

**Record of proceedings dated 30.06.2015**

O. P. No.10 of 2015

M/s Sundew Properties Ltd. Vs TSSPDCL

Petition seeking deemed distribution license.

Sri. P. Sri Raghu Ram Senior Advocate along officers of the petitioner for the petitioner and Sri. J Aswini Kumar Advocate for Sri. Y Rama Rao counsel for the respondent are present. The counsel for the petitioner submitted his arguments. The counsel for the respondents sought adjournment to any other date as the matter needs some examination and he needs to go through the record so that he can make his submission. Though the role of the respondents is minimal and there is no necessity of hearing, yet Commission desired to hear the licensee as several questions regarding supply and as well legal position need to be explained.

The Commission adjourned the hearing, but made it clear that no further adjournment would be sought either by the petitioner or the assisting respondent and the parties should be ready all the facts to submit arguments including legal position. Adjourned.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Call on 15.07.2015  
At 11:00 AM  
Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 14 of 2015  
And  
IA No. 1 of 2015

M/s Arhyama Solar Power Pvt. Ltd. vs Govt of Telangana & DISCOMS

Petition seeking the levy of transmission and wheeling charges as determined by erstwhile APERC vide order dated 09.05.2014 contrary to government policy as adopted by the APERC.

Sri. G Randheer representative on behalf of the petitioner and Sri. J. Aswini Kumar Sri. Y. Rama Rao, counsel for respondent are present. The representative of the petitioner sought adjournment of the matter as the counsel is unwell and therefore unable to attend the hearing. Therefore, he requested for any other date for hearing

of the matter to make submissions. The Advocate representing the respondents has no objection. Adjourned.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Call on 17.07.2015  
At 11:00 AM  
Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 61 of 2015  
And  
IA No. 23 of 2015

M/s Green Energy Association vs DISCOMs & SLDC

Petition u/s 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of Regulation 7 (1) & (2) and 9 of the APERC Renewable power purchase obligation (compliance by purchase of renewable energy / renewable energy certificate) Regulation, 2012.

Filed an I.A. seeking to amend the title to the case and also to amend the prayer in the petition.

Sri. B. Tagore counsel for the petitioner and Sr. J. Aswini Kumar Advocate on Behalf of Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents are present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that he has filed the rejoinder to the counter filed by the respondents in the I A for amendment of the cause title. He sought time for the counsel on record to come and argue the matter. The Counsel for the respondents pointed out that the matter is filed by ana ssociatin and they have taken objection to such filing.

The counsel for the petitioner was asked to address the issue of an association filing a petition before the Commission as the Commission cannot entertain a pro-pono-publico as it is not a court of record and is only a statutory body bound to act within the provisions of the statute under which has been established. The counsel agreed to submit the arguments on the issue along with the merits of the case.

The Commission adjourned the hearing, but made it clear that no further adjournment would be given to the petitioner or the respondents and the parties should be ready all the facts to submit arguments. The petitioner should also be ready to submit its arguments on the query raised by the Commission. Adjourned.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Call on 17.07.2015  
At 11:00 AM  
Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No. 81 of 2015  
And  
IA No. 22 of 2015

M/s Earth Solar Pvt.Ltd. vs TSSPDCL & CGM (Comml & RAC), TSSPDCL  
Petition seeking to question the action of the license in not modifying and changing  
the substation as requested and also postponing the COD by one year.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Sri. J. Aswini Kumar Advocate  
for Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents is present. The counsel for the  
respondents sought adjournment of the matter and stated he has to file the counter  
affidavit in the matter. Since there is no representation and it is for the 1<sup>st</sup> time, the  
commission adjourned the hearing in the matter.

The Commission adjourned the hearing. Office to issue a notice for appearance.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Call on 17.07.2015  
At 11:00 AM  
Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No.82 of 2015

M/s Pragathi Group vs TSSPDCL & TSTRANSCO

Petition seeking to question the action of levying wheeling and transmission charges  
by licensees along with other issues.

Sri. N. K. K. Venkat and Sri. Hari Kumar representatives of the petitioner and Sri. J.  
Aswini Kumar Advocate for Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents are  
present. The representatives of the petitioner briefly stated about the case and  
sought time to engage a legal practitioner. It is also stated that the respondents have  
not filed any counter affidavit in the matter. Counsel for the respondents sought time  
to reply to the points made by the representatives on the aspect exempting wheeling  
charges as well as the multiple prayers sought in the petition.

The Commission adjourned the hearing, but made it clear that no further  
adjournment should be sought by either the petitioner or the respondents the parties  
should be ready with all the facts to submit arguments. Adjourned.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Call on 17.07.2015  
At 11:00 AM  
Sd/-  
Chairman

O. P. No.83 of 2015

M/s Lanco Kondapalli Power Ltd. Vs TSPCC, TSSPDCL & TSNPDCL

Petition seeking to question of non-payment of supplementary bills by the licensees.

Sri. M. K. Viswanatha Naidu Advocate for Sri. Challa Gunaranjan counsel for the petitioner and Sri. J. Aswini Kumar Advocate for Sri. Y. Rama Rao counsel for the respondents are present. The counsel for the petitioners sought adjournment of the matter and stated that the matter also involves jurisdiction but this is not a transferred case from the erstwhile APERC as it was specifically filed before the Commission itself. It is also stated that similar petition is filed before the present APERC also. Since the issue of jurisdiction is being heard by the Commission on 04.07.2015, the matter may be adjourned by a month. The counsel for the respondents while agreeing substantially and also requesting for time to file counter affidavit, reiterated the petitioner should make all the 4 DISCOMS existing in two states as parties to the petition. The counsel for petitioner sought to reply the same at the time of hearing the case based on the decision of the Commission on the issue of jurisdiction.

The Commission adjourned the hearing, but made it clear that no further adjournment would be given to the petitioner or the respondents the parties should be ready all the facts and pleadings to submit arguments. Adjourned.

Call on 03.08.2015

At 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman