

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 239/MP/2021 along with IA No. 47/2023

Subject : Petition under Sections 61, 63 and 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with the statutory framework and Article 11 and Article 12 of the Transmission Service Agreement dated 28.06.2017 executed between Goa Tamnar Transmission Project Limited and its Long-Term Transmission Customers inter alia claiming consequential and declaratory reliefs with respect to the Change in Law and Force Majeure events that have adversely impacted the implementation of the Project.

Petitioner : Goa-Tamnar Transmission Project Limited (GTTPL)

Respondent : Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd. and Ors.

Date of Hearing : **4.8.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Basava Prabhu Patil, Sr. Advocate, GTTPL
Shri Deep Rao Palepu, Advocate, GTTPL
Mr. TAN Reddy, GTTPL
Ms. Anisha Chopra, GTTPL
Mr. Sandeep Rajpurohit, GTTPL
Shri Ravi Sharma, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri Aryan Chanda, Advocate, MPPCL
Ms. Deepa Mishra, Advocate, MPPCL
Ms. Ankita Kumari, Advocate, MPPCL
Shri Rajiv Naik, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Anup Jain, Advocate, MSEDCL
Ms. Nishtha Goel, Advocate, MSEDCL

Record of Proceedings

The learned senior counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the present Petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking compensation due to various force majeure and Change in Law events occurring during the implementation of its transmission Project and also seeking extension to the Scheduled Commercial Operation Date ('SCOD') of the said Project due to delay caused by various force majeure events, in terms of Articles 11 and 12 of the Transmission Service Agreement dated 28.6.2017. The learned senior counsel further circulated his notes of arguments and concluded his detailed submissions on the aforesaid Change in Law and Force Majeure events along with carrying cost, IDC and IEDC.



2. The learned counsel for the Respondent/MSEDCL, owing to the non-availability of the arguing senior counsel, sought liberty to advance their submissions on the next date of hearing.

3. Considering the above, the Commission adjourned the matter for arguments of the Respondents.

4. The matter remained part-heard and will be listed for further hearing on **15.9.2026**.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T.D. Pant)

Joint Chief (Law)