CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Petition No. 179/MP/2023 along with IA No. 166/2026

Subject : Petition under Section 11(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003, along with Regulation 111-113 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 inter-alia seeking a declaration/direction with regard to the principles/ methodology to be adopted for computation of the rate/ compensation at which such supply of power to Respondent Nos. 1 to 8 for the period between being 15.03.2023 to 16.06.2023, or such other period as extended by Ministry of Power from time to time, based on principles laid down with respect to Section 11(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Petitioner : Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL)

Respondents : Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (GUVNL) & Ors.

Petition No. 13/RP/2026 along with IA No. 83/2026

Subject : Review Petition under Section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003, read with Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 and Regulation 103 (1) of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999, for Review of Interim Order dated 29.4.2026 of the Commission in Petition No. 179/MP/2023.

Petitioner : Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (GUVNL)

Respondents : Tata Power Company Limited (TPCL) & Ors.

Date of Hearing : **3.11.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Sanjay Sen, Sr. Advocate, TPCL
Shri Venkatesh, Advocate, TPCL
Shri Shryeshth Ramesh Sharma, Advocate, TPCL
Ms. Shubhi Sharma, Advocate, TPCL
Shri Ashutosh Srivastava, Advocate, TPCL
Shri Aashwyn Singh, Advocate, TPCL
Shri Vedant Choudhary, Advocate, TPCL
Ms. Shambhavi Jha, Advocate, TPCL
Ms. Devishi Gupta, Advocate, TPCL
Shri M G Ramachandran, Sr. Advocate, GUVNL
Ms. Ranjitha Ramachandran, Advocate, GUVNL
Ms. Shrishti Khindaria, Advocate, GUVNL
Shri Abhigy Goswami, Advocate, GUVNL

Shri Vipul Lathiya, GUVNL
Shri Vishal Binod, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Aditya Dubey, Advocate, MSEDCL
Ms. Swadha Sharma, Advocate, MSEDCL
Ms. Poorva Saigal, Advocate, PSPCL & HPPC
Ms. Pallavi Saigal, Advocate, PSPCL & HPPC
Shri Rishabh Saxena, Advocate, PSPCL & HPPC
Ms. Shree Dwivedi, Advocate, PSPCL & HPPC

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, learned senior counsel appearing for both sides submitted that they were ready to commence their respective arguments, while fairly adding that the submissions would take substantial time. They further submitted that in the event that matters are deferred for hearing on a specifically fixed date, they may be listed for a physical hearing in the afternoon session. Learned counsel for the Respondent, MSEDCL, sought an additional week to file a reply to the IA and the additional documents filed by TPCL.

2. Considering the submissions of the parties, the Commission deemed it appropriate to adjourn these matters for hearing them on a specifically fixed date in the afternoon session. Meanwhile, the Respondent, MSEDCL, was permitted to file a reply to the IA and the additional documents sought to be placed therewith within ten days, with a copy to the Petitioner, who may file its response, if any, within seven days thereafter.

3. The Petitions will be listed for physical hearing on **25.11.2026** and **26.11.2026** at **2:30 P.M**.

By order of the Commission
Sd/
(Monojit Sehrawat)
Deputy Chief (Law)