COURT-1

IN THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL FOR ELECTRICITY
(Appellate Jurisdiction)

DFR No : 248 of 2025 & IA No. 1072 OF 2025 & IA No. 1070 OF 2025 & IA No. 1071 OF 2025

Dated: 30th October, 2025

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

In the matter of:

Damodar Valley Power Consumers Association & Ors. .... Appellant(s)

Versus

West Bengal Electricity Regulatory Commission & Anr. .... Respondent(s)

Counsel on record for the Appellant(s) : Rajiv Yadav for App. 1

Rajiv Yadav for App. 2

Rajiv Yadav for App. 3

Rajiv Yadav for App. 4

Rajiv Yadav for App. 5

Rajiv Yadav for App. 6

Rajiv Yadav for App. 7

Rajiv Yadav for App. 8

Rajiv Yadav for App. 9

Rajiv Yadav for App. 10

Rajiv Yadav for App. 11

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 12

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 13

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 14

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 15

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 16

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 17

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 18

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 19

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 20

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 21

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 22

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 23

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 24

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 25

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 26

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 27

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 28

Rajiv Yadav

for App. 29

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 30

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 31

Rajiv Yadav
for App. 32

Counsel on record for the Respondent(s) : C.K. Rai
Anuradha Roy
Vinay Kumar Gupta
for Res. 1

Shri Venkatesh
Ashutosh Kumar Srivastava
Nihal Bhardwaj
Surbhi Kapoor
Nikunj Bhatnagar
Manav Bhatia
Siddharth Nigotia
Akash Lamba
Ananya Dutta
Shryeshth Ramesh Sharma
Suhael Buttan
Abhishek Nangia
Tanishka Khatana
Kunal Veer Chopra
Drishti Rathi
Manu Tiwari
Aashwyn Singh
Aniket Kanhaua
Devishi Gupta
Kanika Chugh
Priya Dhankar
Vineet Kumar
Punyam Bhutani
Vedant Choudhary
Adarsh Singh
Mohit Mansharamani
Harsh Vardhan
Indu Uttara
for Res. 2

ORDER

IA NO. 1070 OF 2025
(For condonation of delay of 67 days in filing the appeal)

The explanation furnished for the delay of 67 days in filing the appeal is merely of administrative reason. The explanation, in our view, does not constitute sufficient cause for condonation. We are, however, of the view that the delay is not so inordinate as to justify denying the Appellant an opportunity of having their Appeal heard on merits, albeit on imposition of costs. We, therefore, direct that the delay of 67 days in filing the Appeal be condoned on condition that the Appellant pays costs of Rs.35,000/- (Rupees Thirty Five Thousand only) to the Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL).

Mr. Rajiv Yadav, Learned Counsel for the Appellants, expresses urgency and states that the Appellant would pay costs, as directed hereinabove, within one week and file proof of payment in the Registry within one week thereafter. Time, as sought for, is granted. The Appellant shall pay the afore-said costs by 06.11.2025, and file proof of payment in the Registry before 13.11.2025.

The delay is condoned, and the application is disposed of, subject to compliance with the aforesaid directions.

Needless to state that, in case the aforesaid costs are not paid within the stipulated time and an affidavit of proof of payment is not filed in the Registry within one week thereafter, the application for condonation of delay in preferring the appeal, shall stand dismissed automatically, and the Appeal shall stand rejected. The application is disposed of.

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

DFR NO. 248 OF 2025 & IA NOS. 1072 & 1071 OF 2025

Both Mr. C. K. Rai, Learned Counsel for the 1st Respondent, and Mr. Shri Venkatesh, Learned Counsel for the 2nd Respondent, seek three

weeks' time to file their reply both in the IAs and in the main Appeal. Time, as sought for, is granted.

Post the matter on ***25.11.2025***.

Ajay Talegaonkar Technical Member (Electricity)	Justice Ramesh Ranganathan Chairperson

tpd/kns