CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI

Petition No. 737/MP/2025

Subject	:	Petition under Section 79, including 79(1)(b) and 79(1)(f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Article 12 of the Power Purchase Agreement dated 14.11.2023 executed between Renew Surya Vihaan Private Limited, and Solar Energy Corporation of India Limited for the development of 200 MW CTU connected Solar power project, read with Electricity (Timely Recovery of Costs due to Change in Law) Rules, 2021, seeking a declaration that certain events constitute as Change in Law events and for seeking consequent reliefs qua allowance of the additional expenditure incurred towards such Change in Law event(s).
Petitioner	:	Renew Surya Vihaan Private Limited (RSVPL)
Respondents	:	Solar Energy Corporation of India Limited (SECI) & Ors.
Date of Hearing:		**16.10.2026**
Coram	:	Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson Shri Ramesh Babu V., Member Shri Harish Dudani, Member Shri Ravinder Singh Dhillon, Member
Parties Present :		Ms. Mannat Waraich, Advocate, RSVPL Ms. Prerna Priyadarshini, Advocate, CTUIL Ms. Ayesha Choudhary, Advocate, CTUIL Ms. Shikha Ohri, Advocate, SECI Shri Kartik Sharma, Advocate, SECI Ms. Nishita Choudhary, Advocate, SECI

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the present Petition has been filed seeking relief on account of Change in Law events, namely, (i) Notification No.9/2024-Central Tax (Rate) dated 8.10.2024, which included renting of non-residential property by unregistered persons, in categories liable to pay the reverse charge for GST, (ii) issuance of Working Group Report, 2022 by CEA, and (iii) imposition of GNA Charges in terms of the GNA Regulations. She further submitted that while Respondent No. 1, SECI, has filed its reply, Respondent No. 2, TNPDCL, has neither entered appearance nor filed its reply till date. Similarly, Respondent No. 4, CTUIL, has also failed to file its reply. Accordingly, she requested that the defaulting Respondents' right to file the replies be closed, so that the matter may be heard finally on the next date of hearing.

2. Learned counsel for Respondent, CTUIL, submitted that although time was sought on the previous occasion to file a reply, it has been decided upon an internal

assessment that a reply from their end is not necessary. Accordingly, she submitted that CTUIL does not wish to file any reply in the matter.

3. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, the Commission deemed it appropriate to grant one last opportunity to Respondent No. 2, i.e., TNPDCL, to file its reply, if any, within three weeks, with an advance copy to the Petitioner, who may file a rejoinder, if any, within two weeks thereafter.

4. The Petitioner was also directed to furnish the rating of each additional inverter (170 Nos.) in MVAr as stated to have been installed by the Petitioner pursuant to the Working Group Report 2022, on an affidavit, within two weeks.

5. The Petition to be listed for hearing on **22.12.2026**.

By order of the Commission
Sd/-
(T.D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)