

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 194/MP/2024 along with IA No.46/2024

Subject : Petition under Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking extension of SCOD for the Transmission Line under the 'Transmission Scheme for Solar Energy Zone in Gadag (1500 MW), Karnataka: Part-A Phase-II' due to delay in commissioning of the Transmission Line/Project on account of certain Force Majeure events under the Transmission Service Agreement dated 18.11.2022 between the Gadag II-A Transmission Ltd. and Central Transmission Utility of India Limited.

Petitioner : Gadag-II A Transmission Limited (GIIATL)

Respondents : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL) and Ors.

Date of Hearing : **25.5.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Girik Bhalla, Advocate, GIIATL
Shri Damodar Solanki, Advocate, GIIATL
Shri Alok Shankar, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri S. Vallinayagam, Advocate, TNPDC
Ms. Bhavya Arora, Advocate, TNPDC

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petition was originally filed in 2024 seeking extension of the Scheduled Commercial Operation Date (SCOD) of its Project, at a time when the force majeure events were still continuing. However, the Project has since achieved Commercial Operation Date (COD) in 2026. Accordingly, the learned counsel sought four weeks' time to file an IA seeking amendment of the Petition so as to place the subsequent developments on record.

2. The learned counsel for the Respondent, CTUIL, submitted that CTUIL had already raised a preliminary objection on the maintainability of the Petition as the force majeure events claimed by the Petitioner were still ongoing. However, as the Petitioner has already completed its Project, it ought to withdraw the present Petition with liberty and file a fresh Petition in this regard. The learned counsel for the Respondent, TNPDC, also submitted that the Petitioner ought to file a fresh Petition instead of seeking an amendment of this Petition.

3. In response, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner has raised the plea of Force Majeure for two events, and their submissions, along with supporting documents, are already on record. However, since one of the Force Majeure events has ceased after the filing of the Petition, the proposed amendment would entail only a limited addition of subsequent developments. As regards the objection on the maintainability of the original Petition, the learned counsel sought liberty to make his arguments in this regard on the next date of hearing.

4. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, the matter was adjourned.

5. The Petition will be listed for hearing on maintainability on **23.7.2026**.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T.D. Pant)

Joint Chief (Law)