

**COURT-I**

**IN THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL FOR ELECTRICITY  
(APPELLATE JURISDICTION)**

**APPEAL NO. 76 OF 2017**

**Dated: 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2017**

**Present: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Ranjana P. Desai, Chairperson  
Hon'ble Mr. I.J. Kapoor, Technical Member**

**In the matter of:**

**Essar Oil Ltd. ... Appellant(s)  
Vs.  
Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission & Ors. ... Respondent(s)**

Counsel for the Appellant(s) : Mr. Amit Kapur  
Mr. Malcolm Desai

Counsel for the Respondent(s) : Mr. Arijit Maitra  
Mr. Soumik Ghosal  
Mr. S.R.Pandey for R-1

Mr. M.G.Ramachandran  
Ms. Ranjitha Ramachandran  
Mr. Anand K.Ganesan  
Mr. Shubham Arya for R-2  
Mr. Manu Seshadri for R-4

**ORDER**

The Appellant has challenged the Order dated 17.11.2016 passed by the Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission (**the State Commission**) in Petition No. 1429 of 2014 filed by the Appellant. By the impugned order the State Commission has permitted the impleadment of Respondent Nos.4 to 6, namely, Utility Users Welfare Association; Laghu Udhog Bharti and Shri Amarsinh Chavda respectively. The basic contention of the Appellant is that Respondent Nos. 4 to 6 ought not to have been impleaded as they are neither proper parties nor necessary parties.

We have heard learned counsel for the parties. Mr. C.S. Vaidyanathan, learned Senior counsel appearing for the Appellant, while reiterating the above submission has taken strong exception to the impleadment of Respondent Nos.4 to 6. It is submitted that in the impugned order there are several observations which touch the merits of the case. A grievance is made that while deciding prayer for impleadment the State Commission ought not to have opined on the merits of the case. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents have submitted that no interference is necessary with the impugned order as the impleadment of Respondent Nos. 4 to 6 cannot be faulted as they are necessary and proper parties.

We find substance in the submission of learned Senior counsel appearing for the Appellant that while deciding whether Respondent Nos. 4 to 6 should be impleaded in the matter it was not necessary for the State Commission to opine on the merits of the case. In the circumstances of the case therefore we are of the opinion that the issue as to whether Respondent Nos. 4 to 6 are necessary and proper parties should be kept open to be argued at the final hearing of the petition along with other issues. The final order on the petition filed by the Appellant should be passed by the State Commission on all issues independently and uninfluenced by any of the observations made by the State Commission in the impugned order. Order accordingly. We make it clear that all the contentions of the Appellant and the Respondents including Respondent Nos. 4 to 6 are expressly kept open to be argued at the stage of final hearing of the petition by the State Commission. We make it clear that we have expressed no opinion on any issues involved in this matter and the State Commission will decide all the issues independently and in accordance with law.

With the above observations, the appeal is disposed of. Needless to say that all the pending I.As shall stand disposed of.

**(I.J. Kapoor)**  
**Technical Member**

**(Justice Ranjana P. Desai)**  
**Chairperson**

ts/kt