ANDHRA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

4th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad 500004

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY

:: Present ::
Justice C.V. Nagarjuna Reddy, Chairman
Sri P. Rajagopal Reddy, Member
Sri Thakur Rama Singh, Member

I.A.No.3 of 2019 in O.P.No.8 of 2018, O.P.No.42 of 2019 & O.P.No.27 of 2019

I.A.No.3 of 2019 in O.P.No.8 of 2018

M/s. Lanco Kondapalli Power Ltd. **… Petitioner/Respondent**

A N D

1. Southern Power Distribution Company of AP Ltd.
2. Eastern Power Distribution Company of AP Ltd. … **Respondents/Petitioners**

O.P.No.42 of 2019

Between:

M/s. Srivathsa Power Projects Private Ltd. … **Petitioner**

A N D

Eastern Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Ltd
(APEPDCL) … **Respondent**

O.P.No.27 of 2019

Between:

M/s. Spectrum Power Generation Limited … **Petitioner**

A N D

1. Southern Power Distribution Company of AP Ltd.
2. Eastern Power Distribution Company of AP Ltd. … **Respondents**

The Interlocutory Application and the two Original Petitions have come up for hearing finally on 07-07-2020 in the presence of Sri K. Gopal Choudary, learned counsel for the applicant, Ms. Pujitha Gorantla, learned counsel for GMR Vemagiri Power Generation Limited, Ms. Rashmi G Kamath, learned counsel for Srivathsa Power Projects Pvt. Ltd., Sri Naga Deepak, learned counsel for Spectrum Power Generation Ltd (for brevity referred hereinafter as LKPL, SPPPL and SPGL individually and as Petitioners collectively), Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned standing counsel for the utilities, and Sri M. Venugopala Rao, learned objector at the web hearing. After carefully considering the material available on record and after hearing the arguments of the learned counsel for all the parties and the learned objector, the Commission passed the following:

COMMON ORDER

1. The IA and the OPs raise similar issues, though the form of and periods pertaining to the Application and Petitions vary slightly among them. The plea of the Petitioners in substance is that variable cost for the units supplied by them should be linked to the APM (Administered Price Mechanism) cost of the natural gas used by them for generating the electricity being supplied by them to the Respondent AP DISCOMs. The Applicant in the IA prayed for directing the Respondents to pay variable cost as a pass-through corresponding to the increase / decrease in cost of fuel from time to time for the financial year 2018-19; the Petitioner in OP 27 prayed for approving tariff for the FYs 2018-19 & 2019-20 (comprising fixed charges of Rs.0.92 ps / kWh for actual units supplied subject to an overall ceiling of Rs. 108.17 Cr considering a PLF of 68.49% and variable charges on pass-through basis

considering the revision in Natural Gas prices from 01-04-2018); and the Petitioner in OP 42 prayed for approving variable cost on pass-through basis for the FY 2019-20.

2. The brief facts leading to the filing of the IA and the Petitions are that the Petitioners are having gas based power projects of 355 MW, 17.202 MW and 208 MW respectively. While the Applicant's Power Purchase Agreement (for short "PPA") with the Respondent AP DISCOMs expired on 01-01-2016, those of the Petitioners expired on 31.03.2018 and 18.04.2016 respectively. The PPA with the Applicant was renewed by the Discoms for a term of 10 years and is awaiting the approval of the Commission. No such renewed PPAs have been placed before this Commission so far in respect of the petitioners.

3. While matters stood thus, the Petitioners were allowed to supply short-term power to the AP DISCOMs by the Commission at an ad hoc tariff. The case of the Petitioners is that the variable cost component in the ad hoc tariff at which they are permitted to supply power to the AP DISCOMs is subject to the variations in the prices of APM gas which has to be allowed as pass-through. LKPL contended that the AP DISCOMs knew that variable cost is dependent on the price of APM gas, downward variations in which have been taken advantage of by them to reduce the price per unit paid by them in FY 2017-18; and that therefore, they cannot refuse to undertake an upward revision in the variable cost when the price of APM gas has gone up. SPGL apart from claiming relief of enhanced fuel cost as pass-through also contended that the fixed cost being paid at Rs. 0.92 ps / kWh on the supplied

units by taking a PLF of 40% (697 MU) needs to be revised (to Rs. 108.17 Cr) to account for the higher PLF of 68.49% recorded by them.

4. The Respondent AP DISCOMs contended that the variable cost component considered at the time of permitting the supply of power by the Petitioners was the basis on which their power supply found a place in the merit order and any upward revision would alter the entire merit order and their power would not have been eligible for dispatch; that despite the DISCOM's filings for pass-through of gas price, the Tariff Orders finalized by the Commission did not consider the pass-through and mentioned only specific tariff for the entire period; that in respect of SPGL, the higher PLF recorded by them arose out of the unexpected receipt of gas supply meant for NFCL and that as the Commission had approved a fixed cost of Rs. 64.16 Cr for FY 2018-19, the increased supply could not be taken into account by them as doing so would have meant going beyond the Commission approved fixed costs. Responding to SPPPL's contentions, the DISCOM stated that the Petitioner had the option of refusing to accept the Letter of Intent which mentioned the specific tariff of Rs. 0.48 ps (FC) and Rs. 2.91 ps (VC) for the entire financial year 2019-20; that having accepted the terms of the Letter of Intent by commencing supply of power, the Petitioner now cannot claim revision in variable cost on account of revision in the price of APM gas without an amendment being made to the Tariff Order passed by the Commission. When LKPL and SPPPL matters were placed in the public domain, apart from the learned objectors Sri M. Venugopala Rao and Sri M. Thimma Reddy, the APSEB Engineers Association (APSEBEA) filed their objections. M/s GMR Vemagiri Power Generation Private Ltd., (GVPGL) also sought to oppose the

Application of LKPL as an intervenor-objector. The Commission finds no merit in the attempt by GVPGL to intervene in the matter as it is guided by its private interests rather than any public interest in opposing the Application by LKPL. Hence their objections are not considered.

5. The learned objectors opposed the pass-through of revision in APM gas price in the variable cost for all the three developers. Their objections are on the grounds that the Commission while allowing the short-term procurement did not make any provision for revision of the fixed or variable costs; that pendency of the matter before the Commission for approval of the PPA or continuing process for entering into PPA cannot be grounds for seeking revisions in variable costs; that the downward revision of variable costs during FY 2017-18 by the AP DISCOMs cannot be shown as the basis for seeking upward revision in the subsequent periods, as the same has to be agitated before the appropriate forum separately, by the developers.

6. While presenting his objections Sri. M. Venugopala Rao also explained that fixed costs of LKPL ought to be calculated by taking 80% PLF as the basis and that procurement of power on a short-term basis year after year without following the competitive bidding route is contrary to National Tariff Policy and is depriving the consumers of the benefits of reduction of capital costs and efficiency of operations. Sri Venugopala Rao further submitted that the AP DISCOMs have not complied with the directions of the Commission regarding the placing of material to substantiate that the short-term purchases did not impose any additional burden on the AP DISCOMs or the consumers. In its reply to the objections, the Applicant, LKPL

submitted that the variable cost has been arrived by the Commission relying on the then prevailing gas price; that it is an undisputed fact that gas prices keep varying every six months consequent to the policy decision of the Government of India; that the conduct of the AP DISCOMs in taking the station heat rate to calculate the variable cost and availing flat 2.5% rebate on the Applicant's bills which include the variable cost, shows that the variations in variable cost are calculable; that there are no undue benefits being garnered by it as the Commission has fixed the fixed charges to the limited extent of units as against which it has supplied 400.220 MU in FYs 2018-19 & 2019-20 without any fixed charges; that allowing variations in fuel costs as pass-through for the purpose of variable costs is a well-known procedure and that the Commission has considered and allowed the same in its order in IA.No.23 of 2018 in O.P.Nos. 60 & 61 of 2017; and that even with the fuel-cost pass-through in the variable costs, the power supplied by it is still cheaper than the lowest price discovered by the AP DISCOMs in the e-procurement process during the years 2018 & 2019. In its rejoinder to the counter, the LKPL disputed the AP DISCOMs' version that they have accepted its power based on the lesser variable cost; that the fuel cost pass-through in the variable cost is specifically provided for in their renewed PPA; that the Applicant is obligated to supply its entire production to the AP DISCOMs and that the AP DISCOMs are obligated to take the same as per the renewed PPA; that even with the pass-through of variations in APM gas price the Applicant still retains dispatchable standing in the merit order in the relevant periods; that there was no mention of pass-through in the Tariff Order for FY 2018-19 is a matter of record; that the Tariff Order does not prevail over the separate order governing the parties and the fact of understanding between the Petitioners and the

Respondents has not been brought to the notice of the Commission at the time of incoming Tariff Order and that the Respondents, without any specific order from the Commission, have reduced the variable cost when the APM gas prices have gone down but have not increased the same when the APM gas prices have been revised upward.

7. We have heard Sri K. Gopal Chowdary, learned counsel for LKPL and Sri P. Shiva Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents, and the learned objector Sri. M. Vengugopala Rao. Learned counsel for SGPL and SPPL adopted the submissions of Sri Gopal Chowdary. We have carefully perused the record. Having regard to the pleadings of the respective parties and their counsel, the following points emerge for consideration:

a. Whether the Petitioners are entitled to pass-through of variations in APM price of natural gas after commencement of supply of power.
b. Whether the petitioner in OP No.27 of 2019 is entitled to higher fixed costs of Rs. 0.92 ps / kWh on actual units supplied subject to an overall ceiling of Rs.108.17 Crores.
c. To what relief?

8. Re.Point NO 1.

In order to deal with this point, the background facts regarding the status of PPAs of the petitioners in IA No.3 of 2019 and OP No.27 of 2019 need to be discussed.

The power purchase agreements with LKPL & SPGL have expired on 01.01.2016 and 18.04.2016 respectively. Though there is a buyout or renewal option before the AP DISCOMs as per PPAs, the AP DISCOMs preferred renewal. Accordingly, the DISOCOMs have filed a petition for renewal of PPA in O.P.No 8 of 2018 in respect of LKPL. Subsequently, they changed their mind and filed I.A.No.16 of 2019 seeking permission for withdrawal of the OP. The adjudication is pending on this issue before the Commission. No proposal for renewal of PPA in respect of SPGL has been made by the AP DISCOMs so far. Thus, there are no binding PPAs with LKPL & SPGL for the AP DISCOMs as on today.

9. As for the petitioner in OP No. 42 of 2019, the petitioner entered into power purchase agreement (PPA) for supply of power from its 17.202 MW plant run on natural gas as fuel and situated at Sivakoduru village, Rajolu Taluk, East Godavari District for a period of 15 years from the date of commercial operation i.e., 01.04.2003, vide PPA dated 21.06.2004. The term of the PPA has expired on 31.03.2018. So far, the DISCOM concerned has not approached this Commission for approval of the PPA for any further period.

10. This Commission has issued a Tariff Order on 31.03.2017 For FY 2017-18. As the PPAs have expired, the Commission has not considered the power of LKPL, SPGL and GVK Ltd for dispatch. The AP DISCOMs have filed IA No.8 of 2017 in OP Nos.28 and 29 of 2016 seeking permission to procure energy on short term basis from the aforementioned three sources. Vide its order dated 29.11.2017 the

Commission has permitted the AP DISCOMs to procure power on a short term basis at a fixed cost of Rs. 0.96 ps and variable cost of Rs. 2.33 ps per unit, working out to the total cost of Rs. 3.29 ps per unit for the FY 2017-18. Accordingly, power from the said two petitioners was dispatched from 01.04.2017 to 31.03.2018. For FY 2018-19, a similar order was passed by this Commission on 08.08.2018 in IA No.16 of 2018 whereunder it has permitted AP DISCOMs to purchase power at Rs. 3.29 ps per unit. This Commission has reiterated the said rate while granting permission for short term purchase in its Tariff Order dated 27.03.2018 for FY 2018-19. Even in the Tariff Order dated 22.02.2019 issued for the FY 2019-20, the same rate was reiterated by this Commission for LKPL project. LKPL has filed the present IA i.e., IA No.3 of 2019 in OP No.8 of 2018 for a direction to pay variable costs on pass-through basis corresponding to the increase/decrease of cost of fuel from time to time.

11. In the case of OP No.27 of 2019 filed by SPGL, while IA No. 15 of 2018 in OP No. 61 & 62 of 2018 seeking permission for the AP DISCOMs to procure power during first quarter of FY 2018-19 was pending, the Commission in its retail supply order for the for FY 2018-19 allowed dispatches from M/s SPGL plant on two-part tariff basis fixing fixed cost at Rs. 0.92 ps / kWh and variable cost at Rs.2.39 ps / kWh totalling Rs.3.31 ps / kWh. Following the said order this Commission has disposed of IA No.15 of 2018 in line with the Tariff Order.

12. With regard to SPPPL, in I A No.17 of 2018 in OP Nos. 60 & 61 of 2017 filed by EPDCL, this Commission vide its order dated 26.05.2018 has permitted it to

procure power from the said company at an interim fixed cost of Rs.0.483 Ps per unit for the delivered units and variable cost of Rs.2.85 per unit (pass through based on gas price) during the first quarter of FY 2018-19, after considering relevant facts and circumstances including the fact that no objections were filed by any stakeholder, and by accepting the proposal for procurement of power for the 1st quarter of FY 2018-19. Thereafter, EPDCL filed IA No.23 of 2019 in OP Nos. 60 & 61 of 2017 for permission to procure power from SPPPL at a tentative price of Rs.2.393 / kWh from 01.07.2018 till the end of FY 2018-19 on the same terms as fixed in IA No.17 of 2018. The said request was also accepted by this Commission vide its order dated 01.09.2018. Coming to the FY 2019-20 no separate application was filed by the DISCOM. Considering its tariff filings of EPDCL, the Commission in its retail tariff order dated 22.02.2019 for the FY 2019-20 observed as under :

"291. And the following specific cases, not to affect the power planning of the licensees for FY 2019-20.

a. . . .

b. . . .

c. . . .

d. *Availability from M/s Srivathsa which is exclusively for EPDCL is considered subject to specific approval of the Commission.*

. . . "

(Emphasis Added)

13. On a perusal of the record it could be seen that no separate application has been filed by either APEPDCL or APPCC seeking permission for procurement of power for the FY 2019-20 as mandated under the Tariff Order. Surprisingly, without specific permission of this Commission the Chief Engineer (Commercial), APPCC through his letter dated 14.04.2019 issued letter of intent for supply of power from 01.04.2019 to 31.03.2020 at a fixed cost of Rs.0.48 ps and Variable cost of Rs. 2.91 ps / kWh.

14. The main thrust of the submission of Mr. K. Gopal Chowdary as adopted by Mr. Naga Deepak and Ms. Raashmi G Kamath counsel for SPGL and SPPPL respectively is that, by its very nature variable cost is always a pass-through and that this Commission has fixed Rs. 2.33 ps as variable cost in IA No.8 of 2017 in OP Nos. 28 & 29 of 2016 based on the gas price prevailing at that time. The Learned Counsel has further submitted that both the parties also proceeded on the said premise as evident from the fact that when gas prices have come down for the periods from 01.04.2017 to 30.09.2017 and from 01.10.2017 to 31.03.2018, the respondents AP DISCOMs have reduced the variable cost, which LKPL has not objected and that the same standard shall be applied when upward revision of fuel price takes place.

15. In order to appreciate this submission, it is necessary to have a glance at the order dated 29.11.2017 in IA No.8 of 2017 in OP Nos. 28 & 29 of 2016. A perusal of the said order shows that the petition filed for permission to make short term purchases was hugely opposed by the learned objectors such as Sri. M. Venugopal Rao, Senior Journalist and Convenor for Centre for Power Studies, Sri.

Ch. Nagasinga Rao, State Secretary, CPM, AP, Sri A Punna Rao, Sri Penumalli Madhu, Sri. B. Tulasi Das etc., apart from APSEB Engineers Association. The primordium of their objections was that as there are existing commitments with a number of generating companies for the AP DISCOMs to buy power; it is not desirable to allow power purchases from the petitioners when cheaper power is available from new IPPs and also power exchanges at Rs.2.98 ps per unit while the power of LKPL works out to Rs. 3.47 and the power of SPGL works out to Rs.3.60 per unit. The Commission however while dealing with this objection observed as under:

"In the Memo dated 25.10.2017, the 2nd respondent offered its power with a further concession at Rs.3.31 ps per kWh/unit and in the Memo of the petitioners dated 13-10-2017 it was clearly stated that if the prices are arrived with a PLF of 80% and a fixed price of 0.4776 kWh being the fixed price paid at the time of expiry of the Power Purchase Agreements, then the effective prices will be Rs.3.23 and Rs.3.09 with 55% and 40% PLF respectively for the 2nd and 1st respondents, which more or less tallies with the suggestions made in academic interest by Sri M.Venugopala Rao.

. . .

If procurement of power from the respondents 1 and 2 were to be thus cheaper to the petitioners notwithstanding any liabilities towards persons having Power Purchase Agreements with them, the same exfacie is beneficial both to the distribution companies and the consumers."

(Emphasis Added)

16. This Commission finally ordered as under:

"Therefore,--

(a) the Applicants/Petitioners shall cause the circumstances and persons responsible for presenting an incorrect picture relating to respondents 1 and 2 and Godavari Gas Power Plant in the Aggregate Revenue Requirement (ARR) of FY 2017-18 duly identified, in accordance with the prescribed procedure and take necessary corrective measures, to prevent recurrence of any such events in future;

b) the Applicants/Petitioners are permitted to procure power from the1st respondent at a fixed cost of Rs.0.96 ps and variable cost of Rs.2.33 ps making a total of Rs.3.29 ps per unit during the FY 2017-18:

(c) the Applicants/Petitioners are permitted to procure power from the 2nd respondent at a single part tariff of Rs.3.31 ps per unit during the FY 2017-18.

. . . "

(Emphasis Added)

17. On a careful reading of the above discussed order of the Commission under which the unit cost of power at Rs.3.29 ps and Rs.3.31 ps per unit for LKPL and SPGL respectively was fixed for the FY 2017-18 and continued vide separate order dt: 08.08.2018 in IA No.16 of 2018, it is quite evident that the strong and committed objections of various objectors raised in public interest to the procurement of power form the two petitioners viz., LKPL and SPGL were overruled only on the grounds that in comparison, the tariff at which these two companies offered to supply power is lower than that at which persons with binding PPAs are supplying power and that procurement of power from them is ex facie beneficial both to the distribution companies and the consumers. This being the raison d'être, it lies ill in the mouth of the petitioners to claim extra payment from the AP DISCOMs in the guise of fuel cost

pass-through. As noted above, when consideration of availability of cheaper power was the only basis for permitting procurement outside the PPAs and in the absence of any provision made by this Commission to allow increased variable cost as pass-through, the petitioners are not entitled either in law or on equity to claim any amount in excess of the ones fixed under the orders of this Commission in the name of pass-through. Unless the Commission itself altered its initial order either enhancing or reducing the price if situation so warranted, it is not permissible for either party to increase or reduce the price fixed by the Commission.

18. The submission of Sri. K. Gopal Chowdary that the DISCOMs themselves in their applications for permission to procure power proposed variable cost as pass-through and that in IA No.23 of 2018 this Commission allowed such prayer in case of SPPPL does not help the cause of his client. Even as per the learned counsel in the case of LKPL and SPGL, though the DISCOMs proposed variable costs as pass-through, in the face of stiff opposition for permission to procure power, the Commission has not allowed such a request. On the contrary, the procurement price has been firmly fixed without any scope for variation in future. In the case of SPPL, as noted above the Commission has not received any objections and obviously due to the said reason it has accepted the proposals of the DISCOMs to permit variable cost as pass-through for the year 2018-19 under the two orders passed in IA No.17 of 2018 and IA No.23 of 2018. Indeed, there was no specific permission granted for procurement of power in case of SPPPL for 2019-20 except permitting the DISCOM to apply for such permission. However, in violation of the tariff order, the Chief Engineer (Commercial), APPCC issued a letter of intent to

SPPPL which shall be termed as wholly unauthorised and unwarranted. Be that as it may, even in the said letter of intent no provision was made for paying variable cost as pass through.

19. From the conspectus of the facts discussed above, it is clear that unlike in the case of SPPPL for FY 2018-19, the orders issued granting permission for procurement of power in case of LKPL and SPGL do not permit any pass-through of variable costs and on top of it, the price is firm. Therefore, the orders in IA No.17 of 2018 and IA No.23 of 2018 passed in the case of SPPPL do not enure to the benefit of the petitioners for granting relief of allowing variable costs as pass-through as claimed by them in their respective petitions.

20. In its rejoinder, LKPL pleaded that in the draft power purchase agreement the parties agreed for fuel cost as pass-through. In this context it is relevant to refer to order dt: 29.11.2017 in IA No. 8 of 2017. In Para 31 of the order, it is clearly mentioned that the DISCOMs requested for approval for procurement of power from the petitioners dehors the approval of renewed Power Purchase Agreements and also for fixation of an ad hoc single part tariff in terms of the existing Power Purchase Agreement subject to adjustment later on approval of renewal of Power purchase Agreement and fixation of tariff. This Commission felt that as the DISCOMs have intended to withdraw the proposals for purchasing power, from LKPL, such a request cannot be considered. This Commission accordingly fixed price de hors the draft PPA “or otherwise as of now”. As the procurement price was fixed dehors the draft PPAs, it is idle for the petitioners to rely upon the clauses in the draft PPAs.

21. Ordinarily in case of long term supplies covered by PPAs, variable cost is claimed as pass-through on account of possible increase in the fuel prices in the long run. In contrast to this, in the present situation in view of surplus availability of power, short term purchases are guided by price consideration. Allowing pass-through would inevitably defeat the purpose for which power is sought to be procured on short term basis. Therefore, unless specifically permitted based on the prevailing conditions, the parties cannot seek variations in procurement price.

22. With respect to the issue whether allowing increased fuel price as pass-through would disturb the merit order, as pleaded by the DISCOMs and denied by LKPL, it is unnecessary for the Commission to deal with the same in the light of its decision not to allow the claim for pass-through irrespective of whether or not merit order gets disturbed.

23. As regards the submission of Sri. K.Gopal Chowdary that on two occasions, *if the respondents have acted contrary to the orders of this Commission under which procurement of power is permitted, such a conduct would not alter the nature of the orders. As rightly submitted by Sri Venugopala Rao, if the petitioners felt aggrieved by such reduction, they should have challenged such action of the respondents. So far, they have not availed any such remedy. As and when such

* Corrected as per the orders of the Commission dated : 23.07.2020

remedy is invoked, this Commission will examine and adjudicate the same. The Commission is therefore of the opinion that the alleged wrongful reduction of the price fixed by this Commission by the respondents would not entitle the petitioners to claim prices higher than what have been fixed by this Commission in the name of pass-through. As regards SPGL and SPPPL, there is no plea that the respondents have reduced the price due to reduction in fuel price. At the hearing Mr. P. Shiva Rao submitted that as a matter of fact no such reduction has been made. This submission is not opposed by the learned Counsel for both the said petitioners.

This point is accordingly answered against the petitioners.

24. Point No.2

A perusal of the Commission's record of proceedings shows that on 20.12.2019 the Commission passed an order, the relevant portion of which is extracted hereunder:

"*In this petition, the petitioner has claimed two seperate reliefs viz., (1) for payment of fixed charges based on the actual PLF achieved during the period FY 2018-19 instead of at 40% PLF fixed by this Commission; and (2) for grant of variable costs and pass-through. As regards relief No.1., Sri P.Sivarao, Standing Counsel for the utilities submitted that the respondents have no objection for payment of fixed cost based on the actual PLF. In view of this submission of the learned standing counsel, the need for adjudication of OP on merits to the extent of relief No.1 is obviated. The parties are accordingly at liberty to work out the fixed cost amount payable to the petitioner based on the actual PLF during 2018-19. As* *regards relief No.2., as there is a batch of OPs wherein similar reliefs are claimed and the said batch adjourned at request; Call on 19-02-2020."*

During the hearing no specific submission has been made by the counsel for SPGL with regard to relief of payment of fixed charges; obviously due to the reason that the said issue was settled. Hence, no relief on this account need be granted to SPGL.

In the light of the above discussion we do not find any merit in these petitions to the extent they relate to payment of extra variable cost as a fuel cost pass-through. Accordingly IA No.3 of 2019 in OP No.8 of 2018 and OP No.42 of 2019 are dismissed in toto. OP No.27 of 2019 is dismissed to the extent of prayer No.2 for grant of variable cost as pass-through and the OP regarding prayer No.1 is disposed of as infructuous.

This order is corrected and signed on this the 22nd day of July, 2020.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
Thakur Rama Singh	**Justice C.V. Nagarjuna Reddy**	**P. Rajagopal Reddy**
Member	**Chairman**	**Member**