THE UTTAR PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

LUCKNOW

Petition No. 2288 of 2025

QUORUM

Hon'ble Shri Arvind Kumar, Chairman

Hon'ble Shri Sanjay Kumar Singh, Member

Hon'ble Shri Griesh Kumar Vaish, Member (Law)

IN THE MATTER OF

Petition under Section 86(1)(c) & (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 57 of the Uttar Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2019 and relevant provisions under the Transmission Service Agreement dated 05.04.2024 seeking extension of Scheduled Commercial Operation Date and other consequential reliefs.

AND

IN THE MATTER OF

TP Jalpura Khurja Power Transmission Limited

Through its Authorized Representative,

Corporate office at Shatabdi Bhawan, B-12 & 13

Sector-4, Noida, Uttar Pradesh-201301 ..... **Petitioner**

VERSUS

1. **Uttar Pradesh Power Transmission Corporation Limited**

   Through its Managing Director,

   7th Floor, Shakti Bhawan,14,

   Ashok Marg, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226001

2. **Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited**

   Through its Managing Director

   7th Floor, Shakti Bhawan, 14, Ashok Marg,

   Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226001

3. **Paschimanchal Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited**

   Through its Managing Director,

   Victoria Park, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh – 250001

4. **Madhyanchal Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited**

   Through its Managing Director,

   4A, Gokhale Marg, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh – 226001

5. **Purvanchal Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited**

   Through its Managing Director,

   132 KV S/S Bhikari Vidyut Nagar,

   Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh-221004

6. **Dakshinanchal Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited**

   Through its Director,

   Urja Bhavan Agra - Delhi, Bypass Road, Sikandra, Agra,

   Uttar Pradesh – 282002

7. **Kanpur Electricity Supply Co. Ltd.**

   Through its Managing Director,

   Headquarter, Kesa House,14/71, Civil Lines,

   Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh-208001 **..... Respondents**

THE FOLLOWING WAS PRESENT

1. Sh. Mohit Mansharamani, Advocate, Petitioner
2. Sh. Karan Jaiswal, Advocate, Petitioner
3. Sh. Divyanshu Bhatt, Advocate, UPPTCL
4. Sh. Abhayaditya Singh, Advocate, UPPTCL
5. Sh. Shashwat Singh, Advocate, UPPTCL
6. Ms. Priyanshi Singh, Advocate, UPPCL
7. Ms. Pratiskha Chaturvedi, Advocate, UPPCL
8. Sh. Manish Dwivedi, CE (PPA), UPPCL
9. Sh. Rajiv Singh, EE, UPPCL
10. Sh. Shitanshu Yadav, EE (PPP) UPPTCL
11. Sh. Vivek Singh, Gr. Head, TPJKPTL

12. Sh. Subodh Dixti, TPJKPTL

13. Sh. Abhishek Singh, TPJKPTL

ORDER

(DATE OF HEARING: 15.10.2026)

1. Sh. Mohit Mansharamani, Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner sought ten (10) days' time to amend the Petition in order to bring on record certain subsequent events and factual developments, and accordingly prayed for an adjournment of the matter.

   He further submitted that the grounds of Force Majeure urged in the Petition remain unchanged and that only two or three subsequent developments are required to be incorporated. He further submitted that no interim protection has been granted to the Petitioner so far, and accordingly requested that the Petitioner be permitted to amend the Petition

2. Sh. Divyanshu Bhatt, Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent No. 1, and Ms. Priyanshi Singh, Learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent No. 2 to 7, submitted that, since Commercial Operation Date(COD) had already been achieved, the proposed incorporation of subsequent events might necessitate a variation in the prayers, grounds or dates relating to Force Majeure. Accordingly, they requested that, in the given circumstances, the Petitioner may withdraw the present Petition and may be directed to file a new Petition with fresh prayer incorporating the subsequent events and developments.

3. After hearing the parties, the Commission observed that allowing the amendment would require substantial changes to the pleadings and would also require fresh replies and rejoinders to be filed, which would make the existing exchanges more obfuscating and confounding.

4. In view of above, the Commission urged the Petitioner to withdraw the Petition and file a fresh Petition.

5. On above query, the Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that he would have to seek instructions in this regard from the Petitioner.

6. However, in view of observations as recorded at para 3 above, the Commission decided to dismiss the Petition, with liberty to file a fresh Petition on the same

cause of action. The Commission further directs, in event a fresh Petition is filed by the Petitioner on the subject matter, then the fee deposited in respect of the present Petition shall be adjusted against the fee payable for the fresh Petition.

7. Accordingly, the Petition stands disposed off.

(Griesh Kumar Vaish)	(Sanjay Kumar Singh)	(Arvind Kumar)
Member (Law)	**Member**	**Chairman**

Place: Lucknow
Dated: 27 .10.2026