CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Petition No. 527/MP/2026

Subject : Petition under Sections 79(1)(c) and (k) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 41 and 42 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Connectivity and General Network Access to the inter-State Transmission System) Regulations, 2022, inter alia seeking relaxation and/or removal of the difficulty arising from the summary closure of the Petitioner's application for non-solar-hour access (integration of Battery Energy Storage System) filed within the Right of First Refusal (RoFR) window, solely on account of an inadvertent mismatch between the authorised signatory of the affidavit and the authorised signatory who digitally signed the application, both authorised under the same Board Resolution; and seeking directions to revive, restore and process the Petitioner's Application with protection of the Petitioner's RoFR priority.

Petitioner : Litsolaire Energy Private Limited (LEPL)

Respondent : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)

Petition No. 528/MP/2026

Subject : Petition under Sections 79(1)(c) and (k) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 41 and 42 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Connectivity and General Network Access to the inter-State Transmission System) Regulations, 2022, inter alia seeking relaxation and/or removal of the difficulty arising from the summary closure of the Petitioner's application for non-solar-hour access (integration of Battery Energy Storage System) filed within the Right of First Refusal (RoFR) window, solely on account of an inadvertent mismatch between the authorised signatory of the affidavit and the authorised signatory who digitally signed the application, both authorised under the same Board Resolution; and seeking directions to revive, restore and process the Petitioner's Application with protection of the Petitioner's RoFR priority.

Petitioner : Khaba Renewable Energy Private Limited

Respondent : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)

Petition No. 532/MP/2026

Subject : Petition under Sections 79(1)(c) and (k) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 41 and 42 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Connectivity and General Network

Access to the inter-State Transmission System) Regulations, 2022, inter alia seeking relaxation and/or removal of the difficulty arising from the summary closure of the Petitioner's application for non-solar-hour access (integration of Battery Energy Storage System) filed within the Right of First Refusal (RoFR) window, solely on account of an inadvertent mismatch between the authorised signatory of the affidavit and the authorised signatory who digitally signed the application, both authorised under the same Board Resolution; and seeking directions to revive, restore and process the Petitioner's Application with protection of the Petitioner's RoFR priority.

Petitioner : Luceo Solar Private Limited

Respondent : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)

Petition No. 551/MP/2026

Subject : Petition under Sections 79(1)(c) and (k) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 41 and 42 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Connectivity and General Network Access to the inter-State Transmission System) Regulations, 2022, inter alia seeking relaxation and/or removal of the difficulty arising from the summary closure of the Petitioner's application for non-solar-hour access (integration of Battery Energy Storage System) filed within the Right of First Refusal (RoFR) window, solely on account of an inadvertent mismatch between the authorised signatory of the affidavit and the authorised signatory who digitally signed the application, both authorised under the same Board Resolution; and seeking directions to revive, restore and process the Petitioner's Application with protection of the Petitioner's RoFR priority.

Petitioner : Enren-I Energy Private Limited

Respondent : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)

Date of Hearing : **11.11.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Shreyshth Ramesh Sharma, Advocate, LEPL
Shri Akash Lamba, Advocate, LEPL
Shri Vedant Choudhary, Advocate, LEPL
Ms. Poorva Saigal, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri Anik Majumder, Advocate, CTUIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the Petitioners submitted that the present Petitions, *inter alia,* seek relaxation and/or removal of the difficulty arising from the summary closure of the Petitioners' application for non-solar-hour access (integration of Battery Energy Storage System) filed within the Right of First Refusal (RoFR) window, solely on account of an inadvertent mismatch between the authorised signatory of the affidavit and the authorised signatory who digitally signed the application, both authorised under the same Board Resolution, and consequently, directions to revive, restore and process the Petitioners' Application with protection of the Petitioners' RoFR priority. Learned counsel submitted that the Respondent, CTUIL, has yet to file its reply in the matters. Learned counsel further submitted that, in its recent order dated 01.11.2026 passed in Petition No. 237/MP/2026 (Rajasthan Solarpark Development Company Limited v. CTUIL), the Commission had already dealt with a similar issue of the RoFR application having closed on the ground of major deficiency and, in light of the decision rendered therein, these matters may be reserved for orders, while permitting CTUIL to file its replies, if any.

2. Learned counsel for the Respondent, CTUIL, sought a two-week extension to file replies. Learned counsel further submitted that although she had not yet examined the Commission's above-mentioned order, CTUIL had no objection to the Commission reserving orders in these Petitions, except for Petition No. 551/MP/2026. Learned counsel submitted that in Petition No. 551/MP/2026, there were additional grounds for closure of the Petitioner's application and accordingly, requested that the said case be listed for an oral hearing.

3. In response, learned counsel for the Petitioners, while stating that all four cases are identically placed, requested that they all be listed together for an oral hearing on an early date.

4. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the Commission permitted the Respondent, CTUIL, to file its replies within ten days, with an advance copy to the Petitioners, who may file their rejoinders, if any, within seven days thereafter. The Respondent, CTUIL, was also directed to clarify, in its reply or by way of an additional affidavit, that if the Board authorises more than one person, and the signatory of the application and the signatory of the affidavit are both Board Authorised persons, how such two signatories amount to a major deficiency, causing rejection of the application?

5. The Petitions will be listed for hearing on **3.12.2026.**

By order of the Commission
Sd/
(Vipan Sharma)
Deputy Chief (Law)