

## **Record of Proceedings dated 23.01.2017**

O. P. (SR) No. 72 of 2016

M/s. Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Ltd. Vs -Nil- M/s. Enrich Energy Private Ltd, M/s. Abbas Constructions Pvt. Ltd. & M/s. Minopharm Laboratories Pvt. Ltd. (Added as respondents by the Commission)

Petition filed for adopting of tariff for individual generators of the solar power park developed by M/s. Enrich Energy Pvt. Ltd.

Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Counsel for the petitioner along with Smt. Priya Iyengar, Advocate, Smt. Dipali Sheth, Advocate for the Respondent No.1, Sri. V. Venkat Naga Raju, Advocate for Respondent No.2 and Sri. K. Anup Koushik, Advocate for the Respondent No.3 are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that this is a petition filed for adoption of tariff of Rs. 6.45 Ps. per unit for the projects, which have synchronized their plants on or before 31.12.2016. He also stated that the respondents named by the Commission as parties are sailing with the petitioner. He also stated that the position of law as far as adoption of tariff is settled and need not be elaborated. On the other hand, the counsel for the respondent No.1 stated that the company has already synchronized it's both units well before 31.12.2016 and therefore, entitled to the tariff that is adopted by the Commission. She requested that early disposal of the petition filed by the petitioner herein as the bankers and lenders are pressing for the issue to be settled with the petitioner. In the absence of the same, the counsel requested for protection of the interest of the respondent No.1 by suitable daily order.

2. The counsel for the respondent No.2 sought time, stating that he has no complete instructions in the matter and that he requires few days time to submit arguments in the matter and also file a counter-affidavit, if necessary. He also undertook to file his vakalat on behalf of the respondent No.2 by the next date of hearing. The counsel for the respondent No.3 stated that the company is not in receipt of the notice issued by the Commission and came to know about the matter being listed today and that it is a party to the same only through other respondents. He sought time to obtain instructions as well as filing counter-affidavit, since vakalat is being filed today only. To a specific question by the Commission, both the counsels have stated that they are not instructed as to the correct position of the projects as of this date that is why time is sought by them.

3. The Commission made it clear that in view of the requests made by the counsel for respondent Nos. 2 and 3, time is granted for filing counter-affidavit, if any and also vakalat. It is also made clear in respect of respondent No.1 that there is no further action required and the petition will be decided in respect of adoption of tariff simultaneously in respect of all the companies. Considering the request made by the respondent Nos. 2 and 3, the matter is adjourned to 27.01.2017.

Call on 27.01.2017 at 11.00 A.M.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman