

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 235/AT/2024**

Subject : Petition under Section 63 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for adoption of tariff for 900 MW Wind Solar Hybrid Power Projects (Tranche VII) connected to the Inter-State Transmission System and selected through a competitive bidding process as per the Guidelines of the Government of India.

Petitioner : Solar Energy Corporation of India Limited (SECI)

Respondents : NTPC Renewables Energy Private Limited and Ors.

Date of Hearing : **30.9.2024**

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

Parties present : Ms. Mandakini Ghosh, Advocate, SECI  
Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, PSPCL  
Ms. Pallavi Saigal, Advocate, PSPCL  
Shri Akshat Jain, Advocate, Green Infra  
Shri Abhimanyu Maheshwari, Advocate, Green Infra

**Record of Proceedings**

At the outset, learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the pleadings are already completed in the matter and that the matter may be reserved for the order.

2. However, learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 3 & 5 requested for the adjournment in the matter due to the non-availability of the arguing counsel.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, however, opposed the aforesaid request of the adjournment and submitted that the Respondent Nos. 3 & 5 have already filed a reply pursuant to the liberty granted by the Commission vide Record of Proceedings for the hearing dated 9.9.2024. Learned counsel further submitted that the issues highlighted by the Respondents in their replies are outside the scope of the present proceedings relating to the adoption of tariff under Section 63 of the Electricity Act, 2003. In case the Respondents have any grievance about the actions of CTUIL, they may approach the Commission through independent proceedings after the adoption of the tariff.

4. In response, learned counsel for the Respondents Nos. 3 & 5 submitted that in the event the Commission is not inclined to consider the certain aspects raised by the

Respondents in the instant case, a liberty may be granted to the Respondents to approach the Commission by way of a separate Petition.

5. Learned counsel for Respondent No. 6, PSPCL, submitted that PSPCL has also filed its response in the matter.

6. Considering the submissions of the learned counsels for the parties, the matter was reserved for order.

**By order of the Commission**

**Sd/-**

**(T.D. Pant)**

**Joint Chief (Law)**