

**IN THE JHARKHAND STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY
COMMISSION AT RANCHI**

Case No. 09 of 2015

Tata Steel Limited (TSL) (Steel Manufacturer, for its CPP) Petitioner

Versus

Jharkhand Renewable Energy Development Agency & Ors..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVNEET KUMAR, CHAIRPERSON
HON'BLE MR. MAHENDRA PRASAD, MEMBER (LAW)

For the Petitioner : Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate & Mr. P.A.S. Pati,
Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Mukesh Kumar, Advocate, JREDA &
Mr. Prem Mardi, Advocate, Green Energy Association

ORDER

Date – 8th October, 2026

1. The Petitioner – Tata Steel Limited (TSL) (Steel Manufacturer), has filed the present petition under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Renewable Purchase Obligation and its Compliance) Regulations, 2010, seeking recognition of its Captive Power Plant at Jamshedpur as a co-generation power plant and consequential exemption from RPO obligations.
2. The Prayers of the Petitioner are as under: -
 - (a) It is humbly requested that the RPO liability of Tata Steel during the FY 2011- 12 to 2013-14 may be set-off against the excess compliance done during the FY 2014-15 to 2019-20. The said submissions are

subject to the said RECs may be released back to Tata Steel Limited in the event of a favourable disposal of the Civil Appeal No. 3543 of 2025 filed by Tata Steel Limited against the order dated 27.01.2025 passed in Appeal No. 382 of 2017.

And/ Or

For any other relief to which the petitioner may be entitled in law.

Submission of the Petitioner

3. Tata Steel Limited is a company belonging to the world-renowned Tata group and India's largest private integrated steel manufacturing company operating in Jamshedpur having capacity of 10 MT of saleable steel annually. The integrated steel plant produces steel from raw material to end product like cold rolled sheets, TMT bars, Tubes and slabs etc.
4. The Petitioner - Tata Steel Limited (TSL), submitted that the present application has been filed in response to the communications issued by the Commission vide Letter Nos. JSERC/Legal/09 of 2015/229 dated 07.07.2025 and JSERC/Legal/09 of 2015/63 dated 28.04.2025, whereby the Petitioner was directed to comply with the Judgment dated 27.01.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (APTEL) in Appeal No. 382 of 2017.
5. The Petitioner submitted that while the Commission, on the basis of the computation submitted by Jharkhand Renewable Energy Development Agency (JREDA), determined its RPO liability for FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14 and directed payment of Rs. 11,82,29,146/-, the Petitioner has challenged the aforesaid Hon'ble APTEL Judgment before the Hon'ble Supreme Court through Civil Appeal No. 3543 of 2025, which is presently pending adjudication. The Petitioner further submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has issued notice on the issue relating to imposition of penalty and, therefore, no coercive action should be taken during the pendency of the proceedings.

6. The Petitioner submitted that under Clause 10.1 of the JSERC (Renewable Purchase Obligation and its Compliance) Regulations, 2010, the amount determined on the basis of the shortfall and the forbearance price is in the nature of a penal consequence arising from non-fulfilment of RPO. Further, the question relating to imposition of such liability is presently under consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Petitioner further contended that it continues to support the findings recorded by the Commission in its earlier Order dated 28.02.2017 in Case No. 09 of 2015, wherein RPO exemption was granted in respect of electricity generated from the Petitioner's co-generation facilities, and submitted that it remains entitled to similar treatment in accordance with the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the applicable RPO Regulations.
7. The Petitioner submitted that, without prejudice to its rights and contentions pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, Hon'ble APTEL and this Commission, the RPO liability for FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14 may be adjusted against the surplus RPO compliance achieved during FY 2014-15 to FY 2019-20. The Petitioner contended that, pursuant to the Commission's Orders dated 28.02.2017 and 06.01.2021, it had procured RECs and achieved excess RPO compliance during the subsequent years, which ought to be allowed as a set-off against the liability determined for the earlier period.
8. The Petitioner further submitted that its co-generation facilities, including PH#4, PH#5, CDQ and TRT units, were considered by the Commission while granting relief in the Order dated 06.01.2021. It was also contended that additional units such as PH#3 and PH#6 constitute co-generation facilities within the meaning of Section 2(12) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and ought to be considered while evaluating its overall RPO position. On the basis of year-wise details of electricity consumption, RPO obligations and renewable energy procurement furnished before the Commission, the Petitioner claimed that the excess RPO compliance achieved during FY 2014-15 to FY 2019-20 is sufficient

to offset the RPO liability pertaining to FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14.

9. The Petitioner submitted that orders passed by the Odisha Electricity Regulatory Commission (OERC) in Case No. 40 of 2020 and the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (MERC) in Suo Motu Case No. 01 of 2024, wherein adjustment of excess RPO compliance against obligations of other periods was permitted. Referring to the aforesaid decisions, the Petitioner prayed that the Commission may allow similar set-off of excess compliance against the RPO liability determined for FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14. The Petitioner further submitted that such adjustment is sought without prejudice to its pending legal remedies and that, in the event of succeeding before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the corresponding Renewable Energy Certificates adjusted pursuant to such set-off may be restored to the Petitioner. Accordingly, the Petitioner requested the Commission to permit adjustment of its earlier RPO liability against excess compliance achieved during FY 2014-15 to FY 2019-20 and grant such other reliefs as deemed fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.

Reply of The Respondent

10. Respondent, Jharkhand Renewable Energy Development Agency (JREDA), submitted that the Petitioner, being a captive user and an obligated entity under the applicable Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO) Regulations, was required to comply with the prescribed RPO targets for the relevant financial years. It was contended that the applicable Regulations cast a mandatory obligation upon captive users to procure a specified percentage of their electricity consumption from renewable energy sources and to furnish requisite information to the State Agency regarding compliance thereof. The Respondent further submitted that any shortfall in fulfillment of RPO attracts the consequences prescribed under the Regulations.
11. Respondent further submitted that it is relevant to point out that the present petitioner did not respond to several communications whereby

the requirement from RPO obligations was to be uploaded quarterly, which is mandatory requirement of Law, Here the stand taken by the Petitioner that they are exempted from the RPO mechanism was not accepted by the Hon'ble APTEL while deciding the present issue vide its Order dated 27.01.2025 passed in Appeal No: 382 OF 2017. Prior to this the Petitioner had earlier moved before APTEL which was also rejected and the same is Reported in (2012) SCC Online APTEL 135. wherein it was held that the discretionary power of relaxation should be exercised fairly and reasonably It was also held that the relaxation of RPO for the period 2011-14 was improperly granted and cannot retrospectively comply with the Renewable Energy Purchase requirement for that period.

12. Respondent submitted that it was held by the Hon'ble APTEL that the Appellant does not fall within the category of aggrieved person to prefer an appeal under section 111 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and as such the State Commission (JSERC) was fully justified and has not committed an error or illegality. It has been further held that the power to relax the Obligation of fulfilling RPO can only be exercised by the State Commission. Here the observation made by the APTEL in concluding paragraphs of the Judgement dated 27.01.2025 has fastened the liability upon the State Commission and as such the same has to be addressed by the JSERC accordingly.

13. Respondent submitted that the Impugned Order dated 28.02.2017 in the present case has been set aside and the JSERC has been directed to determine the amount for the relevant period of Non-Compliance in terms of Regulation 10 of the RPO Regulations of the Petitioner within a month and the Appellant shall deposit the shortfall amount before the JSERC to be utilized for the purchase of the REC's.

14. Respondent submitted that it is worth mentioning that the Petitioner being dissatisfied by the said Order dated 27.01.2025 of the APTEL has moved before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No.

3543 of 2025 but has failed to obtain any stay in the Hon'ble APTEL's Order. In other words the Petitioner is now bound to follow the order and deposit the RPO amount without any further delay or else statutory penalties/interest shall be levied.

15. Respondent further contended that the statutory objective of promotion of co-generation under Section 86(1)(e) of the Electricity Act, 2003 cannot be interpreted to mean that electricity generated from conventional co-generation or waste heat recovery facilities is automatically deemed equivalent to renewable energy for the purpose of RPO compliance. It was submitted that neither the Electricity Act, 2003 nor the applicable RPO Regulations provide for automatic exemption from RPO merely on account of operation of a co-generation plant. The Respondent also submitted that waste heat recovery generation cannot be treated at par with renewable energy generation unless specifically recognized by the competent authority or under the applicable regulatory framework.

16. Further, respondent submitted that the Petitioner had failed to establish entitlement to the reliefs sought and had not complied with various regulatory requirements relating to submission of RPO compliance information. It was further submitted that JREDA, being the State Designated Agency, has already assessed the Petitioner's RPO liability and communicated the same to the Petitioner. Accordingly, Respondent submitted that the petition ought to be dismissed and that the Petitioner be directed to comply with RPO as per the relevant Regulations.

17. Respondent submitted that on 03.09.2026, Petitioner has submitted the documents pertaining to purchase of RECs for the period from FY 2014-15 to FY 2019-20. The same is reconciled with the data and RECs of Petitioner by both including WHRB and excluding WHRB generation. However, under both methodologies, the reconciliation indicates shortfall of the purchase of RECs by the petitioner of 375.61 MUs and

866.16 MUs respectively.

Commission's Observation and findings

18. The Commission has taken into consideration all the submissions made by both the parties and perused the materials available on record. The Commission observes that it had earlier passed an Order dated 28.02.2017 in Case No. 09 of 2015 (M/s Tata Steel Limited v. Green Energy Association), wherein it was held that captive co-generation plants are entitled to exemption from Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO) requirements for FY 2011-12, FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14:

“ 21. In the said admitted position and facts and circumstances on record, the petitioner cannot be held to be intentionally defaulting compliance of its RPO obligations for the preceding period i.e. FY 2011-12, FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14. The petitioner cannot be made liable for any consequential obligations for its no fault – such as - for depositing the same amount in a separate fund for purchase of Renewable Energy Certificates etc. of the said financial years and is held to be entitled for the benefit in the line of the decision of the Commission in Bokaro Steel Plant (SAIL). Issue No.2 is, thus, decided in favour of the petitioner.

22. It is, however, made clear that the benefit is limited to the said preceding financial years i.e. FY 2011-12, FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14.”

19. The Commission further notes that M/s Green Energy Association, being aggrieved by the aforesaid Order dated 28.02.2017 passed by the Commission in Case No. 09 of 2015, preferred Appeal No. 382 of 2017 before the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (APTEL). The aforesaid appeal challenged the findings of the Commission regarding the exemption granted to captive co-generation plants from the applicability of Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO) for FY 2011-12, FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14.

20. The Commission notes that, pursuant to the Judgment dated 27.01.2025 of the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 382 of 2017, the earlier Order dated 28.02.2017 passed by the Commission in Case No. 09 of 2015 has been set aside. The relevant findings and directions contained in the said Order are as under:

“ 55. This Tribunal has rendered the above conclusion after duly considering the judgments as placed before us and therefore, we find no reason to deliberate further on these judgments, the conclusion is thus applicable in this case, as under:

(i) Electricity generated, from fossil fuel-based co-generation plants, is not a generation from non-conventional sources of energy or renewable sources of energy,

(ii) “co- generation”, as defined in Section 2(12) of the Electricity Act, cannot be termed as a source of electricity like renewable sources of energy,

(iii) These judgments run contrary to and fall foul of the Full Bench judgment (of three members) of this Tribunal in Lloyds Metal & Energy Ltd. Consequently, it is the judgment of the Full Bench of this Tribunal in Lloyds Metal & Energy Ltd. which is binding, and not the law declared in Century Rayon Ltd (Order in Appeal No. 57 of 2009 dated 26.04.2010), and the judgments of the two-member benches of this Tribunal which followed it,

(iv) RPO obligations can, therefore, be fastened on captive power consumers, and

(v) Such RPO obligations, to procure and consume power from renewable sources of energy, can neither be adjusted nor set off against the quantum of power consumed from co-generation plants based on fossil fuel.

56. The State Commission has erred in granting exemption to Respondent No. 2, such an unjustified and unreasonable decision deserves to be set aside which is not only contrary to the law but also against the interest of the consumers.

57. We also condemn the act of Respondent No. 2, by making written submissions in addition to what has been argued before us, by raising the issue of maintainability of the Appeal through the written submission without arguing the issue in the court.

.....

59. Therefore, we decline to accept the submission of Respondent No. 2 on this count.

.....

.....

ORDER

For the reasons stated above, we are of the view that the captioned

Appeal No. 382 of 2017 has merit and is allowed.

The Impugned Order dated 28.02.2017 in Case No. 09 of 2015 passed by the Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission is set aside.

The State Commission is directed to determine the amount for the relevant period of non-compliance in terms of Regulation 10 of the RPO Regulations within one month of this judgment and Respondent No. 2 shall deposit the same within one month thereafter before the State Commission to be utilized for the purchase of the RECs on behalf of the Respondent No. 2 and the same shall be in addition to the RECs as required to be purchased by him.”

21. Further, the Commission after considering the judgment dated 02.12.2013 of the Hon'ble APTEL in *Lloyds Metal & Energy Ltd. v. MERC & Ors.* (Appeal No. 53 of 2012), the Commission held that while fossil fuel based co-generation cannot be equated with renewable energy for the purposes of Section 86(1)(e) of the Electricity Act, 2003, additional electricity generated through co-generation is not required to be fastened with Renewable Purchase Obligation in the manner determined therein. The relevant findings and directions contained in the said Order are as under

“39. Summary of our findings:

Upon conjoint reading of the provisions of the Electricity Act, the National Electricity Policy, Tariff Policy and the intent of the legislature while passing the Electricity Act as reflected in the Report of the Standing Committee on Energy presented to Lok Sabha on 19.12.2002, we have come to the conclusion that a distribution company cannot be fastened with the obligation to purchase a percentage of its consumption from fossil fuel based co-generation under Section 86(1)(e) of the Electricity Act, 2003. Such purchase obligation 86(1)(e) can be fastened only from electricity generated from renewable sources of energy. However, the State Commission can promote fossil fuel-based co-generation by other measures such as facilitating sale of surplus electricity available at such co-generation plants in the interest of promoting energy efficiency and grid security, etc.”

22. The Commission further notes that, in compliance with the aforesaid directions of the Hon'ble APTEL, the Commission vide letters dated 28.04.2025 and 07.07.2025 directed the Petitioner to comply with its Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO) liability for FY 2011-12, FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 as determined on the basis of the calculations submitted by Jharkhand Renewable Energy Development Agency (JREDA) and to take necessary steps towards fulfillment of the directions contained in the Judgment dated 27.01.2025 passed by the Hon'ble APTEL.

23. The Commission also observes that it had passed the order in case no. 21 of 2019 dated 06.01.2021 against the application filed by TSL (Steel Manufacturer) for exemption/ relaxing from RPO on the ground that electricity produced from captive co-generation units of the Petitioner is far in excess of its RPO requirements for FY 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19. The Commission had passed the order as below:

“ 46. In view of above, We answer accordingly:- whether the Electricity

produced from captive co-generation be considered at par with renewable power and as such the obligated entity be exempted from Renewable Purchase Obligation or not? We answer:- No! We have also considered whether for additional electricity produced through co-generation by the petitioners, they have to be fastened with Renewable Purchase Obligation?

We answer;- No!

47. To summarize;- the Electricity produced from captive co-generation

cannot be considered at par with renewable power and as such the obligated entity are not exempted from Renewable Purchase Obligation as it is not a substitute of renewable energy as per our regulation. However in order to promote co-generation as mandated by The Legislatures and policy framers, for additional electricity produced through co-generation by the petitioners, they have not to be fastened with Renewable Purchase Obligation? We answer;- No!

In the result, it is ordered as,

ORDER

48. The petitions in case no. 21 of 2019, 17 of 2020, 09 of 2020

and 10 of 2020 are partly allowed to the extent that for additional electricity produced through co-generation by the petitioners, they have not to be fastened with Renewable Purchase Obligation. Prayers of the petitioners that co-generation be considered at par with renewable power and as such the obligated entity be exempted from Renewable Purchase Obligation is not allowed being devoid of merit.”

24. The Commission observes that the principle adopted in its Order dated 06.01.2021, whereby relaxation from RPO was granted in respect of additional electricity generated through co-generation, is no longer sustainable in view of the subsequent and binding pronouncement of the Hon'ble APTEL. The findings of the Hon'ble Tribunal unequivocally establish that electricity generated from fossil fuel-based co-generation plants cannot be used either for fulfillment of RPO or for obtaining any adjustment, set-off, exemption or relaxation from RPO obligations. The Commission further notes that the Judgment of the Hon'ble APTEL was rendered subsequent to the Commission's Order dated 06.01.2021 and, therefore, constitutes the prevailing legal position governing the issue.

25. Further the Commission notes that being a statutory authority subordinate to the appellate jurisdiction of the Hon'ble APTEL, the Commission is bound to give effect to and act in conformity with the law declared by the Hon'ble Tribunal. Accordingly, to the extent the Order dated 06.01.2021 in Case No. 21 of 2019 granted relief from RPO obligations in respect of additional electricity generated through co-generation, the same stands overridden by the subsequent Judgment dated 27.01.2025 of the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 382 of 2017 and cannot be relied upon for determination of RPO liability.

26. In view of the above, the Commission holds that no exemption, adjustment, set-off or relaxation from Renewable Purchase Obligation is admissible on account of electricity generated or consumed from fossil fuel-based co-generation plants, including any additional electricity generated therefrom. The Petitioner's RPO liability shall therefore be determined strictly in accordance with the applicable RPO Regulations and the directions contained in the Judgment dated 27.01.2025 passed by the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 382 of 2017.

27. The Commission further notes that the Petitioner has challenged the Judgment dated 27.01.2025 passed by the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 382 of 2017 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. However, it is an admitted position that no interim order or stay has been granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court against the operation of the aforesaid Judgment. It is a settled principle of law that mere filing or pendency of an appeal does not render the impugned judgment inoperative, nor does it automatically operate as a stay of the judgment under challenge. In the absence of any specific order staying the operation, implementation, or enforcement of the Judgment dated 27.01.2025, the same continues to hold the field and remains binding upon all subordinate authorities, including this Commission.

28. The Commission has examined the submissions of the Petitioner, the calculations furnished by JREDA, the provisions of the applicable RPO Regulations, and the findings recorded by the Hon'ble APTEL in its Judgment dated 27.01.2025 in Appeal No. 382 of 2017. The Commission notes that, pursuant to the aforesaid Judgment, the Petitioner is liable to fulfill its Renewable Purchase Obligation (RPO) for the period FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14, for which exemption had earlier been granted by the Commission vide Order dated 28.02.2017 in Case No. 09 of 2015, but which now stands set aside by the Hon'ble APTEL. Further, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Tribunal, the Petitioner is also liable to fulfill its RPO obligations for the subsequent period FY 2014-15 to FY 2019-20 without claiming any exemption, adjustment, set-off or relaxation on account of electricity generated through fossil fuel-based co-generation.

29. The Commission further observes that the relief granted in Case No. 21 of 2019 vide Order dated 06.01.2021, whereby electricity generated through co-generation was not subjected to RPO obligation, cannot survive in view of the subsequent and binding Judgment of the Hon'ble APTEL dated 27.01.2025. The Hon'ble Tribunal has categorically held that RPO obligations can be imposed upon captive power consumers and that such obligations cannot be adjusted or set-off against electricity generated or consumed from fossil fuel-based co-generation plants. Accordingly, the entire quantum of consumption attracting RPO liability is required to be considered without extending any relaxation in respect of electricity generated through co-generation.

30. The Commission further notes that the Petitioner has prayed for adjustment of the RPO liability determined for FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14 against the alleged surplus RPO compliance achieved during FY 2014-15 to FY 2019-20. However, the Commission observes that the liability relating to FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14 has arisen pursuant to and in compliance with the binding directions of the Hon'ble APTEL and pertains to a separate period of regulatory non-compliance. Further, the Petitioner has failed to demonstrate any provision under the applicable RPO Regulations permitting retrospective adjustment or carry-forward of excess compliance of later years against liabilities pertaining to earlier financial years. In the absence of any specific enabling provision in the Regulations, such adjustment cannot be permitted.

31. Further, Clause 10.2 of JSERC (Renewable Purchase Obligation and its Compliance) Regulations, 2010 provides for carrying forward of obligation subject to the condition of non-availability of RECs. Relevant Regulation is reproduced as below:

“10.2 Where any Obligated entity fails to comply with the obligation to purchase the required percentage of power from renewable energy sources or the renewable energy certificates, it shall also be liable for penalty as may be decided by the Commission under section 142 of the Act:

Provided that in case of genuine difficulty in complying with the renewable purchase obligation because of non availability of Certificates, the Obligated entity can approach the Commission for carry forward of compliance requirement to the next year;”

The Commission notes that Petitioner has not shown any such difficulties or submitted any details in the instant Petition.

32. The Commission further observes that the relief granted vide Order dated 06.01.2021 in Case No. 21 of 2019 and analogous matters was rendered in the peculiar facts and circumstances of those cases. Subsequently, the legal position concerning co-generation and RPO applicability stands conclusively settled by the Judgment of the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 382 of 2017, wherein it has been held that RPO obligations can be imposed upon captive consumers and that such obligations cannot be adjusted or set-off against electricity generated from co-generation plants based on conventional sources. The Commission has already taken note of the aforesaid legal position in its Order dated 27.08.2026 in Case No.

37 of 2025 and finds the same applicable in the present matter as well.

33. In view of the foregoing, the Commission is of the considered opinion that the Petitioner's contention seeking adjustment of the alleged excess RPO compliance of FY 2014-15 to FY 2019-20 against the RPO liability of FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14 is devoid of merit and is, therefore, rejected. The Commission holds that the Petitioner is independently liable for RPO compliance for FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14 as well as FY 2014-15 to FY 2019-20 in accordance with the law laid down by the Hon'ble APTEL, without any exemption, adjustment or relaxation on account of electricity generated through fossil fuel-based co-generation.

34. Accordingly, the Commission accepts the computation of RPO liability submitted by the Respondent and holds that the Petitioner is liable to deposit an amount of Rs. 11,82,29,146/- (Rupees Eleven Crore Eighty-Two Lakh Twenty-Nine Thousand One Hundred Forty Six only) towards RPO non-compliance, as calculated by the Respondent in accordance with the applicable Regulations and the directions of the Hon'ble APTEL. The Petitioner is directed to deposit the aforesaid amount within the time stipulated in this Order, failing which appropriate action shall be initiated in accordance with law and the applicable Regulations.

35. The Commission is therefore of the considered view that there exists no regulatory or legal basis to permit adjustment of the Petitioner's RPO liability for FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14 against any alleged surplus compliance of subsequent years. The Commission further finds no infirmity in the methodology adopted by JREDA while determining the Petitioner's RPO liability pursuant to the directions contained in the Judgment of the Hon'ble APTEL. Accordingly, the Petitioner's prayer for adjustment of RPO liability cannot be acceded to.

ORDER

36. Accordingly, after considering the submissions of the Petitioner, the materials available on record, the Judgment dated 27.01.2025 passed by the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 382 of 2017, and the applicable provisions of the JSERC RPO Regulations, the Commission finds no merit in the Petitioner's request for adjustment of the RPO liability pertaining to FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14 against the alleged surplus RPO

compliance achieved during FY 2014-15 to FY 2019-20.

37. The Commission directs the Petitioner, Tata Steel Limited, to comply with the Renewable Purchase Obligation liability for FY 2011-12 to FY 2013-14 as assessed by Jharkhand Renewable Energy Development Agency (JREDA) and to deposit an amount of Rs. 11,82,29,146/- (Rupees Eleven Crore Eighty-Two Lakh Twenty-Nine Thousand One Hundred Forty Six only) in Jharkhand RPO Charge Regulatory Fund (Indian Bank A/C No 8060680939) within one month for purchase of RECs on its behalf, as calculated by the JREDA in accordance with the applicable Regulations and the directions contained in the judgment dated 27.01.2025 passed by the Hon'ble APTEL in Appeal No. 382 of 2017.

38. Accordingly, the Petitioner is directed to comply with the RPO liability and deposit the amount determined by JREDA within Thirty (30) days from the date of issuance of this Order.

Accordingly, with the above observations and directions, the instant Petition stands **dismissed and disposed off**.

Sd/-
Member (L)

Sd/-
Chairperson