CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Petition No. 456/MP/2026 along with IA Nos. 153/2026 & (Diary No.) 803/2026

Subject	:	Petition under section 79 (1)(c), (f) and (k) of the Electricity Act, 2003, read with Regulations 41 and 42 of the CERC (Connectivity and General Network Access to the Inter-State Transmission System) Regulations, 2022 and Regulation 65 of the CERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2023.
Petitioner	:	CGE Renewables Private Limited (CGERPL)
Respondent	:	Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)
Date of Hearing	:	**23.10.2026**
Coram	:	Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member Shri Harish Dudani, Member Shri Ravinder Singh Dhillon, Member
Parties Present	:	Shri Basava Prabhu Patil, Sr. Advocate, CGERPL Shri Parinay Deep Shah, Advocate, CGERPL Ms. Shikha Ohri, Advocate, CGERPL Shri Kartik Sharma, Advocate, CGERPL Shri Harsh Dev Singh, Advocate, CGERPL Ms. Nishita Choudhary, Advocate, CGERPL Shri Arijeet Shukla, Advocate, CGERPL Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, CTUIL Ms. Pallavi Saigal, Advocate, CTUIL Shri Naman Aggarwal, Advocate, CTUIL Ms. Muskan Agarwal, CTUIL

Record of Proceedings

During the hearing, the learned senior counsel recapitulated the issues involved in the matter and mainly submitted the following:

(a) Following the revocation of the Petitioner's connectivity by CTUIL on 7.10.2026, i.e. a day before the previous hearing on 8.10.2026, the Commission, vide Record of Proceedings dated 8.10.2026, granted the protection against the creation of third-party rights for the capacity corresponding to the Petitioner's Connectivity at Bhuj-II PS until further orders. Further, in view of this subsequent revocation, the Petitioner has filed IA (Diary) No. 803/2026 seeking amendment of the Petition, *inter alia*, praying for quashing of the revocation letter dated 7.10.2026 issued by CTUIL.

(b) Pursuant to the minutes of the meeting issued by CEA on 1.9.2026 on the subject of "*Benchmarking of Project Cost Requirements for Different Types of Renewable Energy (RE) Projects for Financial Closure Compliance under CERC Regulations*" (CEA Minutes), the minimum benchmark project costs were revised to ₹3.5 crore/MW for Solar projects and ₹6 crore/MW for Wind projects. As the Petitioner's connectivity had not been revoked on the

date of the said Minutes, the revised minimum benchmark project cost ought to have been applied in the Petitioner's case, given that the Petitioner satisfied these revised standards.

(c) The action of revoking the Petitioner's entire 90 MW connectivity for an alleged shortfall of mere Rs. 30 crores (for Solar component), against the total Project Cost of Rs. 510 crore, is completely disproportionate. Even otherwise, on 20.8.2026, the Petitioner had furnished the revised FC documents for the Project Cost of Rs. 550 crore, which fully complied with the minimum Project cost requirements.

(d) Pertinently, the Petitioner was granted the final connectivity on 20.6.2025, whereas the Detailed Procedure, providing for the minimum project cost requirement, was issued only on 10.4.2026. Further, the Petitioner was not an Applicant but already an existing Connectivity grantee. Also, whether for not meeting the requirement for 30 MW, can the entire capacity that has been granted be revoked, considering reasonable proportionately.

(e) The transmission system required for making the Petitioner's Connectivity effective is unlikely to come up before 30.6.2027. Hence, the continuance of the Petitioner's Connectivity does not cause prejudice to any person. Thus, without prejudice to the above submissions, the present case is a fit case for the exercise of the Commission's powers under Regulations 41 and 42 of the GNA Regulations, 2022.

2. In response, the learned counsel for the Respondent, CTUIL, submitted that the Petitioner had failed to comply with the FC requirement in respect of the solar capacity, for which the benchmark had not been revised and remained at ₹5 crore/MW under the Advisory dated 3.2.2025 and the Detailed Procedure dated 10.4.2026. Learned counsel further submitted that CTUIL had published a draft Detailed Procedure on CTUIL's website in December 2025 and circulated it to all stakeholders for comments; NSEFI and other generators gave comments, however, the Petitioner had not submitted any comments. Learned counsel further submitted that if the distinction sought to be drawn by the learned senior counsel for the Petitioner between a Connectivity applicant and a Connectivity grantee were considered, the Petitioner would not be entitled to various rights and entitlements under the Third Amendment to the GNA Regulations, 2022. Learned counsel further submitted that the Petitioner has recently filed an amended Petition and, accordingly, prayed that notice be issued to enable CTUIL to file its formal reply to the amended Petition. He, therefore, sought three weeks' time to file a reply to the amended Petition.

3. The Commission asked CTUIL to confirm, if consultation with CEA was carried out while notifying cost/MW on 3.2.2025 and 10.4.2026, to which counsel of CTUIL replied that he needs to take instructions in this regard and will file the required information.

4. After hearing the learned senior counsel and counsel for the parties, the Commission allowed the IA (Diary) No. 803/2026 and the amended Petition was taken on record. The Commission further directed the Respondent, CTUIL, to file its reply, if any, within three weeks with a copy to the Petitioner, who may file their rejoinder, if any, within two weeks thereafter. The interim direction issued vide the Record of Proceedings dated 8.10.2026 shall continue until further orders.

5. The Respondent, CTUIL, is directed to submit on an affidavit within three weeks the following information:

(a) What were the parameters, basis which benchmark for project cost vide Advisory dated 3.2.2025, Minimum project cost/MW vide Procedure dated 10.4.2026 and benchmark project cost/MW vide Advisory dated 3.09.2026 were decided? Whether CTU maintains a cost database for such projects (Wind, Solar, BESS, RPPD)? Furnish the minutes of meeting/ documents on the consultation carried out with CEA to finalise the numbers as in Advisory dated 3.2.2025, Minimum project cost/MW vide Procedure dated 10.4.2026 and Benchmark project cost/MW vide Advisory dated 3.09.2026.

(b) What should be the date of applicability of the revised numbers of benchmark cost/MW / minimum cost/MW, once the same is issued by CTU? Should the cost/MW as issued by CTU be applicable to projects prior to a few months of achievement of FC or as on date of achieving FC or any other proposition that can be applied.

(c) CTUIL to furnish the copy of comments received on the draft Detailed procedure based on which the final procedures was issued on 10.4.2026. CTUIL to furnish the website link where such stakeholders comments have been uploaded.

6. The Petition will be listed for hearing on **22.12.2026**.

By order of the Commission

Sd/
(Vipan Sharma)
Deputy Chief (Legal)