

BEFORE THE GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
GANDHINAGAR

Petition No. 2460 of 2025.

In the matter of:

Petition under Section 86 (1) (b), (e), (f) and (k) of the Electricity Act, 2003, read with Article 8 of the PPA dated 15.12.2022 executed between M/s. Martial Solren Pvt. Ltd. and GUVNL for supply of 200 MW Solar Power from its Solar PV power plant in the State of Gujarat seeking inter alia extension of the Scheduled Commercial Operation date on account of certain Force Majeure events affecting the project implementing and thereby passing appropriate Order (s) / Direction(s) in this regard to the extent prayed by the Petitioner herein.

Along with

IA No. 24 of 2025 in Petition No. 2460 of 2025.

In the matter of :

Application under Section 94 (2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and under Rule 26 of the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 seeking urgent directions in the Petition.

And

IA No. 67 of 2025 in Petition No. 2460 of 2025.

In the matter of:

Application filed under Section 94 (2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and under Rule 26 of the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004 seeking urgent directions in the captioned Petition on account of the subsequent developments.

Petitioner : Martial Solren Private Limited

Represented by : Ld. Adv. Ms. Nipun Sharma

Vs.

Respondent : Gujarat Urja Vikas Nigam Limited

Represented by : Ld. Adv. Aneesh Bajaj along with Mr K.T. Shah

CORAM:

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

Date: 19/08/2025.

DAILY ORDER

1. The matter was kept for hearing on 05.08.2025.
2. Ld. Adv. Ms. Nipun Sharma appearing on behalf of the Petitioner submitted that the arguing Sr. Counsel Mr. Rashesh Sanjanwala is having some personal difficulty and hence is not available today for the present Petition. She requested that the Petitioner may be granted a short date. She further submitted that as on today the petitioner has commissioned remaining 50 MW project on 26.07.2025. She further submitted that limited issue remains for decision of the Commission in the present Petition is whether the Petitioner is liable to pay liquidated damages in view of Force Majeures events claimed.
3. She further submitted that the Petitioner has received the payments but there is a lack of clarity regarding the deduction of amounts. It is also submitted that the Petitioner wants to file its further submissions in the present Petition and sought one week time for it.
4. Ld. Adv. Mr. Aneesh Bajaj appearing for the Respondent GETCO submitted that the Respondent should also be allowed the time to file its Reply. He did not raise any objection to adjournment sought by the Petitioner. He submitted that the Respondent has already made the payment by reducing the amount of Liquidated damages.

5. In response to the Reply of the Respondent, the Adv. of Petitioner submitted that the reconciliation of the payment should be given to the Petitioner to tally the deducted amount of Liquidated damages. The Petitioner also sought 2 week's time to file its Rejoinder to the Reply being filed by the Respondent.
6. In response for reconciliation of the amount, Ld. Adv. of the Respondent agreed to it.
7. Heard the parties. We note that the Petitioner has sought an adjournment due to unavailability of the arguing Sr. Counsel Rashesh Sanjanwala, which is not objected by the Respondent GETCO. As the Petitioner has sought time to file its submissions in the matter, hence let it be filed within one week time with a copy to the Respondent. As the Respondent has also sought time to file its Reply on Petition earlier, which was granted by the Commission, hence let it be filed within one weeks time with a copy to the Petitioner. Thereafter the Petitioner is at liberty to file its Rejoinder, if any, within one week with a copy to the Respondent.
8. We direct the parties to complete the pleadings within three weeks in the present matter.
9. We Order accordingly.

Sd/-
[S. R. Pandey]
Member

Sd/-
[Mehul M. Gandhi]
Member

Place: Gandhinagar.
Date: 19/08/2025.