



August 22, 2023

BSE Limited
Listing Department
P. J. Towers,
Dalal Street, Fort
Mumbai – 400 001

National Stock Exchange of India Ltd.
Listing Department
Exchange Plaza, Plot No. C-1, Block G,
Bandra Kurla Complex,
Bandra (E), Mumbai – 400 051

Scrip Code: 532371

Scrip Symbol: TTML

Dear Sir / Madam,

Subject: Intimation under Regulation 30 of SEBI (Listing Obligations & Disclosure Requirements) Regulations 2015 – Disclosure of continuing material events.

Pursuant to the provisions of Regulation 30(4)(i)(d) of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements), Regulations 2015 ('SEBI LODR Regulations 2015'), we hereby enclose the details of pending litigations / disputes as per the revised materiality thresholds of the Company in accordance with the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) (Second Amendment) Regulations, 2023, as Annexure 1. The same has also been disclosed in Annual Report for FY22-23.

The said annexure contains details pursuant to Para B Part A of Schedule III of SEBI LODR Regulations 2015 and additional details as required under SEBI Circular No. SEBI/HO/CFD/CFD-PoD1/P/CIR/2023/123 dated July 13, 2023.

This is for your information and records.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,
For Tata Teleservices (Maharashtra) Limited

Vrushali Dhamnaskar
Company Secretary

Encl.: As stated above

TATA TELESERVICES (MAHARASHTRA) LIMITED

Registered Office : D-26, TTC Industrial Area, MIDC Sanpada, P.O. Turbhe, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, 400 703

Tel: 91 22 6661 5111 | Fax: 91 22 6660 5517 | Email : investor.relations@tatatel.co.in

Website: www.tatatelebusiness.com | CIN: L64200MH1995PLC086354



Annexure 1.

Sr. No	Name of the Opposing Party	Court / Tribunal / Agency before which the matter is pending	Brief Details of the case Expected Financial implication/ Quantum of claim (if any)
1.	Pune Municipal Corporation (PMC)	Civil Court, Pune	PMC in respect of Company's rented office in Pune is raising since 1998 bills for higher property tax based on rent paid by Company. The Civil Court, Pune in 2003 quashed demands and directed PMC to fix ARV after giving opportunity to TTML to represent and raise fresh demand accordingly. PMC has not done it and still raised demands for Rs.80.78 Cr in May 2019 which was stayed by the Civil Court, Pune, which also restrained PMC from publishing the demands on its website or otherwise. Still, PMC website shows Rs. 216.20 Cr. as property tax arrears and penalty due from Company. In respect of the above, the estimated financial implication by way of basic property tax of Rs. 3.23 Cr has been provided. Company does not expect any penalty.
2.	Union of India (Department of Telecommunications)	Supreme Court	The Company has filed a review petition against the order / judgment dated July 23, 2021, in the AGR matter, whereby the clarification/ modification applications filed by the TSPs for correction of errors were dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Review Petition is pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for hearing and final disposal. No negative financial implication is expected.
3.	Union of India (Department of Telecommunications)	Supreme Court	In June 2004, DoT inserted a clause in the UASL imposing penalty @ 150% on shortfall in payment of license fees, w.e.f. 14.11.2003. DoT levied penalty and interest on penalty amounting to Rs. 42.88 Cr alleging shortfall in payment of license fee for FY1999 – FY2002. Appeal was filed by DoT against TDSAT order dated 12.02.2010 setting aside imposition of penalty by the DoT @ 150% on account of the alleged shortfall of license fee. Vide the aforesaid orders, the TDSAT held that the levy of 150% and interest thereon not permissible under the Contract Act and even otherwise, the penal clause, even if valid, could be given effect only from November 14, 2003. The appeal is pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for hearing and final disposal. No additional financial impact expected as AGR Judgement includes all demands up to FY 16-17.

TATA TELESERVICES (MAHARASHTRA) LIMITED

Registered Office : D-26, TTC Industrial Area, MIDC Sanpada, P.O. Turbhe, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, 400 703

Tel: 91 22 6661 5111 | Fax: 91 22 6660 5517 | Email : investor.relations@tatatel.co.in

Website: www.tatatelebusiness.com | CIN: L64200MH1995PLC086354



Sr. No	Name of the Opposing Party	Court / Tribunal / Agency before which the matter is pending	Brief Details of the case Expected Financial implication/ Quantum of claim (if any)
4.	Union of India (Department of Telecommunications)	Bombay High Court	<p>The Company challenged the demand notice of Rs. 290.17 Cr, issued by Department of Telecommunications towards one-time spectrum charge (OTSC). The Company retained 1.25 MHz (out of alleged excess of 2.5 MHz) in Mumbai by paying under protest pro-rate OTSC and surrendered balance excess spectrum in Mumbai and Maharashtra in 2013. The Bombay High Court granted interim protection to the Company and stayed the demand. The Writ is pending for hearing.</p> <p>No negative financial implication is expected as company has surrendered the excess spectrum as allowed under the DoT Circular.</p>
5.	Department of Telecommunications	TDSAT	<p>The Company filed a petition seeking quashing of order/communication dated April 28, 2020 issued by the DoT declaring the Company to be in violation of Condition 6.1 of both the Unified License and Unified Access Service License in respect of demerger of mobility business and called upon the Company to show cause on the limited issue as to why financial penalty not exceeding Rs. 100 Cr. be not imposed. TDSAT directed TTL to file its response to the SCN to be considered by DoT within a reasonable time in accordance with law. TDSAT adjourned the matter sine die and observed that either party can approach TDSAT for revival of the petition. A personal hearing was granted by DoT in July, 2020. DoT is yet to pass a formal order.</p> <p>No Financial Implication expected in view of TDSAT orders and dismissal by NCLT of similar proceedings under Companies Act, 2013.</p>
6.	Union of India (Department of Telecommunications)	Bombay High Court/Delhi High Court	<p>The Company has challenged the authority of DoT to issue penalty demand notices for Rs. 268.84 Cr before High Courts for alleged non-compliance with subscriber verification guidelines. The Company has obtained stay from High Courts against various demand notices and the matters are pending adjudication.</p> <p>Circulars are contrary to Section 20A of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885</p> <p>Expected financial implication, if any: Rs. 265.15 Cr.</p>
7.	Bharti Airtel	Supreme Court	<p>The Company has filed an appeal before the Supreme Court against the TDSAT judgment dated August 30, 2012 which was against the Company for payment of SMS termination charges ("SMS TC") amounting to Rs. 66.38 Cr for the period June 2009 to September 2011 in terms of the SMS Agreements dated August 29, 2008 and September 04, 2008.</p> <p>Hon'ble Supreme Court (SC) vide its interim order on October 17, 2012, rejected the application for interim relief. The Company has paid the amount under SC order. The Company does not expect any further financial implication.</p> <p>The appeal is pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for hearing and final disposal.</p>



Sr. No	Name of the Opposing Party	Court / Tribunal / Agency before which the matter is pending	Brief Details of the case Expected Financial implication/ Quantum of claim (if any)
8.	Vodafone/Idea	Supreme Court	<p>The company has received demands from Vodafone and Idea. The Company has filed appeals against TDSAT orders dated March 31, 2016, whereby, the Company was to pay to Vodafone & Idea, SMS Termination charges @10 paisa per SMS on net inflow of Traffic basis.</p> <p>The appeal is pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for hearing and final disposal. The Company believes that the amounts adjudged as payable by TDSAT are not tenable in the absence of any contractual arrangements.</p> <p>Expected Financial Implication, if any: Rs. 45.05 Cr.</p>
10.	BSNL	Supreme Court	<p>BSNL issued demand notices to pay Access Deficit Charge (ADC) amounting to Rs. 166.90 Crs. Supreme Court confirmed the demands of BSNL of year 2002-05 by its order dated April 30, 2008 and held that ADC was payable on Walky (treating it as WLL-M), without dealing with the quantification of the demand. The company filed a Petition in TDSAT for quantification of demands. TDSAT relied upon the judgment of Supreme Court in its orders dated April 15, 2010 to hold that ADC was payable for Walky, as per bills raised.</p> <p>BSNL has additionally filed the Civil Appeals against TDSAT orders upholding TRAI regulations of 2006, 2007 & 2008 reducing the ADC charges.</p> <p>An appeal was filed before the Supreme Court in 2010 against TDSAT judgment declining the quantification, which is pending adjudication.</p> <p>Expected financial implication, if any: Rs. 55.30 Cr.</p>
11.	BSNL, MTNL	Supreme Court/ Delhi High Court	<p>The Company filed an appeal at Supreme Court, against the TDSAT Judgment dated May 28, 2010, setting aside the Port Charges Amendment Regulations 2007 where the port charges were reduced. BSNL challenged the validity of Port Charges 2nd Amendment Regulations 2012 at Delhi High Court where TRAI further reduced the port charges. Delhi High Court passed a conditional interim order which has been duly complied with by the Company and the matter is pending adjudication.</p> <p>The appeal is pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for adjudication. Expected Financial Implication, if any: Rs. 56.70 Cr.</p>
12.	BSNL	Supreme Court	<p>The Company had earlier filed a petition before the TDSAT challenging the validity of the BSNL's Circular and disconnection notices issued by BSNL (September 2005 to November 2005) regarding transit charges, which was disposed off relying on TDSAT order in Bharti Televentures matter. The Company has filed an appeal against TDSAT judgment distinguishing itself on factual grounds from Bharti matter.</p> <p>The appeal is pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for hearing and final disposal.</p> <p>Expected Financial Implication, if any: Rs. 44.10 Cr.</p>



Sr. No	Name of the Opposing Party	Court / Tribunal / Agency before which the matter is pending	Brief Details of the case Expected Financial implication/ Quantum of claim (if any)
13.	GST Department	Bombay High Court	Appeal has been filed by the Company disputing demand of service Tax on sales of SIM cards. These demand are out of limitation period. Period: FY 2007-08 to FY 2016-17 (up to June 2017) Expected Financial Implication, if any: Rs.57.52 Cr.
14.	GST Department	GST Commissionerate	CENVAT credit reversal demand – Non-maintenance of proper CENVAT register. Matter has been remanded back by the Tribunal to adjudicating authority for verification of records. Period: FY 2009-10 to FY 2011-12 Expected Financial Implication, if any: Rs.36.14 Cr.
15.	GST Department	CESTAT, Mumbai	Appeal has been filed by the Company disputing demand raised on account of difference noted in revenue reported in financial statement and ST-3 return. Company has responded and filed proper reconciliation in this regard. Period: FY 2008-09 to FY 2011-12 Expected Financial Implication, if any: Rs.31.45 Cr.
16.	GST Department	GST Commissionerate	Company disputing demand of CENVAT reversal on income from trading of Handsets, Telephone Handsets, Walky Talky, Scrap etc. during the period. Basis favorable orders in other cases matter has been kept in abeyance by the authorities. Period: FY 2008-09 to FY 2011-12 Expected Financial Implication, if any: Rs. 24 Cr.