

Record of proceedings dated 02.02.2022

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
I. A. No. 13 of 2019 in O. P. No. 4 of 2013	M/s. VBC Ferro Alloys Limited	TSSPDCL & SE (O) Sangareddy TSSPDCL

Application filed seeking revisiting the conditions stipulated in the retail supply tariff order for FY 2013-14 for category of HT-I (B) consumers.

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Advocate for applicant and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for applicant stated that the prayer in this petition is prima facie with regard to revisiting the tariff order for the year 2013-14 in respect of deemed consumption by the ferro alloys units as specified therein in terms of the earlier orders. Due to imposition of restriction and control measures for the said year, the applicant was not able to function and the unit was closed. The Commission, while imposing the restriction and control measures in the relevant year, had specifically imposed a condition of not levying deemed consumption charges in respect of the industry.

The Commission, in the relevant tariff order, had imposed condition of drawing at least 85% after energy demand at 6701 KVAH per KVA of demand. The tariff had been fixed at Rs. 4.05 per unit. However, during the course of the relevant year, the licensees failed to meet the demand and approached the Commission to impose restriction and control measures under section 23 of the Electricity Act, 2003. The Commission having considered the demand supply position of power availability and allowed the licensees to impose such measures on such of the consumers as was decided by it. In doing so, the Commission had quantified and specified the methodology of availing the power in respect of the each of the categories of consumers. The applicant being constrained to function under the said conditions had closed the unit, since the equipment is required to have continuous power supply for 365 days in a year. If the machinery is stopped, it will take about two days to restore normalcy, which is detrimental to the functioning of the applicant.

The counsel for applicant emphasized the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 as also the Conduct of Business Regulation, 2015. It is his case that the Commission has ample power to revisit the order passed by it at any point of time to mitigate the difficulty caused to any of the stakeholders. Particular reference has

been drawn to section 62 (4) of the Act, 2003 and clauses 38 (1) and (3) of the Conduct of Business Regulation, 2015. He also relied on an order passed by the Andhra Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission on 06.04.2015 in respect of the similar issue arising in that state. He has brought to the notice of the Commission during the financial years 2012-13 and 2013-14 only two ferro alloys units functioned and all other units were closed as they existed in the combined state at that time.

The counsel for applicant has also drawn attention the communication made by the government with regard to consideration of the issue by the Commission towards restoration of power supply and waving of the charges for the relevant period as also subsequently any penalties. It is stated that the Commission refused to dwell into the issue and relegated the matter to be decided between the licensee and the government. On further pursuance of the matter, the Commission only clarified that the issue will be examined on a case to case basis, if at all, they approach the Commission.

The counsel for applicant stated that the applicant made efforts to revive the unit, but was stuck with the levy of charges for the period and also penalties due to non-consumption of the energy.

The representative of the respondents stated that non-levy of penalties or deemed consumption charges is applicable only to restriction and control measure period and it cannot be waved of unless suitable assistance is received from the government. The licensee had no support from the government despite explaining the status of the licensees as well as that of the consumers. Even otherwise, they cannot seek revisiting of an order passed determining the tariff as it anyway would constitute reviewing the order, which is not permissible under the Act, 2003 and the regulation thereof. The amendment of the order once passed by the Commission determining the tariff is subject to the discretion of the Commission as the provision employs the word 'may' and not 'shall'.

The representative of the respondents further stated that the licensees have acted in accordance with the directions of the Commission with regard to levy or exemption of the deemed consumption charges as well as penalty thereof. If the petitioner is seeking to wave of the amounts, the licensee should be suitably

compensated. The calculations made by the licensee in respect of levy are in accordance with the orders of the Commission. The Commission has already decided the issue, when it has replied to the government, as such there remains nothing to be decided by the Commission.

The counsel for petitioner while rebutting the contentions of the licensee, pointed out that the licensee cannot blow hot and cold in the matter. The issue is not generic to all industrial consumers, but is specific to ferro alloys units, as the Commission had imposed specific condition with regard to off take of energy. He has placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in 1975 (2) SCC 508 being Amalgamated Electricity Company Limited against Jalgaon Borough Municipality, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the issue of minimum guarantee and minimum consumption. The present case also is on similar lines, which may be considered.

Having heard the submissions of the parties, the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
I. A. No. 14 of 2019 in O. P. No. 4 of 2012	M/s. VBC Ferro Alloys Limited	TSSPDCL & SE (O) TSSPDCL, Sangareddy

Application filed seeking revisiting the conditions stipulated in the retail supply tariff order for FY 2012-13 for category of HT-I (B) consumers.

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Advocate for applicant and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for applicant stated that the prayer in this petition is prima facie with regard to revisiting the tariff order for the year 2012-13 in respect of deemed consumption by the ferro alloys units as specified therein in terms of the earlier orders. Due to imposition of restriction and control measures for the said year, the applicant was not able to function and the unit was closed. The Commission, while imposing the restriction and control measures in the

relevant year, had specifically imposed a condition of not levying deemed consumption charges in respect of the industry.

The Commission, in the relevant tariff order, had imposed condition of drawing at least 85% after energy demand at 6701 KVAH per KVA of demand. The tariff had been fixed at Rs. 4.05 per unit. However, during the course of the relevant year, the licensees failed to meet the demand and approached the Commission to impose restriction and control measures under section 23 of the Electricity Act, 2003. The Commission having considered the demand supply position of power availability and allowed the licensees to impose such measures on such of the consumers as was decided by it. In doing so, the Commission had quantified and specified the methodology of availing the power in respect of the each of the categories of consumers. The applicant being constrained to function under the said conditions had closed the unit, since the equipment is required to have continuous power supply for 365 days in a year. If the machinery is stopped, it will take about two days to restore normalcy, which is detrimental to the functioning of the applicant.

The counsel for applicant emphasized the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 as also the Conduct of Business Regulation, 2015. It is his case that the Commission has ample power to revisit the order passed by it at any point of time to mitigate the difficulty caused to any of the stakeholders. Particular reference has been drawn to section 62 (4) of the Act, 2003 and clauses 38 (1) and (3) of the Conduct of Business Regulation, 2015. He also relied on an order passed by the Andhra Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission on 06.04.2015 in respect of the similar issue arising in that state. He has brought to the notice of the Commission

during the financial years 2012-13 and 2013-14 only two ferro alloys units functioned and all other units were closed as they existed in the combined state at that time.

The counsel for applicant has also drawn attention the communication made by the government with regard to consideration of the issue by the Commission towards restoration of power supply and waving of the charges for the relevant period as also subsequently any penalties. It is stated that the Commission refused to dwell into the issue and relegated the matter to be decided between the licensee and the government. On further pursuance of the matter, the Commission only clarified that the issue will be examined on a case to case basis, if at all, they approach the Commission.

The counsel for applicant stated that the applicant made efforts to revive the unit, but was stuck with the levy of charges for the period and also penalties due to non-consumption of the energy.

The representative of the respondents stated that non-levy of penalties or deemed consumption charges is applicable only to restriction and control measure period and it cannot be waved of unless suitable assistance is received from the government. The licensee had no support from the government despite explaining the status of the licensees as well as that of the consumers. Even otherwise, they cannot seek revisiting of an order passed determining the tariff as it anyway would constitute reviewing the order, which is not permissible under the Act, 2003 and the regulation thereof. The amendment of the order once passed by the Commission determining the tariff is subject to the discretion of the Commission as the provision employs the word 'may' and not 'shall'.

The representative of the respondents further stated that the licensees have acted in accordance with the directions of the Commission with regard to levy or exemption of the deemed consumption charges as well as penalty thereof. If the petitioner is seeking to wave of the amounts, the licensee should be suitably compensated. The calculations made by the licensee in respect of levy are in accordance with the orders of the Commission. The Commission has already decided the issue, when it has replied to the government, as such there remains nothing to be decided by the Commission.

The counsel for petitioner while rebutting the contentions of the licensee, pointed out that the licensee cannot blow hot and cold in the matter. The issue is not generic to all industrial consumers, but is specific to ferro alloys units, as the Commission had imposed specific condition with regard to off take of energy. He has placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in 1975 (2) SCC 508 being Amalgamated Electricity Company Limited against Jalgaon Borough Municipality, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the issue of minimum guarantee and minimum consumption. The present case also is on similar lines, which may be considered.

Having heard the submissions of the parties, the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
I. A. (SR) No. 28 of 2019 in O. P. No. 21 of 2017	M/s. VBC Ferro Alloys Limited	TSSPDCL & SE (O) Sangareddy TSSPDCL

Application filed seeking revisiting the conditions stipulated in the retail supply tariff order for FY 2018-19 for category of HT-I (B) consumers.

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Advocate for applicant and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for applicant stated that the prayer in this petition is prima facie with regard to revisiting the tariff order for the year 2018-19 in respect of deemed consumption by the ferro alloys units as specified therein in terms of the earlier orders. The petitioner stopped the unit during R & C Measures and during 2018 it made efforts to revive the unit. Accordingly it requested the release of power supply and initially 1 MVA released for restoration of supply and after obtaining the necessary approvals another 19 MVA has been released. The total availed in January 2019 after payment of all the charges that is security deposit etc., in 20 MVA.

The counsel for petitioner stated that the unit started functioning in January 2019 and earlier efforts were made to get waiver of earlier deemed consumption charges as well as security deposit. Representation was made to the government which in turn referred the matter to the Commission. The consumer requested the licensee to waive of the earlier demands made towards deemed consumption and other charges and the licensee replied that the matter is before the Government and the Commission, as such action will be taken based on decision of the Government and the Commission.

The petitioner had approached the Hon'ble High Court questioning the demand made by the licensee for arrears. The Hon'ble High Court disposed of the writ petition requiring the petitioner to make representation and the same to the disposed of by the licensee. Subsequently after restoration of power supply, the licensee sought to disconnect it due to non-payment of the earlier demands. Again the petitioner approached the Hon'ble High Court to stop disconnection of power supply. The issue before the Hon'ble High Court and the present application are different. The present application is limited to calculation of deemed consumption charges by the licensee duly taking into account the period to be considered in terms of the order of the Commission as also modifying the tariff order applicable for FY 2018 – 19.

The Commission, in the relevant tariff order, had imposed condition of drawing atleast 85% after energy demand at 6701 KVAH per KVA of demand. The applicant during the years 2012, 2013 being constrained to function under the

restriction and control measure conditions had closed the unit, since the equipment was required to run on continuous power supply for 365 days in a year. If the machinery is stopped, it will take about two days to restore normalcy, which is detrimental to the functioning of the applicant.

The counsel for applicant emphasized the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 as also the Conduct of Business Regulation, 2015. It is his case that the Commission has ample power to revisit the order passed by it at any point of time to mitigate the difficulty caused to any of the stakeholders. Particular reference has been drawn to section 62 (4) of the Act, 2003 and clauses 38 (1) and (3) of the Conduct of Business Regulation, 2015. He has brought to the notice of the Commission during the financial years 2012-13 and 2013-14 only two ferro alloys units functioned and all other units were closed as they existed in the combined state at that time.

The counsel for applicant has also drawn attention the communication made by the government with regard to consideration of the issue by the Commission towards restoration of power supply and waving of the charges for the relevant period as also subsequently any penalties. It is stated that the Commission refused to dwell into the issue and relegated the matter to be decided between the licensee and the government. On further pursuance of the matter, the Commission only clarified that the issue will be examined on a case to case basis, if at all, they approach the Commission.

The counsel for applicant stated that the applicant made efforts to revive the unit, but was stuck with the levy of charges for the period and also penalties due to non-consumption of the energy. As stated earlier the unit was revived and became functional in January 2019 and thereafter the licensee proceeded to levy deemed consumption charges for the period January to March 2019 instead of taking one complete year of 365 days as per the formula ordered by the Commission and thus demanded payment of amount for deemed consumption charges for 2 months 11 days only.

The counsel for the applicant stated that the Commission provided in its orders that the deemed consumption charges shall be calculated in respect of ferro

alloys units on an annual basis and not for the financial year. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled to the same benefit of calculating deemed consumption at the 85% of the load for the total period of one year instead of 3 months as has been done by the licensee. The applicant therefore is before the Commission seeking modification of the tariff order by revisiting the same.

The representative of the respondents stated that non - levy of penalties or deemed consumption charges is applicable only to restriction and control measure period and it cannot be waived unless suitable assistance is received from the government. The licensee had no support from the government despite explaining the status of the licensees as well as that of the consumers. Even otherwise, they cannot seek revisiting of an order passed determining the tariff as it anyway would constitute reviewing the order, which is not permissible under the Act, 2003 and the regulation thereof. The amendment of the order once passed by the Commission determining the tariff is subject to the discretion of the Commission as the provision employs the word 'may' and not 'shall'.

The representative of the respondents further stated that the licensees have acted in accordance with the directions of the Commission with regard to levy or exemption of the deemed consumption charges as well as penalty thereof. If the petitioner is seeking to waive of the amounts, the licensee should be suitably compensated. The calculations made by the licensee in respect of levy are in accordance with the orders of the Commission. The Commission has already decided the issue, when it has replied to the government, as such there remains nothing to be decided by the Commission.

The representative of the respondent stated that the applicant approached the Hon'ble High Court in two writ petitions on the same issue in W. P. Nos. 14612 and 17927 of 2019. Both the writ petitions are pending consideration before the Hon'ble High Court. The issue raised therein is substantially similar to the issue in the application. Therefore, the present application cannot be considered. It is also stated that the conditions imposed in the tariff order are applicable for the relevant tariff year and not for the subsequent period. Therefore, the licensee appropriately billed the petitioner for the period of 2 months 11 days only for that financial year for applying the principle of deemed consumption for one year. The contention of the

applicant is not correct and it is inappropriate to take a full year of 365 days. Accordingly the action of the licensee for FY 2018 – 19 is in accordance with the order of the Commission.

The counsel for applicant while rebutting the contentions of the licensee, pointed out that the licensee cannot blow hot and cold in the matter. The issue is not generic to all industrial consumers, but is specific to ferro alloys units, as the Commission had imposed specific condition with regard to off take of energy. He has placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in 1975 (2) SCC 508 being Amalgamated Electricity Company Limited against Jalgaon Borough Municipality, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the issue of minimum guarantee and minimum consumption. The present case also is on similar lines, which may be considered.

Having heard the submissions of the parties, the matter is reserved for orders.
Sd/- Sd/- Sd/-
Member Member Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
R. P. (SR) No. 66 of 2021 & I. A. (SR) No. 85 of 2021 in O. P. No. 14 of 2021	TSSLDC (TSTRANSCO)	-None-

Review petition filed seeking review of the order dated 02.09.2021 passed in O. P. No. 14 of 2021 and I. A. No. 5 of 2021 in respect of annual performance review for FY 2019-20 of SLDC activity.

Application filed seeking to condone the delay in filing the review petition.

Sri. C. Srinivasa Rao, Joint Managing Director (Finance, Comml. & HRD) for review petitioner has appeared through video conference. The representative of the review petitioner stated that the Commission, while allowing the petition for annual performance of FY 2019-20 for SLDC activities, had refused to consider a small amount relating to capital expenditure, which was borrowed from TSTRANSCO. The said amount has to be repaid to the TSTRANSCO. Deducting the said amount would adversely effect its operations in maintaining the grid by procuring the necessary standard equipment for present and future operations. Therefore, he sought review of the order of the Commission and to rectify the amounts refused in the annual

performance petition. The Commission passed order on the annual performance in September, 2021 and the petition is filed in November, 2021 and there is a delay of few days in filing the review petition. The Commission may condone the delay in filing the review petition. The representative of the review petitioner sought admission of the review petition by condoning the delay, as also taking up the matter for review. Having heard the submissions, the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
R. P. (SR) No. 67 of 2021 & I. A. (SR) No. 86 of 2021 in O. P. No. 13 of 2021	TSTRANSCO	-None-

Review petition filed seeking review of the order dated 02.09.2021 passed in O. P. No. 13 of 2021 and I. A. No. 6 of 2021 in respect of annual performance review for FY 2019-20 of transmission business.

Application filed seeking to condone the delay in filing the review petition.

Sri. C. Srinivasa Rao, Joint Managing Director (Finance, Comml. & HRD) for review petitioner has appeared through video conference. The representative of the review petitioner stated that the Commission, while allowing the petition for annual performance of FY 2019-20 for transmission business, had refused certain aspects, which have bearing on the finances of the transmission licensee. Although, the directions of the Commission have been complied with, certain amounts relating to capital expenditure, depreciation and consumer contribution have been decided against the review petitioner. He sought to explain by demonstrating various provisions of the regulations and order of the Commission. It is also his case that deducting amounts or not according approval for the amounts claimed, would have adverse impact on the revenues of the licensee. Also allowing lesser amount would result in having effect on the returns of the company. Therefore, he sought review of the order of the Commission and to rectify the amounts refused in the annual performance petition. The Commission passed order on the annual performance in September, 2021 and the petition is filed in November, 2021 and there is a delay of few days in filing the review petition. The Commission may condone the delay in filing the review petition. The representative of the review petitioner sought

admission of the review petition by condoning the delay, as also taking up the matter for review. Having heard the submissions, the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 4 of 2022	M/s. ReNew Mega Solar Power Pvt. Ltd & another	TSNPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner No. 1 by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri D. Prakash Reddy, Senior Advocate along with Ms. Mazag Andra Bi, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application for payment of 90% of the amount to them and another application for deposit of balance amount with the Commission. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory applications, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 5 of 2022	M/s. ReNew Akshay Urja Pvt. Ltd & another	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner No. 1 by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri D. Prakash Reddy, Senior Advocate along with Ms. Mazag Andra Bi, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application for payment of 90% of the amount to them and another application for deposit of balance amount with the Commission. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory applications, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 6 of 2022	M/s. ReNew Saur Shakti Pvt. Ltd & another	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner No. 1 by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri D. Prakash Reddy, Senior Advocate along with Ms. Mazag Andra Bi, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application for payment of 90% of the amount to them and another application for deposit of balance amount with the Commission. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory applications, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 7 of 2022	M/s. ReNew Solar Energy (Telangana) Pvt. Ltd & another	TSNPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner No. 1 by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri D. Prakash Reddy, Senior Advocate along with Ms. Mazag Andra Bi, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application for payment of 90% of the amount

to them and another application for deposit of balance amount with the Commission. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory applications, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 8 of 2022	M/s. Prathamesh Solarfarms Pvt. Ltd & another	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner No. 1 by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri D. Prakash Reddy, Senior Advocate along with Ms. Mazag Andra Bi, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application for payment of 90% of the amount to them and another application for deposit of balance amount with the Commission. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March,

2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory applications, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 9 of 2022	M/s. ReNew Akshay Urja Pvt. Ltd & another	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner No. 1 by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri D. Prakash Reddy, Senior Advocate along with Ms. Mazag Andra Bi, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application for payment of 90% of the amount to them and another application for deposit of balance amount with the Commission. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory applications, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 10 of 2022	M/s. ReNew Saur Shakti Pvt. Ltd & another	TSNPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner No. 1 by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri D. Prakash Reddy, Senior Advocate along with Ms. Mazaga Andra Bi, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application for payment of 90% of the amount to them and another application for deposit of balance amount with the Commission. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory applications, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 11 of 2022 & I. A. No. 3 of 2022	M/s. Winsol Solar Fields (Polepally) Pvt. Ltd	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due with interest for late payment along with late payment surcharge and consequential relief of payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent to pay 75% of the overdue amounts along with interest for late payment to the petitioner within one week.

Sri Aditya K. Singh, Advocate representing Link Legal for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have already filed an interlocutory application for payment of 75% of the amounts due to the petitioner. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. He also stated that unless payment is made, the petitioner will suffer serious financial crises, as it is a small company. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit, the matter is adjourned. The counter affidavit shall be filed by 02.03.2022 and reply, if any, thereof by 31.03.2022.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 12 of 2022 & I. A. No. 4 of 2022	M/s. Mahabubnagar Solar Parks Pvt. Ltd	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due with interest for late payment along with late payment surcharge and consequential relief of payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent to pay 75% of the overdue amounts along with interest for late payment to the petitioner within one week.

Sri Aditya K. Singh, Advocate representing Link Legal for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have already filed an interlocutory application for payment of 75% of the amounts due to the petitioner. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. He also stated that unless payment is made, the petitioner will suffer serious financial crises, as it is a small company. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit, the matter is adjourned. The counter affidavit shall be filed by 02.03.2022 and reply, if any, thereof by 31.03.2022.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 13 of 2022 & I. A. No. 5 of 2022	M/s. Winsol Solar Fields (Polepally) Pvt. Ltd	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due with interest for late payment along with late payment surcharge and consequential relief of payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent to pay 75% of the overdue amounts along with interest for late payment to the petitioner within one week.

Sri Aditya K. Singh, Advocate representing Link Legal for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have already filed an interlocutory application for payment of 75% of the amounts due to the petitioner. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. He also stated that unless payment is made, the petitioner will suffer serious financial crises, as it is a small company. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit, the matter is adjourned. The counter affidavit shall be filed by 02.03.2022 and reply, if any, thereof by 31.03.2022.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 14 of 2022 & I. A. No. 6 of 2022	M/s. Polepally Solar Parks Pvt. Ltd	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due with interest for late payment along with late payment surcharge and consequential relief of payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent to pay 75% of the overdue amounts along with interest for late payment to the petitioner within one week. Sri Aditya K. Singh, Advocate representing Link Legal for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have already filed an interlocutory application for payment of 75% of the amounts due to the petitioner. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. He also stated that unless payment is made, the petitioner will suffer serious financial crises, as it is a small company. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit, the matter is adjourned. The counter affidavit shall be filed by 02.03.2022 and reply, if any, thereof by 31.03.2022.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 15 of 2022 & I. A. No. 7 of 2022	M/s. Winsol Solar Fields (Polepally) Pvt. Ltd	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due with interest for late payment along with late payment surcharge and consequential relief of payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent to pay 75% of the overdue amounts along with interest for late payment to the petitioner within one week.

Sri Aditya K. Singh, Advocate representing Link Legal for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have already filed an interlocutory application for payment of 75% of the amounts due to the petitioner. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. He also stated that unless payment is made, the petitioner will suffer serious financial crises, as it is a small company. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit, the matter is adjourned. The counter affidavit shall be filed by 02.03.2022 and reply, if any, thereof by 31.03.2022.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 16 of 2022 & I. A. No. 8 of 2022	M/s. ACME Solar Holdings Pvt. Ltd & M/s. ACME PV / Powertech Pvt. Ltd.	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioners by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking direction to the respondent not to take any precipitative / coercive / adverse action against the petitioners / applicants during the pendency of the present petition.

Sri Hemanth Sahai, Senior Advocate along with Sri Shreshth Sharma and Sri Saurobroto Dutta, Advocates for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application seeking direction to the respondent not to take any precipitative / coercive / adverse action against the petitioners / applicants during the pendency of the present petition. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. He also requested the leave of the Commission to file another interlocutory application within next few days. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. The representative of the respondent required the service of the fresh I. A. proposed to be filed by the petitioner. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory application to be filed, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 17 of 2022 & I. A. No.9 of 2022	M/s. ACME Solar Holdings Pvt. Ltd & M/s. Dayakara Solar Power Pvt. Ltd.	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioners by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking direction to the respondent not to take any precipitative / coercive / adverse action against the petitioners / applicants during the pendency of the present petition.

Sri Hemanth Sahai, Senior Advocate along with Sri Shreshth Sharma and Sri Saurobroto Dutta, Advocates for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application seeking direction to the respondent not to take any precipitative / coercive / adverse action against the petitioners / applicants during the pendency of the present petition. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. He also requested the leave of the Commission to file another interlocutory application within next few days. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by atleast four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. The representative of the respondent required the service of the fresh I. A. proposed to be filed by the petitioner. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory application to be filed, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 18 of 2022 & I. A. No.10 of 2022	M/s. ACME Solar Holdings Pvt. Ltd & M/s. Grahati Solar Energy Pvt. Ltd.	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioners by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking direction to the respondent not to take any precipitative / coercive / adverse action against the petitioners / applicants during the pendency of the present petition.

Sri Hemanth Sahai, Senior Advocate along with Sri Shreshth Sharma and Sri Saurobroto Dutta, Advocates for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application seeking direction to the respondent not to take any precipitative / coercive / adverse action against the petitioners / applicants during the pendency of the present petition. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. He also requested the leave of the Commission to file another interlocutory application within next few days. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by atleast four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. The representative of the respondent required the service of the fresh I. A. proposed to be filed by the petitioner. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory application to be filed, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 19 of 2022 & I. A. No.11 of 2022	M/s. ACME Solar Holdings Pvt. Ltd & M/s. ACME Solar Power Technology Pvt. Ltd.	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioners by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking direction to the respondent not to take any precipitative / coercive / adverse action against the petitioners / applicants during the pendency of the present petition.

Sri Hemanth Sahai, Senior Advocate along with Sri Shreshth Sharma and Sri Saurobroto Dutta, Advocates for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for recovery of the amounts payable by the licensee for electricity supplied by the petitioner. The payments have been held up for more than a year now. They have filed an interlocutory application seeking direction to the respondent not to take any precipitative / coercive / adverse action against the petitioners / applicants during the pendency of the present petition. The counsel for petitioner sought to explain the urgency in the case. He also requested the leave of the Commission to file another interlocutory application within next few days. The representative of the respondent stated that the petition along with notice has been received only on 25.01.2022 and therefore, he needs time to file counter affidavit by at least four weeks. The counsel for petitioner opposed the grant of such length of time for filing counter affidavit as the payments are long overdue. However, the Commission expressed its inability to schedule the hearing in the month of March, 2022 due to the exercise of retail supply tariff determination for FY 2022-23. Accordingly, it is inclined to adjourn the matter to April, 2022. The counsel for petitioner insisted on an early date. The representative of the respondent required the service of the fresh I. A. proposed to be filed by the petitioner. Considering the request and the time needed to file counter affidavit as also taking up the fresh interlocutory application to be filed, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 04.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 1 of 2022 & I. A. No. 1 of 2022	M/s. Hyderabad MSW Energy Solutions Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking to quash notice dated 16.07.2021 issued by the respondent seeking reimbursement of the tipping fee from the petitioner.

Seeking exparte ad-interim stay of the operation of the notice dated 16.07.2021 issued by the respondent seeking reimbursement of the tipping fee from the petitioner.

Sri Matrugupta Mishra, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that there is an urgency in the matter. The Commission had, on the last date of hearing, directed the licensee to file an undertaking by way of a memo that they will not effect deductions from the amounts payable to the petitioner, the amount paid or payable by the government towards tipping fee. The representative of the respondent stated that a memo to that effect has been filed before the Commission yesterday itself. In view of the filing of memo, recording the same, the matter is adjourned. In the meantime, the respondent shall file its counter affidavit and the petitioner may file a rejoinder, if any. Both parties are to effect service of the same on either side well in advance to the date of hearing.

Call on 11.04.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman