

**Record of proceedings dated 22.07.2024**

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
R. P. (SR) No. 40 of 2016 In I. A. No. 2 of 2016 in O. P. No. 10 of 2025	M/s. Sundew Properties Ltd.	TGSPDCL

Review petition filed seeking review the order dated 04.08.2016 in I. A. No. 2 of 2016 in O. P. No. 10 of 2017 passed by the Commission.

Sri. V. Sivaramakrishna Murthy, Asst. Vice-President for review petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché being the representative of the respondent have appeared in the matter. The representative of the review petitioner stated that though the matter was referred to the review petitioner's counsel, he did not turn up. However, the review petitioner is not pressing the matter now and would file a memo by tomorrow to that effect. The representative of the respondent has no objection for the same. Considering the submissions of the representative of the review petitioner, the matter is disposed of as not pressed.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 2 of 2016	M/s Ultra Tech Cement Ltd.	TGSPDCL & its officers

Petition filed questioning the action of DISCOM in not implementing the order of the CGRF and to punish the licensee under section 142 of the Act, 2003.

Sri. Deepak Chowdary, Advocate representing Sri. Challa Gunaranjan, Counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché being the representative of the respondents have appeared in the matter. The advocate representing the counsel for petitioner stated that originally, the respondents have approached the Hon'ble High Court questioning the order of CGRF. The Hon'ble High Court had refused to entertain the writ petition and directed the respondents to implement the order passed by the CGRF. When the petitioner sought the implementation of the said order, the licensees again refused to implement the same. Then the petitioner filed writ petition which was disposed of in favour of the petitioner. Then the respondents preferred a writ appeal, which was heard and disposed of duly remanding the matter back to the single judge for fresh disposal. But till date despite of efforts made by the petitioner, it did not see the light of the day.

On the contrary, the representative of the respondents vehemently insisted that the respondents have filed writ appeal against the original order refusing to entertain the writ petition, but at was pains to point out the correct details. He submitted that a memo had been filed setting out the details of the matter, but it did not reflect the submissions made by the representative of the respondents.

At this stage, the advocate representing the counsel for petitioner stated that he is not in possession of the memo filed by the respondents and would obtain the same from the office of the Commission and verify the details by next date of hearing. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 09.09.2024 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 21 of 2016	Sri Akther Ahmed	CGRF-2, ADE (O) Shamshabad, TGSPDCL, DE (O) & SE (O) TGSPDCL

Petition filed questioning the action of DISCOM in not implementing the order of the CGRF and to punish the licensee U/s 142 of the Act, 2003.

Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché being the representative of the respondents has appeared in the matter. There is no representation for petitioner. As the matter was listed for ascertaining the status of the pending litigation before superior fora, the presence of counsel for petitioner is necessary. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 22.08.2024 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No. 27 of 2016	M/s. Sugna Metals Limited	DE (O) Vikarabad TGSPDCL & its officers

Petition filed questioning the action of DISCOM in not implementing the order of the CGRF and to punish the licensee U/s 142 of the Act, 2003.

Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché being the representative of the respondents has appeared in the matter. There is no representation for petitioner. As the matter was listed for ascertaining the status of the pending litigation before superior fora, the presence of counsel for petitioner is necessary. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 22.08.2024 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
O. P. No.59 of 2018	TGDISCOMs	APGENCO, APTRANSCO, APEPDCL & APSPDCL

Petition filed seeking certain directions to APGENCO and APDISCOMs.

Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché being the representative of the petitioners has appeared in the matter. There is no representation for respondents. The representative of the petitioners stated that he has been entrusted the matter recently and he needs to secure the records as well as the present status of the issue from the management of the petitioners. Therefore, he requested to adjourn the matter. Considering the request of the representative of the petitioners and the absence of the counsel for respondent, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 09.09.2024 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman

Case No.	Name of the Petitioner(s)	Name of the Respondent(s)
R. P. No. 2 of 2024 in O. P. No. 22 of 2023 (Suo Motu)	M/s. Sri Luxmi Tulsi Agro Paper (P) Limited	TGSLDC

Review petition filed seeking review the order dated 27.03.2024 in O. P. No. 22 of 2023 (suo motu) passed by the Commission.

Sri. Deepak Chowdary, Advocate representing Sri. Challa Gunaranjan, Counsel for petitioner and Sri. Mohammad Bande Ali, Law Attaché being the representative of the respondents have appeared in the matter. The advocate representing the counsel for petitioner stated that it has been informed by the office of the

Commission that an application for condonation for delay in filing the review petition is required to be filed. Considering the procedural difficulty of the Commission, he would take steps to file the application by the next date of hearing. The matter may be adjourned to any other date. On the other hand, the representative of the respondent has filed counter affidavit in the matter, a copy of which is served on the counsel for review petitioner. In view of the submissions of the counsel for petitioner, the matter is adjourned.

Call on 09.09.2024 at 11.30 A.M.

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Member

Sd/-  
Chairman