



**Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission**  
**Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi – 110017.**

No. F.11(1707)/DERC/2019-20/6550

**IA No. 3 of 2022**  
**in**  
**R. Petition No.59/2019**

**In the matter of:** Petition under Section 94 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 7 (iv) and 57 of the DERC Comprehensive (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2001 seeking review of the Order dated 13.05.2019 passed by this Commission in Petition No. 26 of 2018.

**BSES Yamuna Power Limited** .....Review Petitioner  
**Versus**

1. Indraprastha Power Generation Co. Ltd. ....Respondent No. 1
2. Pragati Power Corporation Ltd. ....Respondent No. 2
3. Delhi Transco Ltd. ....Respondent No. 3

**and**  
**IA No. 4/2022**  
**in**  
**R. Petition No.60/2019**

**In the matter of:** Petition under Section 94 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 7 (iv) and 57 of the DERC Comprehensive (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2001 seeking review of the Order dated 13.05.2019 passed by this Commission in Petition No. 08 of 2018.

**BSES Rajdhani Power Limited** .....Review Petitioner  
**Versus**

1. Indraprastha Power Generation Co. Ltd. ....Respondent No. 1
2. Pragati Power Corporation Ltd. ....Respondent No. 2
3. Delhi Transco Ltd. ....Respondent No. 3

**Coram:**

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Shabihul Hasnain 'Shastri', Chairperson**  
**Hon'ble Dr. A. K.Ambasht, Member**

**Appearance:**

1. Mr. Rahul Kinra, Sr. Advocate, BRPL & BYPL
2. Mr. Buddy Ranganadhan, Adv. BRPL & BYPL
3. Ms. Anand K. Ganesan, Adv. IPGCL & PPCL
4. Ms. Kavya Shandilya, Adv., DTL

**INTERIM ORDER**

(Date of Hearing: 15.09.2022)  
(Date of Order: 15.09.2022)

1. Heard Mr. Rahul Kinra, holding brief of Sr. Advocate, Mr. Bhatt. We have been informed that IPGCL and PPCL have filed an affidavit before this Commission

categorically denying the willingness to participate in the reconciliation proceedings as proposed by the Commission on request of the Petitioner. Earlier also they had appeared and shown reluctance, today the affidavit is on record. Mr. Kinra has pleaded that he may be granted a week's time to consult his clients and the case may be fixed on the next date. However, after going through the contents of the IPGCL and PPCL, the Commission feels that this was an attempt for a reconciliation and the Commission had passed orders in a persuasive manner in the hope that the matter can be settled amicably in the interest of all the parties. However, if the other party has filed a categorical denial to the reconciliation proceedings, no rejoinder can be filed by the Petitioner. Ms. Kavya Shandilya, Counsel for DTL, has also submitted orally that as per the instructions they are not willing to come to the table for discussion. Mr. Kinra has pleaded vehemently that the matter should be kept pending but we feel it will be totally unnecessary as the prayer of the Petitioner is categorically denied. The interim relief applications bearing Nos. 3 and 4 of 2022, on which these reconciliation proceeding were sought to be started, stands disposed of. Disposal of these applications will not mean that the contentions of the Petitioner have been rejected or the stand of the opposite parties has been legally accepted.

2. However, the Review Petition will come in its own turn on 15.11.2022. The applications are disposed of without any observation.

**Sd/-**  
**(Dr. A.K. Ambasht)**  
**Member**

**Sd/-**  
**(Justice Shabihul Hasnain 'Shastri')**  
**Chairperson**