

Record of proceedings dated 31.10.2022

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 49 of 2022	M/s. Vena Energy Solar India Power Pvt. Ltd.	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking directions to the respondent for payment of dues along with late payment surcharge duly complying with the provisions of PPA of the project situated at Sadasivpet (V), Medak District

Sri. Aditya K. Singh, counsel for petitioner along with Mrs. Anukriti Jain, Advocate and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due inspite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the

arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 50 of 2022	M/s. Vena Energy Solar India Power Pvt. Ltd.	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking directions to the respondent for payment of dues along with late payment surcharge duly complying with the provisions of PPA of the project situated at Minpur (V), Medak District

Sri. Aditya K. Singh, counsel for petitioner along with Mrs. Anukriti Jain, Advocate and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing.

The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due inspite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no

clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 52 of 2022 & I. A. No. 42 of 2022	M/s. Ujjvalatejas Solaire Urja Pvt. Ltd.	TSNPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordanced with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent to pay 80% of the pending amounts to USUPL within one week as well as to deposit the balance 20% of the pending amounts with the Commission.

Sri. Rohit Venkat, counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no

details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due inspite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment. To rebut the figures of the respondent, the petitioner, on its side, is filing the details of calculations as also the amount due to it to enable the Commission to direct specifically the amounts to be paid by the licensee. The counsel for petitioner made brief written submission highlighting the decisions of the Hon'ble ATE alongwith the background of the case reflecting the events in the matter. He also filed notes on the issues arising in the petition with due reference to the calculations, decisions of the superior fora as also the policy decisions of the government.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which

are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 at 11.30 AM.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Record of proceedings dated 31.10.2022

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 53 of 2022 & I. A. No. 43 of 2022	M/s. Suprasanna Solaire Urja Pvt. Ltd.	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent to pay 80% of the pending amounts to SSUPL within one week as well as to deposit the balance 20% of the pending amounts with the Commission.

Sri. Rohit Venkat, counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount

that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lessor amount of the total payment due inspite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment. To rebut the figures of the respondent, the petitioner, on its side, is filing the details of calculations as also the amount due to it to enable the Commission to direct specifically the amounts to be paid by the licensee. The counsel for petitioner made brief written submission highlighting the decisions of the Hon'ble ATE alongwith the background of the case reflecting the events in the matter. He also filed notes on the issues arising in the petition with due reference to the calculations, decisions of the superior fora as also the policy decisions of the government.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 at 11.30 AM.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Record of proceedings dated 31.10.2022

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 54 of 2022 & I. A. No. 44 of 2022	M/s. Nirjara Solaire Urja Pvt. Ltd.	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the respondent and consequently payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent to pay 80% of the pending amounts to NSUPL within one week as well as to deposit the balance 20% of the pending amounts with the Commission.

Sri. Rohit Venkat, counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by

22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due inspite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment. To rebut the figures of the respondent, the petitioner, on its side, is filing the details of calculations as also the amount due to it to enable the Commission to direct specifically the amounts to be paid by the licensee. The counsel for petitioner made brief written submission highlighting the decisions of the Hon'ble ATE alongwith the background of the case reflecting the events in the matter. He also filed notes on the issues arising in the petition with due reference to the calculations, decisions of the superior fora as also the policy decisions of the government.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 59 of 2022 & I. A. No. 49 of 2022	M/s. Achampet Solar Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the DISCOM and consequential payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent No. 1 to pay 80% of the pending amounts to ASPL within one week pending final adjudication.

Sri. Amit Kapur along with Sri. T. G. Rejesh, counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the

other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement along with the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due in spite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment. To rebut the figures of the respondent, the petitioner, on its side, is filing the details of calculations as also the amount due to it to enable the Commission to direct specifically the amounts to be paid by the licensee.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired

that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 60 of 2022 & I. A. No. 48 of 2022	M/s. Padmajiwadi Solar Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the DISCOM and consequential payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent No. 1 to pay 80% of the pending amounts to PSPL within one week pending final adjudication.

Sri. Amit Kapur along with Sri. T. G. Rejesh, counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while

passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due in spite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment. To rebut the figures of the respondent, the petitioner, on its side, is filing the details of calculations as also the amount due to it to enable the Commission to direct specifically the amounts to be paid by the licensee.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received

from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 61 of 2022 & I. A. No. 46 of 2022	M/s. Ghanpur Solar Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the DISCOM and consequential payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent No. 1 to pay 80% of the pending amounts to GSPL within one week pending final adjudication.

Sri. Amit Kapur along with Sri. T. G. Rejesh, counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the

petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due inspite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment. To rebut the figures of the respondent, the petitioner, on its side, is filing the details of calculations as also the amount due to it to enable the Commission to direct specifically the amounts to be paid by the licensee.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to

corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 62 of 2022 & I. A. No. 50 of 2022	M/s. Thukkapur Solar Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the DISCOM and consequential payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent No. 1 to pay 80% of the pending amounts to TSPL within one week pending final adjudication.

Sri. Amit Kapur along with Sri. T. G. Rejesh, counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lessor amount of the total payment due inspite

of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment. To rebut the figures of the respondent, the petitioner, on its side, is filing the details of calculations as also the amount due to it to enable the Commission to direct specifically the amounts to be paid by the licensee.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 63 of 2022 & I. A. No. 51 of 2022	M/s. Renjal Solar Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the DISCOM and consequential payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent No. 1 to pay 80% of the pending amounts to RSPL within one week pending final adjudication.

Sri. Amit Kapur along with Sri. T. G. Rejesh, counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lessor amount of the total payment due inspite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment. To rebut the figures of the respondent, the petitioner, on its side, is filing the details of calculations as also the amount due to it

to enable the Commission to direct specifically the amounts to be paid by the licensee.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 64 of 2022 & I. A. No. 47 of 2022	M/s. Gummadidala Solar Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the DISCOM and consequential payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

I. A. filed seeking interim order directing the respondent No. 1 to pay 80% of the pending amounts to GSPL within one week pending final adjudication.

Sri. Amit Kapur along with Sri. T. G. Rejesh, counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lessor amount of the total payment due inspite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment. To rebut the figures of the respondent, the petitioner, on its side, is filing the details of calculations as also the amount due to it to enable the Commission to direct specifically the amounts to be paid by the licensee.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the

arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 65 of 2022	M/s. Essel Mining & Industries Limited (10 MW Mustyal plant)	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the DISCOM and consequential payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri. Aditya K. Singh, counsel for petitioner along with Mrs. Anukriti Jain, Advocate and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the

amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due inspite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired

that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 66 of 2022	M/s. Essel Mining & Industries Limited (5 MW Achampet plant)	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the DISCOM and consequential payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri. Aditya K. Singh, counsel for petitioner along with Mrs. Anukriti Jain, Advocate and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal

amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due in spite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the

licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 67 of 2022	M/s. Essel Mining & Industries Limited (10 MW Pedda Shankarampeta plant)	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the DISCOM and consequential payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri. Aditya K. Singh, Advocate for petitioner along with Mrs. Anukriti Jain, Advocate and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due inspite of the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction

of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 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. 68 of 2022	M/s. Essel Mining & Industries Limited (10 MW Kalwakurthy plant)	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking release of payments due to the petitioner by the DISCOM and consequential payment of future bills in a timely manner in accordance with PPA.

Sri. Aditya K. Singh, counsel for petitioner along with Mrs. Anukriti Jain, Advocate and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is coming up for counter and hearing. The Commission had earlier required the respondent to file an affidavit indicating the amounts that are being paid through the financial agencies as also the quantum of instalment for the benefit of the petitioner. Though the Commission directed that such an affidavit be filed by 22.10.2022, the respondent has filed the same only the other day when it has been served on the petitioner. Even now, the respondent did not mention the LPS amount that is being considered for reimbursement alongwith the principal amount and no details are mentioned in the affidavit despite the fact that in the earlier round of cases, the Commission had specifically pointed out that LPS amount is liable to be paid to the petitioner and directed accordingly while passing orders in the said batch of cases. According to the PPA, the respondent has to clearly identify and pay the LPS amount the moment the payment of principal amount has been delayed upon submission of invoice for the purpose by the petitioner beyond the stipulated time. While explaining the provisions in the PPA with regard to billing and payment, it is stated that the DISCOM is entitled to rebate only when it has made payment of the original amount within the stipulated time, but, is liable to pay the LPS amount on delaying the payment of original amount beyond the period stipulated in the PPA. Contrary to the said provision, it is noticed that in some cases, the respondent has indicated a lesser amount of the total payment due inspite the figures mentioned by the petitioner in its petition. This amounted to reduction of the net payment and claiming rebate at a higher percentage than that is accepted in favour of DISCOM for early payment.

The representative of the respondent stated that they have filed the affidavit clearly indicating the amount that is proposed to be disbursed through the arrangement made with the financial institutions. The payment is particularly with reference to the principal amount. He has no instructions on the aspect of LPS amount, which is the bone of contention of the petitioner apart from the principal amount. He needs time to seek instructions as also clarification from the

management on the aspect of LPS payment to the generators apart from the principal amount committed in the affidavit.

The Commission expressed its dismay that the respondent filed affidavit without giving the complete picture of the payments sought to be made and which are not sought to be made. It is also noticed by the Commission that there is no clarity on the aspect of payment of LPS from the respondent. Therefore, it desired that the licensee shall place before the Commission the relevant particulars with regard to the principal amount as also LPS in respect of each of the generators. The Commission also enquired about undertaking any conciliation process before initiating the proceedings. The counsel for petitioner replied emphatically that no steps as provided in the PPA were initiated nor any communication was received from the respondent. Since the statement made by the licensee is insufficient and inadequate, the Commission desired the licensee to place proper information with regard to all the payments due including the subsequent period and the petitioner to corroborate by way of reply as to the details if any are missing in the statement of the licensee. In the circumstances, the matter is adjourned for further hearing including required corroboration of the figures by either side.

Call on 21.11.2022 at 11.30 AM.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Record of proceedings dated 31.10.2022

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 72 of 2022	M/s. Sunshakti Solar Power Projects Private Limited	TSNPDCL & its officer

Petition filed seeking extension of SCOD and consequential reliefs.

Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attachee for respondents is present. There is no representation for petitioner. Since the matter is required to be heard and the presence of the counsel for the petitioner is required for the purpose, the the matter is adjourned.

Call on 21.11.2022 at 11.30 AM.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman