

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 631/MP/2025**

Subject : Petition under Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Article 12 of the Power Purchase Agreement dated 13.7.2020 executed between Apraava Energy Private Limited and Solar Energy Corporation of India Limited seeking compensation on account of increase in GST Rate on renewable energy devices and parts for their manufacture, including Windmill, Wind Operated Electricity Generator (WOEG), from 5% to 12% in terms of Notification No. 08/2021 Integrated Tax (Rate) dated 30.9.2021 issued by Ministry of Finance.

Petitioner : Apraava Energy Private Limited (AEPL)

Respondents : Solar Energy Corporation of India Limited (SECI) and Ors.

Date of Hearing : **29.4.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Vishrov Mukherjee, Advocate, AEPL  
Ms. Janmali Manikala, Advocate, AEPL  
Ms. Priyanka Vyas, Advocate, AEPL  
Ms. Shikha Ohri, Advocate, SECI  
Shri Kartik Sharma, Advocate, SECI  
Shri Apoorv Kurup, Sr. Advocate, CSPDCL  
Ms. Nidhi Mittal, Advocate, CSPDCL

**Record of Proceedings**

Learned counsel for the Petitioner, AEPL, submitted that the present Petition pertains to the Change in Law claims on account of GST, and is squarely covered by the previous decisions of the Commission. He further submitted that the matter may be reserved for order and also sought liberty to file written submissions in the matter.

2. Learned counsel for the Respondent, SECI, also fairly stated that the issue in the present matter is already settled in terms of the previous decisions of the Commission; however, she also submitted that the Change in Law claims of the Petitioner are subject to joint reconciliation between the parties, and one-to-one correlation has to be established.

3. Learned counsel for the Respondent, CSPDCL, submitted that the liability has to be transferred to SECI first, owing to the nature of the back-to-back arrangement in the matter. She further sought liberty to file written submissions in the matter.

4. Considering the above, the Commission permitted the Petitioner, SECI and CSPDCL to file their written submissions in the matter within two weeks. Further, at the request of the learned counsel for SECI, it was permitted to file its additional written submissions if CSPDCL makes any new submissions, particularly on the aspect of the back-to-back nature of the agreements, within a week thereafter.

5. Subject to the above, the matter was reserved for order.

**By order of the Commission**

**Sd/-**

**(T.D. Pant)**

**Joint Chief (Law)**