



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

O. P. (SR) No. 36 of 2021

Dated 30.08.2021

Present

Sri T. Sriranga Rao, Chairman
Sri M. D. Manohar Raju, Member (Technical)
Sri Bandaru Krishnaiah, Member (Finance)

Between:

M/s. BVM Energy and Residency Private Limited,
15th Floor, Kapil Towers, Financial District,
Nanakramguda, Gachibowli,
Hyderabad – 500 032

... Petitioner

AND

1. Transmission Corporation of Telangana Limited,
Vidyut Soudha, Khairatabad,
Hyderabad – 500 082.
2. Chief General Manager (IPC & RAC),
TSSPDCL, H.No.6-1-50, 5th Floor,
Mint Compound, Hyderabad – 500 063.
3. The Chairman & Managing Director,
Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Limited,
Corporate Office, # 6-1-50, Mint Compound,
Hyderabad – 500 063.

... Respondents

The petition came up for hearing on 25.08.2021 in respect of maintainability of the petition. Sri Challa Gunaranjan, Advocate for review petitioner has appeared through video conference on 25.08.2021. The matter having been heard and having stood over for consideration to this day, the Commission passed the following:

ORDER

The petitioner has filed a petition under section 86 (1) (c) and (e) and section 42 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Terms and Conditions of Open Access Regulation, 2005 [Regulation No. 2 of 2005] as adopted by the Commission vide

Regulation No. 1 of 2014 and Conduct of Business Regulations, 2015 [Regulation No. 2 of 2015], seeking extension of SCOD to the petitioner's project and consequently to grant permission to supply power under long term open access for captive consumers.

2. The petitioner has sought the following prayer as specifically mentioned in the petition.

"a. To direct the respondents to extend the feasibility of the petitioner project situated at Siddapur Village, Jharasangam Mandal, Sangareddy District upto 17.7.2018 i.e., the date of completion of the project.

b. To direct the respondents to inspect the petitioner's 7.0 MW solar power plant and issue synchronization / commissioning certificate forthwith.

c. To direct the respondents to grant open access in order for the petitioner to supply power from its 7 MW project for captive / scheduled consumers for a period of 25 years."

3. Having heard the arguments of the counsel for the petitioner on the maintainability of the petition. Is there a case for admission of the petition for adjudication?

4. The counsel for the petitioner stated on the date of hearing as below:

"... .. The counsel for the petitioner stated that three prayers have been sought in the petition, which are consequential in nature. The petitioner sought prayer in the petition for extension of feasibility of the project, synchronization thereof and allowing captive open access. The project has been established under the Telangana Solar Policy of 2015. The proposals were made in the year 2015 and feasibility has been accorded by communicating the estimates in the year 2016 granting 24 months time period with two months of grace period. The period would expire in February, 2018 and the petitioner had made an application for extension prior to completion of the period in December, 2017 itself. The period sought is about 8 months to complete the project. The project was completed by July, 2018. He explained the correspondence that has been made by the petitioner and the licensee from time to time. It is stated that the power plant is ready in July, 2018 itself, but the licensee has been dodging to reply on the request made by the

petitioner for extending the feasibility to the project.”

5. The Commission is of the view that the petitioner has shown sufficient material and appropriate reasons as to why this Commission should adjudicate the issue. As such, it is noticed from the material placed before this Commission that the respondents have failed to respond to the request of the petitioner and consider his case for enlargement of time insofar as the feasibility is concerned. The reasons and the collected guidelines, if any, which were applied by the respondents in allowing or not allowing the case of the petitioner, can only be considered and examined only after submissions by the respondents. Prima facie for the present, the petitioner has made out a case for adjudication of the petition by the Commission.

6. Accordingly, the petition is admitted. Office is directed to number the petition and post the same for hearing on 23.09.2021.

This order is corrected and signed on this the 30th day of August, 2021.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
(BANDARU KRISHNAIAH)	(M.D.MANO HAR RAJU)	(T.SRIRANGA RAO)
MEMBER	MEMBER	CHAIRMAN

//CERTIFIED COPY//