



August 18, 2023
BJ/SH-L2/

BSE Limited
Corporate Relationship Department
Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers
Dalal Street
Mumbai – 400001.
Scrip Code: **500400**

National Stock Exchange of India Limited
Exchange Plaza, C-1, Block G,
Bandra-Kurla Complex,
Bandra (East)
Mumbai – 400 051.
Symbol: **TATAPOWER**

Dear Sirs,

Sub: **Intimation - Details of Pending Material Litigations / Disputes as required under Regulation 30 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015**

In terms of Regulation 30 of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, as amended, read with Schedule III thereunder read with SEBI Circular dated July 13, 2023, the details of pending material litigations / disputes are attached herewith as Annexure A.

We request you to kindly take the above information on record.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,
For **The Tata Power Company Limited**

(H. M. Mistry)
Company Secretary

Encl: As above

TATA POWER

The Tata Power Company Limited

Registered Office Bombay House 24 Homi Mody Street Mumbai 400 001

Tel 91 22 6665 8282 Fax 91 22 6665 8801

Website : www.tatapower.com Email : tatapower@tatapower.com CIN : L28920MH1919PLC000567



Printed on 100 % Recycled Paper



Annexure A

Disclosures as required under Regulation 30 of the SEBI (Listing Obligation and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015

Case 1:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name(s) of the opposing party	Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited (MSEDCL)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (ATE)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	MSEDCL raised demand for determination of fixed charges for Unscheduled Interchange (UI) of power. TPCL had filed a petition against the said demand for which stay has been granted by the ATE till the methodology for the determination is fixed.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty, etc.	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 215 crore

Case 2:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	a) Union of India, b) The Joint Secretary, c) The Commissioner, Central GST and Central Excise Commissionerate and d) The Additional Director General
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Bombay High Court
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	The Service Tax department issued show cause cum demand notice for recovery of service tax on transmission fee received for period from July 2012 to June 2017 based on the direction from High Powered Committee. TPCL filed a writ petition with High Court against this arbitrary and untenable demand even though Transmission & Distribution income/ fee is a part of negative list under finance Act. All the pleadings in the matter are completed and interim orders staying the show cause notice and writ petition admitted. Matter was listed on 21.06.19 when the same was adjourned. Intimation dated 26th December 2022 for keeping Show Cause Notice (SCN) in abeyance is received by TPCL.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 375 crore



Case 3:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (MERC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Disallowance of certain costs recoverable from consumers in truing up order for the period FY16 and FY17 by MERC.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 348 crore (including carrying cost till 30 th June 23)

Case 4:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (MERC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Disallowance of certain costs in truing up order for the period FY20-22 by MERC. Appeal filed against these disallowances.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 642 crore (including carrying cost till 30 th June 23)

Case 5:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (MERC) Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (ATE)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Supreme Court
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Disallowance of Carrying cost on past recoveries allowed by ATE.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 269 crore

Case 6:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (MERC), MSEDCL, Tata Power-Distribution
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (ATE)



	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal filed by Indian Railways against order dated 05.09.2019 passed by MERC in case no. 154 of 2019 relating to petition for issuing specific conditions with regard to distribution activities of Indian Railways as Deemed Distribution Licensee. The MERC has, inter alia, decided that Indian Railways is liable to pay Cross Subsidy Surcharge (CSS) and other charges for energy drawn through open access.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 299 crore + carrying cost

Case 7:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (GUVNL) Punjab State Power Corporation Limited (PSPCL) Haryana Power Purchase Centre (HPPC) Maharashtra State Electricity Development Corporation Limited (MSEDCL) Rajasthan Urja Vidyut Nigam Limited (RUVNL)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Supreme Court
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	ATE vide order dated 27th April 2021, allowed the appeal with respect to certain items related to change in law pertaining to Mundra Power Plant. The Procurers have litigated the said order in Supreme Court.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 352 crore

Case 8:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (GUVNL)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Petition filed by TPCL seeking execution of order dated 03.01.2023 passed by CERC in petition no. 128 MP 2022 determining the methodology for compensation for adverse impact of section 11 under Electricity Act direction dated 05.05.2022 for Mundra Plant
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 720 Crore

Case 9:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	



	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (GUVNL)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (ATE)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal filed by GUVNL against order dated 03.01.2023 passed by CERC in petition no. 128 MP 2022 determining the methodology for compensation for adverse impact of section 11 direction dated 05.05.2022
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Same as Case No 8 above. i.e. in Case 8 TPCL is claiming this entire amount. In this case, GUVNL is resisting the claim.
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	Same as Case No 8 above i.e. in Case 8 TPCL is claiming this entire amount. In this case, GUVNL is resisting the claim

Case 10:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Haryana Power Purchase Centre (HPPC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (ATE)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal filed by HPPC against order dated 03.01.2023 passed by CERC in petition no. 128 MP 2022 determining the methodology for compensation for adverse impact of section 11 direction dated 05.05.2022
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 121 Crore

Case 11:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Punjab State Power Corporation Limited (PSPCL)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Petition Filed by PSPCL seeking specific performance of PPA and Compensation/damages for alleged shortfall in supply from Mundra Plant
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 289 Crore + Interest

Case 12:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Haryana Power Purchase Centre (HPPC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Petition Filed by HPPC seeking specific performance of PPA and



		Compensation/damages for alleged shortfall in supply from Mundra Plant
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 316 Crore+ Interest

Case 13:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Maharashtra State Electricity Development Corporation Limited (MSEDCL)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Petition Filed by MSEDCL seeking specific performance of PPA and Compensation/damages for alleged shortfall in supply from Mundra Plant
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 172 Crore + Interest

Case14:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (GUVNL)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Petition Filed by GUVNL seeking specific performance of PPA and Compensation/damages for alleged shortfall in supply from Mundra Plant
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹3,921 Crore + interest

Case 15:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (GUVNL)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Petition filed by TPCL seeking direction against GUVNL and RVNL for wrongful computation of Plant Declared Capacity (DC) penalty and unilateral deduction of capacity charges and rebate for Mundra Plant
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 136 Crore

Case 16:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)



	Name (s) of the opposing party	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited Punjab State Power Corporation Limited Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited Ajmer Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Limited Jaipur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Limited Jodhpur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Limited Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited Union of India, Ministry of Power
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (ATE)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal filed by TPCL against order dated 03.01.2023 passed by CERC in petition no. 128 MP 2022 determining the methodology for compensation for adverse impact of section 11 direction dated 05.05.2022 for Mundra Plant
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 500 Crore

Case 17:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (APTEL)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal Filed by TPCL for Mundra Plant, challenging CERC's Compensation Mechanism vide Order dated 13.08.21 challenging recovery of depreciation in 25 years rather balance PPA Period, lower returns on Equity and recovery of Income tax on ROE for FG D project
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Under recovery of depreciation for the remaining 13 years - ₹1,275 crore and lower ROE for the entire span of the project (25 years)- ₹ 1,082 crore
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 2,357 crore

Case 18:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	District Administration, Jamshedpur
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Divisional Commissioner, Singhbhum (Kolhan) Division, Chaibasa
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	TPCL has received demand notice from District Administration, Jamshedpur towards its use of the leased land for its Jojobera Power Plant through sub-leasing arrangement with Customer. Based on the legal opinion obtained, the Company strongly believes that there is a strong case. In case of unfavorable outcome, the Company believes that it will be allowed to recover from customer through future tariff.



b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 896 crore

Case 19:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	The Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Kleros Capital Partners Private Limited
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Singapore International Arbitration Centre with place of sitting in Singapore (SICA)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Kleros claims that Tata Power breached confidentiality and non-circumvention clauses in NON-Disclosure Agreement (NDAs) for a proposed coal mining project in Russia. Kleros has initiated the dispute before SIAC to claim damages for alleged breach of NDA
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	USD 5.25 Billion to USD 20 Billion.

Case 20:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Maithon Power Limited (MPL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL) Damodar Valley Corporation (DVC) West Bengal State Electricity Distribution Company Limited (WBSEDCL) Tata Power Trading Company Limited (TPTCL) Kerala State Electricity Board Limited (KSEB)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC)
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Filed by MPL, seeking approval for entering into an Agreement with the Indian Railways for transfer of assets worth ₹ 356 crore, free of cost to Railways under Gati Shakti Multi-Modal Cargo Terminal (GCT) Policy 2021.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 356 Crore

Case 21:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Maithon Power Limited (MPL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC)/Union of India (UOI)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	High Court of Delhi
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Writ Petition Filed by MPL, challenging certain provisions of CERC Tariff Regulations, 2020 (First Amendment) and CERC Tariff Regulations, 2019 related to under recovery of depreciation/returns on FGD/NOx Projects.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Under recovery of depreciation for the remaining 13 years - ₹360 crore and lower ROE



		for the entire span of the project (25 years)- ₹ 207 crore
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 567 Crore

Case 22:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Renewable Energy Limited (TPREL) and Walwan Renewable Energy Limited (WREL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Andhra Pradesh Southern Power Distribution Company Limited
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Supreme Court
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Special leave Petition filed by DISCOM against Andhra Pradesh High Court's order with regards to revision of Wind and solar Tariffs in Andhra Pradesh PPAs
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Principal amount is already recovered, only LPS of ₹ 90 Crore is remaining.
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 520 Crore (including LPS of ₹ 90 Crore)

Case 23:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Renewable Energy Limited (TPREL) and Walwan Renewable Energy Limited (WREL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Andhra Pradesh Southern Power Distribution Company Limited
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Andhra Pradesh High Court
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Contempt petition filed by TPREL/WREL against the common order dated 15.03.2022 in W.A. 383/384/388 of 2019 with regards to revision of Solar and Wind Tariffs
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Same as case No 22 above
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	Same as case No 22 above

Case 24:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	TP Saurya Limited (TPSL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Kerala State Energy Board Limited
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Petition filed on behalf of TPSL seeking Basic Custom Duty (BCD) recovery under change in Law on Solar Modules for the KSEB 110MW Solar Project.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Based on the original order of Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission (KSERC), BCD is a pass through in tariff. Hence, no financial implication



c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 130 Crore
----	---------------------------	-------------

Case 25:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Walwhan Renewable Energy Limited (WREL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (GUVNL)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Supreme Court
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Civil Appeals filed by GUVNL seeking revision of solar tariff determined under GERC's Tariff Order of 2010.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 130 Crore

Case 26:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Walwhan Renewable Energy Limited (WREL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Petition filed by Energy Watchdog against Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulator (TNERC) order, wherein the Control Period for solar tariff order was extended but the tariff was not revised downward.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 219 Crore

Case 27:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Renewable Energy Limited (TPREL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Sh. Bharat Kumar Sh. Joginder Payla Sh. Rohtash Kumar Sh. Vikal Sh. Ranvir Singh
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Mr. Yuvraj Pal Singh, IRS DCIT & Initiating Officer, BPU Chandigarh, Haryana, 160017
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	TPREL received 5 show cause notices on 31 December 2020 under Section 24(1) of the Prohibition of Benami Property Transactions Act, 1988 ("PBPT Act") in the relation to the land purchased for the Chayan Project in Rajasthan. TPREL has responded to the above show cause notices. No further enquiries were raised by the department till date.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	Nil



Case 28:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Renewable Energy Limited (TPREL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Enercon GmbH – Germany, administrator to estate of Alloy Wobben Wind World India Limited (WWIL) Enercon India Limited
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Karnataka High Court
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Enercon GmbH (Germany) challenged the IP rights (Patents) used by its subsidiary (WWIL) despite Enercon GmbH terminating the Patent User Agreement with its subsidiary in India
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	Nil

Case 29:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Renewable Energy Limited (TPREL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Government of Karnataka, Karnataka Renewable Energy Development Limited, Serentica Renewables, Orange Ashoka Renewables
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Karnataka High Court
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	TPREL has filed the WP 17327/ 2023 which challenges all the conditions of Serentica's Government Order (GO) dated 13.07.2023 for both the transfer of 200 MW and additional 100 MW within the 4 coordinates allocated to Orange Ashoka as per GO.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Potential impact of ₹ 120 crore pertaining to encashment of BG if the project does not happen. However, TPREL will sell the land worth ₹ 40 crore and hence the Net impact will be around ₹ 80 crore
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	Nil

Case 30:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	TP Saurya Limited (TPSL) and Poolavadi Wind farms Limited (PWL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Principal Secretary Revenue and Forest, Chief Secretary Forest and Revenue, Deputy Conservator of Forest (Nashik), Assistant Conservator of Forest (Nashik), Range Forest Office (Nashik), Collector (Nashik), Additional



		Collector (Nashik), SDO (Yeola) and Tehsildar and Executive Magistrate (Nashik)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Bombay High Court
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	TPSL & PWL has filed Writ Petitions against the Revenue Department officials and the Forest department officials, Nasik Division inter alia for their arbitrary actions on 28 th March 2023 for the Seizure of the solar plant goods belonging to PWL and the alleged forest lands of TPSL thereby attaching the land and goods as forest produce under the Section 52 of Indian Forest Act, 1927. Further, Writ Petition (WP) prayers to withdraw and stay the effect and give interim stay on letters issued by the aforesaid respondent authorities.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Potential loss will be TPSL Land cost of approx. ₹ 40 Crore and PWL- Revenue loss as per PPA of ₹ 35 Lakhs per day for the delay under the supply agreement.
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	Nil

Case 31:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Renewable Energy Limited (TPREL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Shiv Kumar Gaur v. State of UP and 7 Ors. Respondents include: Ashish Khanna (KMP), State of U.P
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Allahabad High Court Criminal Miscellaneous Writ Petition No. 11960 / 2023 Connected Matters CrI. Misc. WP No. 11015 / 21 and 12755 / 21
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	FIR under Section 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B and 406 of IPC was lodged against TPREL employees (including KMP). Interim Stay against the above FIR and arrest was passed on 04.05.22 which continues as on date. Settlement Agreement dated 18.05.23 has been executed, the Petitioner has filed this WP to quash the FIR, Interlocutory Order directed the matter to Allahabad High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre to ratify the Settlement Agreement, subsequent to which the FIR shall be quashed. Mediation date is 25.08.23. Next date of hearing is 05.09.23,
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	NA; Criminal Litigation against KMP
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	NA; Criminal Litigation against KMP

Case 32:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Walwhan Renewable Energy Limited (WREL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	VAT authorities



	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	VAT authorities
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	WREL has received notice for FY 2015-16 with a proposed demand of ₹ 300 crore on account of non-disclosure of import purchase in their monthly VAT returns. WREL has responded to the notice and awaiting formal order from the department. However, based on email communication the demand has now been revised to ₹ 80 lacs
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 300 crore

Case 33:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	TP Central Odisha Distribution Limited
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Regional Provident Fund Commissioner (RPFC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Odisha High Court
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	RPFC raised a demand on erstwhile Central Electricity Supply Utility (CESU) for non-remittance of Employer and Employee contribution for the period Nov 1997 – Dec 2011 and short remittance (10% instead of 12%). Total demand ₹ 552 crore. The case is pending at High Court.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 552 crore

Case 34:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	TP Central Odisha Distribution Limited
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Riverside Utilities Private Limited (RUPL) and Seaside Utilities Private Limited (SUPL), the (Distribution Franchisees (DF)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Central Electricity Supply Utility (CESU) filed a counter claim in Odisha High Court (HC). Matter is pending before the Arbitrator.
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Writ petition filed by DF for non-renewals of Franchisee agreement. CESU had filed a counter claim against it. HC has ordered for termination of DF agreement and directed CESU & DF to reconcile. However, the reconciliation process failed. Currently, the matter is pending before the Arbitrator
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 383 crore

Case 35:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	TP Central Odisha Distribution Limited



	Name (s) of the opposing party	Service tax department
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	CSAT, Kolkata
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Indirect taxation matter relating to service tax is disputed and is contested by the Company. The case pertains to service tax on charges other than distribution of electricity recovered from consumers.
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 153 crore

Case 36:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal against tariff order dated 30.09.2015 (True Up FY 13-14)
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 282 Crore excluding carrying cost

Case 37:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal against DERC 2021 Tariff order 30.09.21 (True up FY 19-20)
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 677 Crore excluding carrying cost

Case 38:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal for recovery of loss on retirement of assets (FY 03 to FY 16)
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 203 Crore excluding carrying cost

Case 39:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)



	Name (s) of the opposing party	Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal against tariff order dated 31.08.2017. (True up FY 14-15 & FY 15-16)
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 184 Crore excluding carrying cost

Case 40:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal against tariff order dated 31.07.2019. (True up FY 17-18)
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 209 Crore excluding carrying cost

Case 41:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	Appellate Tribunal for Electricity
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Appeal against DERC Tariff order dated 28.8.2020 (True up FY 18-19)
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 232 Crore excluding carrying cost

Case 42:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
a)	Brief Details of Litigation	
	Name of the Company	Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)
	Name (s) of the opposing party	Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (DERC)
	Court/ Tribunal / Agency where litigation is filed	High Court of Delhi
	Brief details of dispute / litigation	Business Plan Regulation (BPR) 2023 challenged vide Writ Petition (WR)
b)	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc	Nil
c)	Quantum of claims, if any	₹ 258 Crore excluding carrying cost