

Record of proceedings dated 18.04.2022

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 27 of 2016	M/s. Sugna Metals Limited	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 K. Natraj, Advocate representing Sri N. Vinesh Raj, advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The advocate representing the counsel for petitioner stated that there is stay obtained by the respondents. The representative of the licensee has stated that it had filed writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and obtained stay of the order of the Ombudsman. In view of the submissions of the parties, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 11.08.2022 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 2017 & I. A. No. 25 of 2017	M/s. Sundew Properties Limited	TSSPDCL & TSTRANSCO

Petition filed seeking transfer of distribution assets falling within the area of SEZ area.

I. A. filed seeking directions to respondent No. 1 to disconnect the consumers pertaining to SPL's licence area and handover the assets to the petitioner and also to the respondent No. 2 to grant transmission connectivity at 33 KV level on two Nos. of 33 KV SPL feeders.

Sri T. G. Rajesh Kumar, advocate representing M/s. J. Sagar Associates, counsel for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present.

The advocate representing the counsel for the petitioner stated that earlier the Commission required the parties to make an attempt to hammer out the salutation between them, but the same has not fructified. The representative of the respondents confirmed that the effects have failed. The advocate representing the

counsel for petitioner sought time to make submissions in the matter by two weeks.

In view of the request made by the advocate for petitioner, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 23.05.2022 at 11.30 AM.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 4 of 2021	M/s. Sundew Properties Limited	– None—

Petition filed seeking determination of tariff for the power procured by it / to be charged to its consumers with TSSPDCL tariff as the ceiling tariff.

Sri T. G. Rajesh Kumar, advocate representing M/s. J. Sagar Associates, counsel for petitioner is present. The advocate representing the counsel for the petitioner stated that the matter is connected with O. P. No. 16 of 2017 and accordingly, the same may be adjourned. Therefore, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 23.05.2022 at 11.30 AM.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. (SR) No. 57 of 2021 & I. A. (SR) No. 58 of 2021	M/s. Halo Energies Private Limited	TSSPDCL & its officers

Petition filed seeking to question the levy of cross subsidy surcharge towards the power drawn by its consumers.

I. A. filed seeking direction to the respondents not to deduct or recover CSS from the bills of its consumers pending disposal of the main petition.

There is no representation for petitioner. The Commission, having noticed that the adjournment was granted earlier to apprise it about the withdrawal of the writ petition filed by the writ petitioner, finds no information placed on record. However, Sri Deepak Chowdary, Advocate assisted the Commission by stating that the writ petition filed by the petitioner has been withdrawn, which information, he is in the know of the same. In view of the situation obtaining the matter, the petition is adjourned.

Call on 11.08.2022 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. 21 of 2022	M/s. Rain Cements Limited	TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking directions to the respondents to treat its WHRS plant as renewable source.

Sri Deepak Chowdary, Advocate representing Sri Challa Gunaranjan, advocate for petitioner is present. There is no representation for respondents. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for declaring the petitioner as a renewable source, however, while filing the petition the documents have mixed up and the same relating to petition filed before APERC have been filed in this petition, which are not relevant. He is proposing to file interlocutory application to place correct material on record. He sought time of two weeks. In view of the request made by the counsel for petitioner, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 02.05.2022 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. 27 of 2022	M/s. Penna Cements Industries Limited	TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking clarification and / or exemption from RPPO by considering the energy consumed from its WHRS plant through cogeneration process.

Sri Deepak Chowdary, Advocate representing Sri Challa Gunaranjan, advocate for petitioner is present. There is no representation for respondents. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for treating the petitioner's WHRS plant as a renewable source. The petitioner has not filed any submissions to the original proceedings in O. P. No. 31 of 2020 initiated by the Commission. The Commission had, while disposing of the petitions filed by M/s. India Cements and others, limited the application of RPPO compliance to 2018-19 only. The same relief may be granted in this petition also as has been observed in the orders referred above. The Commission pointed out that SLDC will initiate action in the matter and the Commission will take up the compliance aspect separately. However, the counsel for petitioner pointed out that the relief may be considered to a limited extent for the present in this case and it will be constrained to file every year seeking such

exemption. As there is no representation for the respondents and nothing more can be added by them apart from the findings reached already by the Commission, 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. 24 of 2022 & I. A. No. 13 of 2022	Sri Palabtlia Shiva Kumar	AE (Operation) Farooq Nagar, TSSPDCL & its officers

Petition seeking to punish the respondents for non-compliance of the interim order dated 01.12.2021 in Appeal No. 26 of 2021 passed by the Vidyut Ombudsman.

I. A. filed seeking to release power supply under domestic category against the NR 5152148494 dated 26.09.2021 in compliance of interim order dated 01.12.2021 in Appeal No. 26 of 2021 passed by V. O.

Sri K. Nataraj, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for implementation of the interim order passed by the Vidyut Ombudsman. The petitioner has also filed an interlocutory application for interim orders for release of power supply to the domestic connection. The counsel for petitioner stated that the respondents are not complying with the interim order of the Vidyut Ombudsman, as such the petition is filed under the clauses applicable for implementation of the order of the Ombudsman as well as the provisions made in the Conduct of Business Regulations, 2015. The respondents are required to comply with the order and thereafter, they should contest the matter before the Vidyut Ombudsman.

The counsel for petitioner stated that the respondents are demanding payment of amounts towards arrears with which the petitioner or the seller of the premises is not concerned. It is stated in the rejoinder that the present petition is intended for implementing the order of the Vidyut Ombudsman and if the respondents are aggrieved by the said order, they may take appropriate remedies.

The representative of the respondents relying in the counter affidavit stated that the present is not maintainable and the petitioner has an opportunity to seek implementation of the order Vidyut Ombudsman before the said authority itself. The

present petition is filed invoking clauses in the Business Regulation, 2015 which pertain to the orders of the Commission and not that of the Vidyut Ombudsman. The respondents being aggrieved by the order of the Ombudsman have already approached the Hon'ble High Court, but the same is not yet registered. In any case, the petitioner should have pursued the appeal before the Ombudsman without waiting for disposal of the same, has approached the Commission with this petition.

The Commission sought to know from the counsel for petitioner as to what is the stand of the petitioner insofar as maintainability of the petition, as nothing is mentioned in reply to the contention of the respondents made in the counter. The counsel for petitioner did not provide any answer to the same. Further, the representative of the respondents sought to rely on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 1815 of 2020 in the matter between Telangana State Southern Power Distribution Company Limited & Anr. Vs. M/s. Srigdha Beverages. The said judgment requires the purchaser of the premises or industrial unit to pay the earlier owner dues.

In view of 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)
O. P. No. 25 of 2022	M/s. The Hyderabad Institute of Oncology Private Limited	TSTRANSCO & TSDISCOMs

Petition filed seeking payment of amount towards power supplied to the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 from February, 2018 to November, 2021.

Sri KSSV. Raghava Reddy, Advocate representing Sri P. Narender Naik, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for petitioner sought time for filing the rejoinder to the counter affidavit, however, the counter affidavit has not been received by him till date. A copy of the counter affidavit is made available by the respondents during the course of hearing. The counsel for petitioner sought two weeks time for filing rejoinder and hearing may be scheduled in the month of June, 2022. The Commission, while recording the receipt of counter affidavit, directs the petitioner to file the rejoinder within two weeks that is by 02.05.2022 duly serving a copy to the respondents. The

hearing will be scheduled after two weeks thereafter. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 23.05.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman