

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 7/MP/2026 along with IA Nos. 2/IA/2026 and 7/IA/2026

Subject : Petition under Sections 79(1)(c), 79(1)(f) and 79(1)(k) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 42 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Connectivity and General Network Access) Regulations, 2022 (as amended) and Regulation 65 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business Regulations), 2023, seeking directions to Central Transmission Utility of India Limited to consider the documents furnished by Prerak Greentech Solar Private Limited as compliance of the Financial Closure requirement under Regulation 11A(2) of the GNA Regulations, 2022 (as amended) or, in the alternative, to communicate the firm start date of Connectivity and grant a period of 06 (six) months prior thereto for achieving Financial Closure.

Petitioner : Prerak Greentech Solar Private Limited (PGSPL)

Respondent : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)

Date of Hearing : **8.1.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Basava Prabhu Patil, Sr. Advocate, PGSPL
Shri Nishant Kumar, Advocate, PGSPL
Shri Animesh Kumar, Advocate, PGSPL
Dr. Sumit Kumar, Advocate, PGSPL
Ms. Palak Joshi, Advocate, PGSPL
Shri Shikhar Khanna, Advocate, PGSPL
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Pallavi Saigal, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Kaavya Madan, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Shree Dwivedi, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Muskan Aggarwal, CTUIL
Shri Swapnil Verma, CTUIL
Shri Ranjeet Singh Rajput, CTUIL

Record of Proceedings

During the course of the hearing, the learned senior counsel and learned counsel for both sides argued the matter at length.

2. Learned senior counsel for the Petitioner mainly submitted as under:



(a) Instead of complying with the directions issued *vide* Record of Proceeding for the hearing dated 23.12.2025, CTUIL *vide* letter dated 31.12.2025 revoked the connectivity granted to the Petitioner;

(b) Despite having submitted the 'in-principle' sanction letter of a lender towards Financial Closure (FC) on 28.8.2025 itself, CTUIL insisted on the final sanction letter and that too only *vide* e-mail dated 18.11.2025, i.e., much later than 15 days' time period as per its own advisory;

(c) Non-consideration of the Petitioner's Board approval (passed on 28.8.2025) submitted *vide* e-mail dated 27.11.2025 on the ground of "new documents" is also erroneous;

(d) In any case, the timeline for achieving the FC can only be determined after CTUIL communicates the first start date, and no firm start date has been communicated in this case;

(e) The contention that 28.2.2026 is a firm start date is misplaced as the common transmission system necessary for operationalisation of connectivity is expected to be ready only on 30.9.2026;

(f) The Petitioner has already taken various steps towards implementation of the Project; and

(g) CTUIL ought to be restrained from taking any coercive steps, including the creation of third-party rights in relation to the Petitioner's connectivity, till the disposal of the Petition.

3. The learned counsel for the Respondent, CTUIL, mainly submitted that (i) the 'in-principle' sanction letter does not meet the mandate of the concerned regulations; (ii) the firm start date of connectivity has been communicated to the Petitioner and the Petitioner is conflating the "firm start date" with "effective date"; (iii) instead of furnishing the final sanction letter, the Petitioner furnished entirely new documents, i.e., Board Resolution after the due date and hence, CTUIL could not have consider it for FC compliance.

4. Further, at the request of the learned counsel for the parties, the Commission permitted the Respondent, CTUIL, to file its note of submissions within a week, with a copy to the Petitioner, who may file its note of submissions within a week thereafter. The Commission also directed that the quantum corresponding to the Petitioner's connectivity at Bhadla III PS shall not be reallocated to any other developers till the outcome of the Petition.

5. The Commission further directed the Petitioner to submit the current status of its 400 MW Project and dedicated transmission line, on an affidavit, within a week. The Commission also directed the Respondent, CTUIL, to file the following information, on an affidavit, within a week:

(a) A copy of the amendment (if any) to the final grant of connectivity to the Petitioner.

(b) When did CTUIL confirm the firm start of connectivity to the Petitioner and the necessary proof thereof?

(c) Reasons for the delay in conveying the deficiency in respect of the in-principle Sanction letter regarding Line of Credit Commitment as submitted by the Petitioner on 28.8.2025?

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T.D. Pant)

Joint Chief (Law)