

No.06/2022 dated: 04-02-2022

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
CAUSE LIST- I

Cases posted for 08-02-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)

Time : 11-00 AM

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.2 of 2016	DCW Ltd., Versus 1) PTC Limited 2) TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. Ravi Kishore Adv. M.Gopinathan	For order
2	M.P.No.32 of 2021	M/s.Birla Carbon India Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/ TANGEDCO (ii) CE/TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	For order
3	D.R.P.No.4 of 2022	M/s.Sulochana Cotton Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Palladam EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to give adjust of 1,28,004 units generated in the petitioner's solar power generator during the period from 01.08.2021 to 28.09.2021 against the petitioner HTSC as per the solar tariff order No.4 of 2014. For admission.
4	D.R.P.No.5 of 2022	M/s.Sulochana Cotton Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Palladam EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to give adjust of 4,93,599 units generated in the petitioner's solar power generator during the period from 01.08.2021 to 28.09.2021 against the petitioner HTSC as per the solar tariff order No.4 of 2014. For admission.
5	D.R.P.No.6 of 2022	M/s.Hindustan Textiles Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Dindigul EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to give adjust of 2,41,920 units generated in the petitioner's solar power generator during the period August 2021 against the petitioner HTSC as per the solar tariff order No.4 of 2014. For admission.

6	M.P.No.42 of 2021	M/s.OPG Energy Pvt. Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) AAA Plus Energy Pvt. Limited	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To exercise its regulatory powers and clarify that no wheeling charges are payable where a captive consumer is being supplied electricity through a dedicated transmission line and is situated within the same premises as the generating plant. For counter.
7	M.P.No.47 of 2021	M/s.T.R.K.Textile India Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Palladam EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to revise the EWA by ordering to expunge the inconsistent portions of the EWA and to execute a fresh EWA and also to accept the invoices of the petitioner whenever raised for the encashment of the unutilised Solar Energy available at the account of the petitioner, for its 75% of the value and to effect the payment. For counter.
8	R.P.No.8 of 2021 in D.R.P.No.18 of 2013	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.ITC Limited	AGP. Richardson Wilson M/s.S.Ramasubramaniam & Associates	To condone the delay of 84 days in filing the Review Petition against the order dated 17.8.2021 in D.R.P.No.18 of 2013 and to review the order on the ground that the impugned order is against the Electricity Rules, 2005 and Judgment of APTEL in Appeal No.33 of 2012. For filing counter on the maintainability and merits.
9	D.R.P.No.2 of 2022	M/s.GMR Energy Trading Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) Director/Finance (iii) CFC/Palladam EDC (iv) SE/Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.Apoorva Misra Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay the outstanding Late Payment Surcharge (LPS) amount payable to the petitioner of Rs.3,12,19,097/- for the delay in payment of monthly bills / invoices raised by the petitioner. For counter.

10	R.P.No.7 of 2021 in M.P.No.25 of 2021	Rajah Muthiah Chettiar Charitable and Educational Trust Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Regulatory Cell (iii) SE/Chengalpattu EDC	Adv.T.Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue an order of Interim Injunction restraining the respondents not to levy demand and collect electricity charges i.r.o. petitioner's electricity service connection and to review the order of the Commission in M.P.No.25 of 2021 dated 16.11.2021. For counter.
11	D.R.P.No.16 of 2021	M/s.Wind Construction Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) Director (Finance) iii) Director (Generation) iv) SE/NCES/Solar Energy	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.40,85,02,740/- and accrued interest thereon of Rs.1,18,49,644 and also interest on delayed payment towards invoices already paid amounting to Rs.5,40,10,563/- together with opening of LC under EPA. For rejoinder.
12	R.P.No.6 of 2021 in M.P.No.14 of 2012	M/s.The Tata Power Company Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SLDC (iii) IWPA (iv) Ushdev Power Holdings Pvt. Limited	SKV Law Offices Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Review / modify the impugned order dated 05.10.2021 passed in M.P.No.14 of 2012 in terms of the submissions made in the present Review Petition and appoint POSOCO to verify the data and clarify the compensatory mechanism in terms of the NSEFI Judgement. For rejoinder.
13	M.P.No.1 of 2022	CE/NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To pass an order to amend the TNERC (Grid Interactive Solar PV Energy Generating Systems) Regulations, 2021 for extending Net Feed-in methodology to all HT consumers for the establishment of roof top / ground mounted SPV Plants within their premises irrespective of voltage level for all roof top loads of 1 MW and above within sanctioned load duly collecting the networking charges from them. For further hearing.

14	S.M.P.No.1 of 2021	Suo-Motu Proceedings in the matter of TNERC – Fees & Fines Regulations.	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji On behalf of Stakeholders</p> <p>Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj on behalf of TASMA</p> <p>Adv.Shiva Krishnamurthy on behalf of Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Ltd Tmt.R.Anitha, Govt. Advocate on behalf of Energy Dept., GoTN</p>	For seeking the views of all the stakeholders on the perceived excessive filing fees upon directions from the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.10944 of 2021, W.P.No.15030 of 2020 and W.P.No.23678 of 2017. For formal closure.
15	D.R.P.No.44 of 2014	<p>Mirra and Mirra Industries Versus</p> <p>1) TANGEDCO & ors.</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	To direct TANGEDCO to effect adjustment of the WEG from the petitioner's captive windmills operating under the REC scheme first and thereafter adjust the energy generated by the other wind mills. For reporting status of the case pending before the Supreme Court.
16	D.R.P.No.55 of 2014	<p>SRF Ltd., Versus</p> <p>1) TANGEDCO & Ors.</p>	<p>Adv. Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	Praying to first effect adjustment of WEG under REC scheme and thereafter adjust with banking facility. For reporting status of the case pending before the Supreme Court.
17	D.R.P.No.68 of 2014	<p>Dattatreya Textiles Pvt. Ltd., Versus</p> <p>1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) SE, Madurai EDC 5) AO/Revenue, CEDC/North</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	Direct that TANGEDCO to first effect adjustment of the wind energy supplied to the petitioner from wind mills operating under the Renewable Energy Wheeling Agreement under the REC scheme against the petitioner's HTSC No.47 and thereafter adjust the energy generated. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.

18	D.R.P.No.69 of 2014	Sundaram Textiles Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) SE, Madurai/North 5) AO/Revenue, CEDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the TANGEDCO to first effect adjustment of the wind energy supplied to the petitioner from wind mills operating under the Renewable Energy Wheeling Agreement under the REC scheme against the petitioner's HTSC No.203 and thereafter adjust the energy generated. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
19	R.P.No.2 of 2013	Spictex Cotton Mills (P) Ltd. Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj AGP. Richardson Wilson	To review the order dated 17.4.2013 in D.R.P.No.2 of 2012. For arguments.
20	D.R.P.No.14 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Virudhunagar EDC	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj AGP. Richardson Wilson	To set aside the 2 nd respondent impugned notice dated 11.8.2012 towards short levy of excess energy charges. For arguments.
21	D.R.P.No.15 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO .	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj AGP. Richardson Wilson	To set aside the 2 nd respondent impugned notice dated 28.9.2012. For arguments.
22	M.P.No.2 of 2019	TANGEDCO Versus 1) Asahi Glass India Limited & 20 ors.	AGP.Richardson Wilson Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj (R-3, R-4, R-5, R-6, R-7, R-8, R-10, R-11, R-13, R-14, R-15, R-16, R-17, R-18 & R-19) Adv. Rahul Balaji for R-9 & R-21	To pass orders for implementing both Captive and Third Party Users in connection with calculation of excess demand and energy charges in the orders passed by the Commission dated 7.9.2010 in M.P.No.9 of 2010, M.P.No.6 of 2010, M.P.No.17 of 2010 and D.R.P.No.9 of 2010. For arguments.
23	D.R.P.No.24 of 2013	Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries Pvt. Ltd., Versus i) TANGEDCO & Ors ii) DSRM	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	Direct the respondents to adjust 88,100 energy units. For arguments.

24	M.P.No.1 of 2021	M/s.NLC India Limited Versus i) TANGEDCO ii) TANTRANSCO	Adv.K.Harishankar Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Direct SLDC to strictly follow and enforce "MUST RUN" status on all solar and wind power plants and direct to forthwith stop issuing backing down / curtailment instructions to Solar and Wind Plants. For arguments.
25	M.P.No.19 of 2021	M/s.R.S.Yarns and Power Pvt. Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CFC / TANGEDCO	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue a clarification, as to whether additional surcharge on wheeling charges are applicable to the OA Consumers having drawal voltage over and above 66 kV, who source electricity from the Third Party Power Generators having injecting voltage over and above 66 kV or not. For arguments.
26	M.P.No.37 of 2021	M/s.Kamuthi Renewable Energy Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/NCES (iii)SE/P&C/TANTRANSCO/Mdu (iv) SE/NCES/Tirunelveli	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	To declare that the entire 72 MW solar power plant stood commissioned and entitled to the Tariff fixed under "Comprehensive Tariff Order on Solar Power" in Order No.4 of 2014 and set aside the CE/NCES communication's dated 30.9.2016 to segregate the 72 MW solar power plant erected as 25 MW and 47 MW separately with separate energy meters and be paid at different tariff rates as illegal. For arguments.
27	D.R.P.No.8 of 2021	M/s.NVR Energy Pvt Limited Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) SE/Tuticorin EDC (iv) SLDC / TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Direct TANGEDCO to modify the JMR statements for the period October 2019 till April 2021 and to refund of Rs.22,96,755/- collected from the petitioner by adopting such methodology including payments against the supplementary bills. For arguments.

28	D.R.P.No.9 of 2021	M/s.Narbheram Solar TN Pvt Limited Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) SE/Tuticorin EDC (iv) SLDC / TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Direct TANGEDCO to modify the JMR statements for the period October 2019 till April 2021 and to refund of Rs.27,08,933/- collected from the petitioner by adopting such methodology including payments against the supplementary bills. For arguments.
29	D.R.P.No.11 of 2021	M/s.Hindustan Zinc Ltd Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES iii) SE/Tiruppur EDC iv) SE/Udumalpet EDC v) SE/Palladam EDC	M/s.Link Legal Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.10,03,05,054/- (upto June 2020) towards Outstanding Late Payment Interest towards delayed payment and unpaid energy bills amounting to Rs.21,71,75,405/- and interest towards late payment till the date of actual realisation. For arguments.
30	R.P.No.1 of 2021 in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016	PTC India Limited Versus (i) MALCO Energy Ltd (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.Ravi Kishore Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Review the order of the Commission dated 02.03.2021 in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016. For arguments.
31	R.P.No.5 of 2021 in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO Versus (i) M/s.MALCO Energy Ltd. (ii) M/s.PTC India Ltd	Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Ravi Kishore	Review the order of the Commission issued in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016 dt.02.03.2021 in the matter of directing the respondents to jointly and severally pay the petitioner at the applicable tariff. For arguments on the maintainability of the petition.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

No.07/2022 Dated: 04-02-2022

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST-II

Cases posted for 08-02-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)

(After the proceedings of the Cause List-I are over)

**CORAM: Thiru. M. Chandrasekar, Hon'ble Chairman
Thiru.K.Venkatasamy, Hon'ble Member (Legal)**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel / Party	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.5 of 2021	M/s.Arkey Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle	Adv.Anirudh Krishnan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and above the contracted quantum and delayed payment along with interest. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

**Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission**

No.08/2022 Dated: 04-02-2022

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST-III

Cases posted for 08-02-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)

(After the proceedings of the Cause List-II are over)

**CORAM: Thiru.K.Venkatasamy, Hon'ble Member (Legal)
Thiru.R.Jarard Kishore, Hon'ble Member**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel / Party	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.10 of 2020	M/s.GMR Generation Assets Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the TANGEDCO to calculate the amount due and payable to the petitioner and set-off perpetuated by TANGEDCO on account of LLR and alleged Excess Payment along with interest, totaling to a sum of Rs.97,44,46,724. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

**Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission**