

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the
Electricity Act, 2003) Central Act 36 of 2003)**

PRESENT:-

Thiru S. Nagalsamy

..... Member

MP 12 of 2013

M/s. TANFAC

....Petitioner
Thiru Rahul Balaji
Advocate

versus

Nil

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for the Petitioner explained the case. The additional benefit they seek now in this petition is to account the power generated from Cogeneration plant towards RPO obligation. Petition admitted. Hearing shall be in due course.

**(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
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 S. Nagalsamy

..... Member

DRP 24 of 2013

M/s. Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries (P) Ltd.

..... Petitioner
Thiru Rahul Balaji
Advocate

versus

1. Director (Operation) TANGEDCO
2. S.E/Dindigul EDC
3. DSRM Steels Pvt Ltd
4. ACE, Erode EDC
5. TANTRANSCO/ SLDC

..... Respondents
Thiru P.H. Vinod Pandian
Standing Counsel

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

The counsel for the petitioner introduced the case. Petition admitted. Respondents shall file counter in 4 weeks.

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

..... Member

DRP 25 of 2013

M/s. Sun Paper Mill Ltd.

..... Petitioner
Thiru R.S. Pandiyaraj
Advocate

Versus

1. TANGEDCO
2. TANTRANSCO

..... Respondents
Thiru P.H. Vinod Pandian
Standing Counsel

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

The learned counsel for the petitioner presented the case praying to either to fix the rate for supply of power or allow them to cancel the Energy Purchase Agreement. The CE/PPP, TANGEDCO opposed the petition on the ground that the Commission had already fixed the rate for supply of power and there was no reason for allowing them to cancel this EPA. However, the counsel for the petitioner argued that there was valid reason as per the clause 10(b) of the Energy Purchase Agreement for cancellation of the Energy Purchase Agreement. To find out whether the reason adduced by the petitioner is a valid reason or not, the petition is admitted. The respondents shall submit their counter within four weeks.

**(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
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 S. Nagalsamy

..... Member

DRP 28 of 2013

Sri Venkitalakshmi Texts

..... Petitioner
Thiru R.S. Pandiyaraj
Advocate

Versus

1. CE/NCES
2. S.E/Coimbatore EDC
3. SE/Tirunelveli EDC

..... Respondent
Thiru P.H. Vinod Pandian
Standing Counsel

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

The counsel for the petitioner introduced the case and prayed to direct the respondents to cancel the EPA and permit the petitioner to adjust the wind energy generated in their wind mills to their LT service connection. The petition is admitted. The respondent shall submit their counter within 4 days.

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

..... Member

DRP 29 of 2013

M/s. Angalakshmi Spin Mills

..... Petitioner
Thiru S. Sivanandam
Advocate

Versus

1. TANGEDCO
2. TANTRANSCO
3. SE/ Coimbatore EDC
4. SE/ Tirunelveli EDC

..... Respondents
Thiru P.H. Vinod Pandian
Standing Counsel

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

The petition came up for admission. The counsel for the petitioner was not present. The Advocate Thiru R.P. Parthasarathy prayed for adjournment on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner. The case is adjourned.

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

..... Member

DRP 30 of 2013

M/s. Shakthi Murugan Textiles

..... Petitioner
Thiru S. Sivanandam
Advocate

Versus

1. TANGEDCO
2. TANTRANSCO
3. SE/Tirunelveli EDC
4. SE/Coimbatore EDC

..... Respondents
Thiru P.H. Vinod Pandian
Standing Counsel

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

The petition came up for admission. The counsel for the petitioner was not present. The Advocate Thiru R.P. Parthasarathy prayed for adjournment on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner. The case is adjourned.

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

..... Member

MP 14 of 2012

1. IWPA
2. Tata Power Co. Ltd
3. Ushdev Holding Pvt Ltd

**..... Petitioners
Thiru Rahul Balaji
Advocate**

Versus

1. TANGEDCO
2. LDC

**..... Respondents
Thiru P.H. Vinod Pandian
Advocate**

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

Heard both the counsel. The matter was already taken up in the High Court of Judicature at Madras. Case is kept in abeyance till then.

**(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
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 S. Nagalsamy

..... Member

DRP 28 of 2012

1. Green Infra Wind Power Projects Ltd
2. Green Infra Wind Generation Ltd
3. Green Infra Wind Farms Ltd

**..... Petitioners
Thiru Rahul Balaji
Advocate**

Versus

1. TANGEDCO
2. SLDC
3. TANTRANSCO

**..... Respondents
Thiru P.H. Vinod Pandian
Advocate**

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

Heard both the counsel. The matter was already taken up in the High Court of Judicature at Madras. Case is kept in abeyance till then.

**(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
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 S. Nagalsamy

..... Member

DRP 13 of 2013

M/s. National Energy and Services Ltd

..... Petitioner
Thiru Rahul Balaji
Advocate

Versus

1. TANGEDCO
2. CE/IPP

..... Respondents
Thiru P.H. Vinod Pandian
Advocate

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

The counsel for the petitioner sought for adjournment and the case was adjourned at the request of the petitioner.

**(Sd.....)
(S. Nagalsamy)
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 S. Nagalsamy

..... Member

I.A. 1 of 2013 in DRP.14 of 2013

Sri Pathy Papers and Board (P) Ltd.

..... Petitioner
Thiru R.S. Pandiyaraj
Advocate

Versus

1. CFC/Revenue
2. SE/Virudhunagar EDC

..... Respondents
Thiru P.H. Vinod Pandian
Advocate

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

The learned counsel for the respondent informed the Commission that the matter had already been taken up in the APTEL on an appeal. The case is therefore kept pending till it is disposed by APTEL.

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

..... Member

I.A. Nos. 1 & 2 of 2013 in MP.No. 27 of 2013 and MP No. 27 of 2013

1. Indian Wind Power Association

..... Petitioners

2. Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association

Thiru Rahul Balaji

Thiru R.S. Pandiayaraj

Advocates

Versus

TANGEDCO

..... Respondent

Thiru P.H. Vinod Pandian

Advocate

and

TANGEDCO

..... Petitioner

Thiru Seshadri, CE/PPP

Versus

Nil

..... Respondent

Hearing date: 04-10-2013

DAILY ORDER

The Indian Wind Power Association represented by the learned counsel Thiru Rahul Balaji and the Tamil Nadu Spinning Mill Association represented by the learned counsel Thiru R.P. Parthasarathy have filed impleading petitions and argued their case elaborately. Thiru Seshadri, CE/PPP, TANGEDCO opposed these impleading petitions and argued that the present petition MP 27 of 2013 is to get the approval of the Commission to purchase 2122 MW of RTC power and the Indian Wind Power Association and Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association have no locus standi to implead in this case. The Wind Power is infirm power whereas the petition is for purchase of base load power. After hearing the arguments both the impleading petitions are dismissed. The judgement is reserved in the main petition.

(Sd.....)

(S. Nagalsamy)

Member

/ True Copy /

**Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission**