

## **The HPPTCL Versus The HPSEBL**

**MA No. 41 of 2025**

**03.03.2025**

Present: Sh. Harsh Mohan and Sh. Krishnandan Singh, Tariff Consultants for the Petitioner.  
Sh. Kamlesh Saklani, Authorised Representative for the Respondent.

### **DAILY ORDER**

No reply filed.

Heard. An application for condoning the delay of 79 days has been filed that due to internal procedures, the Review Petition could not be filed within time. Further, a significant time was taken for collecting the documents required to seek the review and the draft of the review could only be finalized on receipt of the requisite documents. It is submitted that the delay is not intentional and deliberate. The application is supported by an affidavit.

No reply to the application has been filed. Rather, the HPSEBL has filed reply to the main Review petition.

Sh. Kamlesh Saklani, Authorized Representative submits that no satisfactory explanation for condoning the delay has been offered, as such, explanation is not satisfactory and application be dismissed.

We have carefully gone through the record. Since, a significant time was consumed in collecting the documents for filing the review, the explanation offered for condonation of delay appears to be bonafide. The application is, therefore, considered and allowed subject to costs of Rs. 2000/-. The delay is ordered to be condoned. The application for condonation of delay is disposed off. Be tagged to the file for record.

The Review Petition be registered.

The reply to the review Petition has already come on record. Rejoinder, if any, be filed within two weeks.

List on 01.04.2025 at 11:00 AM for hearing.

**-sd-**  
**(Shashi Kant Joshi)**  
Member

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

**-sd-**  
**(Devendra Kumar Sharma)**  
Chairman