

COURT-1

**IN THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL FOR ELECTRICITY
(Appellate Jurisdiction)**

**APL No. 161 OF 2025 & IA No. 865 OF 2025 & IA No. 1028 OF 2025 & IA
No. 1029 OF 2025**

Dated: 14th July, 2025

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

In the matter of:

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited Appellant(s)

Versus

Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission & Anr. Respondent(s)

Counsel on record for the Appellant(s) : Anand K. Ganesan
Swapna Seshadri
Amal Nair
Shivani Verma
Devyani Prasad
for App. 1

Counsel on record for the Respondent(s) : Gargi Kumar
for Res. 1

Tajender K. Joshi
Rampal Kohle
for Res. 2

ORDER

IA No. 1028 of 2025

(for condonation of delay in filing reply to the appeal)

Mr. Tajender K. Joshi, learned Counsel for the 2nd Respondent, states that, while reply was filed through the e-filing portal after court

working hours on 01.07.2025, the Registry has computed the date of receipt of reply as 02.07.2025; and, If the reply is treated as having been filed on 01.07.2025, the delay would only be of five days, in which case no costs are imposed by this Tribunal.

In the light of the afore-said facts, we deem it appropriate to condone the delay in filing the reply to the appeal. The delay is condoned and reply filed by the 2nd Respondent is taken on record.

The application is, accordingly, disposed of.

IA NO. 1029 OF 2024

(for condonation of delay in filing reply to the IA)

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), and file proof of payment in the Registry. Learned Counsel undertakes to pay costs and file proof of payment of costs in the

Registry within ten days. Subject to compliance with the aforesaid directions, the delay in filing reply to the IA is condoned, and the reply to the IA filed by the 2nd Respondent shall be taken on record. The application is disposed of.

The 1st Respondent shall also intimate the CTUIL of the Appeal No. and the date of Order, in terms of which costs are being paid.

APL No. 161 OF 2025 & IA No. 865 OF 2025

Post the matter on **29.07.2025.**

(Seema Gupta)
Technical Member (Electricity)

(Justice Ramesh Ranganathan)
Chairperson

ts/pk