

**Record of proceedings dated 15.07.2015**

O. P. No. 2 of 2015

M/s ITC Limited Vs TSLDC

Petition filed u/s 86 (1) (e) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking direction to the SLDC to give accreditation to the petitioner's renewable energy project.

Sri. N Alagiri Senior Manager (projects) for the petitioner and Sri. Y Rama Rao counsel for the respondent are present. The representative of the petitioner stated that the petitioner has been waiting for the report of the TSNREDC with regard to utilisation of fossil fuel and towards this end an inspection which was to take place in July 2015 has not yet happened. On the other hand the counsel for the respondent has clearly stated that a counter is filed by the respondent in the matter stating that the petitioner is using fossil fuel around 55% and thus it is entitled to accreditation under the regulation.

The Commission made it clear that the matter can be taken up only after a report is available from TSNREDC and the machinery is segregated to the satisfaction of the DISCOM. Any report obtained petitioner should also be made available to DISCOM. Adjourned at the request of the parties.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Call on 03.08.2015  
At 11:00 AM  
Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 10 of 2015

M/s Sundew Properties Limited vs TSSPDCL

Petition seeking deemed distribution license

Sri. P Srirghu Ram Senior Advocate along with Sri. P. Sri Ram counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y Rama Rao counsel for the respondent are present. The senior counsel for the petitioner argued the matter in detail providing for the case of distribution license to the petitioner. The counsel for the respondent opposed the petition in detail based on the submission filed by them including case law.

The Commission required the details of the supply being made by the petitioner and quantity of power being availed and the source of supply. It also required the details

of the same to be available to DISCOM and DISCOM to verify the details. The counsel for the petitioner agreed to place the details before the Commission by giving a copy to the respondents. Adjourned.

Call on 03.08.2015

At 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 34 of 2015

M/s Indian Wind Power Association vs NEDCAP, APCPDCL & APTRANSCO

Petition seeking issuance of regulation for determination of RE tariff based on CERC terms and conditions for tariff determination from renewable sources Regulation dated 16.09.2009 for procurement of wind energy by distribution licensee.

Sri. S. V. S. Chowdary counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y Rama Rao counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner has already accepted the jurisdiction of the Commission and in the process of filing amendment petitions. Thus he needs time to argue the matter after some time.

The counsel for the respondents stated that based on the filing made and after notice he will argue the amendment petitions.

The Commission desired that the petitioner should submit the arguments on the on the basis of maintainability of the petition and it also felt that the present petition cannot be proceeded with as it relates to determination of tariff for wind projects, without a policy on wind energy from the government.

The Commission adjourned the hearing indefinitely, but directed t the office to address the government on the basis of the provision of the Electricity Act, 2003 to come out with a policy for wind projects so as to enable the undertake determination of the tariff for wind projects in the state of Telangana.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 35 of 2015

M/s Axis Wind Energy Limited and 6 others vs Government of AP and 6 others

Petition seeking framing of guidelines determining evacuation policy and wheeling charges for captive generation or sale to third parties.

Sri. S. V. S. Chowdary counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y Rama Rao counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner has already accepted the jurisdiction of the Commission and in the process of filing amendment petitions. Thus he needs time to argue the matter after some time.

The counsel for the respondents stated that based on the filing made and after notice he will argue the amendment petitions.

The Commission desired that the petitioner should submit the arguments on the on the basis of maintainability of the petition and it also felt that the present petition cannot be proceeded with as it relates to determination of tariff for wind projects, without a policy on wind energy from the government.

The Commission adjourned the hearing indefinitely, but directed t the office to address the government on the basis of the provision of the Electricity Act, 2003 to come out with a policy for wind projects so as to enable the undertake determination of the tariff for wind projects in the state of Telangana.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 42 of 2015

M/s Penna Cement Industries Ltd. Vs APTRANSCO, APPCC & DISCOMS

Petition u/s 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking to recover the amount Rs. 2,66,34,295/- towards pending dues on account of supply of electricity.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Sri. Y Rama Rao counsel for the respondent is present. The counsel for the respondent stated that the counter affidavit needs to be filed

As there is no representation, the matter is adjourned at the request of the counsel for the respondent.

Call on 08.09.2015  
At 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 50 of 2015

M/s IL&FS Wind Farms Limited vs TSSPDCL

Petition u/s sec 142, 143 and 129 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for directions to the respondents to comply with the tariff orders dated 31.03.2009 passed by the Commission and pay at the rate of Rs. 3.37 of KWH for the electricity supplied by the petitioner and other reliefs mentioned therein

Sri. B Tagore counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y Rama Rao counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner has already accepted the jurisdiction of the Commission and in the process of filing amendment petitions. Thus he needs time file the petition and argue the matter after some time.

The counsel for the respondents stated that based on the filing made and after notice he will argue the amendment petitions.

The Commission observed that since it also involves the issue of jurisdiction of the Commission, it desired that the petitioner should take steps to amend the cause title and then submit the arguments on the on the basis of maintainability that may be decided in the batch cases being heard by the Commission. The Counsel for the parties agreed for the same.

The Commission adjourned the hearing indefinitely and would intimate the next date of hearing in due course of time after consultation within the Commission.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 51 of 2015

M/s Nile Limited vs TSSPDCL

Petition seeking directions for payment of monthly bills

Sri. M. K. Viswanath Naidu Advocate for Sri. Challa Gunaranjan counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y Rama Rao counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner has already accepted the jurisdiction of the Commission and in the process of filing amendment petitions. Thus he needs time file the petition and argue the matter after some time.

The counsel for the respondents stated that based on the filing made and after notice he will argue the amendment petitions.

The Commission observed that since it also involves the issue of jurisdiction of the Commission, it desired that the petitioner should take steps to amend the cause title and then submit the arguments on the on the basis of maintainability that may be decided in the batch cases being heard by the Commission. The Counsel for the parties agreed for the same. The Commission adjourned the hearing

Call on 04.08.2015

At 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

R. P. (SR) No. 07 of 2015

M/s Axis Wind Energy Limited and 6 others vs Indian Wind Energy Association and 6 others

Petition u/s 94 (2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 for review of the order in O. P. No 13 of 2012 dated 15.11.2012 on the file of erstwhile APERC.

Sri. S. V. S. Chowdary counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y Rama Rao counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner has already accepted the jurisdiction of the Commission and in the process of filing amendment petitions. Thus he needs time to argue the matter after some time.

The counsel for the respondents stated that based on the filing made and after notice he will argue the amendment petitions.

The Commission desired that the petitioner should submit the arguments on the on the basis of maintainability of the petition and it also felt that the present petition cannot be proceeded with as it relates to determination of tariff for wind projects, without a policy on wind energy from the government.

The Commission adjourned the hearing indefinitely, but directed t the office to address the government on the basis of the provision of the Electricity Act, 2003 to come out with a policy for wind projects so as to enable the undertake determination of the tariff for wind projects in the state of Telangana.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. (SR) No. 08 of 2015

M/s Indian Wind Power Association vs NREDC, APDISCOMs & APTRANSCO

Petition u/s 86 (1) (f) and (e) of the Electricity Act, 2003 for several reliefs in respect of promotion of generation of electricity from renewable energy sources.

Sri. S. V. S. Chowdary counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y Rama Rao counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner has already accepted the jurisdiction of the Commission and in the process of filing amendment petitions. Thus he needs time to argue the matter after some time.

The counsel for the respondents stated that based on the filing made and after notice he will argue the amendment petitions.

The Commission desired that the petitioner should submit the arguments on the on the basis of maintainability of the petition and it also felt that the present petition cannot be proceeded with as it relates to determination of tariff for wind projects, without a policy on wind energy from the government.

The Commission adjourned the hearing indefinitely, but directed t the office to address the government on the basis of the provision of the Electricity Act, 2003 to come out with a policy for wind projects so as to enable the undertake determination of the tariff for wind projects in the state of Telangana.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman