

The HPPTCL Versus HPSEBL, HPPCL and SJVNL

Review Petition No. 60 of 2026

08.09.2026

Present: Sh. Vikas Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner.
Sh. Rajesh Kashyap, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 1.
Sh. Jitender Dogra, DGM (SoP) for the Respondent No. 2.
Ms. Sneh Bhimta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 3.

DAILY ORDER

No reply to the application for condonation of delay is intended to be filed by the Respondent No.2.

Heard on application for condonation of delay.

This Petition has been filed under section 94 (1)(F) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 70 of the HPERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2024, seeking review of the Order dated 17.07.2025 passed in Petition No. 101 of 2024.

An application for condonation of delay of 216 days has been filed by the Applicant/Petitioner on the grounds that the impugned order dated 17.07.2025 passed in Petition No. 101 of 2024 seeking approval of Capital Cost & determination of Tariff for the Period starting from CoD to FY 2023-24 for 400/220 kV, 315 MVA Pooling Sub-Station at Gumma (Asset-1), Additional 400/220 kV, 315 MVA Transformer Bank of Gumma (Asset-2), 220 kV Double Circuit Twin Moose Transmission Line from Hatkoti to

Gumma along with LILO of 400 kV Double Circuit Jhakri to Abdullapur Transmission Line (Asset-3) and 220 kV Switching Station at Hatkoti (Asst-4) was received on 21.07.2025 by the Petitioner and thereafter the same was examined and analyzed in consultation with the Tariff Consultant. The issues arising out of the said order required detailed examination from Technical as well as financial perspectives which also required collection and compilation of supporting documents, data verification and preparation of detailed justification and the documents had to be arranged from different wings/offices of the Petitioner which required considerable time.

The Petitioner has further submitted that the issue regarding COD was deliberated in detail by the Petitioner internally and discussions regarding reviewing the said issue in the instant review Petition took considerable time. In view of above Petitioner has prayed for condonation of delay of 216 days in filing of the review Petition in terms of provisions of Regulation 75 of the HPERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2024 read with section 5 of the Limitation Act 1963. It is averred that the delay was unavoidable. The application is supported by an affidavit.

In reply to the application Respondents No. 1 and 3 has filed their reply and have denied the contents of the application that the Petitioner has failed to offer any satisfactory explanation for condoning the delay and has not been able to establish any genuine or unavoidable circumstances, as such, the explanation is not satisfactory and application be dismissed. The replies too are also supported by an affidavit.

I have heard Sh. Sh. Vikas Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner, Sh. Rajesh Kashyap, Ld. Counsel for the

Respondent No. 1, Sh. Jitender Dogra, DGM (SoP) for the Respondent No. 2 and Ms. Sneh Bhimta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 3 and have perused the record. Sh. Vikas Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner has also relied on the Orders of this Commission in support of his arguments where the Commission has earlier condoned the delay of about 7 months, 3 days and delay of about 6 months in two separate orders allowing condonation of delay.

It is apparent from the reply that soon after receiving copy of the Impugned Order, the Petitioner took all necessary steps to avoid delay but since the Commission had passed the Order in exercise of the power under section 86 of the Electricity Act, 2003, only a Petition under the provisions of Electricity Act, 2003 was tenable. Moreover, the Commission has approved the COD of Asset-1, Asset-2 and Asset-3 as 01.02.2022 against the claimed CoD i.e., 02.11.2020, 05.02.2021 and 01.11.2020 respectively. The said issue regarding CoD was deliberated in detail by the Petitioner internally and discussion regarding reviewing the said issue in the instant Review Petition took considerable time. In these circumstances, the explanation given for condonation of delay appears to be just and bonafied. The application is, therefore, considered and allowed and delay of 216 days is ordered to be condoned. The application is, disposed of, be tagged to the file for record.

The Review Petition be registered if, not registered.

Let reply to the Review Petition be filed within two weeks with advance copy to the opposite party. Rejoinder, if any, be also filed within a week on receipt of copy of reply.

List on 14.10.2026 at 11:00 AM for completion of proceedings.

-sd-
(Shashi Kant Joshi)
Member-cum-Chairman

HPERC