

Record of proceedings dated 14.11.2022

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 32 of 2015 & I. A. No. 5 of 2015	M/s. Tata Power Trading Company Ltd.	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 M. Ramakanth, Advocate for petitioner and Sri D. N. Sarma, OSD (Legal and Commercial) for respondents are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the matter before the Hon'ble High Court is yet to be decided, it is not seeing the light of the day though efforts are made for listing the same by filing a petition also. Therefore, adjournment may be granted for a longer period with a date. The representative of the respondents did not oppose the same. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 09.01.2023 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 the parties have taken steps to find a solution to the issue and a meeting was taken for that purpose. However, no tangible result has been arrived at. The representative of the

respondents stated that the meeting did take place and the respondents would communicate their view shortly. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 09.01.2023 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 09.01.2023 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. 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. Vishwanath Yadav, Advocate representing Sri. N. Vinesh Raj, counsel for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The advocate representing the counsel for petitioner stated that the matter filed before the Hon'ble High Court is still pending. The representative of the respondents stated that the matter is still pending before the Hon'ble High Court and he would submit the developments, if any, on the next date of hearing. The Commission in view of the submissions made by the parties is not inclined to give any date for the present and would schedule the same for hearing on filing of a memo by either of the parties bringing the fact of disposal of the proceedings pending before the Hon'ble High Court. Hence the matter is adjourned without giving any date.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 59 of 2018	TSDISCOMs	APGENCO, APTRANSCO & APDISCOMs

Petition filed seeking certain directions to APGENCO and APDISCOMs

Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for petitioners is present. There is no representation on behalf of the respondents. The representative of the petitioners stated that there is a pending litigation before the Hon'ble High Court. The Commission, in view of the submissions made by the representative of the petitioners, is not inclined to give any date for the present and would schedule the same for hearing on filing of a memo by any of the parties bringing the fact of disposal of the proceedings pending before the Hon'ble High Court. Hence the matter is adjourned without giving any date.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 38 of 2021	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, counsel for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the appeal filed by the respondents is pending before the Hon'ble ATE. The representative of the respondents also confirmed the same. The Commission, in view of the submissions made by the parties, is not inclined to give any date for the present and would schedule the same for hearing on filing of a memo by either of the parties bringing the fact of disposal of the proceedings pending before the Hon'ble ATE. Hence the matter is adjourned without giving any date.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 28 of 2022	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 Vidyut Ombudsman U/S. 146 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Ms. Nishtha, Advocate representing Sri. Yogeshwar Raj Saxena, Advocate for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The advocate representing the counsel for petitioner stated that the writ petition filed by the respondents is pending before the Hon'ble High Court. The representative of the respondents also confirmed the same. The Commission, in view of the submissions made by the parties, is not inclined to give any date for the present and would schedule the same for hearing on filing of a memo by either of the parties bringing the fact of disposal of the proceedings pending before the Hon'ble High Court. Hence the matter is adjourned without giving any date.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 74 of 2022	M/s. Dinkar Technologies Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking extension of SCOD and consequential reliefs.

Ms. Meghna Sarma, counsel for petitioner and Sri Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the matter is coming up for the first time. The representative of the respondent has sought time of one month for filing counter affidavit. In view of the request of the representative of the respondent, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 09.01.2023 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. (SR) 101 of 2022	M/s. Mahaveer Ferro Alloys	TSSPDCL & its officers

Petition filed seeking declaration of claim of development charges along with interest on restoration of CMD and consequential relief including punishing the respondents.

Ms. Nishtha, counsel for petitioner is present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the matter is coming up for admission of the petition and issue of the maintainability is raised. It is her submission that the petitioner is being mulcted with development charges for the second time, as the unit got restored after going through sick industry process. This is contrary to the principle of no-double taxation. The Commission

sought to know from the counsel for petitioner as to why this petition should be entertained as the core issue of development charges is pending consideration before the Hon'ble High Court as appraised to it. On this aspect, the counsel for petitioner stated that there is a distinction that can be made in respect of this matter and the issue pending before the Hon'ble High Court. The same issue is not being agitated here and the claim of the respondent is incorrect, as the same charges cannot be levied twice. The Commission ascertained whether notice is issued to the respondents and received a reply in negative from the representative of the licensee. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned. The office is directed to take necessary steps in the matter.

Call on 09.01.2023 at 11.30 AM.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman