

**The HPPTCL Versus the HPSEBL.**

**IA No. 208 of 2022  
in  
Filing No. 195 of 2022**

**17.12.2022**

Present: Sh. Shashant Singh Bisht, Regulatory Consultant for the Petitioner.  
Sh. Kamlesh Saklani, Authorised Representative for Respondent.

**DAILY ORDER**

Reply to the application for condonation of delay is taken on record. Heard. Sh. Kamlesh Saklani, Authorised Representative for Respondent states that the rigors of the Limitation Act, 1963 do not apply to the regulatory powers exercised by the Commission for approval of the capital cost and that the HPSEBL would strongly contest the Petition for Review on merits. We have gone through the application for condonation of delay which is duly supported by an affidavit. We are satisfied with reasons furnished in the application. Hence, the application under section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 is allowed which after needful be tagged to be file.

There are arguable point in the Petition. Hence, the Review Petition is admitted for hearing. Be registered, if not already registered.

Let reply be filed within two weeks with advance copy to the Petitioner and the Petitioner shall also file the rejoinder within a week on a receipt of the copy of the reply.

Matter be listed on **16.01.2023** at **11:00 AM** for hearing.

-Sd-

**(Shashi Kant Joshi)**  
**Member**

-Sd-

**(Yashwant Singh Chogal)**  
**Member (Law)**

-Sd-

**(Devendra Kumar Sharma)**  
**Chairman**