



TELANGANA STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
5th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad-500 004

I. A. No. 1 of 2017
in
O. P. No. 76 of 2015

Dated 27.11.2017

Present

Sri. Ismail Ali Khan, Chairman
Sri. H. Srinivasulu, Member

Between:

M/s. Shri. Raghavendra Ferro Alloy's Private Limited,
H. No. 19-55, Vasavi Nagar, Nakrekal,
Nalgonda District – 508 211.

... Petitioner

And

1. The Transmission Corporation of Telangana Limited,
Vidyut Soudha, Khairathabad, Hyderabad – 500 004.
2. The Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Limited,
6-1-50, Mint Compound, Hyderabad – 500 063.
3. The Superintending Engineer,
Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Limited,
Nalgonda.

... Respondents.

This petition came up for hearing on 17.06.2017 and 13.11.2017. Sri. O. Manohar Reddy, counsel for the applicant present on 17.06.2017 and there is no representation for applicant on 13.11.2017. Sri. Y. Rama Rao, standing counsel for the respondents alongwith Sri. B. Vijaya Bhaskar, Advocate present on 17.06.2017 and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, standing counsel for the respondents alongwith Sri Sai Vihar and Mr. Pravalika, Advocates present on 13.11.2017. The petition having stood for consideration to this day, the Commission passed the following:

ORDER

The applicant had filed the application under section 62 of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking the following prayer.

“To declare the action of the respondent in demanding deemed consumption charges in pursuance to the Guaranteed Energy Offtake at 6701 KVAH per KVA per annum on contracted maximum demand for the financial year 2015-16 as unenforceable during the disconnection period as the demands raised by the respondents are contrary to the tariff order dated 27.03.2015 in O. P. No. 76 of 2015 passed by the Commission for the financial year 2015-16, unenforceable or in the alternative the Commission may be pleased to grant exemption from collecting deemed energy charges during the disconnection period and consequently direct the respondents not to demand the amount for the disconnection period and set aside the demands raised by the respondents on the petitioner.”

2. The Commission noticed that the applicant has neither appeared itself nor its advocate was present on both the occasions, when the matter was listed for hearing. Though his presence was recorded on the first date of hearing, he was not actually present, when the case was called on the said date. Despite service of notice on the counsel for the applicant on the second occasion also, no representation is made either by the applicant itself or by the counsel for the applicant.

3. In the circumstances explained above, we are constrained not to grant further date of hearing for appearance of the applicant or its counsel. We deem it appropriate to dismiss the application for non-prosecution and default in appearance.

4. Accordingly, the Commission hereby dismiss the application for non-appearance and non-prosecution, but without any costs.

This order is corrected and signed on this the 27th day of November, 2017.

**Sd/-
(H. SRINIVASULU)
MEMBER**

**Sd/-
(ISMAIL ALI KHAN)
CHAIRMAN**

//CERTIFIED COPY//