

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Review Petition No. 25/RP/2025 along with IA No. 135 of 2025

Subject : Review Petition under Section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 52 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2023 and Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908.

Petitioner : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited (MPPMCL)

Respondents : Khargone Transmission Limited (KTL) and Others

Review Petition No. 9/RP/2024 along with IA Nos. 19/2025 and 134/2025

Subject : Petition for review and modification of the final order dated 31.12.2023 in Petition No. 237/MP/2021 under Section 94(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 52 and 65 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2023 read with judgement dated 10.1.2024 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in Writ Petition (C) No. 194/2024 and C.M Application No. 889/2024.

Petitioner : Khargone Transmission Limited (KTL)

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Limited (MPPMCL) and Others

Date of Hearing : **24.6.2026**

Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member
Shri Harish Dudani, Member

Parties Present : Shri Basava Prabhu Patil, Senior Advocate, KTL
Shri Deep Rao Palepu, Advocate, KTL
Shri Arjun Agarwal, Advocate, KTL
Shri Prajeet Ghosh, Advocate, KTL
Shri Anand K. Ganesan, Advocate, GUVNL
Ms. Harsha Rao, Advocate, GUVNL
Shri Robin Singh, Advocate, GUVNL
Shri Venkatesh, Advocate, NTPC
Shri Nihal Bhardwaj, Advocate, NTPC
Shri Jatin Katiyar, Advocate, NTPC
Shri Ravi Sharma, Advocate, MPPMCL



Shri Aryan Chanda, Advocate, MPPMCL
Ms. Sneha Singh, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Vyom Chaturvedi, Advocate, MSEDCL

Record of Proceedings

These matters were heard through a virtual hearing.

2. At the outset, learned senior counsel appearing for the Review Petitioner, Khargone Transmission Limited, in Review Petition No. 9/RP/2024, submitted that there is a delay of 650 days in filing Review Petition No. 25/RP/2025 by MPPMCL, and accordingly, Review Petition No. 25/RP/2025 is barred by limitation and ought to be dismissed on this ground alone.
3. The learned counsel for MPPMCL objected to the continuance of the *ad interim* stay granted by the Commission vide RoP dated 4.4.2024 in IA No. 19 of 2024 in Review Petition No. 9/RP/2024, and urged the Commission to decide IA No. 134 of 2025, filed by MPPMCL, for vacation of the stay.
4. However, due to a paucity of time, the Commission deemed it fit to adjourn the matters. The interim protection dated 4.4.2024 in IA No. 19 of 2024 shall remain in force until the next date of hearing.
5. These Review Petitions, along with IAs, will be listed for hearing on **11.8.2026 at 2.30 P.M.**

By order of the Commission

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

