

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 781/MP/2025

Subject : Petition under Section 79(1)(c) and 79(1)(f) of The Electricity Act, 2003, seeking exit from the Power Purchase Agreement dated 28.06.2023 without any Financial Implication due to frustration and impossibility arising from the revocation of connectivity and inordinate delay in the project implementation due to the Respondents' delays and defaults.

Petitioner : Scatec India Renewables One Private Limited (SIROPL)

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

Date of Hearing : **15.1.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Dinesh Pardasani, Advocate, SIROPL
Shri Bibin Kurian, Advocate, SIROPL
Shri Kaustubh Shrinarain, Advocate, SIROPL
Shri Parinaydeep Shah, Advocate, SECI
Ms. Shikha Ohri, Advocate, SECI
Shri Kartik Sharma, Advocate, SECI
Shri Hitendra Nath Rath, Advocate, Gridco
Shri Anmol Mehta, Advocate, Standard Chartered Bank
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Reeha Singh, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri Swapnil Verma, CTUIL
Shri Ranjeet S Rajput, CTUIL

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Respondent, GRIDCO, sought an additional three weeks for filing a reply in the matter.

2. Learned counsel for the Respondent, SECI, submitted that the interim protection granted to the Petitioner by the Commission *vide* the Record of Proceedings dated 16.9.2025 ought to be discontinued. She further submitted that the interim protection was granted to the Petitioner in terms of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi's order dated 23.7.2025, read with the order dated 30.7.2025. She also added that the Petitioner had sought the stay of the adjudication/decision in Petition No. 26/MP/2024 pending the final

adjudication of the prayers raised in the present Petition. However, the Commission has denied the Change in Law claims *vide* its order dated 28.11.2025 in Petition No. 26/MP/2024. She also highlighted that no case has been made out for fraud or special equity warranting the stay of the invocation of the bank guarantee.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, SIROPL, submitted that there are multiple grounds, apart from the grounds highlighted by SECI, on which the Petitioner has preferred the present Petition. He also pressed upon the continuance of the interim protection granted by the Commission till the next date of hearing in the matter. He further apprised the Commission that the Petitioner has also preferred Appeal (DFR) No. 495 of 2025 along with IA No. 1940/2025 against the order dated 28.11.2025 in Petition No. 26/MP/2024 before the APTEL, wherein the APTEL *vide* its order dated 23.12.2025 has directed that no coercive steps should be taken against the Petitioner with regard to bid securities and BGs submitted by the Petitioner till the next date of hearing.

4. Considering the above, the Commission permitted the Respondent, GRIDCO, to file its reply in the matter within three weeks, with a copy to the Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, within two weeks thereafter. Further, in view of an interim protection already operating in favour of the Petitioner in terms of APTEL's ad-interim order dated 23.12.2025, the Commission did not find it necessary to pass an interim direction at this stage.

5. The matter will be listed for the hearing on **10.3.2026 at 2.30 P.M.**

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