

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No.110/MP/2026

Subject : Petition under Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Sharing of Inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses) Regulations, 2020 seeking determination of Cost-Sharing and Tariff for 400 kV Bays at Jam Khambhaliya Sub-station utilised for ISTS purposes.

Petitioner : Reliance Industries Limited (RIL)

Respondents : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL) and Ors.

Date of Hearing : **20.8.2026**

Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Ramesh Babu V, Member
Shri Harish Dudani, Member
Shri Ravinder Singh Dhillon, Member

Parties Present : Shri Hemant Singh, Advocate, RIL
Ms. Supriya Rastogi, Advocate, RIL
Ms. Lavanya Panwar, Advocate, RIL
Shri Ashok Singh, RIL
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Kaavya Madaan, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Priyansi Jadiya, CTUIL
Ms. Ranjitha Ramachandran, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Aneesh Bajaj, Advocate, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the present Petition has been filed seeking determination of the cost-sharing mechanism applicable to two (2) out of six (6) 400 kV GIS bays, including the associated tie bays, constructed at Jam Khambhaliya ISTS Pooling Station under the Bilateral Transmission Agreement dated 28.06.2022 executed between the Petitioner and PGCIL. The learned counsel further referred to the single-line diagram annexed as P-8 to the Petition and submitted that the cost of the two 400 kV bays, i.e., bays 415 & 418, along with the two shared tie bays, i.e., bays 414 & 417 (common use for both RIL and ISTS entities), ought to be recovered through PoC mechanism under the Sharing Regulations, 2020. The learned counsel also submitted that while PGCIL has furnished the cost details of two line bays and not the shared tie bays, such details may be sought from PGCIL. The learned counsel, while seeking liberty to file his brief note of submissions, requested that the matter may be reserved for order.

2. Learned counsel for the Respondent/CTUIL also submitted that the submissions of all the parties are already on record and the Commission may reserve the matter for order.

3. Learned counsel for the Respondent/PGCIL submitted that since the Petition largely referred to ISTS use of two 400 kV bays out of six 400 kV bays, PGCIL has only provided the costing details of such bays. In any case, determination of their tariff is an entirely separate exercise that cannot be undertaken in these proceedings.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Commission permitted both sides to file their respective note of submissions (not exceeding three pages) within a week with a copy to the other side.

5. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the matter for order.

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