

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 4/MP/2017**

Subject : Petition under Section 79(1) (f) and 79(1) (b) of the Electricity Act, 2003 in connection with the disputes and differences arising under the Power Purchase Agreement dated 18.7.2008 between the Petitioner and Respondent No. 1.

Petitioner : Maithon Power Ltd.

Respondents : BRPL and anr.

**Petition No. 5/MP/2017**

Subject : Petition under Section 79(1) (f) and 79(1) (b) of the Electricity Act, 2003 in connection with the disputes and differences arising under the Power Purchase Agreement dated 12.5.2008 between the Petitioner and Respondent No. 1.

Petitioner : Maithon Power Ltd.

Respondents : TPDDL and anr.

Date of Hearing : **22.9.2022**

Coram : Shri I.S. Jha, Member  
Shri Arun Goyal, Member  
Shri Pravas Kumar Singh, Member

Parties Present : Shri Hemant Sahai, Advocate, MPL  
Shri Nishant Talwar, Advocate, MPL  
Shri Pankaj Prakash, MPL  
Shri Buddy A. Ranganathan, Advocate, BRPL  
Shri Dushyant Manocha, Advocate, BRPL

**Record of Proceedings**

**Petition No. 4/MP/2017**

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Respondent, BRPL pointed out that the claim made in the original petition for a period of 6 months (i.e from September, 2011 to March 2012) has been revised by the Petitioner to a period of 12 months (i.e April 2011 to March 2012) in the additional information filed, in response to ROP issued by this Commission. He accordingly submitted that the Petitioner may be directed to file a fresh affidavit for consideration of the Commission. In response, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Commission may formally accept the amendment made or permit the petitioner to file fresh affidavit, seeking acceptance of the said amendment.



The learned counsel added that the Petitioner is not pressing for prayers (a) and (b) sought in the said petition. The Commission, after hearing the parties, observed that the Petitioner may file additional affidavit seeking amendments to the original petition, as above, within 10 days, after serving copy to the Respondents.

2. The learned counsel for the Petitioner, thereafter made detailed oral submissions in the matter. However, due to paucity of time, the learned counsel for the Respondent BRPL could not make his reply submissions in the matter. Accordingly, the hearing was adjourned. The matter is part-heard.

**Petition No. 5/MP/2017**

3. Due to paucity of time, the matter could not be taken up for hearing and hence adjourned.

4. The Commission, however, observed that the Petitioner and the Respondents (in both petitions) may explore all possibilities for an amicable settlement of all outstanding issues and accordingly postponed the hearing of these petitions till **1.11.2022**. The Commission also directed the parties to file a reconciliation statement, if any, based on the amicable settlement, by **7.11.2022**.

5. Subject to the above, the Petitions shall be listed for hearing on **17.11.2022**

**By order of the Commission**

**Sd/-**  
(B. Sreekumar)  
Joint Chief (Law)

