

Record of proceedings dated 02.06.2021

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
Case No O. P. No. 3 of 2015	M/s. Geo Syndicate Power Private Limited	Vs. TSNPDCL

Petition filed seeking determination of tariff for the supply of electricity generated from geothermal energy to respondent pursuant to sections 62, 64, 86 (1) (a) & (b) and other applicable provisions of the Act, 2003.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner despite service of notice. Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee, of TSSPDCL representative the respondent and has appeared through video conference. The representative of the respondent stated that the respondent was under the impression that the petitioner would file a detailed report and that they will submit their arguments in the matter. However, as directed and as represented by him on earlier hearing, he submitted his arguments. It is stated that the price quoted by the generator is very high at the rate of Rs. 8.85. Therefore, the coordination committee of the DISCOMs decided not to procure the power. He also stated and explained the earlier sequence of events in the matter. It is his case that the power generated by the petitioner cannot be procured due to high cost. Therefore, the Commission may consider refusing the request of the petitioner.

Heard the representative of the respondent and the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 32 of 2015 & I. A. No. 5 of 2015	M/s. Tata Power Trading Company Ltd	. Vs. TSDISCOMs, APSPDCL, APEPDCL and APPCC

Petition filed seeking questioning the illegal, unilateral and wrongful deduction of Rs. 9,72,00,000/- and Rs. 96,48,000/- towards illegal compensation claim for supply of short term power.

I. A. filed seeking release of Rs. 9,72,00,000/- and Rs. 96,48,000/- in lieu of bank guarantee for corresponding amounts.

Sri Vishal, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. D. N. Sarma, OSD (Legal and Commercial) for respondents have appeared through video conference. The counsel for the petitioner stated that he has filed a memo about the pending case before the Hon'ble High Court. He stated that the matter is likely to be listed the first week of July, 2021. He sought adjournment of matter in view of the stay granted by the Hon'ble High Court which is in operation. Accordingly the matter is adjourned.

Call on 15.07.2021 at 11:30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 8 of 2021	M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited	Vs TSDISCOMs

Petition filed seeking resolution of disputes regarding billing u/s. 86 (1) (f) of the Act, 2003.

Sri. Brahamananda Rao, Advocate representing Sri P. Siva Rao, the counsel for petitioner and Sri. D. N. Sarma, OSD (Legal and Commercial) along with Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee, of TSSPDCL for the respondents have appeared through video conference. The advocate for the petitioner sought time for filing rejoinder to the counter affidavit in the matter which is already filed and received by them. Accordingly the matter is adjourned as a last chance for filing rejoinder the counsel for petitioner may file the rejoinder on or before the next date of hearing by duly serving a copy of the same on the respondents in advance either through email or in physical form.

Call on 28.06.2021 at 11.30 AM.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 3 of 2021 & I. A. No. 29 of 2017	M/s. REI Power Bazaar Private Ltd	Vs TSTRANSCO, TSDISCOMs & TSGENCO

Petition filed seeking to establish power market (power exchange) in the State of Telangana u/s 86 (1) (k) r/w section 66 of the Act, 2003.

I. A. filed seeking to receive additional documents for consideration of the original petition.

Sri. Abhinay Raddy, Advocate representing Sri P. Vikram, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. D. N. Sarma, OSD (Legal & Commercial) along with Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee of TSSPDCL for the respondents have appeared through video conference. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner has filed all the documents however, he needs time to verify if any documents are required to be filed. Therefore, he sought adjournment in the matter. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 16.06.2021 at 11.30 AM.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 70 of 2018	M/s. Sugna Metals Limited	Vs. TSSPDCL & its officers

Petition filed seeking directions to readjust the open access demand and to punish the licensee for not refunding the excess amount collected towards charges.

Sri. N. Vinesh Raj, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee of TSSPDCL for the respondents have appeared through video conference. The counsel for the petitioner sought further time to make submissions in the matter by stating that due to the pandemic situation he is not able to establish contact with the party and they are unable to come for discussion. The representative of the respondents has no objection. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 15.07.2021 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 20 of 2016 & I. A. No. 13 of 2016	M/s. Sugna Metals Limited	Vs. DE (Operation) TSSPDCL & its officers

Petition filed questioning the action of DISCOM in not implementing the order of the CGRF and to punish the licensee u/s 142 of the Act, 2003.

I. A. filed seeking interim orders not to disconnect the power supply pending disposal of the original petition.

Sri. N. Vinesh Raj, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee of TSSPDCL for the respondents have appeared through video conference. The counsel for the petitioner sought further time to make submissions in the matter by stating that the respondents have approached the Hon'ble High Court in the matter. The representative of the respondent stated that the matter is pending before the Hon'ble High Court. The counsel for the petitioner stated that due to the pandemic situation he is not able to establish contact with the party and they are unable to come for discussion. The representative of the respondents has no objection. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 15.07.2021 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 27 of 2016	M/s. Sugna Metals Limited	Vs. DE (O) Vikarabad TSSPDCL & its officers

Petition filed questioning the action of DISCOM in not implementing the order of the CGRF and to punish the licensee u/s 142 of the Act, 2003.

Sri. N. Vinesh Raj, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee of TSSPDCL for the respondents have appeared through video conference. The counsel for the petitioner sought further time to make submissions in the matter by stating that due to the pandemic situation he is not able to establish contact with the party and they are unable to come for discussion. The

representative of the respondents has no objection. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 15.07.2021 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
R. P. (SR) No. 4 of 2019 in O. P. No. 8 of 2017	M/s. Shree Cement Limited	Vs. TSSPDCL & Vedanta Limited (Previously known as Sesa Sterlite Limited)

Review petition filed seeking review of the order dated 01.11.2018 passed in O.P. No. 8 of 2017 by M/s Shree Cement Limited

Sri M. Abhinay Reddy, Advocate for the review petitioner, Sri D. N. Sarma, OSD (Legal & Commercial) for respondent No. 1 and Sri Lakshyajit Singh Bagwal, Advocate for the respondent No. 2 have appeared through video conference. The counsel for the review petitioner sought further time to file rejoinder in the matter insofar as the respondent No. 2's counter affidavit is concerned. In view of the request of the counsel for petitioner the matter is adjourned as a last chance. The petitioner shall file the rejoinder on or before the next date of hearing without fail by duly serving to the other parties either by email or in physical form. Accordingly the matter is adjourned.

Call on 16.06.2021 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 10 of 2021	M/s. Medak Solar Projects Private Limited	Vs. TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking to punish the respondents for non-compliance of the order dated 02.01.2019 in O. P. No. 46 of 2018 passed by the Commission.

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for the respondents have appeared through video conference. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the matter involves implementation of the order of the

Commission. The respondents have not been complying with the directions of the Commission. It was stated earlier that the respondents have approached the appellate forum questioning the order of the Commission but to his knowledge no notice or order has been communicated by any appellate forum be it Hon'ble High Court or the Hon'ble ATE. In the absence of any order from the appellate forum, the respondents are bound to give effect to the order of the Commission. In the event if they succeed in obtaining any order from the appellate forum, they can always revert back to the earlier stage. Either the respondents should implement the order or obtain order from the appellate forum by the next date of hearing, if the Commission is inclined to grant time. The representative of the respondent stated that as submitted earlier, the respondent have approached the Hon'be ATE by filing an appeal. However, due to the pandemic situation they are unable to get the same numbered and obtain orders against the directions of the Commission. The Hon'ble ATE is not taking up the appeals. Further the respondents seek time to either implement the orders of the Commission or obtain orders from the Hon'ble ATE for which time may be granted upto 6 (six) weeks. Therefore, the matter may be adjourned. The counsel for the petitioner would urge the Commission that the Commission should not give leverage to the respondents for non-implementation of the order which is 2 years 5 months old.

Having regard to the rival submissions, the matter is adjourned with the condition that the respondent shall report about compliance of the order on or before the next date of hearing.

Call on 15.07.2021 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 11 of 2021	M/s. Dubbak Solar Projects Private Limited	Vs. TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking to punish the respondents for non-compliance of the order dated 02.01.2019 in O. P. No. 47 of 2018 passed by the Commission.

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for the respondents have appeared through video conference. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the matter involves implementation of the order of the Commission. The respondents have not been complying with the directions of the Commission. It was stated earlier that the respondents have approached the appellate forum questioning the order of the Commission but to his knowledge no notice or order has been communicated by any appellate forum be it Hon'ble High Court or the Hon'ble ATE. In the absence of any order from the appellate forum, the respondents are bound to give effect to the order of the Commission. In the event if they succeed in obtaining any order from the appellate forum, they can always revert back to the earlier stage. Either the respondents should implement the order or obtain order from the appellate forum by the next date of hearing, if the Commission is inclined to grant time. The representative of the respondent stated that has submitted earlier, the respondent have approached the Hon'be ATE by filing an appeal. However, due to the pandemic situation they are unable to get the same numbered and obtain orders against the directions of the Commission. The Hon'ble ATE is not taking up the appeals. Further the respondents seek time to either implement the orders of the Commission or obtain orders from the Hon'ble ATE for which time may be granted upto 6 (six) weeks. Therefore, the matter may be adjourned. The counsel for the petitioner would urge the Commission that the Commission should not give leverage to the respondents for non-implementation of the order which is 2 years 5 months old.

Having regard to the rival submissions, the matter is adjourned with the condition that the respondent shall report about compliance of the order on or before the next date of hearing.

Call on 15.07.2021 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 12 of 2021	M/s. Sarvotham Care	Vs. TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking to punish the respondents for non-compliance of the order dated 02.01.2019 in O. P. No. 61 of 2018 passed by the Commission.

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for the respondents have appeared through video conference. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the matter involves implementation of the order of the Commission. The respondents have not been complying with the directions of the Commission. It was stated earlier that the respondents have approached the appellate forum questioning the order of the Commission but to his knowledge no notice or order has been communicated by any appellate forum be it Hon'ble High Court or the Hon'ble ATE. In the absence of any order from the appellate forum, the respondents are bound to give effect to the order of the Commission. In the event if they succeed in obtaining any order from the appellate forum, they can always revert back to the earlier stage. Either the respondents should implement the order or obtain order from the appellate forum by the next date of hearing, if the Commission is inclined to grant time. The representative of the respondent stated that has submitted earlier, the respondent have approached the Hon'be ATE by filing an appeal. However, due to the pandemic situation they are unable to get the same numbered and obtain orders against the directions of the Commission. The Hon'ble ATE is not taking up the appeals. Further the respondents seek time to either implement the orders of the Commission or obtain orders from the Hon'ble ATE for which time may be granted upto 6 (six) weeks. Therefore, the matter may be adjourned. The counsel for the petitioner would urge the Commission that the Commission should not give leverage to the respondents for non-implementation of the order which is 2 years 5 months old.

Having regard to the rival submissions, the matter is adjourned with the condition that the respondent shall report about compliance of the order on or before the next date of hearing.

Call on 15.07.2021 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 72 of 2018	M/s. Kallam Spinning Mills Limited	Vs. TSDISCOMs

Petition filed seeking directions to the DISCOMs to procure power from its hydel project.

Sri P. Srinivasa Rao, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for the respondents have appeared through video conference. The counsel for the petitioner stated that as directed by the Commission the petitioner has approached the licensee for settlement of the issue of tariff between them. However, no amicable settlement could be reached in the matter. He has submitted the correspondence resting on the subject by way of memo filed on 01.06.2021 through email. He also relied on certain judgements. The representative of the respondents stated that they have offered the rate has decided by the combined Commission and sought to place reliance on the contentions in the counter affidavit.

Having heard the matter on earlier occasion in detail it is not required to hear all the contentions again. Therefore, the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
O. P. No. 59 of 2018	TSDISCOMs	Vs. APGENCO, APTRANSCO & APDISCOMs

O. P. No. 59 of 2018

TSDISCOMs Vs. APGENCO, APTRANSCO & APDISCOMs

Petition filed seeking certain directions to APGENCO and APDISCOMs

I. A. filed seeking interim directions to APGENCO not to proceed with coercive measures before any other forum in respect of the alleged claim to be paid by TSDISCOMs.

Sri Y. Rama Rao, Advocate for the petitioners and Sri Brahmananda Rao, Advocate representing the respondents has appeared through video conference. The counsel

for the petitioner stated that he needs time to make submissions in the matter however, as per the latest judgements the Commission alone has jurisdiction in the matter. The counsel for the respondent stated that the respondent GENCO had approach the National Company Law Tribunal. The matter is pending consideration. The respondent GENCO has also approached the Hon'ble High Court by filing writ petition in W. P. No. 42577 of 2018 which is also pending consideration. In view of the above the matter is may be adjourned. The counsel for petitioner stated that the matter may be adjourned for the present and he will make submissions on the next date of hearing. Accordingly adjourned.

Call on 29.07.2021 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No	Petitioner	Respondent
R. P. (SR) No. 132 of 2018 in O. P. No. 36 of 2018	M/s. GEA BGR Energy System India Limited	Vs. Spl. Chief Secretary, Energy Department, TSSPDCL & CGM (IPC & RAC) TSSPDCL

Review petition filed seeking review of the order dated 15.09.2018 passed in O. P. No. 36 of 2018.

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Advocate for the review petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents have appeared through video conference. The counsel for petitioner stated that the counter affidavit purported to have been filed is not yet served on him. The representative of the respondents stated that the counter affidavit is already filed and he would make available the counter affidavit immediately. The counsel for the petitioner sought adjournment of two weeks to file a rejoinder in the matter and also to make submission thereof. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 28.06.2021 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman