

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No.265/MP/2022 along with IA No.63/2023

Subject : Petition under Section 79(1)(c) and (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 for adjudication of disputes.

Petitioner : Arunachal Pradesh Power Corp. Pvt. Ltd. (APPCPL)

Respondents : Saranyu Power Trading Private Limited (SPTPL) and Ors.

Petition No.94/MP/2023

Subject : Petition under Section 79(1)(f) read with Section 19 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 9, 19 and 20 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Procedure, Terms and Conditions for grant of trading license and other related matters) Regulations, 2020 seeking recovery of penalty for less return of power by the Respondents as per Banking Agreements executed between the Petitioner and the Respondents and seeking revocation of the inter-State trading license granted to Respondent No.1.

Petitioner : Kreate Energy (I) Private Limited (KEIPL)

Respondents : Saranyu Power Trading Private Limited (SPTPL) and Ors.

Date of Hearing : **6.5.2026**

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

Parties Present : Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Advocate, APPCPL
Ms. Ritu Apurva, Advocate, APPCPL
Shri Ajitesh Garg, Advocate, KEIPL
Shri Arijit Maitra, Advocate, IPCL
Ms. Pallavi Saigal, Advocate, IPCL
Shri Aditya Singh, Advocate, HPPC
Shri Akshat Jain, Advocate, SPTPL
Shri Shikhar Verma, Advocate, SPTPL

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Respondent/IPCL, relying on the judgment of the APTEL dated 25.2.2026 in Appeal No. 358 of 2025 and Ors., submitted that in terms of the principles laid down therein, neither this Commission has jurisdiction to adjudicate the disputes involved in these cases nor has the authority



to refer them to arbitration and therefore, these cases are liable to be rejected for the lack of jurisdiction. The learned counsel also added that in Petition No. 94/MP/2023, a prayer has also been made for the revocation of the trading licence of the Respondent/SPTPL. However, as the Commission lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate the dispute arising from the underlying banking arrangement(s) between the parties, such a prayer premised thereon cannot be considered, as splitting/bifurcation of the causes of action is impermissible. The learned counsel also sought liberty to file his brief note on the above aspects.

2. The learned counsel for the Petitioner/APPCPL in Petition No.265/MP/2022, submitted that a Review Petition seeking the review of APTEL's judgment dated 25.2.2026 is presently pending and now scheduled for hearing during the next week. Accordingly, the learned counsel requested that the matter be adjourned by six weeks.

3. In response, the learned counsel for the Respondent/IPCL submitted that these cases ought not to be deferred merely on the ground of pendency of a review petition.

4. The learned counsel for the Petitioner/KEIPL in Petition No.94/MP/2023 also sought an adjournment therein on the ground of unavailability of arguing counsel due to a bereavement in the family, and further added that in the said Petition, there is an admitted default/liability by the Respondent.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, the Commission deemed it appropriate to adjourn these matters. The Commission also permitted the Respondent/IPCL to file its note of arguments/submissions, as above, on or before **15.6.2026**.

6. The Petitions will be listed for hearing on **23.6.2026**.

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