

**Record of proceedings dated 23.11.2015**

O. P. No.10 of 2015

M/s Sundew Properties Limited vs TSSPDCL

Petition seeking deemed distribution licence

Sri. P. Sri Raghuram, Senior Advocate along with representatives of the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the respondents are present. The counsel for the petitioner as well as the Financial Officer of the company made submissions on behalf of the petitioner. The counsel for the respondent reiterated the submissions made in the counter affidavit and also stated about the application of provision of the Act.

Having heard the counsel for the parties, the Commission heard the case and made it clear that it would examine the matter thoroughly and if required call for further hearing in the matter. Case is treated as heard.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No.11 of 2015

M/s SLT Power & Infrastructure Projects Pvt.Ltd. vs Govt. of Telangana,  
TSTRANSCO, TSSPDCL & NREDCAP

Petition seeking directions to apply the tariff determined on 22.06.2013 in respect of the industrial waste project of 3.5 MW of the petitioner in terms of order of Hon'ble ATE dated 20.12.2012

Sri. M. V. Pratap, Advocate along with Sri. G. Vijay Bhaskar Reddy, Representative of the petitioner and Sri Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondents are present. The counsel for the petitioner and the counsel for the respondent have made their submissions. In view of the submissions the Commission reserved its orders.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 13 of 2015

And

IA No. 21 of 2015

M/s Global Energy Pvt.Ltd. vs Nil & M/s Ushdev Engitech Ltd.

Petition seeking intra state trading license for the State of Telangana

Petition to implead the petition in I.A. as respondents in OP No. 13 of 2015

Sri. P. Vikram, Counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondents are present. No representation is made on behalf of M/s. Ushdev Engitech Limited. The counsel for the petitioner stated that a reply is filed to the counter filed by TSSLDC after a serving a copy to the counsel for the TSSLDC. The counsel for the respondent reiterated the contents of the counter affidavit.

Having heard the counsel for the parties, the Commission reserved order in the matter.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 14 of 2015

M/s. Arhyama Solar Power Pvt.Ltd. vs Energy Dept., Govt.of Telangana, TSSPDCL & TSTRANSCO

Petition seeking the levy of transmission and wheeling charges as determined by erstwhile APERC vide order dated 09.05.2014 contrary to government policy as adopted by the APERC.

Smt. P. Lakshmi, Advocate and counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondents are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the respondent have partly adjusted the amounts towards wheeling charges paid by them, but there is a difference in the amount to be adjusted, therefore, seeks time to file a statement reply by four weeks. The counsel for the respondents sought time to verify the same.

The Commission adjourned the hearing for reporting the actual position by the parties.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Call on 23.12.2015  
At 11.00 AM  
Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 74 of 2015  
And  
I. A. No. 24 of 2015

M/s Hetero Wind Power Ltd. vs TSTRANSCO, APTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition seeking execution of tariff order dt.09.05.2014 with regard to exemption of transmission & wheeling charges for the petitioner's wind project.

Filed an I.A. seeking to amend the title in the petition.

Sri. Prasad Rao Vemulapalli, Counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the respondents have to adjust huge amount towards transmission and wheeling charges and not implementing the order of the Commission dated 09.05.2015. The counsel for the respondent stated that there is a review filed by TSTRANSCO against the said order. Therefore, the respondent are awaiting the result of the said petition.

The Commission pointed out that in the absence of any orders from the Commission on the review petition and there being no challenge to the order, why the said order is not being implemented. It also noted that a similar review petition filed by M/s APTRANSCO before APERC has already been dismissed stating that review cannot be undertaken in respect of an order passed in respect of combined state.

The Commission having regard to the position as is available and in the absence of necessary material being filed in the review petition, required the respondent to indicate whether they will draw the review petition and adjust the amounts within the time specified by the Commission. Accordingly adjourned.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Call on 23.12.2015  
At 11.00 AM  
Sd/-  
Chairman

R. P.(SR) No. 1 of 2015

TSTRANSCO vs Nil

Petition seeking review of the order dated 09.05.2014 determining the transmission tariff for the 3<sup>rd</sup> control period of 2014-2019

Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for petitioner is present. The Counsel for the petitioner sought adjournment as material in support of the review petition is not filed before the Commission.

The Commission pointed out that in the absence of any orders from the Commission on the review petition and there being no challenge to the order, by the licensee, why the said order is not being implemented. It also noted that a similar review petition filed by M/s. APTRANSCO before APERC has already been dismissed stating that review cannot be undertaken in respect of an order passed in respect of combined state.

The Commission having regard to the position as is available and in the absence of necessary material being filed in the review petition accordingly adjourned for reporting whether the licensee is still inclined to pursue the present review petition.

Call on 23.12.2015

At 11.00 AM

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 82 of 2015

And

I. A. No. 32 of 2015

M/s. Pragathi Group vs TSSPDCL, TSTRANSCO & TSSLDC (Proposed to be impleaded)

Petition seeking to question the action of levying wheeling and transmission charges by licensees along with other issues.

Petition in IA No. 31 of 2015 to implead TSSLDC

Sri. Venkat, Consultant representative of the petitioner and Sri. Y.Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the respondent stated that on the earlier hearing date, the Commission directed the petitioner to add TSSLDC as a party respondent to the petition and directed the TSSLDC to file its counter affidavit on the petition filed by the petitioner. However, the TSSLDC is not in the receipt of any notice taking up the petition for adding TSSLDC as party respondent from the Commission.

In view of the above, the Commission adjourned the hearing and directed the office to issue specific notice on the application made by the petitioner.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Call on 23.12.2015  
At 11.00 AM  
Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 88 of 2015

Exhibition Society vs Nil

Application filed for exemption from license under Section 13 of Electricity Act, 2003.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner nor any communication is received from the society. There is no representation on two earlier occasions also. In the circumstances, the petition is dismissed for default.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 89 of 2015

M/s. Bhagyanagar India Ltd. Vs Govt. of Telangana, TSSPDCL, TSTRANSCO and Officers

Petition filed questioning the action of the licensees in demanding payment of wheeling charges contrary to the tariff order dt.09.05.2014 of erstwhile APERC

Smt. P. Lakshmi, Advocate and counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondents are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the respondent have partly adjusted the amounts towards wheeling charges paid by them, but there is a difference in the amount to be adjusted, therefore, seeks time to file a statement reply by four weeks. The counsel for the respondents sought time to verify the same.

The Commission adjourned the hearing for reporting the actual position by the parties.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Call on 23.12.2015  
At 11.00 AM  
Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 90 of 2015

M/s Lodha Healthy Construction and Developers Pvt.Ltd. Vs TSSPDCL & Officers

Petition filed questioning the action of DISCOM in not implementing the order of the Vidyut Ombudsman and to punish the Licensee u/s 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Sri. Vijay, Advocate representing Sri. C. Gunaranjan, Counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the respondent sought further time to inform the Commission about the status of implementation of the order of Ombudsman. The advocate pointed out that already time has been taken for reporting compliance of the order of the Ombudsman.

The Commission has adjourned the hearing at the request of counsel for the respondent with the condition that the respondents shall not seek further extension of time and come for argument at the next date of hearing without fail.

Call on 23.12.2015

At 11.00 AM

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 91 of 2015

M/s. Sanathnagar Enterprises Ltd. vs TSSPDCL & Officers

Petition filed questioning the action of DISCOM in not implementing the order of the Vidyut Ombudsman and to punish the licensee u/s 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Sri. Vijay, Advocate representing Sri. C. Gunaranjan, Counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the respondent sought further time to inform the Commission about the status of implementation of the order of Ombudsman. The advocate pointed out that already time has been taken for reporting compliance of the order of the Ombudsman.

The Commission has adjourned the hearing at the request of counsel for the respondent with the condition that the respondents shall not seek further extension of time and come for argument at the next date of hearing without fail.

Call on 23.12.2015

At 11.00 AM

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 92 of 2015

M/s Suguna Metals Ltd. vs Vidyut Ombudsman of Telangana & TSSPDCL Officers

Petition filed questioning the action of DISCOM in not implementing the order of the Vidyut Ombudsman and to punish the Licensee u/s 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Sri. G. Pavan Kumar, Advocate representing Sri. N.Vinesh Raj, Counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the respondent sought further time to inform the Commission about the status of implementation of the order of Ombudsman. He also sought time to file counter affidavit in the matter. The advocate pointed out that already time has been taken for reporting compliance of the order of the Ombudsman.

The Commission has adjourned the hearing at the request of counsel for the respondent with the condition that the respondents shall not seek further extension of time and come for argument at the next date of hearing without fail.

Call on 23.12.2015

At 11.00 AM

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman