

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 230/MP/2023

Subject : Petition under Section 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Article 12.2 of the Power Purchase Agreement dated 20.08.2019 for the development of 300 MW (reduced to 150 MW) ISTS connected Solar power project entered between Adani Solar Energy Jaisalmer Two Private Limited (formerly known as SBSR Power Cleantech Eleven Private Limited) and Solar Energy Corporation of India Ltd. seeking reliefs for the additional expenditure incurred due to occurrence of Change in Law events.

Petitioner : Adani Solar Energy Jaisalmer Two Private Limited (ASEJTPL)

Respondents : Solar Energy Corporation of India Ltd. & Ors.

Date of Hearing : **19.2.2025**

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

Parties Present : Shri Gopal Jain, Sr. Advocate, ASEJTPL
Shri Hemant Singh, Advocate, ASEJTPL
Shri Lakshyajit Singh, Advocate, ASEJTPL
Ms. Lavanya Panwar, Advocate, ASEJTPL
Shri Devansh Pundir, Advocate, ASEJTPL
Shri Gyanendra Singh, Advocate, ASEJTPL
Shri Fajal, Advocate, ASEJTPL
Shri Akshya Lal, Advocate, ASEJTPL
Ms. Mandakini Ghosh, Advocate, SECI
Ms. Akansha Bhola, Advocate, SECI
Shri Venkatesh, Advocate, TPDDL
Ms. Urvashi Mishra, Advocate, BYPL
Ms. Gauri, Advocate, BYPL

Record of Proceedings

At the outset, the learned counsel for the Respondent, Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL), submitted that the Parties involved in the instant case have also filed Petition Nos. 192/MP/2021 (by Petitioner), 235/MP/2023 (by TPDDL), and 174/MP/2024 (by BYPL) in connection with the Petitioner's Solar Project, and since the issues involved therein have a direct bearing on the present case, the instant Petition may also be listed for the hearing along with the said cases as presently listed on 7.3.2025.

2. Learned senior counsel for the Petitioner, while opposing the above request made by the learned counsel for the Respondent, TPDDL, submitted that the issues/reliefs in the above-cited cases do not have a bearing on the reliefs sought in the present case and therefore, the instant Petition may be dealt with separately. Learned senior counsel also added that the reliefs sought in the present Petition are squarely covered by the previous



order(s) of this Commission and that the dispute regarding the contracted capacity does not have any material bearing on the grant of the reliefs prayed for.

3. In response, the learned counsel for the Respondent, TPDDL, submitted that the Petitioner's own submission reveals that only the 50 MW of the Project capacity has been commissioned within the Scheduled Commercial Operation Date (SCOD) and for the balance capacity, its prayers seeking an extension of SCOD is pending consideration in Petition No.192/MP/2021.

4. Learned counsel for Respondent No. 3, BSES Yamuna Power Limited (BYPL), submitted that she had been appointed in this matter only recently and, accordingly, sought liberty to file a short note of arguments.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned senior counsel and learned counsel for the Parties, the Commission deemed it appropriate to list the matter along with Petition Nos. 192/MP/2021 and Ors. without tagging with them. The Commission also permitted the Respondent, BYPL, to file its note of arguments, if any, on or before 3.3.3025 with a copy to the other side.

6. The matter will be listed along with Petition No. 192/MP/2021, 235/MP/2023, and 174/MP/2024 for the hearing on **7.3.2025**.

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