

Record of proceedings dated 11.01.2024

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 17 of 2023	Garrison Engineer (I) R&D	TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking orders for handing over of connected assets to MES (Deemed licensee) created from defence funds at RCI, Hyderabad to establish direct grid connectivity being deemed licensee to enable MES to operate as deemed distribution licensee.

Sri M. A. Dubey, Director (E/M) along with Sri Abhishek Sharma, GE (I) RCI for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché for respondents are present. The representative of the petitioner stated that the petition is filed for declaration of MES as a deemed licensee and also to handover the assets relating to distribution within the area of operation. At present the petitioner is drawing power at 132 KV directly from the transmission system and distributing the same within the area under its control. The intention of the petitioner is to avail power directly from the generation sources. It intends to avail long term open accession for the purpose. The petitioner also intends to avail the bulk transmission agreement with TSTRANSCO.

He stated that for purpose of availing LTOA it is ready to install ABT based metering and also enter into long term PPA with generation sources. Under the policy of the Government of India notification, the petitioner is a deemed licensee and as such entitled to avail power supply from any sources. The transmission and distribution network falling within the area under its control may be directed to be handed over to it for use of MES as deemed licensee for direct grid connectivity. However, TSTRANSCO may continue to maintain the asset for which the petitioner is willing to pay the necessary charges for maintenance.

The representative of the respondents stated that the petitioner has filed the petition for handing over the assets relating to transmission and distribution within the area under its control for operationalizing deemed licensee status. However, the petitioner has not filed an application for the said purpose and obtained orders of the Commission till date. Unless the petition is declared as deemed licensee by the Commission, the subsequent events would not arise. It is also stated that as per the prevailing general terms and conditions of supply, the lines cannot be handed over to

the petitioner even though it has paid for the same. The respondents have no notice that the petitioner is claiming status of deemed licensee by way of this petition. In any case, he has no instructions and have to obtain the same insofar as the prayer is made in the petition by the petitioner. Thus, he requested for time in the matter. In view of the request of the representative of the respondent, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 25.01.2024 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. 20 of 2023	M/s. Sarda Metals & Alloys Limited	TSDISCOMs

Petition filed seeking directions to the respondents to pay the surcharge on delayed payments of regular power supply bills and backdown compensation amount along with interest.

Sri. Deepak Chowdary, Advocate representing Sri. Challa Gunaranjan, counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché for respondents are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the counter affidavit insofar as TSPCC is concerned, has not been filed by it. On enquiry, the representative of the respondents also stated that he would ascertain and ensure filing of the same. At the time of hearing, the Commission pointed out that the counter has to be filed immediately and a rejoinder if any has to be filed by the date of hearing and arguments will be heard on the next date of hearing.

However, while preparing this record, the Commission noticed that it had deleted the TSPCC from the array in the title to the petition. Accordingly, no notice has been issued to the said committee. In these circumstances, the matter is simply adjourned for hearing and the parties shall make their submissions on the next date of hearing without the necessity of filing of the counter affidavit by the TSPCC, as otherwise the pleadings are completed except for the rejoinder from the petitioner.

Call on 25.01.2024 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. 23 of 2023	M/s. DRES Energy Private Limited	TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking directions to the respondents to grant LTOA for (19) years to its 7.1 MW solar power project located at Bahadurpally (v), Quthubullapur Mandal, Medchal District and to settle the energy injected into the grid for the period from 26.04.2023 to 05.05.2023 and consequential reliefs.

Sri. K. Gopal Chowdary, Advocate appearing on behalf of Ms. Mazag Andrabi, counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché for respondents are present. The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for considering the LTOA date contrary to the request made by the petitioner. The petitioner had availed LTOA in the year 2019 and later got extension in 2021. The issue pertains to further extension in 2023, wherein the nodal agency had changed the start date of LTOA to another date other than the date when earlier permission expired at its discretion, thereby causing a loss to the petitioner towards the energy injected into the grid.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for petitioner stated that the petitioner had applied for renewal of the LTOA on 23.01.2023 by way of notice that is three months prior to the expiry of the existing LTOA permission on 25.04.2023. The said application was not accepted by the respondent and instead required the petitioner to file a revised application seeking long term open access. Thereafter, the nodal agency pointed out certain deficiencies and required the petitioner to file a fresh application for the same. Thereupon the petitioner has filed a fresh application on 17.02.2023 along with necessary information. The major requirement on the part of the respondent was that the petitioner ought to have provided the latest power quality test report in terms of the CEA Regulation as has been addressed by the distribution licensee on 02.03.2023.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner stated that the application would fall under the window for the month of February, 2023 under the Regulation No. 2 of 2005 and the nodal agency should convey its acceptance within a month of closure of the window that is by 31.03.2023. However, the permission was accorded on 05.05.2023 based on the fusibility report of the distribution licensee in April, 2023. This date of LTOA is falling beyond the date of

completion of the earlier permission on 25.04.2023 by 10 days. Even before according permission, the petitioner was informed by the nodal agency that the real time data was getting partially reflected to SLDC, accordingly required it to rectify the same and obtain clearance from the SLDC.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner further stated that the LTOA was signed after four months of the application made by the petitioner in June 2023. Setting out these facts, he stated that the Act, 2003 provides for non-discriminatory open access under section 2 (17), yet the licensees are creating hindrances and delaying the permission for open access. It is his case that in massive grid a capacity of 7.1 MW would not make any difference, however, the licensees have delayed the approval of LTOA and thereby caused loss to the petitioner.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner had made an application for a period of 19 years however, the period is limited to 2 years only. The provision in the Regulation No. 2 of 2005 as adopted by the Commission would envisage that the LTOA would be for a period of 2 years or 'more' but strangely the nodal agency had limited the approval for 2 years only instead of allowing the same for the life period of the plant. This is nothing but violating the Act and regulations in force.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner stated that with the changing the date of approval, the petitioner had lost energy which is injected into the grid to the tune of 2,82,350 units. Since the nodal agency and the licensee have caused delay and also changed the start date of LTOA, the petitioner had injected the energy non-gratuitously and thus, attracted sec 70 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. The said energy has to be banked and accounted for sale as and when the petitioner provides the schedule for its consumption through its consumers or pay for the same at the pooled cost rate as provided in the regulations.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for petitioner sought the prayers mentioned in the petition be accepted.

The representative of the respondents stated that the petitioner had not complied with the requirement of the regulations and procedure as set out by the nodal agency as also the distribution licensee and thereby it itself caused delay, thus, no fault lies on the respondents. The petitioner being aware of the requirements to be complied with while making the application has ostensibly did not choose to enclose the requisite information for consideration. The nodal agency as well as the licensee were not at fault and as and when the information was sought, which was provided thereof, the application was considered by them. The petitioner cannot allege the lapses on the part of the nodal agency as well as distribution licensee as they have strictly followed the procedure set out in the Act and regulations. In fact, the nodal agency and distribution licensee hastened the process of approving the application by communicating expeditiously the deficiencies in the application as also the lack of information with other authorities so as to conclude the agreement for long term open access.

The representative of the respondents would endeavour to state that the nodal agency did not deviate from the stipulations in the Act and regulations and no information extraneous to the provisions has been sought. As soon as the application is complete in all respects, the approval was accorded for LTOA. If the delay is there, it is on the part of the petitioner only for which the respondents are not liable for compensate for the alleged loss. The petitioner is not entitled to any relief as prayed for.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for petitioner stated that the respondents have acted contrary to the Act and regulations and attempted to frame their own set of rules and regulations by requiring the petitioner to file fresh application or to submit the information which is either in their possession only or could have been asked well in advance as was done earlier. All the actions were within their knowledge, yet they acted contrary to the provisions of requiring the information or documentation as required. Interestingly the procedure for renewal of LTOA has been deviated by them, which is contrary to the earlier renewal in the year 2021. The respondents have no authority to frame their own procedures causing hardship to the petitioner.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner stated that nothing precluded the nodal agency and the licensee to inform and comply with the procedure set out in the regulations read with the provisions of the Act, 2003. Significantly, the understanding with regard to long term open access period as provided in the regulation is misconceived. The provision emphatically makes it clear that the LTOA shall be for a period of two years or 'more' and cannot be limited to two years only. The petitioner being a solar project would be available for further period and as such applied for a period of 19 years. The same has been negated by limiting the LTOA to two years only without any reasons. As such, the petitioner is entitled to the reliefs as prayed for.

Having heard the argument of the parties, the matter is reserved for orders. The parties are at liberty to file written submissions within one week that is the respondents shall file within a week from today and if required the petitioner will file its written submissions within a week thereafter.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 24 of 2023	M/s. DRES Energy Private Limited	TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking directions to the respondents to grant LTOA for (19) years to its 8 MW solar power project located at Lingampally (v), Municipality Mandal, Medak District and to settle the energy injected into the grid for the period from 09.05.2023 to 16.05.2023 and consequential reliefs.

Sri. K. Gopal Chowdary, Advocate appearing on behalf of Ms. Mazag Andrabi, counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché for respondents are present. The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for considering the LTOA date contrary to the request made by the petitioner. The petitioner had availed LTOA in the year 2019 and later got extension in 2021. The issue pertains to further extension in 2023, wherein the nodal agency had changed the start date of LTOA to another date other than the date when earlier permission expired at its discretion, thereby causing a loss to the petitioner towards the energy injected into the grid.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for petitioner stated that the petitioner had applied for renewal of the LTOA on 23.01.2023 by way of notice that is three months prior to the expiry of the existing LTOA permission on 09.05.2023. The said application was not accepted by the respondent and instead required the petitioner to file a revised application seeking long term open access. Thereafter, the nodal agency pointed out certain deficiencies and required the petitioner to file a fresh application for the same. Thereupon the petitioner has filed a fresh application on 17.02.2023 along with necessary information. The major requirement on the part of the respondent was that the petitioner ought to have provided the latest power quality test report in terms of the CEA Regulation as has been addressed by the distribution licensee on 02.03.2023.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner stated that the application would fall under the window for the month of February, 2023 under the Regulation No. 2 of 2005 and the nodal agency should convey its acceptance within a month of closure of the window that is by 31.03.2023. However, the permission was accorded on 17.05.2023 based on the feasibility report of the distribution licensee in April, 2023. This date of LTOA is falling beyond the date of completion of the earlier permission on 08.05.2023 by 9 days.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner further stated that the LTOA was signed after four months of the application made by the petitioner in June 2023. Setting out these facts, he stated that the Act, 2003 provides for non-discriminatory open access under section 2 (17), yet the licensees are creating hindrances and delaying the permission for open access. It is his case that in massive grid a capacity of 8.00 MW would not make any difference, however, the licensees have delayed the approval of LTOA and thereby caused loss to the petitioner.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner had made an application for a period of 19 years however, the period is limited to 2 years only. The provision in the Regulation No. 2 of 2005 as adopted by the Commission would envisage that the LTOA would be for a period of 2 years or 'more' but strangely the nodal agency had limited the approval for 2 years only

instead of allowing the same for the life period of the plant. This is nothing but violating the Act and regulations in force.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner stated that with the changing the date of approval, the petitioner had lost energy which is injected into the grid to the tune of 2,85,600 units. Since the nodal agency and the licensee have caused delay and also changed the start date of LTOA, the petitioner had injected the energy non-gratuitously and thus, attracted sec 70 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. The said energy has to be banked and accounted for sale as and when the petitioner provides the schedule for its consumption through its consumers or pay for the same at the pooled cost rate as provided in the regulations.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for petitioner sought the prayers mentioned in the petition be accepted.

The representative of the respondents stated that the petitioner had not complied with the requirement of the regulations and procedure as set out by the nodal agency as also the distribution licensee and thereby it itself caused delay, thus, no fault lies on the respondents. The petitioner being aware of the requirements to be complied with while making the application has ostensibly did not choose to enclose the requisite information for consideration. The nodal agency as well as the licensee were not at fault and as and when the information was sought, which was provided thereof, the application was considered by them. The petitioner cannot allege the lapses on the part of the nodal agency as well as distribution licensee as they have strictly followed the procedure as set out in the Act and regulations. In fact, the nodal agency and distribution licensee hastened the process of approving the application by communicating expeditiously the deficiencies in the application as also the lack of information with other authorities so as to conclude the agreement for long term open access.

The representative of the respondents would endeavour to state that the nodal agency did not deviate from the stipulations in the Act and regulations and no information extraneous to the provisions has been sought. As soon as the application is complete in all respects, the approval was accorded for LTOA. If the delay is there, it is on the part of the petitioner only for which the respondents are not

liable for compensate for the alleged loss. The petitioner is not entitled to any relief as prayed for.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for petitioner stated that the respondents have acted contrary to the Act and regulations and attempted to frame their own set of rules and regulations by requiring the petitioner to file fresh application or to submit the information which is either in their possession only or could have been asked well in advance as was done earlier. All the actions were within their knowledge, yet they acted contrary to the provisions of requiring the information or documentation as required. Interestingly the procedure for renewal of LTOA has been deviated by them, which is contrary to the earlier renewal in the year 2021. The respondents have no authority to frame their own procedures causing hardship to the petitioner.

The advocate appearing on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner stated that nothing precluded the nodal agency and the licensee to inform and comply with the procedure as set of in the regulations read with the provisions of the Act, 2003. Significantly, the understanding with regard to long term open access period as provided in the regulation is misconceived. The provision emphatically makes it clear that the LTOA shall be for a period of two years or 'more' and cannot be limited to two years only. The petitioner being a solar project would be available for further period and as such applied for a period of 19 years. The same has been negated by limiting the LTOA to two years only without any reasons. As such, the petitioner is entitled to the reliefs as prayed for.

Having heard the argument of the parties, the matter is reserved for orders. The parties are at liberty to file written submissions within one week that is the respondents shall file written submissions within a week from today and if required the petitioner will file its written submissions within a week thereafter.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 27 of 2023	M/s. Bhagyanagar India Limited	TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking directions to the respondents to grant LTOA from 31.03.2023 as well as to settle the energy injected into the grid for the period from 31.03.2023 to 14.06.2023 and other reliefs.

Sri. Deepak Chowdary, counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché for respondents are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed for considering the LTOA date contrary to the request made by the petitioner. The petitioner had availed LTOA in the year 2014 and later got extension in 2017, 2019 and 2021. The issue pertains to further extension in 2023, wherein the nodal agency had changed the start date of LTOA to another date other than the date when earlier permission expired at its discretion, thereby causing a loss to the petitioner towards the energy injected into the grid.

The counsel for petitioner stated that the petitioner had applied for renewal of the LTOA on 16.11.2022 by way of notice that is three months prior to the expiry of the existing LTOA permission on 31.03.2023.

The counsel for the petitioner stated that the application would fall under the window for the month of November, 2022 under the Regulation No. 2 of 2005 and the nodal agency should convey its acceptance within a month of closure of the window that is by 31.12.2022. However, the feasibility report was made available on 25.04.2023 for the LTOA commencing from 31.03.2023 to 30.03.2025 with a delay of 134 days from the date of application and 89 days beyond the approval date of 31.12.2022. Ultimately on 14.06.2023, the LTOA was approved. In the meantime, the TSTRANSCO had addressed letters on 09.05.2023 regarding real time data reflection to SLDC, on 23.05.2023 reiterating the issue of compliance of real time data as also 13.06.2023 accepting the real time data. All these letters have been replied by the petitioner from time to time.

The counsel for the petitioner further stated that the LTOA was signed after seven months of the application made by the petitioner in November 2022. Setting out these facts, he stated that the Act, 2003 provides for non-discriminatory open access under section 2 (17), yet the licensees are creating hindrances and delaying

the permission for open access. It is his case that in massive grid a capacity of 5.00 MW would not make any difference, however, the licensees have delayed the approval of LTOA and thereby caused loss to the petitioner.

The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner had made an application for a period of 6 years however, the period is limited to 2 years only. The provision in the Regulation No. 2 of 2005 as adopted by the Commission would envisage that the LTOA would be for a period of 2 years or 'more' but strangely the nodal agency had limited the approval for 2 years only instead of allowing the same for the life period of the plant. This is nothing but violating the Act and regulations in force.

The counsel for the petitioner stated that with the changing the date of approval, the petitioner had lost energy which is injected into the grid to the tune of 14,23,430 units. Since the nodal agency and the licensee have caused delay and also changed the start date of LTOA, the petitioner had injected the energy non-gratuitously and thus, attracted section 70 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. The said energy has to be banked and accounted for sale as and when the petitioner provides the schedule for its consumption through its consumers or pay for the same at the pooled cost rate as provided in the regulations.

The counsel for petitioner sought the prayers mentioned in the petition be accepted.

The representative of the respondents stated that the petitioner had not complied with the requirement of the regulations and procedure as set out by the nodal agency as also the distribution licensee and thereby it itself caused delay, thus, no fault lies on the respondents. The petitioner being aware of the requirements to be complied with while making the application has ostensibly did not choose to enclose the requisite information for consideration. The nodal agency as well as the licensee were not at fault and as and when the information was sought, which was provided thereof, the application was considered by them. The petitioner cannot allege the lapses on the part of the nodal agency as well as distribution licensee as they have strictly followed the procedure as set out in the Act and regulations. In fact, the nodal agency and distribution licensee hastened the process

of approving the application by communicating expeditiously the deficiencies in the application as also the lack of information with other authorities so as to conclude the agreement for long term open access.

The representative of the respondents would endeavour to state that the nodal agency did not deviate from the stipulations in the Act and regulations and no information extraneous to the provisions has been sought. As soon as the application is complete in all respects, the approval was accorded for LTOA. If the delay is there, it is on the part of the petitioner only for which the respondents are not liable for compensate for the alleged loss. The petitioner is not entitled to any relief as prayed for.

The counsel for the petitioner stated that the respondents have acted contrary to the Act and regulations and attempted to frame their own set of rules and regulations by requiring the petitioner to file fresh application or to submit the information which is either in their possession only or could have been asked well in advance as was done earlier. All the actions were within their knowledge, yet they acted contrary to the provisions of requiring the information or documentation as required. Interestingly the procedure for renewal of LTOA has been deviated by them, which is contrary to the earlier renewal in the years 2017, 2019 and 2021. The respondents have no authority to frame their own procedures causing hardship to the petitioner.

The counsel for the petitioner stated that nothing precluded the nodal agency and the licensee to inform and comply with the procedure as set out in the regulations read with the provisions of the Act, 2003. Significantly, the understanding with regard to long term open access period as provided in the regulation is misconceived. The provision emphatically makes it clear that the LTOA shall be for a period of two years or 'more' and cannot be limited to two years only. The petitioner being a solar project would be available for further period and as such applied for a period of 6 years. The same has been negated by limiting the LTOA to two years only without any reasons. As such, the petitioner is entitled to the reliefs as prayed for.

Mrs. Anukriti Jain, counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed under section 142 of the Act, 2003 for implementation of the order of the Commission. The Commission had, in its order dated 08.08.2022, required the respondent to implement the order within 45 days from the date of receipt of the order. However, despite seeking time to file counter affidavit, the respondent has not filed any counter affidavit or made any submissions as regards payments due.

The Commission notices that it had already passed specific directions in the matter at earlier round of litigation. The representative of the respondent stated that he has no instructions specifically on the payment of the amounts due and that he had required and advised the respondent on the course of action required to be undertaken by the respondent. Even on the same, nothing has been instructed to him. However, he sought one opportunity to appraise the Commission as to the action taken by the respondent in the matter. Keeping in view the background situation and the absence of any sort of action taken by the respondent, the Commission presumes that the respondent has nothing to submit in the matter. Accordingly, the matter is reserved.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 31 of 2023	M/s. Mahabubnagar Solar Parks Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking implementation of the order dated 08.08.2022 passed in O. P. No. 12 of 2022 and issuance of appropriate directions to the respondent for non-compliance of the said order.

Mrs. Anukriti Jain, counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed under section 142 of the Act, 2003 for implementation of the order of the Commission. The Commission had, in its order dated 08.08.2022, required the respondent to implement the order within 45 days from the date of receipt of the order. However, despite seeking time to file counter affidavit, the respondent has not filed any counter affidavit or made any submissions as regards payments due.

The Commission notices that it had already passed specific directions in the matter at earlier round of litigation. The representative of the respondent stated that he has no instructions specifically on the payment of the amounts due and that he had required and advised the respondent on the course of action required to be undertaken by the respondent. Even on the same, nothing has been instructed to him. However, he sought one opportunity to appraise the Commission as to the action taken by the respondent in the matter. Keeping in view the background situation and the absence of any sort of action taken by the respondent, the Commission presumes that the respondent has nothing to submit in the matter. Accordingly, the matter is reserved.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 32 of 2023	M/s. Winsol Solar Fields (Polepally) Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking implementation of the order dated 08.08.2022 passed in O. P. No. 15 of 2022 and issuance of appropriate directions to the respondent for non-compliance of the said order.

Mrs. Anukriti Jain, counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed under section 142 of the Act, 2003 for implementation of the order of the Commission. The Commission had, in its order dated 08.08.2022, required the respondent to implement the order within 45 days from the date of receipt of the order. However, despite seeking time to file counter affidavit, the respondent has not filed any counter affidavit or made any submissions as regards payments due.

The Commission notices that it had already passed specific directions in the matter at earlier round of litigation. The representative of the respondent stated that he has no instructions specifically on the payment of the amounts due and that he had required and advised the respondent on the course of action required to be undertaken by the respondent. Even on the same, nothing has been instructed to him. However, he sought one opportunity to appraise the Commission as to the action taken by the respondent in the matter. Keeping in view the background situation and the absence of any sort of action taken by the respondent, the

Commission presumes that the respondent has nothing to submit in the matter. Accordingly, the matter is reserved.

Sd/- Member	Sd/- Member	Sd/- Chairman
Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 33 of 2023	M/s. Winsol Solar Fields (Polepally) Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking implementation of the order dated 08.08.2022 passed in O. P. No. 11 of 2022 and issuance of appropriate directions to the respondent for non-compliance of the said order.

Mrs. Anukriti Jain, counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed under section 142 of the Act, 2003 for implementation of the order of the Commission. The Commission had, in its order dated 08.08.2022, required the respondent to implement the order within 45 days from the date of receipt of the order. However, despite seeking time to file counter affidavit, the respondent has not filed any counter affidavit or made any submissions as regards payments due.

The Commission notices that it had already passed specific directions in the matter at earlier round of litigation. The representative of the respondent stated that he has no instructions specifically on the payment of the amounts due and that he had required and advised the respondent on the course of action required to be undertaken by the respondent. Even on the same, nothing has been instructed to him. However, he sought one opportunity to appraise the Commission as to the action taken by the respondent in the matter. Keeping in view the background situation and the absence of any sort of action taken by the respondent, the Commission presumes that the respondent has nothing to submit in the matter. Accordingly, the matter is reserved.

Sd/- Member	Sd/- Member	Sd/- Chairman
Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 34 of 2023	M/s. Winsol Solar Fields (Polepally) Private Limited	TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking implementation of the order dated 08.08.2022 passed in O. P. No. 13 of 2022 and issuance of appropriate directions to the respondent for non-compliance of the said order.

Mrs. Anukriti Jain, counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché for respondent are present. The counsel for petitioner stated that the petition is filed under section 142 of the Act, 2003 for implementation of the order of the Commission. The Commission had, in its order dated 08.08.2022, required the respondent to implement the order within 45 days from the date of receipt of the order. However, despite seeking time to file counter affidavit, the respondent has not filed any counter affidavit or made any submissions as regards payments due.

The Commission notices that it had already passed specific directions in the matter at earlier round of litigation. The representative of the respondent stated that he has no instructions specifically on the payment of the amounts due and that he had required and advised the respondent on the course of action required to be undertaken by the respondent. Even on the same, nothing has been instructed to him. However, he sought one opportunity to appraise the Commission as to the action taken by the respondent in the matter. Keeping in view the background situation and the absence of any sort of action taken by the respondent, the Commission presumes that the respondent has nothing to submit in the matter. Accordingly, the matter is reserved.

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Member

Sd/-
Chairman