

**Record of proceedings dated 03.01.2022**

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 10 of 2021	M/s. Medak Solar Projects Private Limited	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, advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner has agreed before the Hon'ble ATE that it will not press this petition until further orders of the Hon'ble ATE. As such, the matter may be adjourned. The representative of the respondents stated that the appeal filed by them is likely to be listed during the course of next week before the Hon'ble ATE. However, the matter may be adjourned to a longer date. Having considered the submissions made by the parties, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 11.04.2022 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 2021	M/s. Dubbak Solar Projects Private Limited	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, advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner has agreed before the Hon'ble ATE that it will not press this petition until further orders of the Hon'ble ATE. As such, the matter may be adjourned. The representative of the respondents stated that the appeal filed by them is likely to be listed during the course of next week before the Hon'ble ATE. However, the matter may be adjourned to a longer date. Having considered the submissions made by the parties, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 11.04.2022 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 2021	M/s. Sarvotham Care	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, advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner has agreed before the Hon'ble ATE that it will not press this petition until further orders of the Hon'ble ATE. As such, the matter may be adjourned. The representative of the respondents stated that the appeal filed by them is likely to be listed during the course of next week before the Hon'ble ATE. However, the matter may be adjourned to a longer date. Having considered the submissions made by the parties, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 11.04.2022 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. 24 of 2021	M/s. Prashanth Narayan G (PNG)	TSSPDCL & TSTRANSCO

Petition filed seeking the energy generated fed into the grid for the period before open access as deemed purchase of licensee or pay for the same.

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, counsel for the petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that he needs further time to file rejoinder in the matter as the authorized signatory to the same is not available, as such the rejoinder will be filed in about two weeks. The representative of the respondents has no object to the same. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 31.01.2022 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. 47 of 2021 & I. A. No. 20 of 2021	M/s. Mytrah Vayu (Godavari) Private Limited	TSSPDCL, TSTRANSCO & TSPCC

Petition filed seeking payment of amounts towards energy supplied and rebate claimed by the DISCOM in the year 2016.

I. A. filed seeking direction to the respondent No. 1 not to deduct for generation beyond 23% and consequently to make payments in full towards the invoices raised by the petitioner for the energy generated and supplied by the petitioner.

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the reply to the counter affidavit has been filed. The representative of the respondents stated that they are yet to receive the same. As such, the same has been made available by the office of the Commission today. Therefore, the matter may be adjourned. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 31.01.2022 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. 54 of 2021	M/s. Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Limited	CE TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking to punish the respondents for non-compliance of the order of dated 18.02.2021 in O. P. No. 25 of 2020 passed by the Commission.

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Y. Rama Rao, Advocate for respondent No. 1 and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent No. 2 are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the issue raised in the present petition is with regard to allowing open access on short term basis on which a finding had been rendered by this Commission in the case of the petitioner itself. He has readout the relevant portions of the earlier order passed by the Commission in O. P. No. 25 of 2020 and also explained the subsequent events that have happened in respect of short term open access sought by the petitioner through various letters and communications made between the parties. He also explained the facts arising in the present case and sought action against the respondents. It is stated that the licensee failed to give effect to the observations made by the Commission earlier in the order dated 18.02.2021 in O. P. No. 25 of 2020. The licensee resorted to replying the applications made by the petitioner for short term open access without reasons. Therefore, the petitioner is before the Commission for taking action against the licensee.

The representative of the respondents reiterated the contents of the counter affidavits. The Commission sought to know his reply on the observations made earlier by the Commission in the earlier order dated 18.02.2021. The representative of the licensee was not forthcoming on any of the aspects and left the matter to be dealt by the SLDC. The counsel for respondent No. 1, while reiterating the contents of the counter affidavit of the respondent No. 1, stated that his actions are dependent on the information furnished by the respondent No. 2. It is also his case that section 42 of the Act, 2003 requires wider interpretation in the given circumstances in appropriate case.

The counsel for petitioner stated that the open access sought for is well within the contracted demand availed from the licensee, yet the licensee is not inclined to grant open access. The Commission may consider the difficulty of the petitioner. 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. 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 petitioner stated that the office file has been misplaced in his office, though he is ready to argue the matter. To trace the record and submit the arguments in the matter, he has sought short adjournment. The representative of the respondents stated that it is an old matter. In view of the request of the counsel for petitioner, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 02.02.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

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) Sangareddy TSSPDCL

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 petitioner stated that the office file has been misplaced in his office, though he is ready to argue the matter. To trace the record and submit the arguments in the matter, he has sought short adjournment. The representative of the respondents stated that it is an old matter. In view of the request of the counsel for petitioner, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 02.02.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

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 petitioner stated that the office file has been misplaced in his office, though he is ready to argue the matter. To trace the record and submit the arguments in the matter, he has sought short adjournment. The representative of the respondents stated that it is an old matter. In view of the request of the counsel for petitioner, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 02.02.2022 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. (SR) No. 31 of 2021	M/s. Sri Sai Ram Ice Factory	TSSPDCL & its officers

Petition filed seeking refund of the amounts paid towards electricity charges and punishing the respondents for non-compliance of the order of the Ombudsman U/s 146 of the Act, 2003.

Ms. Nishtha, Advocate representing Sri Yogeshwar Raj Saxena, advocate for petitioner is present. The advocate representing the counsel for petitioner has stated

that the petition is filed for violating the order of the Vidyuth Ombudsman as well as this Commission and disconnecting the power supply to the petitioner's unit. The Commission pointed out that the licensee had approached the Hon'ble High Court against the order of the Ombudsman and obtained orders. The advocate has stated that there is no nexus between the writ petition filed by the licensee and this petition. However, the writ petition is scheduled to be listed this week. The Commission, having heard the submissions of the advocate, reserved the matter for orders.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 36 of 2021	M/s. L. B. Kunjir	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking reimbursement of the principle amount along with DPS / LPS for the energy supplied to the DISCOM.

Sri Uma Shankar, advocate representing Sri V. N. Bohra, advocate for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee respondent are present. The advocate representing the counsel for petitioner stated that the counter affidavit is not yet filed despite granting time. The representative of the respondent has sought further time to file the counter affidavit. The Commission made it clear that the licensee shall file its counter affidavit on or before 17.01.2022 duly serving a copy of it to the counter for petitioner by way of e-mail or in physical form without fail. The counsel for petitioner may filed a rejoinder, if any, on or before the date of hearing duly serving a copy of the same to the respondent through e-mail or in physical form. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 31.01.2022 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. 38 of 2020	M/s. Sri Ambika Steel Industries	TSSPDCL & its officers

Petition filed seeking penal action against the TSSPDCL and its officers for non-compliance of the directions given in the order dated 09.09.2021 by the Commission.

Ms. Nishtha, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The advocate representing the petitioner has stated that

the directions of the Commission have not been complied with till date. The Commission sought to know the status of the submission made earlier about the filing of appeal and obtaining the orders thereof. The representative of the respondents stated that the appeal has been preferred before the Hon'ble ATE and DFR number has been assigned. The appeal is likely to be listed for admission during the course of next ten days. Therefore, he sought a short adjournment of the matter. The Commission is not inclined to accept the request for adjournment of the matter. However, the representative persisted for adjournment. In view of the request of the respondents, the matter is adjourned on payment of cost of Rs. 10,000/- to be identified and communicated by the office.

Call on 31.01.2022 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. (SR) No. 8 of 2021 & I. A. (SR) No. 9 of 2021	M/s. Sneha Renewable Energies Ltd.	Prl. Secretary to GoTS, Energy Dept., TSSPDCL & TSTRANSCO

Petition filed seeking directions to enter into PPA by fixing tariff at Rs. 5/- per unit.

I. A. filed seeking interim directions to purchase power from the petitioner on payment of average pooled purchase costs till the disposal of the petition.

Sri P. Keshava Reddy, Managing Director for petitioner is present. The representative of the petitioner has stated that the counsel on record is not well and is unable to attend the hearing. The Commission sought to know whether judgments proposed to be filed have been filed. The representative replied in the affirmative. In view of the request of the representative, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 17.01.2022 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
R. P. No. 2 of 2021 in O. P. No. 26 of 2016	TSGENCO	TSDISCOMs. APDISCOMs & ESCOMs

Review petition filed seeking review of the order dated 05.06.2017 in O. P. No. 26 of 2016 passed by the Commission.

Sri Y. Rama Rao, Advocate for review petitioner, Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for the respondent Nos. 1 and 2, Sri G. V. Brahmananda Rao, advocate representing Sri P. Shiva Rao, Advocate for respondent Nos. 3 and 4 and Sri B. Srikanth, Advocate representing M/s. Just Law Firm for respondent No. 5 are present. The counsel for review petitioner stated that the review petition was filed in the year 2017 itself and it was within the limitation as specified by the Commission in the Conduct of Business Regulation. The objection taken by the respondent Nos. 3 to 5 is untenable as the review petition is against the order dated 05.06.2017. The contentions raised in the review petition do not constitute grounds for appeal as specific issues relating to the conditions of review being arithmetical mistakes or error apparent on the face of the record have been undertaken in the review petition.

The counsel for review petitioner elaborately dealt with the aspects of review and demonstrated the requirement of reviewing the order passed by the Commission with regard to arithmetical mistakes and error apparent on the face of the record. He waded through the various tables and figures mentioned in the original filings and the order passed thereof insofar as those aspects are concerned. It is his contention that the application of regulations and the provisions of the tariff determination exercised have resulted in miscalculations and wrong findings causing loss to the review petitioner.

The Commission undertook the determination of tariff for the control period based on the submissions of the review petitioner and different stakeholders, but applied inappropriate regulations, which is detrimental to the interest of the review petitioner. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that the Commission reviewed the order to correct the errors as pointed out by the review petitioner.

The counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 3 to 5 have sought further time to file the counter affidavit. However, the Commission expresses its displeasure in granting further time, but allowed them to file written arguments in the matter on or before 17.01.2022.

Having heard the counsel for review petitioner, 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. 1 of 2019	CESS, Sircilla	-None-

Petition filed seeking determination of filing of ARR and expected revenue charges for FY 2020-21.

Sri Rama Krishna, Managing Director for petitioner is present. The representative of the society stated that the petition is filed for determination of tariff for FY 2020-221 and explained the details in the petition. Having heard the submissions of the representative, 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. 1 of 2020	CESS, Sircilla	-None-

Petition filed seeking determination of filing of ARR and expected revenue charges for FY 2019-20.

Sri Rama Krishna, Managing Director for petitioner is present. The representative of the society stated that the petition is filed for determination of tariff for FY 2020-221 and explained the details in the petition. Having heard the submissions of the representative, 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. 1 of 2021	CESS, Sircilla	-None-

Petition filed seeking determination of filing of ARR and expected revenue charges for FY 2021-22.

Sri Rama Krishna, Managing Director for petitioner is present. The representative of the society stated that the petition is filed for determination of tariff for FY 2020-221 and explained the details in the petition. Having heard the submissions of the representative, the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman