CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Petition No.220/TL/2025

Subject	:	Application under Section-14, 15, 79(1)(e) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Procedure, Terms and Conditions for Grant of Transmission License and other related matters) Regulations, 2024 with respect to Grant of Transmission Licence to South Kalamb Power Transmission Limited.
Petitioner	:	South Kalamb Power Transmission Limited (SKPTL)
Respondents	:	Central Transmission Utility of India Limited and Ors.
Date of Hearing	:	**27.10.2026**
Coram	:	Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member Shri Harish Dudani, Member Shri Ravinder Singh Dhillon, Member
Parties Present	:	Shri Naresh Desai, SKPTL Shri Prashant Kumar, SKPTL Shri Akshayvat Kislay, CTUIL Shri Sanjay Sen, Sr. Advocate, SPPL Shri Hemant Singh, Advocate, SPPL Ms. Nehul Sharma, Advocate, SPPL Shri Harshit Singh, Advocate, SPPL Ms. Pragya Gupta, Advocate, SPPL Ms. Roberta Ruth Elvin, Advocate, SPPL

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, the Petitioner's representative submitted that, pursuant to the Commission's directions, the bulk consumers had been impleaded in the matter and had also filed their replies. He further submitted that the Petition was filed in April 2026 and nearly seven months have since elapsed; the delay in issuing the final order granting the transmission licence is delaying the processing of the application for obtaining approval under Section 164 of the Electricity Act, 2003. Accordingly, he prayed for the grant of the transmission licence in the interest of the project and that the matter may be reserved for orders.

2. Learned senior counsel for Respondent No. 10, i.e., Support Properties Private Limited ("SPPL") made the following submissions as under:

a) A similar issue regarding whether transmission assets are to be treated as a dedicated transmission system, with costs recovered from the GNA grantee, or as part of the common transmission system, with costs recovered from the beneficiaries, had arisen in Petition No. 675/TL/2025 (Mahan Rewa Line), in which the Commission had reserved its judgment on 18.9.2026.

b) The observations in the interim order dated 29.9.2026 that the subject transmission scheme (3×1500 MVA, 765/400 kV ICTs along with associated bays) was being implemented in the context of Connectivity/ GNA requirement at South Kalamb S/S required reconsideration, as the subject transmission scheme had consistently been envisaged as part of the common transmission system and not as a dedicated transmission system.

c) The minutes of the 32nd, 35th, 38th and 42nd CMETS-WR meetings clearly indicate that the SPPL - South Kalamb 400 kV D/c line, along with the associated bay at the South Kalamb sub-station end, had been identified as the dedicated transmission system for GNA, whereas the remaining system was identified as common transmission system augmentation.

d) Even as per the CTUIL's affidavit dated 26.10.2026, the ICTs and associated bays proposed under Bus Section-III were not associated with the GNA granted to SPPL/ Adani Infra, as the drawal under the GNA was proposed through the transmission infrastructure associated with Bus Sections-I and II. The subject scheme, on the other hand, had been evolved to facilitate MSETCL's drawal requirements through the downstream 400 kV network connected with Bus Section-III. Accordingly, the factual basis for the observation in the interim order dated 29.9.2026 required reconsideration.

e) CTUIL in its restoration letter dated 17.4.2026, had recommended the grant of a transmission licence for executing the ISTS scheme titled *"Network Expansion Scheme for drawal of power at South Kalamb S/s"*. A scheme recommended and considered as an ISTS scheme at the stage of grant of transmission licence could not subsequently be treated as a dedicated transmission system, and that cost recovery could not be directed through a mechanism not contemplated under the applicable Sharing Regulations.

f) The planning and development of the transmission network fell within the domain of the competent planning authorities, including the CEA under the applicable MoP Rules, whereas the Commission may have an advisory role.

g) Accordingly, the preliminary view expressed in the interim order dated 29.9.2026 passed in the instant Petition may require reconsideration.

h) The Respondent be permitted to file a response to CTUIL's affidavit and the note of arguments.

3. CTUIL, is directed to file the following information, on an affidavit within 10 days:

a) Copy of intimation of in-principle/ final grants of connectivity/ GNA to the Torrent PSH (1100MW), Tata Power PSP (1150MW) and SPPL (1518MW) at the proposed Section-I of South Kalamb S/s. In addition furnish the justification for drawal of 3768MW (Torrent PSH (1100MW) + Tata Power PSP (1150MW) + SPPL (1518MW)) through 2x1500MVA ICTs, and also whether this would satisfy CEA's N-1 planning criteria.

b) Copy of intimation of in-principle/ final grants of connectivity/ GNA to the Torrent PSH (1320MW) and Adani (500MW) at Section-II of the proposed South Kalamb S/s.

c) Vide submission dated 26.10.2026, CTUIL has submitted that SPPL and Adani (Infra) would utilize the transmission infrastructure developed under Bus Section-I and II for drawal of their granted capacity. Clarify whether these entities would be developing necessary augmentation for ISTS interconnection as per Regulation 12.5 or whether corresponding cost has been imposed on these entities. Submit relevant documents.

d) CTUIL, vide GNA restoration letter dated 17.04.2026 to SPPL, has intimated that "GNA Grantee shall be liable for such cost or commercial implications, as may be applicable in terms of Regulation 12.5 read with Regulation 17.1(iii) of CERC GNA Regulations, 2022; applicable CERC Orders and decisions of competent authorities...". Accordingly, clarify whether invoices for such cost implications have been raised to SPPL? If yes, the details thereof.

e) Reply on submission of counsel of SPPL that common transmission network expansion/ strengthening scheme does not attract the Regulation 12.5 for GNA granted to entities covered under 17.1(iii) and ISTS system already approved by the planning authorities.

4. Considering the submissions made by the representative of the Petitioner and the learned senior counsel appearing for Respondent No. 10, SPPL, the Commission permitted Respondent No.10, SPPL, to file its response to CTUIL's affidavit dated 26.10.2026 within 10 days. The parties were also permitted to file their respective note of arguments, if any, within 10 days.

5. Petition shall be listed for hearing on **20.11.2026.**

By order of the Commission

Sd/
(T.D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)