

COURT-2

IN THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL FOR ELECTRICITY
(Appellate Jurisdiction)

RP No. 7 OF 2025

Dated: 5th May, 2026

Present : Hon`ble Mr. Virender Bhat, Judicial Member
Hon`ble Mr. Ajay Talegaonkar, Technical Member (Electricity)

In the matter of:

Rajasthan Steel Chambers

Through Managing Director,
B-234, Road No. 9, VKI Area
Jaipur, Rajasthan – 302 013

Review Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. **Jaipur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd.**
Through its Managing Director,
B-234, Road No. 9, VKI Area Vidyut
Bhawan, Jyoti Nagar, Jaipur – 302005 ... Respondent No.1
2. **Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd.**
Through its Managing Director,
New Power House, Industrial Estates,
Jodhpur – 342003 ... Respondent No.2
3. **Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd.**
Through its Managing Director,
400 kv GSS Building, Ajmer Road,
Heerapura, Jaipur – 302024 ... Respondent No.3
4. **Central Electricity Regulatory
Commission**
Through its Secretary,
6th, 7th & 8th Floors, Tower B,

World Trade Centre, Nauroji Nagar
New Delhi – 110 029

... Respondent No.4

5. **State Load Despatch Centre**

Through Chief Engineer,
Rajasthan Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd,
Vidyut Bhawan, Jyoti Nagar, Jaipur -
302005

... Respondent No.5

6. **The State Power Committee**

Through Chief Engineer / SLDC as
Member-Secretary, Rajasthan Vidyut
Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Vidyut Bhawan,
Jyoti Nagar, Jaipur - 302005

... Respondent No.6

7. **Rajasthan Vidyut Prasaran Nigam
Ltd,**

Through Managing Director,
Vidyut Bhawan, Jyoti Nagar, Jaipur –
302005

... Respondent No.7

Counsel on record for the Petitioner(s) : Anand K. Ganesan
Swapna Seshadri
Aishwarya Subramani
Harsha V Rao
for App. 1

Counsel on record for the Respondent(s) : Sanjay Kumar Agarwal
Eesha Sharma
Mrigangi Parul
for Res. 1

Sanjay Kumar Agarwal
Eesha Sharma
Mrigangi Parul
for Res. 2

Sanjay Kumar Agarwal
Eesha Sharma
Mrigangi Parul

for Res. 3

Poorva Saigal
Shubham Arya
Pallavi Saigal
Reeha Singh
Rishabh Saxena
Shirin Gupta
Harshvardhan Singh
for Res. 5

Poorva Saigal
Shubham Arya
Pallavi Saigal
Reeha Singh
Rishabh Saxena
Shirin Gupta
Harshvardhan Singh
for Res. 7

ORDER

We have heard Mr. Anand K. Ganesan, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. Sanjay Kumar Agarwal, Learned Counsel for the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 and Mr. Shubham Arya, Learned Counsel for the Respondent Nos. 5 to 7.

The Review Petitioner M/s. Rajasthan Steel Chambers is seeking review of the judgment dated 13.02.2025 of this Tribunal in Appeal Nos. 111 of 2018 and 112 of 2018 whereby both these appeals were allowed. The Review Petitioner was the 2nd Respondent in Appeal No. 111 of 2018.

Learned Counsel for the Review Petitioner Shri Anand K. Ganesan, Advocate has referred to paragraph No.9 of the judgment under review which is extracted herein below for the sake of convenience: -

“9. We have heard the Learned Counsel for the Appellants and the Learned Counsels appearing for Respondent Nos. 1, 3, 4 & 5. None appeared to contest the appeals on behalf of Respondent No. 2. We have also perused the impugned orders as well as the written submissions filed by the Learned Counsels.”

Learned Counsel submits that he had appeared on behalf of the 2nd Respondent in Appeal No. 111 of 2018 ie M/s Rajasthan Steel Chambers (Petitioner herein) and had also advanced the submissions on behalf of the said respondent but inadvertently it has been stated in Paragraph 9 of the judgment that none appeared on behalf of the 2nd Respondent to contest the appeals. He further submitted that the “2nd Respondent,” as stated in paragraph No. 9 of the judgment under review, appears to be referring the 2nd Respondent in Appeal No. 112 of 2018 ie M/s. National Engineering Industries Ltd. on whose behalf nobody had appeared to contest the appeal. According to the Learned Counsel, the judgment dated 13.02.2025 passed in these two appeals suffers from error apparent on the face of record in so far as the contentions and submissions made on behalf of the Review Petitioner have not been noted and considered and therefore, the judgment needs to be reviewed.

We have given our anxious consideration to these submissions made by the Learned Counsel for the Review Petitioner.

In pursuance to the order dated 17.03.2026 passed in this review petition, the main files related to these two appeals have been placed before us today by the Registry, which we have perused.

The perusal of the daily orders passed in this batch of two appeals by this Tribunal would reveal that none of these orders mentions presence of Shir Anand K. Ganesan, Advocate on behalf of the 2nd Respondent in Appeal No. 111 of 2018. In fact, these daily orders would reveal that nobody has been appearing on behalf of the 2nd Respondent in both these appeals.

Order dated 19.11.2024 specifically states that Mr. S. K. Agarwal, Advocate and Mr. Shubham Arya, Advocate were heard on behalf of the Appellant and Respondent Nos. 3 to 5 respectively on that day. Neither this order nor any other order subsequent to it mentions that Shri Anand K. Ganesan, Advocate had appeared on behalf of M/s Rajasthan Steel Chambers (Respondent No.2 in Appeal No.111 of 2018) and had advanced arguments on its behalf.

We may also note that on 20.12.2024, when the arguments in this batch of appeals were concluded, the parties were directed to file a brief note by 20.01.2025. However no such note or written submissions were filed on behalf of the Review Petitioner.

Learned Counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that the written submissions on its behalf had already been filed in the year 2018. It is true that written submissions dated 14.08.2018 filed on behalf of the Review Petitioner-M/s Rajasthan Steel Chambers are on record but we find that these were not referred to or relied upon during the course of hearing of the appeal as nobody had either appeared or advanced oral submissions on its behalf.

It appears that the Review Petitioner has awoken from slumber after we passed the judgment in these two appeals thereby allowing the appeals and is seeking a rehearing of these appeals on non-existent, malafide and misleading ground that its counsel had advanced arguments but the same have not been considered. We see no truth at all in the contentions raised by the Review Petitioner and thus, cannot re-open the appeals on such after thought contentions.

In view of what has been noted hereinabove, it is manifest that this Tribunal has not committed any error, much less an apparent error, in observing in Paragraph 9 of the judgment dated 13.02.2025 that nobody had appeared on behalf of the 2nd Respondent to contest the appeals.

Therefore, we find no merit in the Review Petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

Ajay Talegaonkar
Technical Member
mk/mkj

Virender Bhat
Judicial Member