

**Record of proceedings dated 26-08-2016**

O.P No. 50 of 2013 & I.A. No. 26 of 2013  
M/s. KCP Limited Vs APTRANSCO & SPDCL & 2 others

Petition u/s 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 in relation to billing on reactive power surcharge on reactive power drawn by the petitioner's Mini-Hydel project under the amended and restated Power Wheeling & Purchase Agreement dt. 17.03.1999

Interlocutory Application No. 26 of 2013, also filed by the petitioner for stay of collection of demand for reactive power surcharge and surcharge thereon under the APERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are present.

Arguments of Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are heard. For orders, posted to 24-09-2016.

Call on: 24-09-2016  
at 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
MEMBER / PRM

Sd/-  
CHAIRMAN

O.P. No. 51 of 2014 & I.A. No. 14 of 2014  
M/s. Shree Jayalakshmi Powercorp Ltd Vs APTRANSCO & APSPDCL & 2 others

Petition filed under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 in relation to billing on reactive power surcharge on reactive power drawn by petitioner (Mini Hydel Power Plant) under Amended and Restated Power Wheeling & Purchase Agreement dt.03-09-1998 and the application for interim relief

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are present.

Arguments of Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are heard. For orders, posted to 24-09-2016.

Call on: 24-09-2016  
at 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
MEMBER / PRM

Sd/-  
CHAIRMAN

O.P. No. 52 of 2014 & I.A. No. 15 of 2014  
M/s. Espar Pak Ltd Vs APTRANSCO & APSPDCL & 2 others

Petition filed under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 in relation to billing on reactive power surcharge on reactive power drawn by petitioner (Mini Hydel Power Plant) under Power Wheeling & Purchase Agreement dt.11-01-2000 and the application for interim relief

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are present.

Arguments of Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are heard. For orders, posted to 24-09-2016.

Call on: 24-09-2016  
at 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
MEMBER / PRM

Sd/-  
CHAIRMAN

O.P.No.53 of 2014 & I.A.No.16 of 2014

M/s. Tirumala Cotton & Agro Pvt Ltd Vs APTRANSCO & APSPDCL & 2 others

Petition under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 in relation to billing on reactive power surcharge on reactive power drawn by petitioner (Mini Hydel Power Plant) under Amended and Restated Power Wheeling & Purchase Agreement dt.19-10-2000 and the application for interim relief

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are present.

Arguments of Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are heard. For orders, posted to 24-09-2016.

Call on: 24-09-2016  
at 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
MEMBER / PRM

Sd/-  
CHAIRMAN

O.P.No.54 of 2014 & I.A.No.17 of 2014  
M/s. Akshay Profiles Pvt Ltd Vs APTRANSCO & APSPDCL & 2 others

Petition under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 in relation to billing on reactive power surcharge on reactive power drawn by petitioner (Mini Hydel Power Plant) under Power Purchase & Wheeling Agreement dt.11-01-2000 and the application for interim relief

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are present.

Arguments of Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are heard. For orders, posted to 24-09-2016.

Call on: 24-09-2016  
at 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
MEMBER / PRM

Sd/-  
CHAIRMAN

O.P.No.55 of 2014 & I.A.No.1 of 2015  
M/s. RPP Ltd Vs APSPDCL

Petition under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking dispute with regard to the demands for surcharge for reactive energy and delayed payment surcharge thereon in respect of Mini Hydel Power Plant of the petitioner

Sri K. Gopal Choudary, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent are present.

Arguments of Sri K. Gopal Choudary, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent are heard. For orders, posted to 24-09-2016.

Call on: 24-09-2016  
at 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
MEMBER / PRM

Sd/-  
CHAIRMAN

O.P. No. 58 of 2014 & I.A. No. 18 of 2014  
M/s. Sri Dhanalakshmi Cotton & Rice Mills Pvt Ltd Vs APTRANSCO & APSPDCL & 2  
others

Petition under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 in relation to billing on  
reactive power surcharge on reactive power drawn by petitioner (Mini Hydel Power  
Plant) under Amended and Restated Power Wheeling & Purchase Agreement  
dt.25-07-1998 and the application for interim relief

Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned  
Standing Counsel for the respondents are present.

Arguments of Sri Challa Gunaranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri P. Shiva  
Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents are heard. For orders, posted to  
24-09-2016.

Call on:

24-09-2016  
at 11:00 AM

Sd/-  
MEMBER / PRM

Sd/-  
CHAIRMAN

APTRANSCO Vs ---

Public hearing on 26-08-2016 in the matter of review of the Commission order dated 07-11-2015 in O.P.No.13 of 2015 on certain issues in the True-up of Transmission Business for 2nd control period (FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14)

Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the petitioner and Sri K. Gopal Choudary, Amicus Curiae are present.

Orders pronounced (vide separate order)

- “11. Thus a close and careful examination of the issues involved shows the questions attempted to be raised to be not within the scope of a review petition. The review petitioner failed in establishing any patent violation of Regulation 5 of 2005 in the True-up order or any contradiction with any admitted or proved data or material before the Commission. In the absence of any strong ground for review, the petitioner has to fail.
12. The Commission records with appreciation the zeal and commitment of Sri Dinesh Paruchuri, Director (Finance) of the petitioner in his efforts to protect the interests of the petitioner and also the invaluable guidance received from the inputs provided by the learned *Amicus Curiae* Sri K. Gopal Choudary, learned Standing Counsel for the petitioner Sri P. Shiva Rao and the learned energy expert Sri M. Venugopala Rao.
13. The petition is dismissed accordingly. No costs”.

Sd/-  
MEMBER / PRM

Sd/-  
CHAIRMAN