

**BEFORE THE GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
GANDHINAGAR**

**Petition No. 2518 of 2025.**

**In the Matter of:**

**Petition under Section under Section 86 (1) (f) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking quashing/setting aside the email dated 14.02.2025 and the letter dated 01.03.2025 issued by GETCO thereby illegally rejecting Stage - II connectivity application of the Petitioner qua the infrastructure being developed by it for evacuation of power from its 35 MW Wind Power Project to GETCO's 66 KV Nadadhri Sub-station for extraneous reasons untenable in the eyes of law.**

**Along with**

**IA No. 65 of 2025 in Petition No. 2518 of 2025.**

**In the Matter of:**

**Interlocutory under Rule 30 of the GERC (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2004, read with Section 94 (2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking for interim relief.**

Petitioner/ Applicant : Suzlon Energy Limited  
'SUZLON', House 5, Shrimali Society  
Near Shri Krishna Complex, Navrangpura  
Ahmedabad - 380 009.

Represented By : Ld. Adv. Mr. Lakshyajit Singh Bagdwal and Adv.  
Mr. Deveansh Punia

V/s.

Respondent : Gujarat Energy Transmission Corp. Limited  
Sardar Patel Vidyut Bhavan  
Race Course Circle  
Vadodara - 390007, Gujarat.

Represented by : Ld. Adv. Ms. Ranjitha Ramachandran along with  
Mr. P. P. Shah and Mr. Shobhraj Jaiswal.

**CORAM:**

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

**Date: 20/09/2025.**

**DAILY ORDER**

1. The matter was kept for hearing on 19.09.2025.
2. At the outset, Ld. Adv. Mr. Lakshyajit Singh appearing on behalf of the Applicant/Petitioner sought two week time for filing rejoinder to the reply of the Respondent.
3. Ld. Adv. Ms. Ranjitha Ramachandran on behalf of the Respondent GETCO raised that preliminary issue of locus in the present matter. She submitted that the Petition as filed is misconceived and not maintainable and the Applicant/Petitioner has no *locus standi* to raise the various aspects mentioned in the petition. She submitted that the petition has been filed by Suzlon energy Limited. Suzlon energy Limited cannot be an aggrieved party. It is not applicant for the Stage -II Connectivity and there is no direct grievance of the Petitioner. She submitted that the application for the Stage - II connectivity was filed by the Suzlon Global Services Limited while the cause title of the Petition claimed that Suzlon Energy limited is conducting its business through Suzlon Global Services Limited. It is clear that these are two separate companies.

4. She further argued that the Petitioner herein has no cause of action to maintain the Petition, to raise any issue on behalf of other entities. She further argued that the Petitioner, though not itself the developer or the applicant, has repeatedly referred to itself as Suzlon Global Services Limited which is not correct when the Petition has been filed under the name of Suzlon Energy limited and the Affidavit has been signed by an authorised signatory of Suzlon Energy Limited. It is misleading and inappropriate for the Petitioner to make such claims when admittedly, the Petitioner is a different company than Suzlon Global Services Limited. The Petitioner in the entire Petition has failed to provide any basis for the relationship between the Petitioner and the Suzlon Global Services Limited and on what basis the Petitioner can file the petition under its own name and file an affidavit through its own officers.
5. Ld. Adv. for the Applicant/Petitioner has failed to respond on the issue of *locus standi* raised by the counsel of the Respondent. Upon the repeated query by the Commission to explain the *locus standi*, he submitted that necessary instructions need to be obtained from the Applicant/Petitioner Company and sought time for the required explanation on *locus standi*. Instead of responding on the important issue of *Locus Standi*, the Counsel for the Applicant/Petitioner insisted to continue the limited status quo issued by the Commission vide Daily Order dated 10.09.2025, arguing that if stay order is vacated their connectivity would be granted to another applicant by the Respondent GETCO. On query as to why the Applicant/Petitioner approached

to the Commission for seeking status quo in the month of July 2025 when the connectivity was already cancelled by the Respondent in the month of March 2025, the counsel for the Applicant/Petitioner unable to respond on this aspect.

6. We have considered the submissions of both the parties. We note that the present Petition and IA have been filed by Suzlon Energy Limited. The affidavit verifying the Petition as well as IA are signed by authorised signatory persons of Suzlon Energy Limited. The Cause title of Petition showcases the name of Petitioner as 'M/s Suzlon Energy Limited' doing its business through M/s Suzlon Global Services Limited'. Whereas, IA No. 65 of 2025 showcases the name of Applicant/Petitioner as 'M/s Suzlon Energy Limited'. The Cause titles of both 'Petition' and 'IA' establishes that M/s Suzlon Energy Limited has filed the present Petition and IA for seeking adjudication related to disputes arising out of rejection of Stage-II connectivity application of M/s Suzlon Energy Limited. The Counsel for the Applicant/Petitioner present during the course of hearing could not response on the contentions of the Respondent about locus standi of M/s Suzlon Energy Limited for the dispute between M/s Suzlon Global Services Limited and the Respondent. In view of this, it is observed that the Applicant/Petitioner M/s Suzlon Energy Limited has misguided and mislead the Commission and has obtained stay order from the Commission. The factual contention about the issue of *locus standi* as pointed out by the counsel of the Respondent could not be replied by the counsel of the

Applicant/Petitioner to the satisfaction of the Commission and on the contrary, the counsel of the Applicant/Petitioner sought short time to explain a very preliminary issue of *Locus Standi* for seeking directions from his client/Petitioner and insisted to continue to stay order for till next date of hearing. We observed that the *Locus Standi*, is the basic and fundamental requirement of any filing before the adjudicatory authorities. We are of the firmed view that the Applicant/Petitioner has failed in observing such requirement and has attempted to mislead the Commission which cannot be ignored. In view of the above, we are not inclined to continue the status quo as granted earlier vide Daily Order dated 10.09.2025 passed in the present matter.

7. We also note that after discontinuation of connectivity in the month of March 2025 the Petitioner has approached the Commission in the month of July 2025 and the first hearing took place on 29.07.2025 and thereafter on 31.07.2025 on which date status quo regarding connectivity was granted till next date of hearing. As noted above, the connectivity has already been cancelled. Now the Respondent has filed Reply serving a copy of the same to the Petitioner simultaneously but the Petitioner is seeking time of two weeks for filing its Rejoinder to the Reply of the Respondent. We have found that the Petitioner's connectivity got cancelled in the month of March 2025, not only approached the Commission late but also during hearing not in a position to establish *locus standi* and seeking two weeks-time. It appears that the Commission under this circumstances cannot exercise any discretionary

power to give any kind of protection to the Petitioner in terms of granting status quo or even extending the same. The limited status quo granted earlier till next date of hearing is vacated with immediate effect.

8. At the request of the counsels of both parties, the matter is now listed on 22.09.2025 at 11.30 hours.
9. Order accordingly.

**Sd/-**

**[S. R. Pandey]  
Member**

**Sd/-**

**[Mehul M. Gandhi]  
Member**

Place: Gandhinagar.  
Date: 20/09/2025.

