

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 131/MP/2024**

- Subject : Petition under Rule 3(7) and Rule 3(8) of the Electricity (Timely Recovery of Costs due to Change in Law) Rules, 2021 read with Article 12 of the Transmission Service Agreement dated 07.12.2018 executed between Mumbai Urja Marg Limited/ Petitioner and its Long-Term Transmission Customers, and Sections 61 and 63 of the Electricity Act, 2003, seeking verification of the calculation of the impact due to change in law events on the cost of implementation of the Petitioner's transmission project, and consequent adjustment in the monthly transmission charges.
- Petitioner : Mumbai Urja Marg Limited (MUML)
- Respondent : Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Limited and Ors.

**Petition No. 256/MP/2023**

- Subject : Petition under Rule 3(7) and Rule 3(8) of the Electricity (Timely Recovery of Costs due to Change in Law) Rules, 2021 read with Article 12 of the Transmission Service Agreement dated 23.04.2019 executed between Lakadia-Vadodara Transmission Project Limited/Petitioner and its Long-Term Transmission Customers and Sections 61 and 63 of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking verification of the calculation of the impact due to change in law events on the cost of implementation of the Petitioner's transmission project, and consequent adjustment in the monthly transmission charges.
- Petitioner : Lakadia-Vadodara Transmission Project Limited (LVTPL)
- Respondent : Adani Wind Energy Kutchh One Limited and Ors.
- Date of Hearing : **30.9.2024**
- Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson  
Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member  
Shri Harish Dudani, Member
- Parties Present : Shri Basava Prabhu Patil, Sr. Advocate, LVTPL & MUML  
Shri Deep Rao, Advocate, LVTPL & MUML  
Shri Parth Parik, Advocate, LVTPL & MUML  
Shri Arjun Agarwal, Advocate, LVTPL & MUML  
Shri Mohd Munis Siddique, Advocate, LVTPL & MUML  
Ms. Ranjitha Ramachandran, Advocate, GUVNL  
Shri Aneesh Bajaj, Advocate, GUVNL  
Shri Anad K Ganesan, Advocate, GUVNL & DNH  
Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, GUVNL & DNH  
Ms. Ritu Apurva, Advocate, DNH  
Shri Parth Bhalla, Advocate, GUVNL

Shri Utkarsh Singh, Advocate, GUVNL  
Shri Anup Jain, Advocate, MSEDCL  
Shri Alok Shankar, Advocate, MPPMCL  
Shri Gajendra Singh, NLDC  
Shri Sanny Machal, NLDC  
Ms. Kavya Bhardwaj, CTUIL

### **Record of Proceedings**

At the outset, learned counsel for the Respondents, GUVNL and DNHPDCL in Petition No. 131/MP/2024 sought liberty to file its reply on the compliance affidavit dated 25.9.2024 filed by the Petitioner, MUML, pursuant to the direction of the Commission.

2. Learned counsel for the Respondent, DNHPDCL, also sought liberty to file written submissions in Petition No. 256/MP/2023. Further, learned counsel for the Respondent, GUVNL, added that GUVNL has filed its additional reply dated 25.9.2024 in the said matter pursuant to the direction of the Commission dated 5.9.2024. Learned senior counsel for the Petitioner, LVTPL submitted that both these Petitions be heard on the same day.

3. Considering the above, the Commission permitted the Respondent, GUVNL, and DNHPDCL to file its additional reply to the Petitioner's compliance affidavit dated 25.9.2024 in Petition No. 131/MP/2024 within two weeks with an advance copy to the Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, within a week thereafter. The Commission also granted liberty to the Respondent, DNHPDCL, to file its written submissions in Petition No. 256/MP/2023 within two weeks.

### **Petition No. 256/MP/2023**

4. The Commission directed the Petitioner to file the following information on an affidavit within two weeks:

(a) Response to the specific averment made by the Respondent, GUVNL, that in terms of law, the power to decide issues of RoW compensation is with the District Judge and not DC/DM.

(b) The Petitioner has submitted that at the time of the bidding, with respect to the rate of crops/ fruits/ trees compensation, the Petitioner enquired with the local authorities and was directed to approach the Department of Horticulture, which notifies the tree compensation rates and in response, the Petitioner was informed that for payment of the compensation for trees, the Petitioner should refer to the Resolution No. Na.L.A.Q.-227-4945-Gh dated 02.01.1993. However, as per the 2017 Resolution, compensation for these items is required to be decided by the Agricultural Produce Market Committee (APMC), and such rates shall be certified by the Sarpanch, Talati, Mamalatdar, or concerned revenue officer. Submit the rates specified by the APMC and certified by the concerned officer. Also, the written correspondence exchanged with the local authority as well as the response received on the above aspect.

5. The Commissions directed GUVNL to submit on an affidavit within two weeks the sample RoW compensation along with its calculation details paid by GETCO in terms of

GoG resolution 2017/2021 as applicable, for any 400/220 kV line in any district through which the transmission line covered under the instant petition traverses.

6. Petition No. 131/MP/2024 and Petition No. 256/MP/2023 will be listed for the hearing on **18.10.2024** and **19.11.2024**, respectively.

**By order of the Commission**  
**Sd/-**  
**(T.D. Pant)**  
**Joint Chief (Law)**