

## **Record of Proceedings dated 07.03.2020**

O. P. No. 7 of 2019

M/s. Prathmesh Solarfarms Pvt. Ltd. Vs. TSTRANSCO, M/s. Mytrah Agriya Power Pvt. Ltd. & TSSPDCL.

Petition filed questioning the action of the TSTRANSCO in allowing another project to utilize transmission line and interconnection facilities developed by the petitioner contrary to the regulations.

Sri. Damodar Solanki, Advocate representing Smt. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate for the petitioner, Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 and 3 along with Sri. K. Vamshi Krishna, Advocate and Sri. Omer Farooq, Advocate for the respondent No. 2 are present. The counsel for the respondent No. 2 has filed vakalat and sought time for filing counter affidavit. He sought four weeks' time. The counsel for the petitioner has stated that all the pleadings in the matter should be directed to be completed well before the next date of hearing. The pleadings shall be completed by 13.04.2020. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 18.04.2020 at 11.00 A.M.

Sd/-  
Member (F)

Sd/-  
Member (T)

Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 5 of 2020

CESS, Sircilla Vs. TSNPDCL

Petition filed seeking permission to release power supply connection above 75 KW / 100 HP commercial / industrial services within its jurisdiction upto 1500 KVA under HT category.

Smt. M. Pravalika, Advocate representing Sri. A. Raghuram, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the respondent along with Sri. Vamshi Krishna, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that initially the society was allowed to undertake supply at 11000 volts as per the government order issued in the year 1970. Since then the society has been striving to serve better to the members of society and the area in general. Now the present request is to undertake HT supply as many industries are being setup and the business is developing in the area of the society. In case, the NPDCL which is the supplier of power has to undertake supply in the area of the society, then it has to lay

separate lines as it has no lines of its own in the area of the society. The society has been providing supply LT – III category upto 100 HP. Allowing HT supply to be done by the society will be beneficial to both the society and NPDCL.

The counsel for the respondent stated that the request of the society is an unviable proposition causing financial loss to the NPDCL. Moreover, the society does not have expertise and the required personnel to undertake HT supply. The Commission had already taken a view that the society cannot undertake HT supply in the tariff order FY 2016-17. Further, he reiterated the contentions in the counter affidavit filed on behalf of NPDCL.

The counsel for the petitioner on the other hand pointed out that it is a fact that the Commission directed not to undertake HT. The Commission sought to know the reply from the society on the availability of personnel for undertaking HT supply, which has to be in accordance with the general terms and conditions of supply of licensee, that is to say that an officer of the rank of Superintending Engineer, who is designated by the government as competent officer to inspect the HT supply. In reply, the counsel for the petitioner stated that the senior most position is that of the Managing Director, who is in the rank of Superintending Engineer only. However, she insisted that there is technical capability with the society to undertake HT supply and inspection also. They are also undertaking necessary steps to strengthen the same.

Having heard the submissions of the counsel for the parties, the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-  
Member (F)

Sd/-  
Member (T)

Sd/-  
Chairman