

Record of proceedings dated 29.09.2018

O. P. No. 45 of 2018

M/s Tata Power Renewable Energy Limited Vs. Spl. Chief Secretary, TSNPDCL & TSTRANSCO

Petition filed seeking orders for granting extension of time for SCOD for (5) days.

Sri. Sai Phanindra Kumar, Advocate representing Sri. Challa Gunaranjan counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petition is filed for extending the SCOD of the project. There is a delay of (5) days in synchronization of the project, but the same is within the period accepted by the Commission that is 30.06.2017. He also stated that the PBG was returned but after deducting GST. He sought directions to the respondent with regard to the said aspect also. The counsel for the respondent stated that though it is contended about several reasons of force majeure, the same are denied. However, the Commission has already passed orders insofar as the period up to 30.06.2017, hence, the same may be considered. The counsel for the respondents stated that though there is an issue of GST, the same cannot be resolved in this matter. The respondent will take appropriate decision in the matter.

The Commission observed that the issue of GST, its application and refund are not within the jurisdiction of this Commission and therefore, no observations can be made on the same. Heard the counsel for the parties and the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 46 of 2018

M/s Medak Solar Projectsm Private Limited vs TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed claiming the units fed into grid by the petitioner's 8.24 MW solar plant from the date of synchronization to the date of LTOA agreement as deemed to have been banked or in alternative to pay at Rs. 6.78 / unit.

Sri. Sai Phanindra Kumar, Advocate representing Sri. Challa Gunaranjan counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents along with Ms. M.

Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the issue in the petition is with regard to giving the benefit of banking energy by the open access generator. He sought to rely on a decision rendered by the Commission in O. P. No. 94 of 2015, wherein the Commission had allowed banking of energy. Such order was passed duly recognizing the provisions of the policy issued by the government in respect of solar projects. The counsel for the petitioner also stated that about the statement in the policy itself providing for banking facility for captive generators.

The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petition has applied for long term open access and it was given after a long time. In between the petitioner has pumped energy, which the petition now wants to be treated as banked energy. Therefore, he requested to pass orders based on regulation issued by the Commission following the policy, the regulation being No. 1 of 2017.

The counsel for the respondents vehemently opposed the prayer made in the petition. He pointed out that the regulation issued by the Commission can be acted upon prospectively and cannot be given effect retrospectively. It is also his case that the policy issued by the government is not binding on the Commission and not even on the respondents themselves, even though, they being the government companies established under the Companies Act, 1956. The counsel for the respondents also stated that the facts of the case relied upon by the petitioner are not applicable to the present case and therefore, the same cannot be accepted.

At this stage, the counsel for the petitioner has sought adjournment stating that certain material papers including the judgment of the Commission are not filed and a rejoinder is also required to be filed to the counter affidavit of the respondents. Accordingly adjourned, the counsel for the petitioner shall file rejoinder within ten days.

Call on 27.10.2018 at 11.00 A.M.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 47 of 2018

M/s Dubbak Solar Projects Private Limited Vs. TSTRANSCO & TSSPDCL

Petition filed claiming the units fed into grid by the petitioner's 8 MW solar plant from the date of synchronization to the date of LTOA agreement as deemed to have been banked or in alternative to pay at Rs. 6.78 / unit.

Sri. Sai Phanindra Kumar, Advocate representing Sri. Challa Gunaranjan counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the issue in the petition is with regard to giving the benefit of banking energy by the open access generator. He sought to rely on a decision rendered by the Commission in O. P. No. 94 of 2015, wherein the Commission had allowed banking of energy. Such order was passed duly recognizing the provisions of the policy issued by the government in respect of solar projects. The counsel for the petitioner also stated that about the statement in the policy itself providing for banking facility for captive generators.

The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petition has applied for long term open access and it was given after a long time. In between the petitioner has pumped energy, which the petition now wants to be treated as banked energy. Therefore, he requested to pass orders based on regulation issued by the Commission following the policy, the regulation being No. 1 of 2017.

The counsel for the respondents vehemently opposed the prayer made in the petition. He pointed out that the regulation issued by the Commission can be acted upon prospectively and cannot be given effect retrospectively. It is also his case that the policy issued by the government is not binding on the Commission and not even on the respondents themselves, even though, they being the government companies established under the Companies Act, 1956. The counsel for the respondents also stated that the facts of the case relied upon by the petitioner are not applicable to the present case and therefore, the same cannot be accepted.

At this stage, the counsel for the petitioner has sought adjournment stating that certain material papers including the judgment of the Commission are not filed and a rejoinder is also required to be filed to the counter affidavit of the respondents. Accordingly adjourned, the counsel for the petitioner shall file rejoinder within ten days.

Call on 27.10.2018 at 11.00 A.M.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 48 of 2018
&
I. A. No. 24 of 2018

M/s. Padmajwadi Solar Pvt. Ltd. Vs. TSNPDCL

Petition filed seeking orders for granting extension of time for SCOD for (176) days, restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,00,00,000/- submitted by the petitioner under PPA, direction to the respondent to release / return the PBG of Rs.1,00,00,000/- and Rs.70,00,000/- submitted by the petitioner under PPA and also direction to the respondent to refund the amount of PBG of Rs.30,00,000/- that was encashed by the respondent with interest at 12% p.a. till realisation to the petitioner.

I. A. filed restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,00,00,000/- and Rs.70,00,000/- till final disposal of the original petition.

Sri. Ankur Gupta, Advocate on behalf of Sri. Tarun Johri, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the respondent along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the PPA is signed on 01.03.2016 and the SCOD was 28.02.2017. The actual SCOD of the unit took place 23.08.2017. Originally there is a delay of 176 days and considering the fact that the Commission has allowed SCOD up to 30.06.2017, there is a delay of 54 days only. Further, the Commission, in individual cases, considered extension of SCOD up to 31.10.2017, as a result of which, there is no delay in this project.

The counsel for the petitioner also stated that the petitioner has furnished bank guarantee for amounts of Rs.1,00,00,000/- and Rs.70,00,000/-, which is valid up to December, 2018. However, the DISCOM has encashed bank guarantee for an amount of Rs.30,00,000/- and are likely to encash the balance B.G. also. The

petitioner seeks orders of the Commission for approving the actual SCOD and direct the licensee to return the B.Gs. given earlier, as also refund the amount already encashed by them to the petitioner. Insofar as the interest is concerned, the counsel for the petitioner stated that the Commission may consider and decide the issue.

The counsel for the respondent stated that he has no objection for the projects where the Commission has considered the extended SCOD of 31.10.2017. Insofar as B.Gs. are considered, the same will be considered for returning to the petitioner depending on the orders of the Commission.

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

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 49 of 2018
&
I. A. No. 25 of 2018

M/s. Tukkapur Solar Private Limited Vs TSNPDCL

Petition filed seeking orders for granting extension of time for SCOD for (241) days, restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,05,00,000/- submitted by the petitioner under PPA, direction to the respondent to release the PBG of Rs.1,05,00,000/- and Rs.1,50,00,000/- infavour of the petitioner and also direction to the respondent to refund the amount of PBG of Rs.45,00,000/- that was encashed by the respondent with interest @ 12% p.a. till realisation to the petitioner.

I. A. filed restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,05,00,000/- and Rs.1,50,00,000/- till final disposal of the original petition.

Sri. Ankur Gupta, Advocate on behalf of Sri. Tarun Johri, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the PPA is signed on 29.02.2016 and the SCOD was 28.02.2017. The actual SCOD of the unit took place 07.10.2017. Originally there is a delay of 221 days and considering the fact that the Commission has allowed SCOD up to 30.06.2017, there is a delay of 99 days only. Further, the Commission, in individual cases, considered extension of SCOD up to 31.10.2017, as a result of which, there is no delay in this project.

The counsel for the petitioner also stated that the petitioner has furnished bank guarantee for amounts of Rs.1,50,00,000/- and Rs.1,05,00,000/-, which is valid up to

December, 2018. However, the DISCOM has encashed bank guarantee for an amount of Rs.45,00,000/- and are likely to encash the balance B.G. also. The petitioner seeks orders of the Commission for approving the actual SCOD and direct the licensee to return the B.Gs. given earlier, as also refund the amount already encashed by them to the petitioner. Insofar as the interest is concerned, the counsel for the petitioner stated that the Commission may consider and decide the issue.

The counsel for the respondent stated that he has no objection for the projects where the Commission has considered the extended SCOD of 31.10.2017. Insofar as B.Gs. are considered, the same will be considered for returning to the petitioner depending on the orders of the Commission.

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

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 50 of 2018
&
I. A. No. 26 of 2018

M/s. Ghanpur Solar Power Private Limited Vs TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking orders for granting extension of time for SCOD for (243) days, restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,50,00,000/- and Rs.1,05,00,000/- submitted by the petitioner under PPA, direction to the respondent to release the PBG of Rs.1,50,00,000/- and Rs.1,05,00,000/- in favour of the petitioner and also direction to the respondent to refund the amount of PBG of Rs.45,00,000/- that was encashed by the respondent with interest @ 12% p.a. till realisation to the petitioner.

I. A. filed restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,05,00,000/- and Rs.1,50,00,000/- till final disposal of the original petition.

Sri. Ankur Gupta, Advocate on behalf of Sri. Tarun Johri, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the PPA is signed on 29.02.2016 and the SCOD was 28.02.2017. The actual SCOD of the unit took place 29.10.2017. Originally there is a delay of 243 days and considering the fact that the Commission has allowed SCOD up to 30.06.2017, there is a delay of 121 days only. Further, the Commission, in individual cases, considered extension of SCOD up to 31.10.2017, as a result of which, there is no delay in this project.

The counsel for the petitioner also stated that the petitioner has furnished bank guarantee for amounts of Rs.1,05,00,000/- and Rs.1,50,00,000/-, which is valid upto December, 2018. However, the DISCOM has encashed bank guarantee for an amount of Rs.45,00,000/- and are likely to encash the balance B.G. also. The petitioner seeks orders of the Commission for approving the actual SCOD and direct the licensee to return the B.Gs. given earlier, as also refund the amount already encashed by them to the petitioner. Insofar as the interest is concerned, the counsel for the petitioner stated that the Commission may consider and decide the issue.

The counsel for the respondent stated that he has no objection for the projects where the Commission has considered the extended SCOD of 31.10.2017. Insofar as B.Gs. are considered, the same will be considered for returning to the petitioner depending on the orders of the Commission.

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

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 51 of 2018
&
I. A. No. 27 of 2018

M/s. Renjal Solar Power Private Limited Vs TSNPDCL

Petition filed seeking orders for granting extension of time for SCOD for (224) days, restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,50,00,000/- and Rs.1,05,00,000/- submitted by the petitioner under PPA, direction to the respondent to release and return the PBG of Rs.1,50,00,000/- and Rs.1,05,00,000/- submitted by the petitioner and also direction to the respondent to refund the amount of PBG of Rs.45,00,000/- that was encashed by the respondent with interest @ 12% p.a. till realisation to the petitioner.

I. A. filed restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,50,00,000/- and Rs.1,05,00,000/- till final disposal of the original petition.

Sri. Ankur Gupta, Advocate on behalf of Sri. Tarun Johri, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the PPA is signed on 01.03.2016 and the SCOD was 28.02.2017. The actual SCOD of the unit took place 10.10.2017. Originally there is a delay of 224 days and considering

the fact that the Commission has allowed SCOD upto 30.06.2017, there is a delay of 102 days only. Further, the Commission, in individual cases, considered extension of SCOD upto 31.10.2017, as a result of which, there is no delay in this project.

The counsel for the petitioner also stated that the petitioner has furnished bank guarantee for amounts of Rs.1,50,00,000/- and Rs.1,05,00,000/-, which is valid upto December, 2018. However, the DISCOM has encashed bank guarantee for an amount of Rs.45,00,000/- and are likely to encash the balance B.G. also. The petitioner seeks orders of the Commission for approving the actual SCOD and direct the licensee to return the B.Gs. given earlier, as also refund the amount already encashed by them to the petitioner. Insofar as the interest is concerned, the counsel for the petitioner stated that the Commission may consider and decide the issue.

The counsel for the respondent stated that he has no objection for the projects where the Commission has considered the extended SCOD of 31.10.2017. Insofar as B.Gs. are considered, the same will be considered for returning to the petitioner depending on the orders of the Commission.

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

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 52 of 2018
&
I. A. No. 28 of 2018

M/s. Gummadidala Solar Power Private Limited Vs TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking orders for granting extension of time for SCOD for (269) days, restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,50,00,000/- and Rs.1,05,00,000/- submitted by the petitioner under PPA, direction to the respondent to release and return the PBG of Rs.1,05,00,000/- and Rs.1,50,00,000/- submitted by the petitioner and also direction to the respondent to refund the amount of PBG of Rs.45,00,000/- that was encashed by the respondent with interest @ 12% p.a. till realisation to the petitioner.

I. A. filed restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,05,00,000/- and Rs.1,50,00,000/- till final disposal of the original petition.

Sri. Ankur Gupta, Advocate on behalf of Sri. Tarun Johri, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents along with Ms. M.

Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the PPA is signed on 29.02.2016 and the SCOD was 28.02.2017. The actual SCOD of the unit took place 23.11.2017. Originally there is a delay of 268 days and considering the fact that the Commission has allowed SCOD upto 30.06.2017, there is a delay of 146 days only. Further, the Commission, in individual cases, considered extension of SCOD up to 31.10.2017, as a result of which, there is delay of 23 days in commissioning the project.

The counsel for the petitioner also stated that the petitioner has furnished bank guarantee for amounts of Rs.1,50,00,000/- and Rs.1,05,00,000/-, which is valid up to December, 2018. However, the DISCOM has encashed bank guarantee for an amount of Rs.45,00,000/- and are likely to encash the balance B.G. also. The petitioner seeks orders of the Commission for approving the actual SCOD and direct the licensee to return the B.Gs. given earlier, as also refund the amount already encashed by them to the petitioner. Insofar as the interest is concerned, the counsel for the petitioner stated that the Commission may consider and decide the issue.

The counsel for the respondent stated that he has no objection for the projects where the Commission has considered the extended SCOD of 31.10.2017. Insofar as B.Gs. are considered, the same will be considered for returning to the petitioner depending on the orders of the Commission.

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

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 53 of 2018
&
I. A. No. 29 of 2018

M/s. Achampet Solar Power Private Limited Vs TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking orders for granting extension of time for SCOD for (184) days, restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,00,00,000/- and Rs.70,00,000/- submitted by the petitioner under PPA, direction to the respondent to release and return the PBG of Rs.1,00,00,000/- and Rs.70,00,000/- submitted by the petitioner and also direction to the respondent to refund the amount of PBG of Rs.30,00,000/- that was encashed by the respondent with interest @ 12% p.a. till realisation to the petitioner.

I. A. filed restraining the respondent from invoking the PBG of Rs.1,00,00,000/- and Rs.70,00,000/- till final disposal of the original petition.

Sri. Ankur Gupta, Advocate on behalf of Sri. Tarun Johri, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the PPA is signed on 29.02.2016 and the SCOD was 28.02.2017. The actual SCOD of the unit took place 30.08.2017. Originally there is a delay of 184 days and considering the fact that the Commission has allowed SCOD up to 30.06.2017, there is a delay of 62 days only. Further, the Commission, in individual cases, considered extension of SCOD up to 31.10.2017, as a result of which, there is no delay in this project.

The counsel for the petitioner also stated that the petitioner has furnished bank guarantee for amounts of Rs.1,00,00,000/- and Rs.70,00,000/-, which is valid up to December, 2018. However, the DISCOM has encashed bank guarantee for an amount of Rs.30,00,000/- and are likely to encash the balance B.G. also. The petitioner seeks orders of the Commission for approving the actual SCOD and direct the licensee to return the B.Gs. given earlier, as also refund the amount already encashed by them to the petitioner. Insofar as the interest is concerned, the counsel for the petitioner stated that the Commission may consider and decide the issue.

The counsel for the respondent stated that he has no objection for the projects where the Commission has considered the extended SCOD of 31.10.2017. Insofar as B.Gs. are considered, the same will be considered for returning to the petitioner depending on the orders of the Commission.

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

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 54 of 2018

TSSPDCL Vs. Mittal Processors Pvt. Ltd.

Petition filed seeking recovery of outstanding amounts payable by the respondent towards compensation and also refund of STOA charges as per short term power purchase orders dated 29.04.2014 and 12.02.2014.

Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the petitioner along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate and Sri. Adarsh Tripathi, Advocate along with Ms. Shraddha Gupta, Advocate for the respondent are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petition is filed against the trader for payment of compensation and STOA charges. The claim is towards short term purchase made in the year 2015 by the DISCOMs. The counsel for the respondent stated that it being a trader had bid for supplying power in the short term basis for a period less than one year. It contracted two sources for supplying the required power to the DISCOMs. The trader selected M/s. Vandana Power of Chattisgadh for 50 MW and 7.5 MW from M/s TSR Green Power. Based on the capacities proposed by the trader, letter of intent had been issued by the DISCOMs. Supply was undertaken from the sources contracted duly entering into agreements with generators. Coupled with the letter of intent the PPAs form the back to back agreements. The agreement period is 30.05.2014 to 26.05.2015.

It is the case of the counsel for respondent that the petitioner ought to have filed the petition within a period of three years from the date, on which the amount has become due. This filing is beyond the said period of limitation. It is also stated that the petitioners ought to have made the generators also party to the case. The petition is not maintainable for non-joinder of parties. The petition is also not maintainable because section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 provides for adjudication between the licensees and the generators, as the generators are not party to the petition, it being a trader, the present petition is liable to be rejected for want of jurisdiction.

The counsel for the respondent stated that the agreement between it and the DISCOMs provides for arbitration of the issues between them. The petitioners ought to have referred the matter to the arbitration invoking the said provisions. For all these reasons the petition may be rejected, as the same is stated in the counter affidavit, which may be considered.

The counsel for the petitioner stated that he would file a rejoinder to the counter affidavit of the respondent and sought time to enable himself to answer all the points raised by the respondent. In view of the request made by the counsel for the petitioner, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 27.10.2018 at 11.00 A.M.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 55 of 2018

M/s. Avighna Solarfarms Ltd. Vs. TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking orders for granting extension of time for SCOD for (122) days

Sri. S. Subba Reddy, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondent along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petition is filed for extending the SCOD of the project. There is a delay in synchronization of the project, but the same is within the period accepted by the Commission that is 30.06.2017. The counsel for the respondent stated that though it is contended about several reasons of force majeure, the same are denied. However, the Commission has already passed orders insofar as the period up to 30.06.2017, hence, the same may be considered.

Heard the counsel for the parties and the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 56 of 2018

M/s. Amun Solarfarms Ltd. Vs. TSNPDCL

Petition filed seeking orders for granting extension of time for SCOD for (122) days

Sri. S. Subba Reddy, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondent along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the petition is filed for extending the SCOD of the project. There is a delay in synchronization of the project, but the same is within the period accepted by the Commission that is 30.06.2017. The counsel for the respondent stated that though it is contended about several reasons of force majeure, the same are denied. However, the Commission has already passed orders insofar as the period up to 30.06.2017, hence, the same may be considered.

Heard the counsel for the parties and the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 57 of 2018

M/s. Gayatri Power Pvt. Ltd. Vs. TSSPDCL

Petition filed seeking determination of tariff for 2.2 MW mini hydel power plant of the petitioner at Rs.5/- (levelized for 25 years) or appropriate rate as determined by the Commission.

Sri. Challa Gunaranjan, Advocate for the petitioner along with Sri. N Panindra Kumar, Advocate and Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondent along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the present petition is filed for determination of the tariff of the project. This petition is filed pursuant to the directions of this Commission that the developer has to obtain orders on the tariff payable by the DISCOMs. The counsel for the respondent stated that the DISCOMs have been complying with the quantum of renewable energy procurement in terms of the regulation issued by the Commission. In fact, their procurement is in excess of the capacity allowed.

The Commission observed that the matter needs examination and sought to know whether all the information required for tariff determination has been done. The counsel for the petitioner stated that earlier the Commission required the information on the project and its audit reports, which have been filed and now also they are enclosed to this petition.

Expressing the view that the tariff determination for individual projects may not be appropriate, the matter is adjourned without any date. The date will be intimated later on, but any information required from the petitioner will be informed separately.

Sd/-
Chairman

I. A. No. 33 of 2018
in
O. P. No. 26 of 2016

TSGENCO Vs. TSDISCOMs

Application filed seeking amendment of tariff for generation of power for the control period of FY 2014-2019.

Sri. K. Anandam, Chief Engineer (Coal & Comml.) for TSGENCO for the petitioner and Sri. Y. Rama Rao, Standing Counsel for the respondents along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate are present. The representative of the petitioner stated and sought to explain that the tariff order passed by the Commission, while determining the tariff for the control period 2014-2019, has considered certain projects as work in progress and did not allow the capitalization of the asset, thereby enabling recover of the tariff for the said project. The Commission also required the petitioner to approach the Commission as and when the project is ready.

The Commission sought to know why completed cost of the project is filed or why it is not awaiting filing of true up petition for consideration of this project. The representative of the petitioner pointed out that the present petition is pursuant to the directions of the Commission only and prayed for orders to be passed in the matter. The counsel for the respondents stated that the Commission may decide the matter, which the respondents will abide by the order of the Commission. The matter is adjourned for consideration and examination without giving any date.

Sd/-
Chairman

O. P. No. 60 of 2018

TSDISCOMs Vs. –Nil-

Petition filed seeking approval of the pooled cost of power purchase for FY 2017-18 to be adopted for the FY 2018-19.

Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondent along with Ms. M. Pravalika, Advocate is present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that as per regulation issued by the Commission, the Commission has to determine the pooled cost of

power purchase for FY 2017-18, which has to be considered for the year 2018-19.
The Commission may consider the data submitted and passed orders.

Accordingly the matter is reserved for orders.

Sd/-
Chairman