COURT-1

IN THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL FOR ELECTRICITY
(Appellate Jurisdiction)

DFR No : 326 of 2025 & IA No. 1333 OF 2025 & IA No. 1334 OF 2025 & IA No. 28 OF 2026

Dated: 5th February, 2026

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

In the matter of:

Madhya Pradesh Power Transmission Company Ltd	....	Appellant(s)
Versus		
Central Electricity Regulatory Commission & Ors.	....	Respondent(s)

Counsel on record for the Appellant(s) : Shri Venkatesh
Shryeshth Ramesh Sharma
Kanika Chugh
Ashutosh Kumar Srivastava
Suhael Buttan
Priya Dhankar
Vineet Kumar
Surbhi Kapoor
Tanishka Khatana
Punyam Bhutani
Nikunj Bhatnagar
Kunal Veer Chopra
Vedant Choudhary
Manav Bhatia
Drishti Rathi
Nihal Bhardwaj
Adarsh Singh
Siddharth Nigotia
Manu Tiwari
Abhishek Nangia
Mohit Mansharamani
Akash Lamba
Aashwyn Singh
Harsh Vardhan
Aniket Kanhaua
Indu Uttara

Ananya Dutta
Devishi Gupta
for App. 1

Counsel on record for the Respondent(s) :

for Res. 1

Poorva Saigal
Poorva Saigal
Shubham Arya
Pallavi Saigal
Reeha Singh
Rishabh Saxena
Shirin Gupta
Kaavya
Shree Dwivedi
for Res. 2

Anup Jain
Nishtha Goel
Ashwary Kathed
for Res. 5

Akhil Hasija
for Res. 14

ORDER

IA-1333/2025
(For waiver of court fee)

Since it is evident from the report of the Registry that the prescribed court fee has been paid for both the appeals ie DFR No. 326 of 2025 and Appeal No. 3 of 2026, albeit in Appeal No. 3 of 2026, the Appellant cannot be called upon to pay separate court fee again in the DFR No. 326 of 2025. The IA for waiver of court fee is wholly unnecessary. The IA is, accordingly, closed.

IA-28/2026
(For condonation of delay in filing reply)(R2)(02 days)

Since the delay of 02 days in filing the reply is not opposed by the Learned Counsel for the Appellant, the delay is condoned, and the application is disposed of.

IA-1334/2025
(For filing additional document)

This application is filed to receive additional document which did not form part of the documents filed before the Commission. Since these documents are sought to be introduced at the appellate stage, the test of Order 41 Rule 27 CPC must necessarily be fulfilled. We consider it appropriate, in such circumstances, to direct that this IA be listed along with the main appeal to enable us to examine whether or not these additional documents ought to be received when the main appeal is finally heard.

DFR-326/2025

Ms. Priya Dhankar, Learned Counsel for the Appellant would submit that, as the delay in filing reply has been condoned today, they be permitted to file the rejoinder in the Registry during the course of day. Permission, as sought for, is granted.

It is represented by Learned Counsel on both sides that pleadings are otherwise complete. Registry to verify whether pleadings are complete and, thereafter, include this appeal in the 'List of Finals', to be taken up from there in its turn.

Ajay Talegaonkar
Technical Member (Electricity)

Justice Ramesh Ranganathan
Chairperson

mk/mg