.2006 is attached with the report. We regret the mistake. There is no change in Calculation of Build margin and the CER as data of 20% of most recent plants indicated on page 16 have been used. We apologies for the mistake.

8

ਪੰਜਾਬ ਰਾਜ ਬਿਜਲੀ ਬੋਰਡ
ਦਫਤਰ:ਮੁੱਖ ਇੰਜ:/ਵਣਜ,ਪਟਿਆਲਾ
(ਟੈਰਿਫ ਰੈਗੂਲੇਸ਼ਨ-1)

ਵਣਜ ਗਸ਼ਤੀ ਪੱਤਰ ਨੰ: /2006
CC No. 22 / 2006

ਵੱਲ:

1) ਸਾਰੇ ਇੰਜ:-ਇਨ-ਚੀਫ/ਮੁੱਖ ਇੰਜ:/ਉਪ ਮੁੱਖ ਇੰਜ:/ਨਿਗ: ਇੰਜ:/ਵਧੀਕ ਨਿਗ ਇੰਜ: — 2 ਕਾਪੀਆਂ
   ਸੀ:ਕਾ:ਕਾ:ਇੰਜ:/ਕਾ:ਕਾ:ਇੰਜ:/ਸ:ਕਾ:ਕਾ:ਇੰਜ:/ਸ:ਇੰਜ:/ਸੰਚਾਲਣ। — 1 ਕਾਪੀ
2) ਸਾਰੇ ਵਧੀਕ ਸ:ਇੰਜ:/ਸੰਚਾਲਣ ਇੰਜ: ਸਬ ਆਫਿਸਜ਼। — 1 ਕਾਪੀ
3) ਸਾਰੇ ਉਪ ਮੁੱਖ ਇੰਜ:/ਡਾਇਰੈਕਟਰ/ਵਧੀਕ ਨਿਗ:ਇੰਜ:/ਸੀ:ਕਾ:ਕਾ:ਇੰਜ:
   ਕਾ:ਕਾ:ਇੰਜ:/ਸ:ਕਾ:ਕਾ:ਇੰਜ:/ਇਨਫੋਰਸਮੈਂਟ। — 1 ਕਾਪੀ
4) ਸਾਰੇ ਵਧੀਕ ਨਿਗ:ਇੰਜ:/ਸੀ:ਕਾ:ਕਾ:ਇੰਜ:/ਟੈਕਨੀਕਲ ਆਡਿਟ,ਪੰ:ਰਾ:ਬਿ:ਬੋ: — 1 ਕਾਪੀ
5) ਮੁੱਖ ਲੇਖਾ ਅਫਸਰ, ਪੰ:ਰਾ:ਬਿ:ਬੋ:,ਪਟਿਆਲਾ। — 1 ਕਾਪੀ
6) ਮੁੱਖ ਲੇਖਾ ਅਫਸਰ,/ਮਾਲ ਪੰ:ਰਾ:ਬਿ:ਬੋ:,ਪਟਿਆਲਾ — 10 ਕਾਪੀਆਂ
7) ਆਰ.ਏ.ੳ. ਪੰ:ਰਾ:ਬਿ:ਬੋ:,ਪਟਿਆਲਾ। — 1 ਕਾਪੀ
8) ਮੁੱਖ ਆਡੀਟਰ, ਪੰ:ਰਾ:ਬਿ:ਬੋ:,ਪਟਿਆਲਾ। — 3 copies
9) President State Disputes Redressal Commission (Punjab) SCO No. 3009-3010,Sector-22, Chandigarh.

Memo No. 26659/27459 / SSM-594
Dated: 18 .5. 2006

Sub: **Parallel Operation Charges.**

The issue regarding recovery of parallel operation charges from captive power plant owners has been engaging the attention of the Hon'ble Commission. The Commission has observed in the Tariff Order dated 10.5.2006 for the year 2006-07 that the generation plants set up/ to be set up for sale of entire power to the Board are/ shall not be required to pay any parallel operation charges . The Commission has acordingly decided as under:-

> " Where Captive plant feeds captive load while also supplying surplus power to the Board, parallel operation charges shall be leviable proportionately on the total capacity available for feeding the captive load worked out by deducting capacity earmarked for sale of power to the licensee from the total capacity of the captive plant."

In accorance with the decision of the Commission it has been decided to add the following para to the instructions already circulated on the subject vide CC-4/2006 dated 31.3.2006:-

> *"(V) Where Captive plant feeds captive load while also supplying surplus power to the Board, parallel operation charges shall be leviable proportionately on the total capacity available for feeding the captive load worked out*

C.B/ACR.
Dream aime to have further represent about the status / payment of Parallel Operation Charges during off season

Recd 2/6/06

170.3.1.6.1 Can be used by the owner(s) of the Power Plant at one point only i.e. industry set up within boundary of the same premises/plant.

170.3.1.6.2 Use by any other concern including sister concern(s) outside the overall boundary of the premises shall not be allowed.

170.3.1.6.3 Third party sale shall not be allowed.

The plant owner shall also be governed by other terms & conditions, which shall be mentioned in the sanction letter as per the instructions amended from time to time.

Note: *The permission to run CPP on stand alone basis in the adjoining or carved out premises where electric connection is already existing is not to be permitted unless the premises where stand alone plant is sought is effectively separated and there is no possibility of interchangeability of supply.*

170.3.2 *CATEGORY-II*

Captive Power Plant owner who are consumers of the Board and also want to have interfacing with the PSEB system shall be eligible for utilizing power for their self use & shall have option to run their plants in synchronization with PSEB system.

Governing conditions for operation of such a plant shall be:-

170.3.2.1 For parallel operation permission fee chargeable shall be @ Rs 50/- per KVA.

170.3.2.2 In addition to the above plant owner shall have to pay monthly parallel operation charges @ Rs 200/- per KVA on 5% of the installed capacity of TG Sets in KVA.

170.3.2.3 Captive Power Plant Capacity shall be permitted for its own use upto 200% of the sanctioned load of Industry from PSEB.

170.3.2.4 All statutory clearance from the concerned departments e.g C.E.I PPCB &Fire Fighting etc. shall be obtained by the owner at his own level.

170.3.2.5 The voltage level for synchronization with PSEB system shall generally be 11 KV or higher voltage depending upon the capacity of the plant, quantum of power and the nearest grid available for supply of power from PSEB. Any absorption of surplus power from Captive Power Plant shall be treated as dumped power for which no payment shall be made.

170.3.2.6 Interface with PSEB grid & transmission lines shall be made by CPP owner at his own cost.

170.3.2.7 Suitable electronic energy meter duly tested from PSEB Lab and sealed by Sr. Xen /Op. shall be installed by the producer at his end for monitoring the units generated/energy audit.

170.3.2.8 Protection Scheme of the plant shall be got vetted from CE/Sub Station Design.

170.3.2.9 Condition for use of energy generated from Captive Generation units:-

Sundi

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Coram:

1. **Shri Ashok Basu, Chairman**
2. **Shri K.N. Sinha, Member**

Petition No.: 67/2003

(suo-motu)

In the matter of

Determination of terms and conditions of tariff

ORDER
(DATE OF HEARING : 10, 11 & 12.11.2003)

CHAPTER 1

Background

1.1 Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (hereinafter referred to as "the Commission") was constituted in July 1998 under the Electricity Regulatory Commissions Act, 1998. With the omission of Section 43A(2) of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, which enabled the Central Government to determine the terms and conditions of tariff, the jurisdiction to regulate tariff came to be vested in the Commission. Consequently, the Commission initiated steps to determine the terms and conditions of tariff. However, as an interim measure the Commission decided to continue with the terms and conditions laid down by the Central Government and the project–specific tariff notifications issued by that Government by virtue of powers under Section 43A(2) of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, until the terms and conditions of tariff were notified by the Commission.

these circumstances. We have already expressed a view in the later part of this order that all the investment required by the utilities cannot be covered by tariff alone. We shall deal with this issue of investment requirement in detail separately.

6.19 The Return on Equity to the Central Power Sector Utilities was fixed at 16% post-tax in November, 1998. The interest rates which were prevailing at that time, were quite high. Presently the interest rates are around 11% to 12%. The Commission has not disturbed the normative debt : equity ratio of 50:50 for the existing projects. The normative debt : equity ratio of 70:30 prescribed now by the Commission is applicable in case of new projects only which are to be commissioned on or after 1.4.2004. The projects, which are approved by the competent authority after the Central Government Notifications dated 30.3.92 or 16.12.1997 for generation and transmission projects respectively, are by and large executed with debt : equity ratio of 70:30, barring a few exceptions. Most of the IPP projects were executed with debt equity ratio of 70:30. It is well understood that equity is a risk capital and therefore, will carry a premium for the risk over and above the interest rates. The risks which are faced by the Central Power Sector Utilities, are not the same as the risks faced by the IPPs, especially with regard to the payment risk. In the case of Central Power Sector Utilities the Government has provided the comfort of tripartite agreement for ensuring prompt payments, where as such a facility is not available to IPPs. The Central Power Sector Utilities would also be receiving certain additional incomes by way of interest earnings on the bonds issued by the State Governments for the outstanding dues. Further, the bonds are also redeemable over a period of time.

6.20 Keeping all these factors in view, we have decided in favour of providing a post-tax return @ 14% for the Central Power Sector Utilities and @ 16% in case of IPPs. In case, IPPs are provided same payment security mechanism like the Central Power Sector Utilities, ROE in their case shall also be reduced to 14%. The return on equity is based on post-tax and accordingly, the income-tax shall be reimbursed by the beneficiaries as per the provisions discussed in the section relating to income-tax.

<u>Depreciation and Advance against Depreciation</u>

6.21 During the tariff period 2001-2004, the Commission provided for depreciation on a straight line basis, spread over the entire life of the asset. It should be noted that the practice of allowing depreciation has been changed from time to time. Prior to 1992, depreciation was being allowed over the useful life of the asset. In 1992, the provision for depreciation was changed to provide a higher rate of depreciation, thus de-linking the life of the asset from the rate of depreciation. This imbalance between the useful life of the asset and the depreciation rate was further aggravated by the increase in the depreciation rate to yield an over all depreciation rate of 7.5% for thermal power generating stations. This change in rate had altered the depreciation rates for the transmission system as well. However, the depreciation rates in case of the hydro power generating stations remained static and the hydro power generating stations were allowed to recover their depreciation over their useful life of 35 years and for meeting cash flow requirements for debt repayments, advance against depreciation was provided. The change in the depreciation rates had resulted in the high front loading of tariff and issues like interest of the investor after 12 years by which time the 90% depreciation is recovered came to the fore and became an issue for debate in many private power

Conclusion

8.79 The draft regulations on terms and conditions of tariff to be effective from 1.4.2004 have already been published with a view to inviting comments/suggestions from the stakeholders, to be submitted by 23.1.2004. This order incorporates the reasons in support of the provisions made in the draft regulations. We direct that the last date for submission of comments/suggestions by all concerned, be extended up to 31.1.2004.

Sd/-
(K.N. SINHA)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(ASHOK BASU)
CHAIRMAN

New Delhi, dated the 16th January, 2004

RANA SUGARS LIMITED, VILL. BUTTAR SEVIYAN, DISTT. AMRITSAR

PARALLEL OPERATION CHARGES

MONTH	PARALLEL OPERATION CHARGES	TOTAL	SHOWN IN BILL	REMARKS
June, 02	191664	-	-	
July, 02	261360	-	-	
Aug.,02	261360	-	-	
Sept., 02	261360	-	-	
Oct., 02	261360	-	-	
Nov., 02	261360	-	-	
Dec., 02	261360	-	-	
Jan., 03	261360	-	-	
Feb., 03	261360	2282544	2282544	
March, 03	261360	2543904	446743	
April, 03	261360	2805264	-	
May, 2003	261360	3066624	-	
June, 03	261360	3327984	5062751	
July, 03	261360	3589344	4276717	
Aug., 03	261360	3850704	-	
Sept., 03	261360	4112064	4538077	
Oct., 03	261360	4373424	4599556	
Nov., 03	261360	4634784	-	
Dec., 03	261360	4896144	-	
Jan., 04	261360	5157504	-	
Feb., 04	261360	5418864	4457780	
March, 04	261360	5680224	-	
April, 04	261360	5941584	-	
May, 04	261360	6202944	-	
June, 04	261360	6464304	4457776	
July, 04	261360	6725664	-	
Aug., 04	261360	6987024	-	
Sept., 04	261360	7248384	-	
Oct., 04	261360	7509744	-	
Nov., 04	261360	7771104	-	
Dec., 04	261360	8032464	-	
Jan., 05	261360	8293824	-	
Feb., 05	261360	8555184	4457776	
March, 05	261360	8816544	9935933	
April, 05	261360	9077904	10390900	

Sd/-

5.5-F/... PSEB-15 S.S 67 16/6/06

1104
7/6/06

PUNJAB STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD

Large Supply Consumer's Bill Form R O 3-B

All Communications regarding this bill must be addressed to the "OFFICE OF ISSUE" mentioning Account Number
For directions with regard to payment of this bill and important information please see overleaf.

CIRCLE	DIVISION	SUB-DIVISION (Office of Issue) T54	BILLING MONTH	BILL ISSUE DATE	BILL NO.
TARNTARAN	RAYYA	MEHTA CHOWK	5 / 2006	07/06/2006	20010363593

DUE DATE OF PAYMENT (By Bank Draft/Banker's Cheque) 19/06/2006
PAYMENT BY LOCAL CHEQUE CAN BE MADE UPTO 19/06/2006

Admissible Voltage 11 KV | Supply Voltage 11KV | Metering Voltage 11KV

A/C No. T54-LS01-00001

To,
M/s
RANA SUGAR MILLS,
VILL.BUTTAR SEVIYAN,P.O
SATHIALA,BABA BAKALA.
Date of Connection 08/12/1993

SANCTIONED LOAD	1,004.862	KW	Date 08/12/1993
Intensive (ARC FURNACE)		KW	Date
Intensive (IND. FUR. & OTHERS)		KW	Date
General	1004.862	KW	Date 911
Off Seasonal		KW	Date 09-6-06

Nature of Industry : SUGAR MILLS
Season On Date
Season Off Date
Monthly Minimum Charges : 119595.00

CONTRACT DEMAND : 1500.000 KVA
Date 08/12/1993
Peak Load Allowed
KW From
Date / To

Reading Dates (New) 02/06/2006 / / (Old) 01/05/2006

Feeder Code :
Name of Feeder : 11KV Feeder

Meter No. Make 2311 SC
Last MCO Date / /
TPT Unit/Make 2311 SC
Last SJO Date 08/12/1993

Meter	Meter Readings New Status	Old Status	Ind. Factor	Line CTR	MTR Ratio	Metering Voltage Ratio	Net M.F.	MMTS Corr.	Addl. Supply Units	Consumption
MDI	0.60800	0.54000	1000.00	100	200	11 / 11	500.000			A 304.000
KVAH	7655.630	7658.940	1000.00	100	200	11 / 11	500.000			B 98345
MAIN KWH	7411.630	7220.280	1000.00	100	200	11 / 11	500.000			C 95,675
COL KWH										D 0
AUX KWH	82.300	82.300	1000.00	125	150		833.333			E 0

Intensive KWH	General KWH	C+D Gross KWH	P.F.
0	0	95675	0.97

Standard Minimum P.F. 0.90 w.e.f. 01-07-2005

Detail of Current SOP & Rentals Etc.

Energy Charges (Power Intensive)	355911
Energy Charges (General)	
Monthly Minimum Charges	
P.F. Surcharge/Incentive (+/-)	-6228
T.T. Rebate (-)	
Fuel Surcharge	
Demand Surcharge	
L.E.C.	
Voltage Surcharge	
S. Set Charges	261360
Total Charges (SOP) for Current Cycle	611043
Meter Rent	555
Service Rent	
Service Charges	450
Total Rentals & S.C.	1005

BILL AMOUNT

	SOP	RENTALS	ED.	OCTROI	TOTALS
Current Cycle Charges (As per detail alongside)	611043	1005	34963		647016
Sundry Charges					
Sundry Allowances	435				
Prev. Balance					
Total Net Amount	610608	1005	34963		646581
Amount Stayed (By Court/Competent Authority)					

Diff of MMC 9/6/06

Mc MF Addl CE Demand 9-6

The bill is to be deposited under protest

NET AMOUNT PAYABLE By Due Date : Rs. Six Four Six Five Eight Zero Only Rs. ***********646580

Checked & Verified

	FOR PAYMENT WITHIN ONE WEEK AFTER DUE DATE @ 5%	FOR PAYMENT BEYOND ONE WEEK AFTER DUE DATE @ 10%
SURCHARGE AMOUNT	Rs. 30581	Rs. 61161
GROSS AMOUNT PAYABLE	Rs. 677161	Rs. 707741

Consumption History for the Previous 12 Month Period

		01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
	2006	532.000	660.000	328.000	270.000	304.000							
	2005	647.000	594.000	405.000	273.000	309.000	352.000	329.000	356.000	355.000	491.000	364.000	
H	2006	18225	23895	59820	72590	95675							
	2005	32955	29285	18615	43075	83635	78175	82915	73140	69095	89148	3685	13255

Reason for Sundry Charge/Allowance: Overhauling of Accounts due to Dead/Defective Meter

NOTICE : You are requested to make payment of this bill by the date shown in this bill failing which, this should be deemed to be a notice under Section 24 of the Indian Electricity Act 1910, and the supply to your premises shall, without prejudice to the right of the Board to recover such charges as shown in the bill by suit, be disconnected after ...ys of the DUE DATE mentioned herein without any further notice and shall not be reconnected unless and until the amount shown in this bill along with any other expenses ...rred by the Board in cutting off and reconnecting the supply ... paid to the Board ... notice shall remain valid ...
Issued without prejudice to PSEB's right to seek appropriate legal remedies against Tariff Order dated 30th Nov 2004
BD @ 10% as per CC 20/2005 Dt 05/04/2005 w.e.f. 01/03/2005.

% Variation = + 31.80

AEE (CBC) JALANDHAR

CHECKED & ISSUED

ਸਹਾ: ਕਾ: ਇੰ: ਵਿੱਤੀ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧ,
ਪੰ:ਰਾ:ਬਿ: ... ਮਜੀਠਾ ਰੋਡ

AEE (Comm) / SDO-OP

Kind Attention. Mr. Navinjee

RANA SUGARS LIMITED

VILL. : BUTTAR SEVIYAN, P.O. SATHIALA.
TEH. BABA BAKALA, DISTT. AMRITSAR.
PUNJAB - 143 205 (INDIA)
TELE/FAX : 01853-257610, 257604
MOBILE : 98159 00940, 98140 13017

Ref. No.: RSL/2005-2006/ 1337-38
Dated : 29-8-2005

The Add. S.E.,
P.S.E.B.,
Rayya Division,
BEAS

Sub.: PARALLEL OPERATION CHARGES

Dear Sir,

This is to inform you that a sum of Rs. 1,03,90,900/- has been deducted by Director (I.S.B.), PSEB., Patiala for parallel OPERATION CHARGES (FROM June, 2002 to April, 2005 @2,61,360/- per month) from our due amount against power exported to P.S.E.B.

The above amount does not tally with our account. You are, therefore, requested to give us month-wise detailed statement of above deduction, which is required for our Balance Sheet.

An early action in this regard shall be highly appreciated.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,
For RANA SUGARS LIMITED,

(ABHIJIT SINGH JASPAL)
GENERAL MANAGER

CC: Director (C.B. Cell),
P.S.E.B.,
Shakti Sadan
Jalandhar

PST/CST No. 25622714
Dated 16-8-02

BILL/CASH MEMO

Ph : 01822 - 60346 (O)
01822 - 60068 (R)

H.K. TRADING CO.

VILLAGE MURAR (HAMIRA) DISTT. KAPURTHALA

No. 15

Dated 14.11.02

M/s. Rang Sagar Limited Mills (Butra)

C.S.T. 15783011 Dt. 17.12.1991

QNTY.	PARTICULARS	RATE	AMOUNT RS.	P.
	Rice Husk Supply			
	7.11.02 to 12.11.2002			
	Rice-Husk Qty 4084.7	110/-	449317-	00
	with C.S.T. 4.4%.			
	Less Charging		264-	00
	2.40			
	Material Received as per & verified for Rs. 449053			
	Manager Sto.			
	Quality Verified and Approved			
	Dept. Head			
			449053	00
			~~449317~~	00

1. Goods sold will not be taken back.
2. Interest @ 24% will be charged if the bill will not paid within 15 days.
3. Subject to Jalandhar Jurisdiction.

For H.K. Trading Co.

16429

VAT INVOICE
(Original Copy)

Ph : 01822 - 260346 (O)
01822 - 260068 (R)

H.K. TRADING CO.

VILLAGE MURAR (HAMIRA) DISTT. KAPURTHALA

Dated : 10.11.2005

No. 127

M/s. Rana Sugar Limited
Butra
VRN No.
Dated.
GR/RR/No.
Transport Co.

FULL DESCRIPTION OF GOODS	QNTY.	Value Per unit i.e. Rate	AMOUNT RS.	P.
Supply of Rudhusic				
5/10 To 15/10/05	1125-50 Qtl	190/-	213845-	00
16/10 To 27/10/05	27162-18 Qtl	190/-	5160799-	00
			5374644-	00
Material Received as per bill & verified for Rs. 5551630/- Manager Store		Tax @ 4%	214985-	76
		Total VAT		
Input tax credit is available to a taxable person against this copy only		Total Amount	5589629-	76

5551630-00

For H.K. Trading Co.
Harowalia Kalsi

E.&O.E.

Andi