

COURT-1

IN THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL FOR ELECTRICITY
(Appellate Jurisdiction)

APL No. 135 OF 2025 & IA No. 796 OF 2025 & IA No. 1005 OF 2025

Dated: 25th August, 2025

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

In the matter of:

Himachal Pradesh Power Corporation Limited Appellant(s)
Versus

Himachal Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission & Anr. Respondent(s)

Counsel on record for the Appellant(s) : Vishrov Mukerjee
Yashaswi Kant
Girik Bhalla
Pratyush Singh
Damodar Solanki
Priyanka Vyas
Raghav Malhotra
Anamika Rana
Juhi Senguttuvan
Shreya Sundraraman
for App. 1

Counsel on record for the Respondent(s) : Pradeep Misra
for Res. 1

Anand K. Ganesan
Swapna Seshadri
Amal Nair
Shivani Verma
Devyani Prasad
for Res. 2

ORDER

IA NO. 1005 OF 2025

(For condonation of delay of 17 days in filing reply by R-1)

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.

Reliance is placed on behalf of the applicant-Respondent No. 1 on Rule 3 of the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (Procedure, Form, Fee and Record of proceedings) Rules, 2007 to contend that since the Tribunal was closed for summer recess from 1st June till 30th, the applicant cannot be faulted for not filing their reply before the stipulated date of 09.05.2025. What this submission ignores is the fact that (a) the Registry was functioning throughout the month of June; and (b) that, pursuant to the e-filing system introduced from 02.12.2024, it was open to the parties to file their pleadings through the e-filing portal. We find no merit in the submission urged on behalf of the applicant-Respondent No. 1 for the delay in filing the reply.

The present case is yet another instance of procrastination. We, however, see no reason to deny the 1st Respondent an opportunity to file their reply. We consider it appropriate to permit them to file reply on condition that the 1st 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 file 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 1st 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.

APPEAL NO. 135 OF 2025 & IA NO. 796 OF 2025

Rejoinder, if any, shall be filed within two weeks.

Post on **09.09.2025**.

(Seema Gupta)
Technical Member (Electricity)

(Justice Ramesh Ranganathan)
Chairperson

tpd/pk