

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. 18 of 2013

ITC Ltd., Petitioner
Thiru. Krishna Srinivasan, Advocate

Versus

1) The CMD, TANGEDCO
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai and three others. Respondents
Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel

Hearing dated : 11-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

The counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner presented the case. The petition is admitted. The standing counsel for TANGEDCO prayed four weeks time for filing the counter. Time is granted.

(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 & D.R.P.No. 32 of 2013

Suryadev Alloys and Power Private Ltd., Petitioner
Thiru. Vinod Kumar, Advocate

Versus

1) The CMD, TANGEDCO
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai and two others. Respondents
Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel

Hearing dated : 11-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Thiru. Abraham, the junior counsel of Thiru. Vinod Kumar appeared for the petitioner and 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**

I.A.No.1 of 2013 & D.R.P.No. 33 of 2013

A.R.S. Metals Ltd.,

..... Petitioner
Thiru. Seshadri, Advocate

Versus

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

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

Hearing dated : 11-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

The Learned Counsels for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner is a generator as well as consumer. The petitioner is directed to submit details establishing this fact. The counsel for the respondents questioned the maintainability of the petition treating the petitioner as generator. The respondents are directed to file their counter before 20th February 2014 and serve a copy on the petitioner. The case is posted to 25th February 2014.

(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 & D.R.P.No. 34 of 2013

Tulsyan NEC Ltd.,

..... Petitioner
Thiru. Seshadri, Advocate

Versus

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

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

Hearing dated : 11-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

The Learned Counsels for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner is a generator as well as consumer. The petitioner is directed to submit details establishing this fact. The counsel for the respondents questioned the maintainability of the petition treating the petitioner as generator. The respondents are directed to file their counter before 20th February 2014 and serve a copy on the petitioner. The case is posted to 25th February 2014.

(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

P.P.A.P.No. 9 of 2013

Kamachi Sponge and Power Corporation Ltd.,

..... Petitioner
Thiru. Seshadri, Advocate

Versus

The Chief Engineer, PPP
TANGEDCO, 6th Floor, Eastern Wing
144, Anna Salai, Chennai.

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

Hearing dated : 11-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Thiru. Narasimhan, the Junior counsel of Thiru. N.L Rajah prayed to adjourn the case to 25-2-2014 as his senior is not in station. The case is adjourned to 25-2-2014 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. 15 of 2011

1) Terra Energy Ltd.,
2) Shree Ambika Sugar Ltd.,

..... Petitioners
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Versus

1) TNEB
2) TANGEDCO and two others.

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

Hearing dated : 11-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsels for both side were present. The counsel for the 4th Respondent prayed for adjournment of the case. The counsel for the 1st Respondent objected for adjournment. But the delay may not cause any damage to the respondents. The case is adjourned to 4th April 2014.

(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. 16 of 2011

1) Shree Ambika Sugar Ltd., Petitioners
2) Terra Energy Ltd., Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Versus

1) TNEB
2) TANGEDCO and two others. Respondents
Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,
Standing Counsel

Hearing dated : 11-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsels for both side were present. The counsel for the 4th Respondent prayed for adjournment of the case. The counsel for the 1st Respondent objected for adjournment. But the delay may not cause any damage to the respondents. The case is adjourned to 4th April 2014.

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

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

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission