

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003
Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:-

Thiru.K.Venugopal **Member**

Thiru.S.Nagalsamy **Member**

D.R.P.No. 13 of 2012

Lanco Tanjore Power Company Ltd., **Petitioner**
Thiru. P. Vinod Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner
Versus

1) TNEB

2) TANGEDCO

..... **Respondents**
Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel for the respondents

Hearing date : 31-7-2012

DAILY ORDER

The counsel for the petitioner Thiru. P. Vinod Kumar was present. He stated that the DRP No. 13 of 2012 is filed praying to direct the TANGEDCO to permit the petitioner to use Naptha as alternate fuel. The petition is admitted. The respondents were directed to file their counter within six weeks. The petition shall be listed thereafter.

(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

(Sd.....)
(K. Venugopal)
Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003
Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:-

Thiru.K.Venugopal **Member**

Thiru.S.Nagalsamy **Member**

D.R.P.No. 14 of 2012

SJLT Textiles Pvt., Ltd.,

..... **Petitioner**

Represented by Thiru. V. Selvadurai

Versus

- 1) TANGEDCO
- 2)CE, Commercial
- 3)SE, Namakkal EDC

..... **Respondents**

Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel for the respondents

Hearing date : 31-7-2012

DAILY ORDER

The petitioner Thiru. V. Selvadurai presented the case. The petition is admitted. The respondents were directed to file counter within four weeks.

(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

(Sd.....)
(K. Venugopal)
Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003
Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:-

Thiru.K.Venugopal **Member**

Thiru.S.Nagalsamy **Member**

M.P.No. 16 of 2012

TANGEDCO Petitioner
Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian, Standing Counsel
Versus
Nil Respondent

Hearing date : 31-7-2012

DAILY ORDER

Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian, Standing Counsel for TANGEDCO was present. Thiru. Manoharan, Chief Financial Controller / Revenue presented the case. Petition is admitted. The petitioner was directed to host the copy of the petition on the website of the TANGEDCO and also host on the website of the Commission. Interested stakeholders shall file the comments with TNERC with a copy to TANGEDCO within four weeks. The petition shall be taken up thereafter.

(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

(Sd.....)
(K. Venugopal)
Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003
Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:-

Thiru.K.Venugopal **Member**

Thiru.S.Nagalsamy **Member**

M.P.No. 20 of 2012

Sandfits Foundries Pvt., Ltd., **Petitioner**
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate for the petitioner
Versus

1) TANGEDCO
2) SE, Coimbatore EDC **Respondents**
Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel for the respondents

Hearing date : 31-7-2012

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. This petition is transferred from Hon'ble High Court of Madras. This petition is admitted and TANGEDCO is directed to file the counter within two weeks time.

(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

(Sd.....)
(K. Venugopal)
Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003
Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:-

Thiru.K.Venugopal Member

Thiru.S.Nagalsamy Member

M.P.No. 21 of 2012

Tamil Nadu Electricity Consumer Association Petitioner
Thiru. N.L. Rajah, Advocate for the petitioner
Versus

TANGEDCO Respondent
Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel for the respondents

Hearing date : 31-7-2012

DAILY ORDER

Thiru. Kumar, Advocate, represented for the counsel for the petitioner.
The petition is admitted. The respondent was directed to file the counter within
four weeks.

(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

(Sd.....)
(K. Venugopal)
Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003
Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:-

Thiru.K.Venugopal **Member**

Thiru.S.Nagalsamy **Member**

M.P.No. 22 of 2012

Thiru. R. Nawal Kishore Singh **Petitioner**

Thiru. Madheswaran, Advocate for the petitioner
Versus

TNEB **Respondent**

Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel for the respondents

Hearing date : 31-7-2012

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. After hearing both parties, the Commission passed the following order:

I.A. No. 1 of 2012 in MP No. 22 of 2012 is admitted. Let the respondent TANGEDCO file their counter in four weeks time. During the admission stage it was argued by learned counsel of TANGEDCO that there were some petitions filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras as well as Apex Court in these matters by various parties. Let all those issues be brought out in the counter to be filed by TANGEDCO. Matter shall be listed thereafter.

(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

(Sd.....)
(K. Venugopal)
Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003
Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:-

Thiru.K.Venugopal Member

Thiru.S.Nagalsamy Member

M.P.No. 23 of 2012

TANGEDCO	Petitioner
	Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,	Standing Counsel
	Versus	
Nil	Respondent

Hearing date : 31-7-2012

DAILY ORDER

Thiru. Seshadri, Chief Engineer, PPP presented the case. After hearing the petitioner, the Commission passed the following order:

M.P. No. 23 of 2012 was filed by TANGEDCO on 16-7-2012 seeking relaxation from Merit Order Despatch with regard to four power plants which were not found to be in Merit Order, in Tariff Order issued by the Commission. TANGEDCO explained the reasons for operating these power stations and read out from the petition itself such reasons. It was also explained by them that the gas available in case of PPN Power Project was to the tune of 41% and 59% Naptha is being used. The plant is dispatched by TANGEDCO at 100% or 85% or not dispatched at all. As regards the other three diesel generating plants by and large one unit of each station is dispatched. TANGEDCO clarified that if the gas output is not improving they will take a call on operating PPN power station.

During the hearing the Commission read out section 32 (2) (a) which is reproduced below:

“(2)The State Load Despatch Centre shall-

(a) be responsible for optimum scheduling and dispatch of electricity within a State, in accordance with the contracts entered into with a licensee or the generating companies operating in that State”

Similar provision has been incorporated in the Tamil Nadu Electricity Grid Code in section 4 (ii).

Relaxation is sought for the month of July 2012. Arguments concluded. Orders reserved.

(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

(Sd.....)
(K. Venugopal)
Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003
Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:-

Thiru.K.Venugopal **Member**

Thiru.S.Nagalsamy **Member**

M.P.No. 24 of 2012

Tamil Nadu Newsprint and Paper Ltd., Petitioner
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate for the petitioner
Versus
Nil Respondent

Hearing date : 31-7-2012

DAILY ORDER

Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate for the petitioner presented the case. The petition is admitted. The petition needs to be examined by the Commission itself in the absence of any respondents in the matter. The matter shall be listed for arguments after examination by the Commission.

(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

(Sd.....)
(K. Venugopal)
Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003
Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:-

Thiru.K.Venugopal **Member**

Thiru.S.Nagalsamy **Member**

P.P.A.P. No. 5 of 2012

Spic Electric Power Corporation (P) Ltd., **Petitioner**
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate for the petitioner
Versus

TANGEDCO **Respondent**
Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian, Standing Counsel for the respondent

Hearing date : 31-7-2012

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The petition is admitted. Counter shall be filed by the TANGEDCO within two weeks. The matter shall be listed thereafter.

(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

(Sd.....)
(K. Venugopal)
Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003
Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:-

Thiru.K.Venugopal **Member**

Thiru.S.Nagalsamy **Member**

P.P.A.P. No. 6 of 2012

OPG Power Generation Pvt., Ltd., Petitioner
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate for the petitioner
Versus

1) TANGEDCO
2) CE, PPP, TANGEDCO Respondents
Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel for the respondents

Hearing date : 31-7-2012

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The Learned counsel for the Petitioner argued that an Interim Order may be granted for commencing the trial run of 2nd unit of 77 MW in their plant subject to the infirm power rate being fixed by the Commission. Petition is admitted. TANGEDCO is of the view that rate shall be fixed by the Commission and if the rate is acceptable to them then they would allow injection of power. The Commission observed that unit one of the power station is already commissioned and necessary inter connection facility exists at this site. Commission had also passed an order to fix the infirm power rate when unit one was commissioned. This itself was done based on the

prevailing Regulations. Both the parties have tried to contest this order in Appeal / Review and the parties did not succeed in the same for one reason or other.

The Commission is of the view that commissioning of any power station should not be delayed especially when there is acute power shortage in the State as well as in the region. Besides Inter-State transmission constraints are also posing difficulty in getting power from outside regions. Keeping all these in mind, the Commission directs that the parties may in consultation with each other fix the date for trial run for unit No.2 within a period of one month from now. Once this unit is commissioned the entire power will be available to the State of Tamil Nadu, especially when section 11 restrictions are in operation in the State.

Counter shall be filed within four weeks. The matter shall be listed thereafter.

(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

(Sd.....)
(K. Venugopal)
Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission