

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
New Delhi

Review Petition No. 10/RP/2026

In
Petition No. 191/TT/2023

Subject : Petition seeking review of the Order dated 2.2.2026 in
Petition No. 191/TT/2023.

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited
(MPPMCL) & 10 Others

Date of Hearing : **22.7.2026**

Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member

Parties Present : Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Namrata Saraogi, Advocate, PGCIL
Ms. Rupinder Kaur, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Saurabh Mishra, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Rahul Chauhan, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Harshit Gupta, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Mukut Choudhary, Advocate, MSEDCL
Ms. Kajal Kakani, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Chaitanya Ahuja, Advocate, MSEDCL
Ms. Priyakshi, Advocate, EPGL

Record of Proceedings

The matter was heard through virtual hearing.

2. During the hearing, the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that the instant Review Petition has been filed on the ground of disallowance of the time over-run on account of RoW issues, from the SCOD, i.e., 5.2.2014 to 2.4.2016 (787 days) for Asset-I (Extension of 400 kV Bachau Sub-station with line reactor along with associated line bays) and Asset II (Essar Gujarat TPS- Bachau 400 kV D/C (triple) line). She further submitted that the Petitioner has never intermingled the details relating to the payment of compensation with the RoW issues faced during the construction of the transmission line. The Petitioner had only pleaded the RoW issue as a ground for condonation of time overrun of 787 days. The Petitioner, in the pleadings of the main Petition and in the instant Review Petition, has only mentioned the RoW issues date-wise. Therefore, the findings of the Commission that the documents do not indicate the specific locations affected by RoW are an error apparent on the face of the record. She prayed to correct the error apparent on the face of record and condone the time over-run and allow the IDC and IEDC.



3. The learned counsels for MPPMCL and MSEDCL submitted that the reply in the matter has been filed by them on 6.7.2026 and 7.7.2026, respectively. The learned counsel for MPPMCL submitted that since the Petitioner's Review Petition is an appeal in disguise, the same may not be considered.
4. The learned counsel for Essar Power Gujarat Limited (EPGL), Respondent No. 10, requested time to file a reply in the matter.
5. After the hearing, the Commission directed the Respondents, including EPGL, to file their respective replies within a week, with an advance copy to the Review Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, within a week thereafter.
6. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the matter for order.

By order of the Commission

**sd/-
(T. D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)**

