

COURT-1

IN THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL FOR ELECTRICITY
(Appellate Jurisdiction)

APL No. 379 OF 2025

Dated: 12th February, 2026

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

In the matter of:

Kharghar Vikhroli Transmission Limited (formerly known
as Kharghar Vikhroli Transmission Private Limited) Appellant(s)

Versus

Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission & Ors. Respondent(s)

Counsel on record for the Appellant(s) : Gaurav Dudeja
Dhruval Singh
Abhijit Debnath
for App. 1

Counsel on record for the Respondent(s) : Pratiti Rungta
for Res. 1

Abhikalp Pratap Singh
for Res. 2

Tavinder Pal Sidhu
A. P. Singh
Neetica Sharma
Naman Saraswat
Saloni Jagga
Shivangi Chawla
Kanav Singhal
for Res. 5

Rucha Pande
Rucha Pande
for Res. 10

Shirish K Deshpande
for Res. 11

ORDER

We had passed an order on 08.12.2025 which has been erroneously recorded as 08.11.2025. The typographical error in the order shall stand

corrected and the date “8th November, 2025” (which is the date of the order shown earlier) shall stand substituted by “08th December, 2025”.

We also notice that, while recording that the matter be listed after pleadings are complete, we had failed to give the 2nd Respondent, which was represented by Counsel on that date, time to file reply.

Mr. Abhikalp Pratap Singh, Learned Counsel for the 2nd Respondent, would submit that the 2nd Respondent has already e-filed the reply; and they would file the physical copy within two weeks.

Ms. Pratiti Rungta, Learned Counsel for the 1st Respondent, states that, while the 1st Respondent did not enter appearance before 08.12.2025 when the matter was listed after notice, they do not wish to file any reply.

While both Ms. Shivangi Chawla, Learned Counsel for the 5th Respondent, and Ms. Rucha Pande, Learned Counsel for the 10th Respondent, seek time to file reply, their case stands on a different footing from that of the 2nd Respondent. The 2nd Respondent had entered appearance through Counsel before 08.12.2025, when the matter was listed before this Tribunal after service of notice. Respondent Nos. 5 and 10, on the other hand, did not enter appearance by that date. Since the 2nd Respondent had appeared through Counsel and failure to give them time to file reply was an error on our part, we now grant them two weeks’ time to file a physical copy of the reply.

Respondent Nos. 5 and 10, on the other hand, chose not to enter appearance before 08.12.2025 when the matter was listed before us after service of notice. They cannot now come before this Tribunal to claim that they should be given time to file reply as a matter of right. It is always open to them, if they so choose, to file an IA seeking time to file reply, and the said IA, on its being listed, will be considered on its merits.

Mr. Gaurav Dudeja, Learned Counsel for the Appellant, seeks four weeks’ time to file rejoinder to the reply filed by the 2nd Respondent. Time, as sought for, is granted.

After pleadings are complete, and after verification by the Registry, let this Appeal be included in the '**List of Finals**', to be taken up from there for hearing, in its turn.

Ajay Talegaonkar
Technical Member (Electricity)

Justice Ramesh Ranganathan
Chairperson

tpd/mg