

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 15/RP/2025 along with IA No. 90/2025

Subject : Petition under Section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 for review of the ex-parte judgment dated 29.1.2025 passed in Petition No.189/MP/2024- M/s Beempow Energy Private Limited v. MP Power Management Company Limited.

Petitioner : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited (MPPMCL)

Respondents : Beempow Energy Private Limited (BEPL) & Ors.

Date of Hearing : **10.2.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Aashish Anand Barnard, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Paramhans Sahani, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Vishrov Mukerjee, Advocate, BEPL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the Petitioner, MPPMCL, submitted that the present Petition has been filed seeking review of the *ex parte* Order dated 29.1.2025 passed by the Commission in Petition No. 189/MP/2024. By the said Order, the Commission allowed the Petitioner by holding that Notification No. 8/2021, which introduced an increase in the rate of Goods and Services Tax from 5% to 12%/18%, constitutes a “Change in Law” event in terms of Article 17 of the PPAs dated 25.11.2021, thereby holding Respondent No. 1, BEPL, entitled to a discount rate of 9.12% and an annuity period of fifteen years. He further submitted that the notices in the original Petition were issued to the Respondent’s Jabalpur Office instead of the Bhopal Office. He further submitted that due to certain internal miscommunication within MPPMCL, the relevant communications were not conveyed to the Non-Conventional Energy Section, Bhopal, which dealt with the subject matter. Consequently, the Petitioner became aware of the impugned Order dated 29.1.2025 only upon receipt of a letter dated 4.3.2025 from Respondent No. 1, BEPL. He submitted that there is a delay of approximately eighty days, which is *bona fide* and arose solely because the Petitioner became aware of the impugned Order only upon receipt of the aforesaid letter dated 4.3.2025 from Respondent No. 1, BEPL, seeking compliance and accordingly, the Petitioner has also moved IA No.90/2025 seeking condonation of this delay.

2. Learned counsel for Respondent No.1, BEPL, opposed the maintainability of the Review Petition and submitted that the same suffers from an inordinate delay of 130 days and, therefore, is liable to be dismissed at the threshold.

3. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for both parties, the Commission directed as follows:

a) Issue notice in IA as well as the Review Petition, subject to just exceptions.



b) The Respondents to file their replies, if any, within two weeks with a copy to the Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, within two weeks thereafter.

4. The Petition, along with IA, will be listed for hearing on **9.4.2026**.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T.D. Pant)

Joint Chief (Law)