Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi – 110017.

F.11(2157)/DERC/2023-24/7923

IA No. 17/2025

In the matter of: Application for withdrawal of the Petition.

Petition No. 44/2023

In the matter of: Petition under Section 63, Section 86(1)(b) and Section 86(1)(e) of the Electricity Act, 2003 seeking *in-principle* approval of procurement of 400 MW of Round the Clock Renewable Energy ('RE-RTC") with 1000 MW Peak through Solar Energy Corporation of India.

BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. …Petitioner

Coram:
Hon'ble Sh. Ram Naresh Singh, Member
Hon'ble Sh. Surender Babbar, Member

Appearance:
Ms. Kashish Chhabra, Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner

ORDER
(Date of Order: 06.10.2025)

1. The instant Petition has been filed by Petitioner, BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL), seeking in-principle approval for procurement process for 400 MW of Round the Clock Renewable Energy (RE-RTC) with 100 MW Peak under the competitive bidding process presently conducted by SECI.

2. The matter was heard and order was reserved by the Commission. Subsequently, an Interim Application, (IA No. 17/2025) has been filed by the Petitioner on 03.09.2025, wherein the Petitioner has *inter-alia* submitted that the fundamental objective of participating in the said procurement process has not been realized, and therefore, the Petitioner is not desirous of continuing with the same. The Petitioner further submitted that at the time of conceptualization of this tendering process, the Petitioner was assured supply during peak period. However, subsequent to discovery of tariff and internal analysis indicates that the generators would not be able to support during non-solar hours, while complying with the monthly average DFR limits. Furthermore, recent tenders Solar + BESS and Standalone BESS have resulted in the discovery of highly competitive tariffs, which also ensures assured supply during non-solar hours. In line with this,

Petitioner has tied-up 2000 MW of Solar + BESS capacity at a competitive tariff of Rs. 3.53/kWh, compared to the Rs. 4.98/kWh tariff discovered under FDRE tender. Accordingly, the Petitioner has sought permission for withdrawing the instant Petition with liberty to approach the Commission in future subsequently, should the need so arise.

3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that though SECI invited the tender but no PSA was signed between SECI and the Petitioner, further SECI has also tied-up the requirements of the said power, with some other utilities. Therefore, there will not be any adverse liability of the Petitioner against SECI. Considering the same, the prayer of the Petitioner for withdrawal of the Petition is allowed without liberty to approach the Commission since there will be no need for the Petitioner to come back to the Commission on this issue.

4. In view of the above, the Petition stands disposed of as withdrawn.

5. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(Surender Babbar)
Member

Sd/-
(Ram Naresh Singh)
Member