Risk Allocation in High-Stakes Regulatory Disputes: Insights from India's Power Sector on Enforcement Actions and Future Strategies

NIKUNJ BHATNAGAR
Associate

ABHISHEK THAKUR
Associate

Executive Summary

India's power sector is entering a period of unprecedented regulatory stringency, driven by rapid expansion in generation capacity, ambitious clean energy targets and a growing emphasis on system stability. As the market becomes more complex and the pressure on infrastructure rises, regulatory risk has evolved into a central commercial concern rather than a secondary legal issue.

This article provides a structured assessment of how financial and operational risks are currently allocated within India's electricity regulatory framework. It highlights the key areas where disputes commonly arise, including delays in statutory approvals, grid compliance failures, tariff adoption challenges and the commercial impact of policy and tax changes. These risks now carry significant consequences for developers, transmission licensees and distribution companies, including the possibility of multi crore penalties, stranded assets, loss of connectivity and long term damage to investor and lender confidence.

The discussion also examines recent trends in adjudication, which show a decisive shift toward stricter interpretation of timelines, heightened evidentiary standards and reduced tolerance for procedural lapses. Looking ahead, the article identifies the emerging categories of risk that will shape the period from 2026 to 2030. Finally, it sets out practical strategies that sector participants can adopt to reduce exposure, reinforce contractual and compliance readiness and build resilience in a rapidly tightening regulatory environment.

Introduction

India's electricity sector is progressing through its most demanding phase of transition, driven by rapid growth in generation capacity, ambitious decarbonisation targets and a heightened focus on grid reliability. As investments scale up and operational complexity increases, regulatory intervention has become more frequent and more stringent. In this environment, the allocation of responsibility for financial and operational risks has become one of the most contested issues in the sector.

The consequences of unclear or poorly allocated regulatory risk now extend far beyond traditional cost overruns. Generators and utilities face exposure arising from delays in statutory approvals, grid compliance failures, tariff adoption challenges and changes in fiscal or policy frameworks. These risks can trigger multi crore financial losses, the prospect of connectivity revocation, the creation of stranded assets and a decline in investor and lender confidence.

This article examines how risk is allocated within India's regulatory architecture and why enforcement outcomes have become significantly stricter in recent years. It analyses the principal risks that shape current disputes, the emerging patterns in regulatory adjudication and the new forms

SKV LAW OFFICES

of exposure that are likely to define the period from 2026 to 2030. The article concludes with practical strategies that market participants can adopt to reduce enforcement risk and strengthen commercial resilience in an increasingly compliance driven operating environment.

The Principal Risks in Focus

There are many risks for companies operating in India›s electricity sector, which often lead to regulatory disputes and enforcement actions. These risks occur at various stages of a project›s planning and construction and often lead to significant legal issues.

One of the most significant problems that keeps coming up is how long it takes to get approvals. It might take much longer than you think to obtain environmental clearances, permission to buy land, or transmission connectivity. Every month of delay adds to the interest during construction. It increases the likelihood that the commercial operation deadline will be missed, potentially resulting in penalties or contract termination. The deviation settlement process also puts direct pressure on companies through non-compliance sanctions. Renewable generators must pay fines when their actual generation differs from their schedules. Regulators may start disconnection proceedings to protect system stability if they do not meet technical standards, such as ride-through requirements.

Not paying a tariff and ending a contract are even worse problems. The commission may not adopt a tariff after a competitive bid if the project is running late or if it does not serve consumers› interests. If distribution companies do not pay or break the terms of the contract, the contract may also be ended. This usually means that generators get paid for their bank guarantees, leaving them with stranded assets. Finally, policy changes, such as raising GST rates or introducing safeguard charges, can make a project less likely to succeed. Change-in-law provisions allow for compensation, but only when the effects are apparent, and steps have been taken to lessen them.

High Stakes of Regulatory Disputes

In India›s power sector, poor risk allocation can lead to more than just financial losses. It can also lead to price changes worth crores, operational problems, and lasting damage to the system. Investments in a typical utility-scale project range from hundreds of crores to thousands of crores. One bad event could wipe out planned returns, cause loan defaults, or push sponsoring companies toward bankruptcy. These multi-crore effects are most clear when commissions are lowered or cut, adopted rates are reduced because the market is slow or changing.

Losing connectivity or a license is one of the worst things that has happened in the last few years. The Central Transmission Utility of India has cut off grid access for more than 6 gigawatts of renewable energy capacity since 2022 because generators were slow to build it. These kinds of revocations stop projects from moving forward, make it impossible to recover money already spent, and put generators in a cycle of reapplying and going to court. Penalties and blacklisting often make these losses worse because authorities are more

likely to issue larger fines for breaking the grid more than once. Persistent breaches now carry the risk of being excluded from future tenders or having licenses suspended, which not only imposes a direct financial burden but restricts market participation for extended periods.Also, projects are often shut down or disconnected immediately when an enforcement situation arises. The Central Electricity Regulatory Commission («CERC») has directed grid operators to disconnect projects that don›t meet technical standards or that could cause frequency instability more than once. These extreme steps are needed to keep the grid running smoothly, but they hurt the generator›s reputation a lot. A generator who has to deal with repeated enforcement actions loses the trust of lenders, partners, and future buyers. Ultimately, this leads to a broader investor confidence loss.

The Regulatory Framework for Adjudication

India has a legal, organised, and multi-tiered framework for resolving disputes and sharing risks. State Electricity Regulatory Commissions ("SERCs") serve as the primary forum for intra-state matters, including tariff approvals and power purchase agreement disputes. Whereas, the CERC exercises jurisdiction over inter-state transmission.

The Appellate Tribunal for Electricity («APTEL») hears appeals against the decisions of these commissions. Its role is very pivotal because it ensures that risk allocation decisions align with the Electricity Act 2003 and reflect commercial reasonableness. APTEL has been particularly active in matters concerning change-in-law compensation and the equitable sharing of enforcement burdens. The Supreme Court retains ultimate supervisory jurisdiction, interpreting core provisions of the Act and establishing binding principles on issues such as the narrow construction of force majeure clauses and the primacy of statutory tariffs over inconsistent contractual terms over conflicting contractual obligations.

Emerging Risks for 2026 to 2030

The coming decade will introduce a new generation of regulatory and operational risks that go beyond the challenges currently faced by the sector. These risks arise from the increasing penetration of renewable energy, the growing reliance on digital infrastructure, and the expanded use of market based mechanisms in the power system.

1. Intensified focus on grid stability

As renewable capacity increases, system operators are expected to enforce technical standards with far greater scrutiny. Requirements relating to fault ride through capability, voltage and reactive power management, and forecasting accuracy will attract closer monitoring. Projects that lack robust evacuation systems or adequate SCADA integration will face a higher probability of operational restrictions or disconnection.

2. Cybersecurity and digital compliance obligations

Greater digitalisation of power system assets will result in new compliance requirements. These may include mandatory cybersecurity audits, enhanced reporting on cyber incidents and the adoption of sector specific protocols for

the protection of critical infrastructure. Any failure to meet these obligations may result in penalties, forced shutdowns or longer term restrictions on participation in the grid.

3. **Increased financial disclosure and ESG linked compliance**

Governance frameworks such as BRSR Core will require utilities and developers to provide greater transparency on their compliance history. This will include disclosures relating to enforcement actions, regulatory breaches and mitigation steps. Poor records will directly influence financing costs, investor confidence and the commercial viability of long term projects.

4. **Market linked enforcement in an evolving energy market**

As real time markets, ancillary services and congestion management instruments expand, market participants will face stricter enforcement of settlement obligations and data accuracy requirements. Failures in forecasting, scheduling or bidding transparency may result in higher penalties and deeper regulatory intervention.

5. **Stricter oversight of land, environmental and transmission related timelines**

Multi agency approvals will remain a persistent challenge. However, regulators are increasingly unwilling to grant extensions for delays that cannot be clearly justified. Developers will face a higher burden to show that delays were genuinely beyond their control. This will make it more difficult to rely on general force majeure provisions or broad change in law clauses.

Key Lessons from Recent Cases and Market Trends

Recent court cases and market trends show that the rules are getting stricter. Now, enforcement is much stricter. The CERC has made it clear that breaking technical rules more than once will no longer get you a small fine. The most important thing right now is to keep the system safe. There is also less freedom for regulators to make their own choices. Commissions used to be able to give extensions more easily, but APTEL decisions now stress that legislative deadlines and procedural procedures must be strictly followed unless there are truly extraordinary circumstances.

Expectations for compliance have risen a lot. Now, generators are expected to do a better job of filing petitions on time and planning things in real time. Procedural mistakes are now very costly. Not filing complete petitions or omitting supporting documents has resulted in outright denials of relief, despite the substantive merits being robust. When the law has changed, the principle of restitutio in integrum is still applied, but only when the effects are apparent, and mitigation is shown. These changes show that the rules are getting stricter, more mature, and less forgiving. There should be no room for shortcuts in the process.

Strategies to Prevent or Minimise Future Disputes

The transition toward a stricter regulatory regime suggests that management teams must now view risk through a lens of extreme foresight. Prudence dictates that businesses operating in these markets move beyond reactive

measures and instead institutionalize a framework of commercial preparedness. The following strategies represent a shift in how stakeholders can navigate this less forgiving landscape.

The drafting of contracts must move beyond generic templates toward bespoke instruments that feature clear regulatory risk sharing mechanisms. Rather than relying on broad principles of equity after a dispute has erupted, parties should explicitly address who bears the cost for specific triggers such as tax revisions, safeguard duties, or unforeseen approval delays. By embedding clear protocols for these scenarios at the bidding stage, stakeholders ensure that agreements remain commercially viable even when the policy environment shifts.

Parallel to this effort, the maintenance of contemporaneous compliance records is no longer merely an administrative task but a strategic shield. In any regulatory proceeding, the quality of documented evidence often carries more weight than the legal theory presented. A living audit trail that records every project milestone and technical adjustment in real time allows for a surgical demonstration of impact. Such rigour is essential when seeking relief for grid related penalties or proving that a delay was truly beyond the control of the generator.

Businesses must also develop the internal capacity to anticipate enforcement based objections from regulators. This requires the project team to think like a regulator by identifying potential compliance red flags well before they trigger a formal inquiry. By addressing technical or procedural gaps during the planning phase, companies can mitigate the risk of catastrophic outcomes such as tariff rejections or the cancellation of connectivity.

Furthermore, engaging early with regulatory authorities can prevent minor operational friction from hardening into a multi crore legal battle. Treating regulators solely as distant adjudicators is a high risk strategy. Instead, a model of early engagement involving formal clarifications or the use of structured mediation under the Mediation Act 2023 ensures that evolving expectations are understood. This proactive dialogue allows for adjustments to be made without the threat of surprise enforcement actions.

Finally, preparing for litigation should be integrated into commercial planning rather than being treated as a desperate last resort. This mindset shift requires allocating resources for legal and regulatory contingencies at the very inception of a project. Mapping jurisdictional forums and ensuring that teams possess the procedural rigour to meet the highest standards of filing completeness are now essential components of project management. In a landscape where a simple procedural lapse can lead to total project failure, being prepared for litigation is not an admission of conflict but a necessary safeguard for institutional stability.

Conclusion

India's electricity sector has entered a period in which regulatory precision has become central to commercial success. The cost of non compliance is no longer limited to routine penalties. It now includes the possibility of connectivity loss, multi crore exposure, erosion of investor confidence and lasting reputational harm. In this environment, the way risk is allocated and managed determines whether a project remains viable or becomes stranded.

SKV LAW OFFICES

The sector's shift toward stricter enforcement requires a different approach from market participants. Compliance must be treated as a core business function. Documentation must be regarded as strategic evidence rather than administrative paperwork. Foresight must guide every commercial decision, because regulatory expectations now shape both operational outcomes and long term financial performance.

Organisations that embed these principles will be better positioned to navigate a more exacting regulatory landscape. They will also build stronger institutional resilience in a sector where credibility, preparedness and discipline have become essential for sustained growth.

SKV LAW OFFICES