

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 114/MP/2023 along with IA Nos.28/2023 & 51/2023

Subject : Petition under Section 79 (1)(c) and (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 32 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Grant of Connectivity, Long term Access and Medium term Open Access in inter-State Transmission and related matters) Regulations, 2009 for setting aside the letter dated 23.03.2023 issued by the Central Transmission Utility of India Ltd.

Date of Hearing : **12.9.2023**

Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri I. S. Jha, Member
Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri P. K. Singh, Member

Petitioners : Soltown Infra Private Limited (SIPL) and 2 Ors.

Respondent : Central Transmission Utility of India Limited (CTUIL)

Parties Present : Shri Sanjay Sen, Sr. Advocate, SIPL
Ms. Ruth Elwin, Advocate, SIPL
Ms. Neha Dabral, Advocate, SIPL
Shri Parinay Deep Shah, Advocate, SIPL
Shri Kartik Sharma, Advocate, SIPL
Shri Sayan Ghosh, Advocate, SIPL
Ms. Mary Jonet, Advocate, SIPL
Ms. Shikha Ohri, Advocate, SIPL
Ms. Madhavi Divan, Sr. Advocate, CTUIL
Shri Shubham Saigal, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri Alok Shankar, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri Kumarjeet, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri Swapnil Verma, CTUIL
Shri Ranjeet Singh, CTUIL
Ms. Muskan Agarwal, CTUIL

Record of Proceedings

During the course of the hearing, learned senior counsel for the Petitioners and the Respondent, CTUIL, made detailed submissions both on the maintainability and the merits of the case. However, due to a paucity of time, the submissions of learned senior counsel for CTUIL could not be completed.

2. Considering the submissions made by the learned senior counsels for the parties, the Commission directed the Petitioner and the Respondent, CTUIL, to furnish the following details/clarifications, on affidavit within two weeks:

CTUIL



(a) What were the discrepancies in the land related documents in respect of the Petitioner's 1800 MW (500 MW + 600 MW + 700 MW) Connectivity Applications? Whether the discrepancies observed were removed by the Petitioners in terms of the rectification opportunity given to them by the first show cause notice.

(b) Whether there was any discrepancy in the documents submitted by the Petitioner regarding 675 MW connectivity?

Petitioners:

(a) Total area of the land required for the 1800 MW (500 MW + 600 MW + 700 MW) connectivity and area of land available with the Petitioners while making the application for the grant of the connectivity along with documentary proof.

(b) Reasons for surrendering 1800 MW connectivity if the discrepancies observed by CTUIL were removed by the Petitioners in terms of the rectification opportunity given to them?

(c) Reasons for applying the fresh connectivity of only 675 MW (200 MW+350 MW + 125 MW) instead of 1800 MW.

(d) Total area of land related documents in respect of the Petitioner's 1800 MW (500 MW + 600 MW + 700 MW) Connectivity Applications where the discrepancies were observed and whether such discrepancies were removed by the Petitioners in terms of the rectification opportunity given to them.

3. In the meantime, the interim protection granted by the Commission, vide Record of Proceedings for the hearing dated 21.8.2023, shall continue till the next date of hearing.

4. Matter remains Part-heard. The Petition, along with IAs, will be listed for hearing on **20.10.2023**.

By order of the Commission

**Sd/-
(T.D. Pant)
Joint Chief (Law)**