

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition (Diary) No. 652/2026 along with IA (Diary) No. 653/2026

Subject : Petition under Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003, and Regulation 65 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations 2023, seeking setting aside of the communication dated 14.08.2026 issued by the Central Transmission Utility of India Limited and a declaration that the Petitioner had correctly achieved Financial Closure of the Project in terms of Regulation 11A(2) of the CERC (Connectivity and General Network Access to the inter-State Transmission System) Regulations, 2022.

Petitioner : Sprng Vayu Vidyut Private Limited (SVVPL)

Respondent : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)

Date of Hearing : **10.09.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Deep Rao Palepu, Advocate, SVVPL
Shri Prajeet Ghosh, Advocate, SVVPL
Ms. Poorva Saigal, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Pallavi Saigal, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Muskan Agarwal, CTUIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the present Petition has been filed *inter alia* challenging the Respondent/CTUIL's communication dated 14.8.2026 purportedly intimating its intention to revoke the Petitioner's Connectivity on an erroneous premise that the Petitioner has not achieved the Financial Closure since its Project Cost was lower than the purported minimum Project Cost benchmark of Rs. 8 crore/MW. The learned counsel submitted that, being aggrieved by the aforesaid communication, the Petitioner had also approached the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in WP (c) No. 11941/2026 and, by the order dated 18.08.2026, the Hon'ble Court disposed of the said Writ Petition, directing the maintenance of the *status quo* till the Commission considers the interim application filed by the Petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that CTUIL has subsequently reduced the minimum Project Cost benchmark and the issue raised in this case will be resolved if CTUIL considers the Petitioner's case against the revised benchmark.



2. The learned counsel for the Respondent/CTUIL accepted the notice and sought liberty to file a reply. The learned counsel further submitted that reduction in the minimum Project Cost benchmark operates prospectively and cannot be applied to the Petitioner's case.

3. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Commission directed as under:

(a) Admit.

(b) The Respondent to file its reply within two weeks with a copy to the Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder, if any, within three days thereafter.

(c) In the meantime, the interim protection as granted by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi *vide* order dated 18.08.2026 will continue till the next date of hearing.

4. CTUIL is directed to file the following information, on an affidavit, within two weeks:

(a) Petitioner has submitted Financial Closure documents on 7.5.2026 and CTUIL communicated deficiency on 20.7.2026. Clarify why the deficiencies were not communicated within 15 days as per Clause 15(iv) of the Detailed Procedure dated 10.4.2026.

(b) The email dated 14.8.2026 only states that connectivity is liable to be revoked, accordingly, clarify whether decision regarding rejection of financial closure documents and revocation of connectivity has been taken, if so file relevant supporting documents or CTUIL is considering FC documents in terms of Applicability Clause (2) of the advisory dated 3.9.2026.

5. The Petition, along with IA, shall be listed for hearing on **6.10.2026**.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T.D. Pant)

Joint Chief (Law)