

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No.159/MP/2025

Subject : Petition under Sections 63 and 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for relief under Force Majeure, (Article 11) and Change in Law, (Article 12) of Transmission Service Agreement dated 11.11.2020, related to construction of Transmission system strengthening scheme for evacuation of power from solar energy zones in Rajasthan (8.1 GW) under Phase II - Part A.

Petitioner : Powergrid Ramgarh Transmission Limited (PRTL)

Respondents : SBE Renewable Seventeen Private Limited and Ors.

Date of Hearing : **12.2.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, PRTL
Ms. Pallavi Saigal, Advocate, PRTL
Ms. Harsha, Advocate, PRTL
Shri Salil Sinha, Advocate, IGESL
Shri Vipul Sharma, Advocate, IGESL
Ms. Stuti Jain, Advocate, IGESL
Shri Ajit Kumar Yadav, NRLDC
Shri Prashant Garg, NRLDC
Shri Gajendra Vasava, NRLDC

Record of Proceedings

The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the present Petition has been filed seeking the Force Majeure (Article 11) and Change in Law (Article 12) reliefs under the Transmission Service Agreement dated 11.11.2020 in relation to its Transmission Project. He further circulated his note of arguments and made elaborate submissions on the claims of Force Majeure and Change in Law events. He submitted that the Scheduled Commercial Operation Date of the Project was 8.9.2022, against which the Project achieved the Commercial Operation on 24.12.2023, i.e., with a delay of 472 days. The said delay was on account of the Force Majeure events/Change in Law events viz. (i) widespread Covid-19 (90 days), (ii) stoppage of work due to laying of transmission lines in GIB Potential area in line with judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court (383 days), and (iii) delay in availability of shutdown of 33 kV feeders (249 days). He further submitted that the Petitioner has also incurred the additional costs on account of Change in Law events viz. (i) increase in Acquisition Price, and (ii) requirement of installation of bird diverters. Moreover, the Petitioner has also been required to incur additional IDC and IEDC due to the above Force Majeure and Change



in Law events. He also pointed out that despite multiple opportunities, none of the Respondents has filed any reply in the matter.

2. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the Petitioner, the Commission permitted the Petitioner to file a note of arguments within two weeks.

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T.D. Pant)

Joint Chief (Law)