

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 263/MP/2022

Subject : Petition under Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for direction to Odisha Power Transmission Company Limited (OPTCL) to refund the excess paid wheeling charges and short-term open access charges along with interest in respect of its transmission system of 220 kV D/C Rourkela-Tarkera-Budhipadar-Korba (Budhipadar-Korba Circuit 2 & 3- Odisha portion) line and associated sub-station bays to MPPMCL.

Petitioner : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited (MPPMCL).

Respondents : Odisha Power Transmission Co. Limited (OPTCL) & 6 Others.

Date of Hearing : **13.1.2026**

Coram : Shri Harish Dudani, Member
Shri Ravinder Singh Dhillon, Member

Parties Present : Shri G Umapathy, Sr. Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Aditya Singh, Advocate, MPPMCL
Ms Jyotsna Rathore, MPPMCL
Shri R. K. Mehta, Advocate, OPTCL
Ms. Himanshi Andley, Advocate, OPTCL
Shri Anand Ganesan, Advocate, MSEDCL
Ms. Sneha Singh, Advocate, MSEDCL
Ms. Shailey Gupta, Advocate, MSEDCL
Ms. Ranjitha Ramachandran, Advocate, GUVNL
Ms. Shrishti Khindaria, Advocate, GUVNL
Shri Aneesh Bajaj, Advocate, GUVNL

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Respondent, OPTCL, submitted that as per the directions of the Commission issued *vide* the Record of proceedings dated 26.8.2025, OPTCL had tried to conduct a meeting with all the parties, however, such an attempt could not fructify. The learned counsel, accordingly, requested the Commission to adjudicate the matter as the parties are unable to reach to a mutual settlement.

2. Learned senior counsel for the Petitioner, MPPMCL, also agreed that the matter needs to be adjudicated by the Commission as the issue is not being settled amicably. Further, the learned senior counsel also submitted that the dispute in question pertains

to only the Petitioner and the Respondent, OPTCL, and also prayed for direction to OPTCL to make a further payment of Rs. 5 crore.

3. Learned counsel for the Respondent, GUVNL, also reiterated the lack of any amicable settlement among the parties, and further submitted that while GUVNL was willing to explore such an option, the meeting of the parties' highest authorities could not be coordinated. Whereas the learned counsel for the Respondent, MSEDCL, sought an adjournment on the ground of non-availability of the arguing counsel.

4. Considering the submissions made by the learned senior counsel and learned counsel for the parties, the Commission deemed it appropriate to proceed with the adjudication of the matter without further delay and thus directed the parties to file their respective written submissions with a copy to the other side at least two weeks before the next date of hearing. In case the parties are willing to arrive at a common consensus on the joint settlement of issues as a last-ditch effort, they are permitted to do so before the next date of hearing, and either side may file the outcome thereof.

5. The Petition will be listed for the hearing on **10.3.2026**.

By order of the Commission
Sd/-
(T.D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)