

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No.191/MP/2026 along with IA No.67/2026

Subject : Petition under Section 79(1)(c) and (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with the CERC (Connectivity and General Network Access to the inter-State Transmission System) Regulations, 2022 together with subsequent amendments thereto and the Procedure for Grant of Temporary General Network Access (TGNA) to the inter-State Transmission System through National Open Access Registry (NOAR), seeking setting aside of the untenable and unwarranted conditions placed by TP Central Odisha Distribution Limited on the grant of NoC to Jindal Steel Limited for onward supply of power on the ISTS and against obstruction to grant of open access/ standing clearance for short-term power trading by Jindal Steel Limited Angul plant.

Petitioner : Jindal Steel Limited (JSL)

Respondents : TP Central Odisha Distribution Limited (TPCODL) and Ors.

Date of Hearing : **27.5.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Gopal Jain, Sr. Advocate, JSL
Shri Vishrov Mukerjee, Advocate, JSL
Shri Yashawi Kant, Advocate, JSL
Ms. Priyanka Vyas, Advocate, JSL
Shri Pranav Sood, Advocate, JSL
Ms. Pankhuri Gupta, Advocate, JSL
Shri Shashwat Kumar, Advocate, JSL
Shri Manish Kharbanda, Advocate, JSL
Shri Aditya Sondhi, Sr. Advocate, TPCODL
Shri Anand Shrivastava, Advocate, TPCODL
Shri Ravi Nair, Advocate, TPCODL
Shri Chetan Saxena, Advocate, TPCODL
Ms. Janhavi Johar, Advocate, TPCODL
Ms. Devika Dhawan, Advocate, TPCODL
Shri Anubhav Kumar, Advocate, TPCODL
Shri Sitesh Mukerjee, Sr. Advocate, OPTCL
Shri Sandeep Kumar Mahapatra, Advocate, OPTCL
Shri Tribhuvan, Advocate, OPTCL
Shri Sugam Kumar Jha, Advocate, Odisha SLDC
Shri Sreedass KP, Advocate, Odisha SLDC
Shri Raghav Tandon, Advocate, Odisha SLDC



Record of Proceedings

During the hearing, the learned senior counsels and the learned counsel for the Petitioner and the Respondents made detailed submissions on the aspects of the jurisdiction and the interim relief(s).

2. During the arguments, the learned senior counsel for the Respondents also pointed out that the IA, which seeks an interim direction in respect of the Standing Clearance for May 2026, has been rendered infructuous and that no interim relief has been prayed for June 2026. In response, the learned senior counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the issue raised by the Petitioner was an ongoing issue, and that the Petitioner, in the main prayers, has also prayed for setting aside the conditions imposed by Respondent No.1 as a precondition to the grant of its consent, being arbitrary, unreasonable, and illegal. The learned senior counsel further submitted that it is settled law that an interim relief is granted in aid of, and ancillary to the main relief, and therefore, the Commission ought to consider such relief(s) for June 2026 as well, since the dispute to this effect is pending in the main Petition. The learned senior counsel, in this regard, further added that the Petitioner has also prayed the Commission to pass any such other order(s) as it may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the case and sought to place reliance on the doctrine of *lis pendens*. The learned senior counsel also submitted that in any case, this Commission should not be bound by such technicalities and that the Respondent(s) themselves have brought the relevant developments for June 2026 on record.

3. Considering the request of the learned senior counsel and learned counsel for the parties, the Commission permitted both sides to file their respective note of argument (not exceeding five pages) by tomorrow.

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

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