

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 17/RP/2022  
along with IA No. 61/2023**

Subject : Interlocutory application under Section 94 (2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking hearing of Petition No. 17/RP/2022 (in Petition No. 452/MP/2019) in view of the the APTEL order dated 25.7.2023 in Appeal No. 185 of 2017.

Petitioner : NLCIL

Respondent : TANGEDCO and 8 others

Date of Hearing : **4.4.2024**

Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson  
Shri Arun Goyal, Member  
Shri Pravas Kumar Singh, Member

Parties Present : Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, NLCIL  
Ms. Ritu Apurva, Advocate, NLCIL  
Shri Karthikeyan, Advocate, NLCIL  
Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO

**Record of Proceedings**

During the hearing, the learned counsel for the Respondent TANGEDCO and the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that pursuant to the issuance of the order dated 14.3.2024 in IA No. 62/2023 (in Petition No. 149/MP/2015), the order in the present IA along with the Review Petition may be reserved. This was accepted by the Commission.

2. The learned counsel for the Respondent TANGEDCO, however, pointed out that while the learned counsel (Ms. Swapna Seshadri) has appeared for the Review Petitioner in this matter, a different counsel had appeared on behalf of the Petitioner in the Review Petition earlier. He accordingly submitted that two counsels cannot be permitted to appear in the same case without any NOC being filed in the case. In response, the learned counsel for the Petitioner clarified that while the learned counsel (Shri K. Biswal) had been engaged by the Review Petitioner to appear in the review petition, M/s MSA Partners was additionally engaged by the Review Petitioner for filing and appearing in the IAs (62/2023 and 61/2023) pursuant to the remand judgment of APTEL in Appeal No.185/2017, which was handled by MSA partners. She accordingly submitted that the Vakalatnama given by the Review Petitioner to MSA partners is in addition to the earlier Vakalatnama given to Shri K.Biswal, with his consent. Accordingly, the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that there was no need for a 'NOC' in the present case, as contended by the learned counsel for the Respondent TANGEDCO.



3. In response to the learned counsel for the Respondent TANGEDCO request for a week's time to file a short note (not exceeding one page) on the aforesaid issue, the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner prayed that it may also be granted a week time to file its response to the same.
4. The Commission, after hearing the learned counsels for both the parties, permitted them to file their submissions (as in para 3 above), if need be, on or before **30.4.2024**.
5. Subject to the above, order in the IA along with the Review Petition was reserved.

**By order of the Commission**

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

