

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 24/RP/2025 along with IA No. 125/2025**

Subject : Petition under Section 94(1)(f) read with Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 and Regulation 52 of the CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2023 for review and under Section 152 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 read with Regulation 54 of the CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2023 for correction, rectification and clarification of order dated 12.3.2025 in Petition No. 141/MP/2016.

Petitioner : GUVNL

Respondent(s) : TPCL and 7 Ors.

Date of hearing : **27.5.2026**

Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson  
Shri Harish Dudani, Member

Parties Present : Ms. Ranjitha Ramachandran, Advocate, GUVNL  
Shri Amit Kapur, Advocate, TPCL  
Shri Amit Dubey, Advocate, MSEDCL

**Record of Proceedings**

The case was called out for a hearing through virtual mode.

2. During the hearing, the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner submitted that the review is confined to the computation of Change in Law compensation relating to seawater intake channel charges and additional capacity charges. She argued that the basis and detailed computation of the amount, have not been indicated in the impugned order dated 12.3.2025. She further submitted that the computation does not account for the *de minimis* threshold of 1% of the LC in the aggregate for a contract year, and that recovery of annual seawater intake channel charges, as well as the computation of additional capacity charges, should be linked to availability. She further sought liberty to file written submissions in this regard.

3. The learned counsel for Respondent MSEDCL adopted the submissions of the Review Petitioner and sought liberty to file its written submissions.

4. In response, the learned counsel for TPCL submitted that the Review Petitioner seeks to reopen issues already decided by the APTEL. He further submitted that the APTEL, while remanding the matter, had conclusively held the claims to be admissible Change in Law events and directed the Commission only to compute the impact of Change in Law.

5. In rebuttal, the learned counsel for the Review Petitioner clarified that the Review Petitioner is not seeking reconsideration of the finding that the event



constitutes a Change in Law, but is limited to computation and prudence check of the said Change in Law.

6. The Commission, after hearing the parties, permitted them to file their respective written submissions on or before **27.6.2026** and reserved its order in the matter.

**By order of the Commission**

**Sd/-**

**(T.D. Pant)**

**Joint Chief (Law)**

