



\$~64

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 6007/2026 & CM APPL. 29538/2026**

RENEW NAVEEN URJA PRIVATE LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sujit Ghosh, Senior Advocate
with Ms. Mannat Waraich and Mr. A.
Thakur, Advocates

versus

SOLAR ENERGY CORPORATION OF INDIA LIMITED & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Anushree Bardhan, Ms. Ritika
Singh, Ms. Somya Sahni and Ms.
Rashmi Vaish, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

04.05.2026

%

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to respondent no.1/ Solar Energy Corporation of India Limited (SECI) to maintain status quo and not encash the Performance Bank Guarantees for the amount of Rs.36 Crores given by the petitioner. It is stated that the said Performance Bank Guarantees have an expiry date of 30th June, 2026.
2. It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has filed a petition bearing No.169/MP/2024 before the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC) along with I.A. No.39/2024, seeking to be relieved of its obligations under the Power Purchase Agreement dated 29th August, 2022 (PPA) without any financial liability on account of material/ fundamental



breach of terms of the said PPA by the respondent no.1/SECI.

3. The petitioner had also filed an appeal before the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (APTEL) against the order of CERC dated 9th March, 2024. However, *vide* order dated 10th September, 2024 in APL No.231/2024 & I.A. No.697/2024, the application of the petitioner for stay against the invocation of Bank Guarantees was rejected.

4. It is submitted that the Petition No.169/MP/2024 is pending before the CERC and is coming up for hearing on 28th May, 2026.

5. Attention of the Court has been drawn to order passed by APTEL on 22nd April, 2026 in the case of Adani Renewable Energy Four Limited (AREFL) in APL No. 163/2026, wherein the APTEL had directed the parties therein to maintain status quo.

6. Counsel for the petitioner submit that they would be moving an appropriate application before the CERC seeking interim stay on the invocation of the Bank Guarantees.

7. It is submitted that the case of the petitioner is *pari materia* with that of AREFL in the aforesaid case and therefore, similar order should be passed till the time the application of the petitioner is taken up for consideration by CERC.

8. Having heard the counsel for the parties, the present petition is disposed of with a direction that *status quo* shall be maintained and no precipitative actions shall be taken by respondent no.1/ SECI qua the Bank Guarantees furnished by the petitioner, for a period of ten (10) days from today, in order to enable the petitioner to file an appropriate application before the CERC.

9. It is clarified that the present *status quo* order is being passed for a



limited period till the matter is taken up for hearing and considered by the CERC.

10. It shall be open for CERC to consider whether or not continuation of the aforesaid interim direction is warranted or not, considering the facts and circumstances of the case.

11. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion with regard to the merits of the case.

12. Pending application also stands disposed of.

AMIT BANSAL, J

MAY 4, 2026

Vivek/-