



**TELANGANA ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
Vidyut Niyamtran Bhavan, G.T.S. Colony, Kalyan Nagar, Hyderabad 500 045

**R. P. No. 5 of 2025**

**in**

**O. P. No. 30 of 2024**

**Dated 16.02.2026**

**Present**

**Dr. Justice Devaraju Nagarjun, Chairman**

**Between**

1. Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Limited,  
H. No. 6-1-50, Corporate Office, 1st Floor, Mint Compound,  
Hyderabad – 500 063.
2. Northern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Limited,  
H. No. 2-5-31/2, Corporate Office, Vidyut Bhavan,  
Nakkalagutta, Warangal – 506 001

... Review Petitioners / Respondents

**AND**

The Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Kothagudem Collieries,  
Bhadradi-Kothagudem District - 507 101

... Respondent / Petitioner

This petition has come up for hearing on 08.01.2026. Sri. N. Sreedhar Reddy, Advocate representing the review petitioners / Respondents present, Sri. Shiv Rao Advocate present on behalf of the Respondent / Petitioner. The review petition having stood over for consideration to this day, the Commission has passed the following:

## **ORDER**

1. M/s. Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Limited (TGSPDCL) and M/s. Northern Power Distribution of Company of Telangana Limited (TGNDCL) (herein after referred as revision/review petitioners), have filed this petition under Section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and under clause 32 of TGERC Conduct of Business Regulations 2015 (Regulation No. 2 of 2015) read with order 47 rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 seeking to review paragraph 3.2 (e) of the impugned order passed by this Commission in O. P. No. 30 of 2024 dated 29.04.2025 (only in so far as observations of this Commission is concerned stating that the revision petitioners have not raised any objection in respect of O & M expenses projected by the respondent i.e., M/s. The Singareni Collieries Company Limited, in their petition in O. P. No. 30 of 2024, wherein the respondent has sought for revised ARR and tariff proposal for FY 2025-26 and true-up for FY 2023-24 in respect of 2 X 600 MW of Singareni Thermal Power Plant)

2. The facts which necessitated the review petitioners to file this application are that the respondent / M/s. SCCL has filed O. P. No. 30 of 2024 before this Commission seeking to revise the ARR and tariff proposal for FY 2025-26 and true-up for FY 2023-24 in respect of 2 X 600 MW of Singareni Thermal Power Plant. This review petition was taken on file under Section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003, clause 32 of TGERC Conduct of Business Regulations 2015 (Regulation No. 2 of 2015) read with order 47 rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. The review petitioners have also filed their detailed objections and written submissions in respect of the proposals made by the respondent / SCCL for passing the revising ARR and tariff proposals for FY 2025-26 and true-up for FY 2023-24 in respect of 2 X 600 MW of Singareni Thermal Power Plant.

3. After considering the objections of the various stakeholders and on hearing the public at large on 21.01.2025, this Commission has passed orders on 29.04.2025 revising the ARR and tariff proposals for FY 2025-26 and true-up for FY 2023-24 in respect of 2 X 600 MW of Singareni Thermal Power Plant.

4. In the orders passed by this Commission in O. P. No. 30 of 2024 dated 29.04.2025, this Commission has observed at paragraph 3.2 (e) as under

*“Though the Discoms have raised objection in respect of many heads, it has not chosen to raise any objection on O & M expenses”*

Aggrieved by the said observations, the review petitioners have filed this application stating that though they have raised objections by way of detailed reply and written submissions on 09.01.2025 and 10.02.2025 respectively opposing the proposals of the respondent in respect of O & M expenses, same has not been recorded properly in the order dated 29.04.2025.

5. Heard Mr. N. Sreedhar Reddy, learned counsel appearing for review petitioners and Mr. P. Shiva Rao, learned counsel representing the respondent. Perused the record.

6. The main contention of learned counsel for the review petitioners, Mr. N. Sreedhar Reddy is that though the review petitioners have raised objections in respect of O & M expenses in the tariff proposals for the year 2025-26 and true-up 2023-24, this Commission has inadvertently mentioned at paragraph 3.2 (e) stating that the review petitioners have not raised any objection. Therefore, sought for correcting the impugned order dated 29.04.2025 in O. P. No. 30 of 2024 to that extent.

7. Mr. P. Shiv Rao, learned counsel representing the respondent / M/s. SCCL also has submitted that this Commission may take a call on the prayer sought for by the review petitioners in this review petition basing on the material available before this court.

8. I have gone through the entire record meticulously. The Chief Engineer (IPC) of TGSPDCL has filed replies dated 09.01.2025 to the tariff proposal for FY 2025-26 and true-up for FY 2023-24 in respect of 2 X 600 MW of Singareni Thermal Power Plant submitted by respondent M/s. SCCL at para no. (v) of page no. 22 of the reply stating that the respondent has claimed higher O & M charges in the truing up of expenditure as against the approved / trued up figures.

9. At sub-para no. 5 of para no. (v) at page no. 24, the review petitioners have requested the Commission to restrict the O & M claims for the year 2025-26 duly taking into consideration of the methodology stipulated in the clause 45 of MYT Regulation No. 2 of 2023.

10. Similarly, in respect of K factor is concerned, the revision petitioners have mentioned that the respondent / M/s. SCCL has claimed K factor at 1.34 percent by revising the GFA claim to Rs. 7,794.61 crores for the FY 2024-25 and Rs. 7819.62 crores for FY 2025-26 as against this Commission's approval of K factor at 1.08 percent for the approved GFA of Rs. 7,745.32 crores vide order dated 23.03.2023 and 28.06.2024. In sub para no. 8 of para no. (v) of Page 25 also, the petitioners have clearly raised the objection that the k-factor claimed by the respondent is not tenable. Similar pleadings were also found in written submissions made by the petitioners on 10.02.2025.

11. As seen from the orders passed by this Commission in O. P. No 30 of 2024 dated 29.04.2025, though this Commission has mentioned at para 3.2 (e), that the petitioners have not chosen to raise objections on O & M expenses, still this Commission has declined the claim of the respondent in respect of O & M expenses and taken into consideration the submissions of the review petitioners and restricted the claim of the respondent from Rs. 314.28 crores to Rs. 234.22.

12. But, as rightly submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner, though the review petitioners have raised objection in respect of claim of O & M expenses, due to typographical error, inadvertently at paragraph no 3.2 (e), it is mentioned that the Discoms have not raised objections in respect of O & M expenses. Therefore, considering the discussion made above and on perusal of the entire material on record including the orders of this Commission passed in O. P. No. 30 of 2024 dated 29.04.2025 and on considering the reply and written submission filed in O. P. No. 30 of 2024, this Commission hereby orders for deletion of sub-clause (e) of para 3.2 of the order. Thereby the orders passed by this Commission on 29.04.2025 has to be read without sub-clause (e) of para 3.2. This office is directed to upload a fresh order dated 21.01.2025.

**This order is corrected and signed on this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2026.**

**Sd/-**

**(Dr. JUSTICE DEVARAJU NAGARJUN)  
CHAIRMAN**

**-//CERTIFIED COPY//-**