

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

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

I.A.No.1 of 2011 in P.P.A.P.No. 1 of 2011

1) Sakthi Sugars Ltd.,
2)TNPL

..... Petitioners
Thiru. Shivakumar, Advocate

Versus

The CMD, TANGEDCO
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai.

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

Hearing dated : 4-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The standing Counsel for TANGEDCO prayed two weeks time for filing counter. Time is granted. The case may be listed after two weeks.

(Sd.....)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member

(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**

Thiru. G.Rajagopal **Member**

D.R.P.No. 20 of 2011

MMS Steel & Power Pvt. Ltd.,

..... Petitioner

Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Versus

The CMD, TANGEDCO
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai.

..... Respondent

Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel

Hearing dated : 4-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Ms. Revathy M. Kannan, the junior counsel of Thiru. Rahul Balaji prayed for adjournment of the case. The case is adjourned at the request of the petitioner.

(Sd.....)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member

(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

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

D.R.P.No. 17 of 2011

Kaveri Gas Power Ltd.,

..... Petitioner

Thiru. Vinod Kumar, Advocate

Versus

1) The CMD, TANGEDCO

No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai and Three Others.

..... Respondents

Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel

Hearing dated : 4-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner continued his arguments and in support of his arguments he submitted the following two citations (1) 2011 ELR (APTEL) 0620. (2) Appeal No.140 of 2012 dated 27-9-2012. The counsel for petitioner submitted the information sought for in the earlier hearing. Heard the arguments of both sides. Orders reserved.

(Sd.....)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member

(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**

Thiru. G.Rajagopal **Member**

I.A.No.1 of 2012 in D.R.P.No. 29 of 2012

Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries Pvt.Ltd.,

..... Petitioner
Thiru. Seshadri, Advocate

Versus

1) The CMD, TANGEDCO
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai and another.

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

Hearing dated : 4-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The dispute was basically between the consumer and the licensee and it would not fall under the Jurisdiction of this Commission. Moreover, the affected consumer had not submitted the petition. The generator has no locus standi in this case. The case is to be dealt with by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum of the concerned circle. Both petitions are dismissed.

(Sd.....)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member

(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
Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

I.A.No.1 of 2012 in D.R.P.No. 30 of 2012

Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries Pvt.Ltd., Petitioner
Thiru. Seshadri, Advocate
Versus
1) The CMD, TANGEDCO
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai and another. Respondents
Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel

Hearing dated : 4-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The dispute was basically between the consumer and the licensee and it would not fall under the Jurisdiction of this Commission. Moreover, the affected consumer had not submitted the petition. The generator has no locus standi in this case. The case is to be dealt with by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum of the concerned circle. Both petitions are dismissed.

(Sd.....)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member

(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

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

D.R.P.No. 26 of 2012

Madurai Power Corp. Pvt. Ltd.,

..... Petitioner

Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Versus

1) The CMD, TANGEDCO
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai and another.

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

Hearing dated : 4-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Ms. Revathy M. Kannan, the junior counsel of Thiru. Rahul Balaji prayed for adjournment of the case. The case is adjourned at the request of the petitioner.

(Sd.....)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member

(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

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

D.R.P.No. 27 of 2012

Samalpatti Power Company Pvt. Ltd.,

..... Petitioner

Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Versus

1) The CMD, TANGEDCO

No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai and another.

..... Respondents

Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel

Hearing dated : 4-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Ms. Revathy M. Kannan, the junior counsel of Thiru. Rahul Balaji prayed for adjournment of the case. The case is adjourned at the request of the petitioner.

(Sd.....)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member

(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

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

R.P.No. 2 of 2013

M/s. Spictex Cotton Mills (P) Ltd.,

..... Petitioner

Thiru. R.S.Pandiyaraj, Advocate

Versus

1) The CFC, Revenue, TANGEDCO
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai and another.

..... Respondents

Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel

Hearing dated : 4-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The petition is admitted. The respondents are directed to file counter within 4 weeks.

(Sd.....)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member

(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**

Thiru. G.Rajagopal **Member**

I.A.No.1 of 2013 in D.R.P.No. 23 of 2013

M/s. Auromira Biopower India Pvt. Ltd.,

..... Petitioner

Thiru. Vinod Kumar, Advocate

Versus

1) The CMD, TANGEDCO
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai and another.

..... Respondents

Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel

Hearing dated : 4-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has already obtained an interim relief from the Hon'ble High Court of Madras at Madurai Bench in W.P.No.11437 of 2013 and therefore he has not pressed for interim relief. The petition is admitted. The respondents were directed to file their counter within 4 weeks.

(Sd.....)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member

(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

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

D.R.P.No. 26 of 2013

M/s. Sai Regency Power Corp. Pvt. Ltd.,

..... Petitioner

Thiru. Jenasenar, Advocate

Versus

1) The CMD, TANGEDCO

No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai and two others.

..... Respondents

Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel

Hearing dated : 4-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Thiru. E. Manoharan, counsel for the petitioner prayed for adjournment of the case. The case is adjourned at the request of the petitioner.

(Sd.....)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member

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

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission