COURT-I

Before the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (Appellate Jurisdiction)

<u>IA No. 173 & 174 of 2014 in</u> <u>DFR No. 362 of 2014</u>

Dated : 16th July, 2014

Present: Hon'ble Mr. Justice M. Karpaga Vinayagam, Chairperson Hon'ble Mr. Rakesh Nath, Technical Member

In the matter of

M/s Hi-Tech Industries

... Appellant(s)

Versus

Himachal Pradesh Electricity Regulatory.... Respondent(s)Commission & Anr.

Counsel for the Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Raj Kumar Mehta
		Ms. Kanaljit Kaur

Counsel for the Respondent(s) : Mr. Anand K. Ganesan Ms. Swapna Seshadri for R.2

> <u>IA No. 176 & 177 of 2014 in</u> <u>DFR No. 357 of 2014</u>

In the matter of

M/s Suraj Fabrics Industries Ltd. Versus		Appellant(s)	
Himachal Pradesh Electricity Re	gulat	ory Respondent(s)	
Commission & Anr.	-		
Counsel for the Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Raj Kumar Mehta Ms. Kanaljit Kaur	
Counsel for the Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Anand K. Ganesan Ms. Swapna Seshadri for R.2	
	170	60014	

<u>IA No. 178 & 179 of 2014 in</u> <u>DFR No. 361 of 2014</u>

In the matter of

M/s Asian Concerts and Cement Versus	Pvt. I	Appellant(s)
Himachal Pradesh Electricity R Commission & Anr.	egulat	ory Respondent(s)
Counsel for the Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Raj Kumar Mehta Ms. Kanaljit Kaur
Counsel for the Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Anand K. Ganesan Ms. Swapna Seshadri for R.2

<u>IA No. 180 & 181 of 2014 in</u> <u>DFR No. 358 of 2014</u>

In the matter of			
M/s Parvati Steel & Alloys		Appellant(s)	
Versus			
Himachal Pradesh Electricity Rea Commission & Anr.	gulato	ry Respondent(s)	
Counsel for the Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Raj Kumar Mehta Ms. Kanaljit Kaur	
Counsel for the Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Anand K. Ganesan Ms. Swapna Seshadri for R.2	
IA No. 182 & 183 of 2014 in			
<u>IA No. 182 & 1</u>	183 o	<u>f 2014 in</u>	
<u>IA No. 182 & 1</u> DFR No. 62			
DFR No. 62 In the matter of M/s Akron India Pvt. Ltd.			
DFR No. 62	<u>21 of</u>	2014 Appellant(s)	
DFR No. 62 In the matter of M/s Akron India Pvt. Ltd. Versus Himachal Pradesh Electricity Reg	<u>21 of</u>	2014 Appellant(s)	

Ms. Swapna Seshadri for R.2

<u>IA No. 184 & 185 of 2014 in</u> <u>DFR No. 359 of 2014</u>

In the matter of

M/s SPS Steel Rolling Mills Ltd. Versus		Appellant(s)
Himachal Pradesh Electricity Re Commission & Anr.	gulato	ry Respondent(s)
Counsel for the Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Raj Kumar Mehta Ms. Kanaljit Kaur
Counsel for the Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Anand K. Ganesan Ms. Swapna Seshadri for R.2

<u>IA No. 186 & 187 of 2014 in</u> <u>DFR No. 360 of 2014</u>

In the matter of

M/s Him Chemicals Ltd. Versus		Appellant(s)
Himachal Pradesh Electricity Re Commission & Anr.	egulato	ry Respondent(s)
Counsel for the Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Raj Kumar Mehta Ms. Kanaljit Kaur
Counsel for the Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Anand K. Ganesan Ms. Swapna Seshadri for R.2

ORDER

These Six Applications have been filed to condone the delay in filing the Six separate Appeals as against the impugned Order dated 02.05.2011 as well as in re-filing the Appeals after curing the defects. The explanation offered by the learned counsel for the Applicants in their Applications is that the delay in filing the Appeal was due to the pendency of the Writ Petition before the Himachal Pradesh High Court up to 11.11.2013, on which day, the Writ Petitions were disposed of giving liberty to the Applicant/Appellant to file the Appeal. Thereafter, the Applicants received the copy of the Order on 10.01.2014 and they filed the Appeals before this Tribunal on 05.02.2014 in all these matters along with Applications to condone the delay in filing. The Registry found some defects and issued defect notice to the Applicants after curing the defects the Applicants/Appellants has re-filed the Appeal with some delay. Therefore they filed the Applications to condone the delay in filed the Applicants has re-filed the Appeal with some delay.

We have heard the learned counsel for both the parties.

Though it is opposed by the learned counsel for the Respondent by filing a reply contending that the explanation did not show sufficient cause, we deem it appropriate to condone the delay on payment of costs especially when the long delay was caused due to the pendency of the writ petition before the High Court.

4

Therefore, the Applicants are directed to pay the cost of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees fifty thousand only) in each of the Appeals to a charitable organization, namely "SAI DEEP Dr. Ruhi Foundation, A/c No. 95266 3443, A- 508, Sector 19, Noida – 201301" within two weeks.

After receiving the compliance report, the Registry is directed to number these Appeals and post for Admission on **07.08.2014.**

(Rakesh Nath) Technical Member ts/kt (Justice M. Karpaga Vinayagam) Chairperson