

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

IA (Diary) No. 96/2026 in Petition No. 1015/MP/2025

Subject : Application for bringing on record subsequent events and documents as well as seeking appropriate documents.

Petitioner : Datta Power Infra Private Limited (DPIPL)

Respondents : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)

Date of Hearing : **19.2.2026**

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

Parties Present : Shri Buddy Ranganathan, Sr. Advocate, DPIPL
Shri Ajitesh Garg, Advocate, DPIPL
Shri Vikram S Baid, Advocate, DPIPL
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Reeha Singh, Advocate, CTUIL

Record of Proceedings

Learned senior counsel for the Petitioner, DPIPL, submitted that the present IA has been filed *inter alia* seeking direction to the Respondent, CTUIL, to keep the revocation letter dated 11.2.2026 in abeyance pending orders of the Commission in Petition No. 1015/MP/2025. The learned senior counsel further submitted that the filing of the present IA became necessitated owing to the fact that the Respondent, notwithstanding that the matter had been fully heard and reserved for orders by the Commission, has proceeded to revoke the Petitioner's connectivity *vide* email dated 11.2.2026, without awaiting the decision of the Commission. The learned senior counsel submitted that the very grounds forming the basis of the said revocation are identical to those which are under consideration in the pending proceedings, and that the action of the Respondent in revoking the Petitioner's connectivity during the period when the matter stood reserved for orders is *ex facie* arbitrary and thereby rendering the main Petition infructuous and defeating the reliefs sought therein. The learned senior counsel added that, pursuant to the issuance of the revocation notice, the Petitioner, in compliance with Regulation 3.8 of the GNA Regulations, has deposited an amount equivalent to the Connectivity Bank Guarantee under express protest and solely with a view to securing the Connectivity Bank Guarantee from encashment.

2. In response, the learned counsel for the Respondent, CTUIL, fairly submitted that the Commission has, in similar cases, restrained the creation of third-party rights over



the revoked quantum pending the pronouncement of the order, and CTUIL has no objection if a similar dispensation is adopted in this case too.

3. Considering the submissions made by the learned senior counsel and learned counsel for the parties, the Commission directed CTUIL not to re-allocate the quantum corresponding to the Petitioner's 162 MW connectivity at Dhule PS to any third parties till the pronouncement of the order in the Petition. With this, IA (Diary) No. 96/2026 was disposed of.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T.D. Pant)

Joint Chief (Law)