COURT-1

IN THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL FOR ELECTRICITY
(Appellate Jurisdiction)

APL No. 242 OF 2025 & IA No. 1440 OF 2025

Dated: 8th November, 2025

Present: Hon`ble Mr. Justice Ramesh Ranganathan, Chairperson
Hon`ble Mr. Ajay Talegaonkar, Technical Member (Electricity)

In the matter of:

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited, ... Appellant(s)

Versus

NHPC Ltd. & Ors. .... Respondent(s)

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

Counsel on record for the Respondent(s) : Shri Venkatesh
Shryeshth Ramesh Sharma
Kanika Chugh
Ashutosh Kumar Srivastava
Suhael Buttan
Nihal Bhardwaj
Surbhi Kapoor
Adarsh Singh
Siddharth Nigotia
Manu Tiwari
Abhishek Nangia
Mohit Mansharamani
Akash Lamba
Shivam Kumar
Kartikay Trivedi
Aashwyn Singh
Mohit Gupta
Harsh Vardhan
Aniket Kanhaua
Ananya Dutta
Indu Uttara
Priya Dhankar
Vineet Kumar
Tanishka Khatana
Nikunj Bhatnagar
Kunal Veer Chopra

Punyam Bhutani
Vedant Choudhary
Tarang Saraogi
Manav Bhatia
Drishti Rathi
for Res. 1

Bhargavi Kannan
Kavya Sarin
for Res. 4

Bhargavi Kannan
Kavya Sarin
for Res. 5

ORDER

IA NO. 1440 OF 2025
(For condonation of delay of 12 days in filing reply by R-5)

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 5th Respondent an opportunity to file their reply. We consider it appropriate to permit them to file reply on condition that the 5th 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 files 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 5th Respondent shall be taken on record. The application is disposed of.

The 5th 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. 242 OF 2025

Ms. Devyani Prasad, Learned Counsel for the Appellant, states that they do not wish to file any rejoinder to the reply of the 5th Respondent. Her submission is recorded.

Subject to compliance with the aforesaid directions regarding payment of costs by the 5th Respondent, let the appeal be included in the '**List of finals**' to be taken up from there in its turn.

Ajay Talegaonkar
Technical Member (Electricity)

Justice Ramesh Ranganathan
Chairperson

tpd/kns