

COURT-1

IN THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL FOR ELECTRICITY
(Appellate Jurisdiction)

APL No. 122 OF 2025 & IA No. 850 OF 2025 & IA No. 635 OF 2025 &
IA No. 636 OF 2025

Dated: 15th May, 2025

Present: Hon`ble Mr. Justice Ramesh Ranganathan, Chairperson
Hon`ble Ms. Seema Gupta, Technical Member (Electricity)

In the matter of:

Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited Appellant(s)

Versus

Central Electricity Regulatory Commission & Ors. Respondent(s)

Counsel on record for the Appellant(s) : Ranjitha Ramachandran
Srishti Khindaria
Aneesh Bajaj
for App. 1

Counsel on record for the Respondent(s) : Nitish Gupta
Molshree Bhatnagar
Shubhi Sharma
Tushar Srivastava
Nipun Sharma
Nimesh Jha
Shaيدا Das
Punyam Bhutani
Paritosh Bisen
Deepak Thakur
Varnika Tyagi
Kamya Sharma
Aparna Tiwari
Amaan Ahmed Khan
Samprati Singh
Divyansh Kasana
Hemant Sahai
Kanika Chugh
Shryeshth Ramesh Sharma
Siddharth Nigotia
Mohit Gupta
Kartikay Trivedi
Indu Uttara

Shri Venkatesh
Akash Lamba
Abhishek Nangia
Kunal Veer Chopra
Harsh Vardhan
Vedant Choudhary
Nihal Bhardwaj
Mohit Mansharamani
Manu Tiwari
Shivam Kumar
Aashwyn Singh
Aniket Kanhaa
Adarsh Singh
Ananya Dutta
Ashutosh Kumar Srivastava
Suhael Buttan
Priya Dhankar
Vineet Kumar
Surbhi Kapoor
Tanishka Khatana
Nikunj Bhatnagar
Tarang Saraogi
Manav Bhatia
Drishti Rathi
for Res. 2

Poorva Saigal
Shubham Arya
Pallavi Saigal
Reeha Singh
Rishabh Saxena
Harshvardhan Singh
Shirin Gupta
for Res. 3

ORDER

IA NO. 636 OF 2025
(For urgent listing)

The matter listed before us, having served its purpose, stands disposed of.

IA NO. 850 OF 2025

(For condonation of delay of 14 days in filing reply by Res.2)

Despite repeated reminders of the need to file pleadings within the time sought for by the Counsel themselves, applications are still being filed seeking further extension of time for completing pleadings. Such requests not only disable us from striving to achieve the objective of the Act to dispose of the Appeal within 180 days, but also results in needless wastage of precious court time, which can be more usefully spent in hearing Appeals on merits.

The present case is yet another instance of procrastination. We, however, see no reason to deny the 2nd Respondent an opportunity to file their reply. We consider it appropriate to permit them to file reply on condition that the 2nd Respondent pays costs of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) to the Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL) within four weeks, and file proof of payment in the Registry within two weeks thereafter. Subject to compliance with the aforesaid directions, the delay in filing reply is condoned, and the reply filed by the 2nd Respondent shall be taken on record. The application is disposed of.

The 2nd Respondent shall also intimate the CTUIL of the Appeal No. and the date of Order, in terms of which costs are being paid.

APPEAL NO. 122 OF 2025 & IA NO. 635 OF 2025

Heard Mr. M. G. Ramachandran, Learned Senior Counsel, appearing on behalf of the Appellant, in part. Learned Senior Counsel requests that the matter be taken up on 19.05.2025.

Both Mr. M. G. Ramachandran, Learned Senior Counsel, appearing on behalf of the Appellant, and Mr. P. Chidambaram, Learned Senior Counsel, appearing on behalf of the 2nd Respondent, would submit that, since the submissions they have put-forth in the IA would be substantially the same which can be put-forth in the main appeal before this Tribunal, this Tribunal may, if it so considers it appropriate, consider passing final orders in the main appeal itself.

Post the IA for further hearing on **19.05.2025**.

Seema Gupta
Technical Member (Electricity)

Justice Ramesh Ranganathan
Chairperson

tpd/sk