

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 323/MP/2026 along with IA No. 117/2026

Subject : Petition under Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003, seeking extension of SCSD under Articles 2.1.3, 2.1.4 and 4.5.2 of the Power Purchase Agreement dated 18.04.2024 executed between Apraava Energy Private Limited and NHPC Limited due to delay in obtaining Adoption of tariff and procurement approval along with the delay in operationalisation of connectivity granted by Central Transmission Utility of India Ltd. adversely impacting the implementation of the Project.

Petitioner : Apraava Energy Private Limited (AEPL)

Respondents : NHPC Limited and Ors.

Date of Hearing : **14.7.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Vishrov Mukerjee, Advocate, AEPL
Shri Girik Bhalla, Advocate, AEPL
Shri Deepak Thakur, Advocate, AEPL

Record of Proceedings

The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the present Petition has been filed seeking extension of Scheduled Commencement of Supply Date (SCSD) under Articles 2.1.3, 2.1.4 and 4.5.2 of the Power Purchase Agreement dated 18.4.2024 ('the PPA') executed between the Petitioner and the Respondent/NHPC due to delay in obtaining adoption of tariff and procurement approval along with the delay in operationalisation of connectivity granted by the Respondent/ CTUIL. The learned counsel submitted that in terms of Articles 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 of the PPA, the tariff adoption and the approval of Power Supply Agreement (PSA) had to happen within 60 days from the date of submission of Petition to the Appropriate Commission or within 120 days from the date of PSA, whichever is more and for the delay beyond the above-mentioned timelines, there shall entail a corresponding extension in the SCSD for equal number of days for the delay period. The learned counsel further submitted that in the present case, the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission approved the PSA only with a delay of 449 days and, therefore, the Petitioner is entitled to an extension of SCSD to this effect. However, Respondent No.2/MSEDCL has refused to give its concurrence for any extension of the SCSD. The learned counsel also submitted that the identical issues have already been raised in Petition No. 188/MP/202026 & batch, wherein the Commission, *vide* the Record of Proceedings

dated 6.5.2026, has directed the parties to maintain status quo, and that a similar direction may also be passed in this case.

2. After hearing the learned counsel for the Petitioner, the Commission directed as under:

(a) Admit and issue notice to the Respondents.

(b) The Respondents are to file their replies within three weeks with a copy to the Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder(s), if any, within two weeks thereafter.

(c) Since a *status quo* direction has been issued in similar cases, the parties herein shall also maintain the *status quo* till the next date of hearing.

3. The Petition will be listed for hearing along with Petition No. 188/MP/2026 & batch on **10.9.2026**.

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