



ANDHRA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
4th & 5th Floors, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad 500 004

R.P. No.1 of 2013
in
O.P. No.54 of 2013

Dated 22.01.2014

Present

Dr. V.Bhaskar, Chairman
Sri R.Ashoka Chari, Member
Sri P.Rajagopal Reddy, Member

In the matter of review of the order of the Commission in O.P. No.54 of 2013 dated 13-08-2013 determining the Cross Subsidy Surcharge and Additional Cross Subsidy Surcharge of the Financial Year 2013-14, filed under section 94 of Electricity Act, 2003 read with Clause 49 of A.P.E.R.C (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999.

Central Power Distribution Company of AP Ltd.
Eastern Power Distribution Company of AP Ltd.
Northern Power Distribution Company of AP Ltd.
Southern Power Distribution Company of AP Ltd.

.... Petitioners

ORDER

CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION

1. Under Section 42(2) and 42(4) of the Electricity Act 2003 (hereinafter referred as "Act 2003") the Commission initiated *suo-motu* proceedings in O.P. No.54 of 2013 for determining the Cross Subsidy Surcharge and Additional Cross Subsidy Surcharge for the Financial Year (FY) 2013-14 for open access users. In addition to inviting suggestions from the general public, it also conducted a public hearing on 06-08-2013. After examining all the submissions made by stakeholders, the Commission in its order dated 13-08-2013 ordered that the Cross-Subsidy Surcharge & Additional Surcharge be "nil" for all OA consumers falling in the service areas of all the Distribution

Licensees in the State for the FY 2013-14. However, DISCOMs were given the liberty to approach the Commission afresh on Cross Subsidy Surcharge & Additional Surcharge proposals, during that Financial Year, if they could assure 100% power supply to all subsidizing consumers, for at least four (4) months consecutively.

2. The Petitioners / DISCOMs have filed the present petition u/s 94 of the Act, 2003 r/w clause 49 of APERC (Conduct of Business) Regulation No.2 of 1999 seeking review of the above mentioned order of the Commission dt.13.08.2013.

3. As per the averments mentioned in the said petition, the order of the Commission dt.13.08.2013 that Cross Subsidy Surcharge and Additional surcharge for the FY 2013-14 would be nil, is contrary to law in force and is also result of omission of several vital aspects of the subject matter of Cross Subsidy Surcharge, which are apparent on the face of record, and thus deserves to be reviewed for the following reasons.

- a) The very approach of Commission on the issue of determination of Cross Subsidy as contemplated by the Act 2003, was done in a hurried manner, which is in violation of principles of natural justice and contrary to object of public hearing.
- b) The justification that is projected to arrive at a conclusion that Cross Subsidy is nil for Financial Year 2013-14 is that the DISCOMs failed to give assurance of continuous supply of power for four months. In fact the said ground is alien to law for the determination of Cross Subsidy Surcharge. On the other hand, the Commission failed to take into consideration relevant material and data submitted by DISCOMs for determining the Cross Subsidy Surcharge. Thus, the order under review suffers with consideration of extraneous material, and non-consideration of relevant material.
- c) The said order is contrary to mandate of Section 42(2) of Act 2003 whereunder it is stated that Cross Subsidy is provided to meet the levels of cross subsidies determined in respective tariff order in the event that cross subsidizing consumer opts for open access. The Appellate Tribunal in Appeal No.32 of 2009 decided on 28-04-2010 held that the Cross-Subsidy Surcharge, which is

referred to in the proviso to sub-section (2) of Section 42 of the Act, is a compensatory charge. It does not depend upon use of distribution licensee's power and is leviable irrespective of the fact whether its line is used or not. But for the Open Access, the consumer would have taken the quantum of power from the distribution licensee and in the result the consumer would have paid tariff applicable for such supply which would include an element of cross subsidy surcharge on certain other categories of consumers.

- d) No doubt the DISCOMS are obliged under law to provide electricity supply to all categories of consumers, but in doing so some of consumers are cross subsidized. If subsidizing consumers opt for Open Access and if as per the order under review, no surcharge is levied, the object of permitting surcharge is defeated which is not sustainable at law. In fact, in another case, the APTEL in Appeal No.132 of 2011 relying on the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.3466 and 3467 of 2006, held that the consumers who continued to be connected to a particular entity, but have migrated to another company, are still liable for surcharge.
- e) The said obligation of universal supply is subject to the Clause 16 of General Terms and Conditions of Supply issued by Commission dated 06-01-2006 as amended from time to time. The said Clause reads as that "*The Company shall endeavor to afford continuous supply and to restore interrupted supply as early as possible. The Company shall be entitled to stagger or curtail supply of electricity to any consumer or a class of consumers in accordance with the Directions issued by the statutory authorities including Commission from time to time, for maintaining efficient supply and securing equitable distribution of electricity.*"
- f) Therefore, the DISCOMs, de hors to the fact of giving or otherwise of assurance as ordered in the order under review always obliged to provide supply to all consumers continuously, subject to the orders passed by statutory authorities, including State Load Dispatch Centre, etc, as stated above.
- g) Be that as it may, the Commission failed to afford reasonable opportunity to respond to the objections of the several objectors and observations of

Commission made in the public hearing dated 06-08-2013, which resulted in the present impasse of “nil” Cross Subsidy Surcharge, on the ground of alleged default of DISCOMs.

- h) There is no difficulty and, in fact, the DISCOMs hereby submit that they would make all out efforts to provide continuous supply to the consumers. In view of the fact that the Commission mentioned in its order dated 13-8-2013 that the DISCOMs are at liberty to approach the Commission, if the DISCOMs could assure 100% power supply, the DISCOMs are submitting the said assurance and seeking review of order dated 13-08-2013, for determination of appropriate Cross Subsidy Surcharge.
- i) The DISCOMs further stated that the findings of Commission at paragraph 33 of the order under review that DISCOMs would not loose any cross subsidy on account of exemption from payment of Cross Subsidy Surcharge during R&C measures, is factually incorrect and logically wrong since if a consumer opts Open Access and utilizes the DISCOMs power less than the R&C limit, then obviously the DISCOMs /Licensees will lose the cross subsidy to that extent. In other words, there is no way to ensure that the consumer will necessarily utilize DISCOMs power to the extent allowed under R&C and only resort to Open Access for the remaining requirement. Therefore, it is most likely that any consumer will avail of Open Access for entire requirement leading to loss of Cross Subsidy Surcharge, even in respect of power that a DISCOM is willing to offer.
- j) Further the view of the Commission at paragraph 34 of the order dt.13-08-2013 that if the consumer consumes less than that mentioned in the R&C measures, such surplus power can be supplied to other needy consumers of same class to obtain the cross subsidies, has no basis for the simple reason that all consumers in the same class are likely to take similar decisions to avail Open Access in the similar circumstances.
- k) Further, at paragraph 36 of the order dated 13-08-2013 it is found that even if it is assumed that availability of full power is for short period only, the DISCOMs still have the obligation to supply electricity to subsidized consumers during this

period as per Tariff Order. If during the period when full power is available and Cross Subsidy Surcharge is not collected from the subsidizing consumers, then the anticipated cross subsidy in the Tariff Order 2013-14 cannot be recovered and there will be loss of cross subsidy revenues to DISCOMs, which may lead to rise in tariff rates for the subsidized consumers.

- l) The order under review works out detrimental to the interest of DISCOMs whose financial positions is grim due to various other reasons, not attributable to their performance. DISCOMS cannot afford to give any relief to consumers in respect of cross subsidy even during R & C measures as the same would not be compensated and hence has to be passed on to consumers in future tariffs.
- m) The Commission has wide powers to review the orders passed by it, more so, when the commission gave liberty to DISCOMs at paragraph 37 of its orders. It is necessary to review the said order dated 13-08-2013 and determine the Cross Subsidy Surcharge on the basis of embedded method which is being followed all through in the past.

4. For all the reasons mentioned in paragraph 3 above, it was requested that the Commission may review the order dated 13-08-2013 passed in O.P.No.54 of 2013 and determine Cross Subsidy Surcharge for FY 2013-14.

5. A Public Notice inviting objections/comments/suggestions from the interested persons and stakeholders on the said review petition filed by the DISCOMs was published in two daily newspapers, viz., Andhra Prabha on 11-10-2013 and in Eenadu on 16-10-2013 and requesting them to submit objections/comments/suggestions to the Commission Secretary, either by post or through email, by 25-10-2013. In response to the said notice, 26 objections/suggestions were received from the stakeholders. A Public Hearing was also held on 1-11-2013 at 11:00 AM in the Court Hall of APERC, Hyderabad.

6. In the subsequent chapter, a summary of the relevant objections, submitted both in writing & orally, by various persons/consumer associations/representative bodies/ political parties/organizations/legal counsels, along with the replies submitted by the DISCOMs, is furnished. Commission has thoroughly examined these

objections/suggestions, along with the replies submitted by the DISCOM and taken a view based upon the arguments made.

7. In this context, Commission would like to place on record its appreciation to all the objectors who participated in the public hearings and furnished their carefully considered views & suggestions.

8. A list of persons/consumer associations/representative bodies/political parties/organizations/legal counsels who filed objections before the Commission, is given as Annexure.

CHAPTER – II

SUMMARY OF RELEVANT POINTS ARISING FROM WRITTEN OBJECTIONS & PUBLIC HEARING

1. *No proper authorization to file the review petition:*

9. Sri Gopal Chowdary, appearing on behalf of M/s RPP & others has pointed out that the affidavit enclosed to the petition states the deponent has been authorized by APCPDCL to file the petition, whereas the petition is signed by the same person on behalf of all the DISCOMs. It is a wholly incompetent and material misjoinder of petitions. The review petition is liable to be rejected on this ground alone.

Response of DISCOMs:

10. The remaining three DISCOMs have authorized the CGM/CommI/APCPDCL to file the review petition.

Commission's Views:

11. As other 3 DISCOMs have authorized Chief General Manager Commercial, APCPDCL to file the review petition on their behalf also, this objection relating to improper authorization has no merit.

2. *Review petition is barred by limitation:*

12. Sri Gopal Chowdary, Sri Challa Gunaranjan & others have contended that for the purpose of review petition, the Commission has same powers as are vested in a Civil Court under Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (hereinafter referred to as "C.P.C."). The review petition filed by DISCOMs is not maintainable as it was filed on 20.09.2013, beyond the 30 days limit set by the Limitation Act.

Response of DISCOMs:

13. The provisions of the Act 2003/A.P. Electricity Reform Act, clearly state that in respect of the review petition, the APERC is vested with the powers that are exercised by a civil court under the CPC. While these provisions speak about the powers of review exercisable by the APERC, they cannot be applied to the procedure and

limitation aspect. The limitation for exercise of review by the APERC, is governed by the Conduct of Business Regulation issued by the Commission. Therefore, in the absence of anything contrary in the main enactment, the limitation provided in the Regulations at Clause 49 would govern the period of limitation for filing review petition.

14. With regard to application of the Limitation Act, it is submitted that when a specific provision is made under the Electricity Act for filing certain proceedings, the limitation that is provided under the said enactment would govern the situation, but not the provisions of the Limitation Act or the period provided under the Limitation Act. The said principle of law is decided by Hon'ble Supreme Court in a case between Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board Vs CERC dated 15-04-2010 reported at 2010 ELR(SC) Page 313. Therefore, indisputably, as stated supra, Clause 49 of APERC Conduct of Business Regulations being subordinate legislation, has statutory force of Electricity Law and therefore, when there is a specific period of limitation it excludes the application of Limitation Act. As such the objection is not tenable at law.

Commission's Views:

15. There is force in the contention of the DISCOMs. The citation makes it amply clear that the Limitation Act cannot override a special or local law which prescribes a different period of limitation for any suit appeal or application. As per Clause 49 of APERC (Conduct of Business Rules of the Commission), Regulations, 1999, a petition to review the decisions, directions and orders of the Commission can be filed within 90 days. The order dated 13-08-2013 passed by the Commission in O.P.No.54 of 2013 is a *suo-motu* order. The present review petition was filed by DISCOMs on 20-09-2013 to review the *suo-motu* order. Hence, the petition which is filed within 90 days from the date of passing the order, far less its date of communication, is not barred by limitation.

3. Review Petition filed by the DISCOMs is not maintainable:

16. Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Sri Gopal Chowdary, Smt. P.Vydehi, FAPCCI & others have submitted that the petition filed under Section 94 of the Electricity Act to review the Order passed by the APERC is not maintainable and the same is liable to be dismissed *in limini*. They stated that, to apply for a review of the judgment by the

aggrieved person, there should be a discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or order made, or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of record, or for any other sufficient reason. It is submitted that in the present case, the Commission after considering all the material evidence placed by the petitioners herein and the objections filed by the objectors in a proper perspective, has passed the Order dated 13-08-2013. There is no error apparent on the face of record and the petitioners have neither pleaded nor placed any new and important matter of evidence which after the exercise of due diligence was not within their knowledge, to seek review of the order. It is respectfully submitted that none of the ingredients prescribed in Order XLVII Rule-1 of C.P.C., is satisfied and hence, the review petition filed by the petitioners is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed. They further argued that, it is a settled law that a review is not permissible for a mere re-hearing or for re-argument of the case.

17. The grounds alleged are not within the scope of review and the petitioners have never raised the above said grounds either in the original proposals or during the hearing before the Commission. The grounds for review mentioned at paragraph 3 by the petitioners are like the grounds made for appeal and the petitioners have not specifically pointed out at which the order under review suffers error apparent on the face of record or satisfies the ingredients of review under Order XLVII Rule -1. The review sought by the petitioners is not at all warranted, and the grounds raised in the review petition can at best be urged in an appeal before the appellate forum.

18. At best, a fresh petition should be filed by DISCOMS requesting for levy of cross subsidy as permitted by the APERC in its order of 13-8-2013, but in no case can a review petition be entertained.

Response of DISCOMs:

19. No doubt the law is settled that to sustain a review petition, the same should be within scope provided under Order XLVII, Rule 1 of the C.P.C., unlike in the case of appeal. *Order XLVII, Rule1 reads “from the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence was not within his knowledge or*

could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or order made, or an account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of record, or for any other sufficient reason”.

20. The phrase “for any other sufficient reason” fell for interpretation before the Hon’ble Supreme Court in more than one occasion. It is settled law that the sufficient reason is not exhaustive and it can be any other reason which the Commission feels it as sufficient reason. In this case, the APERC in its Order dated 13-08-2013 categorically stated “DISCOMs are at liberty to approach the Commission afresh on Cross Subsidy Surcharge & Additional Surcharge proposals, during this Financial Year, if they could assure 100% power supply to all subsidizing consumers, for at least four months consecutively”. Therefore sourcing the liberty given by the Commission the petitioners approached the APERC to review and revise the Order dated 13-08-2013. As such the grounds that are canvassed in the Review application are very much within the scope of permissible grounds under Order XLVII Rule(1) Code of Civil Procedure.

21. In respect of the objection about the necessity of filing fresh proceedings than filing a review petition, the petitioner submitted that if the DISCOMs approach the Commission with an assurance of the continuous supply of power, the Order dated 13-08-2013 would be *non est*. Therefore the filing of the review petition is the only appropriate course to approach the APERC. Even otherwise, the APERC is vested with inherent powers under Clause 55(3) of the APERC Conduct of Business Regulations 1999, which reads as “Nothing in these Regulations shall expressly or impliedly, bar the Commission to deal with any matter or exercise any power under the Act for which no Regulations have been framed, and the Commission may deal with such matters powers and functions in a manner it thinks fit.”

Commission’s Views:

22. The Commission has carefully examined the rival contentions on the issue of maintainability of this review petition filed by the petitioners herein. Law on maintainability / entertaining a review petition is well settled. A petition for review of the order of the Commission which is appealable can be entertained only for the following reasons viz., (i) where there is a typographical mistake crept in the order, (ii) when

there is an arithmetical mistake that has crept in while effecting calculation or otherwise (iii) where there is a mistake committed by the Commission, which is apparent from the material facts available on record and/or in respect of application of law, (iv) when the Commission omitted to take into consideration certain material facts on record and 'law on the subject' and that if on taking into consideration those aspects there is possibility of Commission coming to a different conclusion contrary to the findings given and (v) if the aggrieved party produced new material which it could not produce during the enquiry inspite of its best efforts and had that material or evidence been available, the Commission could have come to a different conclusion.

23. Thus, the scope of review is limited. On an earlier occasion, while dealing with another review petition filed by M/s. Lanco Kondapalli Power Private Ltd, vide R.P. No.1 of 2011, the Commission had an opportunity to examine the scope of review petition and at paragraph 22 of the order passed therein on 23.04.2013, it is stated that the respondents therein relied upon ruling of the Supreme Court in the case of *Ajit Kumar Rath v. State of Orissa & otrs* reported at (1999) 9 SCC 596. Relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced below for reference.

"The power of the review available to the Tribunal is the same as has been given to a court under section 114 read with Order 47 CPC. The power is not absolute and is hedged in by the restrictions indicated in Order 47. The power can be exercised on the application of a person on the discovery of a new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within this knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was made. The power can also be exercised on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record or for any other sufficient reason. A review cannot be claimed or asked for merely for a fresh hearing or arguments or correction of an erroneous view taken earlier, that is to say, the power of review can be exercised only for correction of a patent error of law or fact which stares in the face without any elaborate argument being needed for establishing it. It may be pointed out that the expression "any other sufficient reason" used in Order 47 Rule 1 means a reason sufficiently analogous to those specified in the rule.

Any other attempt, except an attempt to correct an apparent error or an attempt not based on any ground set out in Order 47, would amount to an abuse of the liberty given to the Tribunal under the Act to review its judgment."

24. The principal contention of the petitioners is that the conclusion arrived at by the Commission at paragraph 37 of its order dt.13.08.2013 passed in O.P.No.54 of 2013 is contrary to law in force and also result of omission of several vital aspects of the matter

of Cross Subsidy Surcharge, which is apparent on the face of record and thus deserves to be reviewed for several grounds mentioned in detail at paragraph 3 supra.

25. In short, according to the petitioners, the Commission did not apply its mind, did not consider relevant issues and considered irrelevant issues; issued the order in a hurry and did not provide adequate opportunity to DISCOMs during the hearing. Further, according to the petitioner, Commission applied defective logic in reaching its conclusion. Lastly, the decision of the Commission is contrary to the existing law in force.

26. After careful examination of these averments of the petitioners, it appears that the petitioner is urging the Commission to “rehear and correct” its earlier order. Such contentions and various other contentions of the petitioners in support of its request to review the order dt.13.08.2013 mentioned in detail at paragraph-3 supra, are more grounds of an appeal rather than that of a review. None of these contentions stand when the test of Order XLVII Rule 1 of the CPC is applied and permit the Commission to exercise its power to review the order dt.13.08.2013. In the guise of review, the petitioners are requesting the Commission to reexamine the reasoning based on which the earlier order was issued.

CHAPTER – III

CONCLUSION

27. In its petition filed on 20.09.2013 u/s 94 of the Act r/w Clause 49 of the APERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 seeking review of the order passed by the Commission on 13.08.2013 in O.P. No.54 of 2013, the petitioners herein have mentioned that the conclusion arrived at by the Commission in the said order is contrary to law in force and also result of omission of several vital aspects of the matter of Cross Subsidy Surcharge, which is apparent on the face of record, instead of stating the same is an error apparent on the face of record. Notwithstanding the petitioners attempt to blur the distinction between “error apparent on face of the record” and “order contrary to law apparent on face of record”, the Commission is of the view that the grounds raised are more of an appeal rather than that of a review, as mentioned above. Therefore, the Commission is not inclined to accept the contention that these are adequate grounds for review of its earlier order.

28. However, the reasoning of the petitioners that “if the DISCOMS approach the Commission with an assurance of continuous supply of power, the order dt.13-8-2013 would become *non est* and therefore, the filing of this review petition is the only appropriate course” is unconvincing. It is evident that at paragraph-37 of the order dt.13-08-2013, Commission permitted the petitioners/DISCOMS to approach the Commission **afresh** (emphasis supplied) on Cross Surcharge and Additional Surcharge proposals, during this Financial Year. The option available has been clearly laid out. After the easing of the power shortage situation, the DISCOMs had the option to file a fresh petition before the Commission requesting for determining the Cross Subsidy Surcharge and the Additional Surcharge under Sections 39, 40 and 42 of the Electricity Act, 2003, for the remaining part of the year 2013-14. Admittedly, the petitioners did not chose to invoke the jurisdiction of the Commission under the above mentioned provisions of law for levy of Cross Subsidy Surcharge and Additional Surcharge and making a case on merits for exercise of power by the Commission for levy of such charges. Instead, the petitioners chose to file a review petition whose scope, as mentioned above, is very limited. The phrase “*any other sufficient reason*”

must mean a reason sufficient on grounds at least analogous to those specified in the rule. For instance, case law available on the subject matter indicate that misconception of the court must be regarded as sufficient reason analogous to an error on the face of the record. Commission is unable to accede to the contention of the petitioners that filing of this review petition is the only appropriate course. By any stretch of imagination, liberty to approach the Commission alone cannot be a sufficient reason to enable the Commission to entertain this review petition. For this reason also, Commission is not inclined to exercise its power to review the order dt.13.8.2013.

29. Thus viewing the petitioners from any corner and judging from any angle, the petitioners are not able to satisfy any of the requirements of Order XLII Rule 1 of C.P.C., to enable the Commission to entertain the petition filed by it seeking review of the order dt.13.08.2013 passed by the Commission in O.P. No.54 of 2013.

30. For all the above reasons, R.P. No.1 of 2013 filed by the petitioners herein is dismissed.

This order is corrected and signed on this 22nd day of January, 2014.

Sd/-
(P.RAJAGOPAL REDDY)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(R.ASHOKA CHARI)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Dr. V.BHASKAR)
CHAIRMAN

Annexure

List of Objectors

| Sl. | Name & Address of the Objector |
|------------|---|
| 1 | M/s Granules India Ltd., 2 nd Floor, 3 rd Block, My Home Hub, Madhapur, Hyderabad 500 081. Phone Nos.(040)3066000 & 66760000; Fax No.(040)23115145; email: mail@granulesindia.com. |
| 2 | M/s Devashree Ispat (P) Ltd., H.No.8-2-293/82, Plot No.86, Prashasan Nagar, Road No.72, Jubilee Hills, PO, Film Nagar, Hyderabad 500 096. Phone Nos.(040)23557186/0175/0091; Fax No.(040)23557184; email: dsisp@hotmail.com. |
| 3 | Sri T.V.Ravindra Babu, Manager, Program Management, Dr.Reddy's Laboratories Ltd., 8-2-237, Road No.3, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad 500 034. Phone No.(040)49002900; Mobile No.9394712720; Fax No.(040)49002999; email: ravindrababu@drreddys.com. |
| 4 | Sri Y.V.Subba Rao, Managing Director, M/s RPP Ltd., H.No.1-B, Arora Colony, Road No.3, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad 500 034. Phone Nos.(040)23544139 & 23542109; Fax No.(040)23540793; email: info@rppgroup.co.in. |
| 5 | Sri R.K.Agarwal, Hon. Chairman, M/s Andhra Pradesh Spinning Mills Association, 105, 1 st Floor, Surya Towers, Sardar Patel Road, Secunderabad 500 003. Phone No.(040)27890041; Mobile No.9849028556; Fax No.(040)27846837; email: contact@apspin.com. |
| 6 | Dr.K.Selvaraju, Secretary General, M/s The Southern India Mills' Association, Post Box No.3783, 41 Race Course, Coimbatore 641 018. Phone No.(0422)4225333; Fax No.(0422)4225366; email: info@simamills.org. |
| 7 | Sri Roberto de Barros Bezerra, Industrial Director, M/s Gerdau Steel India Ltd., Jambulapadu (V), Tadipatri (M), Anantapur 515 411. Phone No.(08558)306168; Fax No.(08558)306111. |
| 8 | Sri P.Narendranath Chowdary, Managing Director, M/s The Andhra Sugars Ltd., Chemicals & Fertilisers Division, Kovvur 534 350. Phone Nos.(08813)231597 to 599; Fax No.(08813)231218; emails: info.tnk@theandhrasugars.com & asltnk@vsnl.com . |
| 9 | Sri A.Bharat Reddy, Director, M/s Elcon Greengen India Pvt. Ltd., 201, Snowdrop Building, 6-3-1112/7, Kirtilal Jewellers Lane, Begumpet, Hyderabad 500 016. Phone Nos.(040)40068127 & 40068128; email: inof@elcongreengen.in. |
| 10 | Sri N.Padma Rao, Executive Director, M/s Jyoti Bio-Energy Ltd., Mayank Towers, # 6-3-1090/B/1&2/401, 4 th Floor, Raj Bhavan Road, Hyderabad 500 082. Phone No.(040)30602073; Fax No.(08593)252952. |
| 11 | Sri Suresh Kumar Singhal, Chairman, All India Induction Furnace Association (South Central Region), 5-5-103 to 105/6, Meher Complex, 1 st Floor, Ranigunj, Secunderabad 500 003. Phone No.(040)27714591; Fax No.(040)27714403; email: ssmpl09@gmail.com. |
| 12 | Sri P.G.Raj Mohan, Asst. General Manager-P.R., M/s R.A.K.Ceramics India Pvt. Ltd., P.B.No.11, IDA Peddapuram, ADB Road, Samalkot, East Godavari Dist. 533 440. Phone No.(0884)2329344; Fax No.(0884)2329343; email: officemail@rakceramindia.com. |

| Sl. | Name & Address of the Objector |
|------------|--|
| 13 | Sri Pramod Kumar Agarwal, Director, M/s Sitaram Spinners Pvt. Ltd., Rama Towers, 2 nd Floor, 5-4-83, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Secunderabad 500 003. Mobile No.9397851499; Fax No.(040)27543804; email: cottonspinners@gmail.com. |
| 14 | Sri Gopal Agarwal, Director, M/s Rama Spinners Pvt. Ltd., Rama Towers, 2 nd Floor, 5-4-83, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Secunderabad 500 003. Phone Nos.(040)23447321 & 23447322; Fax No.(040)27543804; email: cottonspinners@gmail.com. |
| 15 | Sri Pramod Kumar Agarwal, Director, M/s MS Agarwal Foundries Pvt. Ltd., Rama Towers, 2 nd Floor, 5-4-83, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Secunderabad 500 003. Phone Nos.(040)23447321, 23447322 & 27543803; Fax No.(040)27543804; email: msthermex@gmail.com. |
| 16 | Sri Pramod Kumar Agarwal, Director, M/s Agarwal Foundries, Rama Towers, 2 nd Floor, 5-4-83, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Secunderabad 500 003. Phone Nos.(040)23447321, 22, 27543803; Fax No.(040)27543804; email: msthermex@gmail.com. |
| 17 | Smt. P.Vydehi, The Federation of Andhra Pradesh Chambers of Commerce & Industry, Federation House, FAPCCI Marg, Red Hills, Hyderabad 500 004. Phone Nos.(040)23395515 to 22; Fax No.(040)23395525; email: info@fapcci.in |
| 19 | Sri Venugopala Rao, Convener, Centre for Power Studies, H.No.7-1-408 to 413, Flat 203, Balkampet Road, Ameerpet, Hyderabad 500 016. email: vrmummareddi@gmail.com. |
| 19 | Sri M.Thimma Reddy, Convenor, People's Monitoring Group on Electricity Regulation, email: thimmanna_m@rediffmail.com |
| 20 | Sri K.Raghu, Certified Energy Manager and Auditor, Cordinator, Telangana Electricity Employee's JAC, 204, SCK Residency, Red Hills, Lakdi-ka-pul, Hyderabad 500 004. email: kancharla.raghu@gmail.com. |
| 21 | Sri R.Kishore, Sr. Engineer, M/s Amara Raja Batteries Ltd., Karakambadi, Tirupati, 517 520. Phone No.(0877)2265000; Fax No.(0877)2285600; email: amararaja@amararaja.co.in. |
| 22 | Sri Srinivas, M/s Steel Exchange India Ltd., 303, My Home Laxminivas, Opp. Dr.Reddy's Labs, Greenlands, Ameerpet, Hyderabad 500 016. Phone No.(040)23403725; Fax No.(040)23413267; email: pyxishyd1@yahoo.com. |
| 23 | Sri B.S.S.V.Narayana, Manager (Finance & Accounts), M/s Synergies Casting Ltd., Plot No.3 & F, VSEZ, Duvvada, Visakhapatnam 530 049. email: narayanbssv@synergies-india.com. |
| 24 | Sri Chiranjib Das, CEO, M/s Scan Energy & Power Ltd., Sy.No.34, 35 & 36, Kondurg Village & Mandal, Mahabubnagar. email: hyderabad@scansteel.com. |
| 25 | Sri Mahender Boda, General Manager, Plant Operations, M/s Owens Cornigns Ltd., formerly M/s Sain Gobain Vetrotex (I) Ltd., Thimmapur, Kothur Mandal, Mahabubnagar 509 325; email: ckrassociates@rediffmail.com. |
| 26 | Sri I.Gopinath, Sr. V.P. (Corporate Affairs), M/s India Cements Ltd., White House, Block-III B, III Floor, 6-3-1192/1/1, Kundanbagh, Begumpet, Hyderabad 500 016. email: ckrassociates@rediffmail.com. |