

**BEFORE THE GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
GANDHINAGAR**

**Petition No. 2406 of 2024.**

**In the matter of:**

**Petition under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 80 and 82 of the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 and PPA dated 12.12.2022 between Rajpur Renewables Pvt. Ltd. and GUVNL for purchase of power from 30 MW grid connected wind power under GUVNL's Wind Tender (III) and seeking extension of Scheduled Commercial Operation Date (SCOD) of project on account of Force Majeure events and also to challenge the letters dated 06.09.2024 and 18.10.2024 issued by GUVNL rejecting the request for extension of the SCOD of the project.**

Petitioner	:	Rajpur Renewables Private Limited
Represented by	:	Ld. Sr. Adv. Buddy Ranganathan along with Adv. Nisarg Desai and Adv. Ritu Agrawal and Adv. Shefali Trpathi.
		Vs.
Respondent	:	Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited
Represented by	:	Ld. Adv. Anand Ganeshan along with Mr. Rahul Pareek

**CORAM**

**Mehul M. Gandhi, Member  
S. R. Pandey, Member**

**Date: 17/07/2025.**

**DAILY ORDER**

1. The matter was kept for hearing on 10.07.2025.

2. Ld. Sr. Adv. Buddy Rangnathan appearing on behalf of the Petitioner submitted that the present Petition is filed by the Petitioner under under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulations 80 and 82 of the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 and PPA dated 12.12.2022 between Rajpur Renewables Pvt. Ltd. and GUVNL for purchase of power from 30 MW grid connected wind power under GUVNL's Wind Tender (III) and seeking extension of Scheduled Commercial Operation Date (SCOD) of project on account of *Force Majeure* events and also to challenge the letters dated 06.09.2024 and 18.10.2024 issued by GUVNL rejecting the request for extension of the SCOD of the project.

2.1. Ld. Sr. Adv. appearing on behalf of the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner has paid the Liquidated Damages (LD) to the Respondent under protest. There are subsequent developments in the Petition which needs to be brought before the Commission.

3. On the query of the Commission about the additional development in the present Petition, Ld. Adv. of the Petitioner submitted that it needs some time to file its submissions on the same, and the matter may be kept thereafter.

4. Ld. Adv. Anand Ganeshan appearing on behalf of the Respondent did not object to the adjournment sought by the Petitioner. He requested the Commission to allow time to file its Reply in the matter if the Petitioner is filing its submissions on further development in the present Petition.

5. Heard the parties. We note that the Petitioner has sought time to file the submissions due to some developments in the Petition and therefore requested to adjourn the matter for the day. The said adjournment is not objected by the Respondent. Hence, we decide to adjourn the matter in the interest of justice. As the Petitioner has sought time to file its submissions on the further developments in the matter, hence let it be filed within three weeks' time with

a copy to the Respondent. The Respondent is at liberty to file its Rejoinder, if any, within one weeks' time with a copy to the Petitioner. Both the parties are directed to complete the submissions in the matter before the next date of hearing.

6. The next date of hearing will be intimated separately.

7. Order accordingly.

**Sd/-**  
**(S.R. Pandey)**  
**Member**

**Sd/-**  
**(Mehul M. Gandhi)**  
**Member**

Place: Gandhinagar  
Date: 17/07/2025.

