

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 243/MP/2024 along with IA Nos. 58/2024 & 79/2024

Subject : Petition under Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking for quashing/setting-aside of the bill/ invoice dated 12.3.2024 issued by the Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL) for alleged relinquishment compensation upon the Petitioner, i.e. Adani Wind Energy Kutch One Limited, amongst other reliefs.

Petitioner : Adani Wind Energy Kutchh One Limited (AWEKOL)

Respondent : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)

Petition No. 309/MP/2024

Subject : Petition under Section 79(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking quashing of the invoice dated 12.3.2024 raised by the Respondents on the Petitioner towards relinquishment charges pursuant to the order dated 8.3.2019 passed by this Commission in Petition No. 92/MP/2015.

Petitioner : MEIL Anpara Energy Limited (MAEL)

Respondents : Powergrid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL) and Anr.

Petition No. 304/MP/2024 along with IA No. 75/2024

Subject : Petition under Section 79(1)(c) & Section 79(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 32 of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Grant of Connectivity, Long Term and Medium Term Open Access in Inter-State Transmission and Related Matters) Regulations, 2009 along with Regulation 24 and 111 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999 challenging the levy of relinquishment charges by Power Grid Corporation of India Limited and seeking return of Bank Guarantee.

Petitioner : Torrent Power Limited (TPL)

Respondent : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)

Date of Hearing : **15.9.2026**

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, AWEKOL
Shri Hemant Singh, Advocate, AWEKOL
Shri Lakshyajit Singh Bagdwal, Advocate, AWEKOL
Shri Harshit Singh, Advocate, AWEKOL
Shri Jai Lal, Advocate, AWEKOL
Shri Saksham Saxena, Advocate, AWEKOL
Shri Anas Rangrez, Advocate, AWEKOL
Ms. Roberta Ruth Elwin, Advocate, AWEKOL
Ms. Neha M. Dabral, Advocate, AWEKOL
Shree Avijeet Lala, Advocate, MAEL
Ms. Shreya Dubey, Advocate, MAEL
Ms. Divya Chaturvedi, Advocate, TPL
Shri Saransh Shaw, Advocate, TPL
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Shirin Gupta, Advocate, CTUIL

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, learned senior counsel for the Petitioner/AWEKOL in Petition No. 243/MP/2024, learned counsel for the Petitioner/MAEL in Petition No. 309/MP/2024 and learned counsel for the Petitioner/TPL in Petition No. 304/MP/2024 submitted that separate orders are required to be passed in these Petitions as they are factually different from each other. In this regard, learned counsel for the Respondent/CTUIL clarified that these Petitions relate to the relinquishment charges and several issues, including the limitation issue, are common in these Petitions. He further submitted that the only difference is the methodology to be applied for computing relinquishment charges in terms of the order dated 8.3.2019 in Petition No. 92/MP/2015.

2. During the course of hearing, the learned senior counsel for the Petitioner/AWEKOL in Petition No. 243/MP/2024 made detailed submissions and concluded his arguments in the matter. While relying on the preliminary submissions filed by the Petitioner, he mainly submitted that (i) the impugned bill/invoice, having issued after a lapse of three years, is hit by the principles of limitation; (ii) LTA of the Petitioner was never made effective at the time of relinquishment; (iii) there are computational errors in the impugned invoice; (iv) Regulation 18 of the Connectivity Regulations, 2009 will only be applicable when the transmission is put to use, and (v) the Petitioner's Bank Guarantee of Rs. 12.5 crore ought to be returned by CTUIL. He further sought liberty to file written submissions and to make rejoinder submissions in the matter.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner/ MAEL in Petition No. 309/MP/2024 adopted the submissions made by the learned senior counsel for the Petitioner/AWEKOL. He also

made detailed submissions on limitation, stranded capacity, and calculation errors by CTUIL in the facts of this case. He further sought liberty to make rejoinder submissions, if any, on the next date of hearing.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner/ TPL in Petition No. 304/MP/2024 also adopted the submissions made by the learned senior counsel for the Petitioner/ AWEKL on the aspect of limitation, applicability of LPS Rules, and LTA operationalization, etc. She also pointed out that CTUIL has raised demand letters amounting to around Rs. 30.71 crore without providing any basis of computation for arriving at such amount despite being asked for the same on several occasions.

5. Due to a paucity of time, the arguments of the learned counsel for the Respondent/ CTUIL could not commence, and these matters were accordingly adjourned. The parties were permitted to file their written submissions/ notes of argument in these matters within two weeks with a copy to the other side. The interim directions issued in these matters shall continue till the next date of hearing.

6. The Petitions remained part-heard and will be listed for hearing on **19.11.2026 at 2.30 P.M.**

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