

ITEM NO.104-104.3

COURT NO.2

SECTION XVII

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Civil Appeal No(s). 6043/2008

MULA-PRAVARA ELECTRIC COOP.SOC.LTD.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

MAHARASHTRA ELECTRICITY REGUL.COMM. & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA NO. 5/2016

IA NO. 90292/2022- PERMISSION TO PLACE ADDITIONAL FACTS

IA NO. 90302/2022-CLARIFICATION/DIRECTIONS

IA NO. 127604/2022-INTERVENTION

WITH

C.A. No. 4231/2008 (XVII)

IA 20429/2009

IA NO. 67536.2011

IA NO. 67536/2011

IA NO. 3/2016

C.A. No. 6044/2008 (XVII)

(IA 20427/2009, IA 2065/2011 , IA 6/2016)

SLP(C) No. 10078/2014 (IX)

IA NO. 56247.2021- PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 13-09-2023 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KISHAN KAUL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHANSHU DHULIA

For Appellant(s)

Mr. Shivaji M. Jadhav, AOR
Mr. Brij Kishor Sah, Adv.
Mr. Vignesh Singh, Adv.
Mr. Adarsh Kumar Pandey, Adv.
Ms. Apurva, Adv.
Mr. Aditya S. Jadhav, Adv.

Mr. V.Giri, Sr. Adv.
Mr Hasan Murtaza, AOR
Mr. Bhavesh V. Panuvani, Adv.
Mr. Rakesh B. Mandavkar, Adv.
Ms. Suveni Bhagat, Adv.
Mr. Pragyaanshu Pandey, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr.S.K. Rungta, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Pratiti Rungta, Adv.
Mr. Pratiti Rungta, Adv.
Mr. Prashant Singh, Adv.
Mr. Sumit Pragal, Adv.
Mr. Shivankur Shukla, Adv.
Ms. Amita Singh Kalkal, AOR

Mr. Soumik Ghosal, AOR
Mr. Arijit Maitra, Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Singh, Adv.

Mr. Nitin Lonkar, Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Dharmadhikari, Adv.
Mr. Aaditya Aniruddha Pande, AOR
Mr. Bharat Bagla, Adv.
Mr. Sourav Singh, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Krishna, Adv.

Mr. Udit Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Anup Jain, Adv.
For M/S. Udit Kishan And Associates, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

What is once again placed before us is that the parties are in process of resolution of their dispute amicably. This is stated to be more in the context of the fact that the appellant, the distributor, is aggrieved by the tariff order and in 2007 itself, the licence of the appellant stood expired. The appeals are of vintage 2008. The successor to the appellant is respondent No. 3.

It is submitted by learned senior counsel for the appellant that the recoveries in terms of the tariff order which have been upheld and which are

impugned, have to be from consumers but the appellant is no more the distributor for the last 12 years. He seeks to flag these issues as that would be the germane for determining how the settlement process has to proceed further and that is the reason we have pen down the order to crystallize the controversy. We expect the State of Maharashtra to take necessary steps for an endeavour for resolution of dispute amicably, more so, in the conspectus of the aforesaid factual scenario placed before us. We grant eight weeks' time, as prayed for, to learned counsel for the State of Maharashtra/respondent No. 2.

List for direction in 'miscellaneous matter' on 20.11.2023.

[CHARANJEET KAUR]
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

[POONAM VAID]
COURT MASTER (NSH)