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.R.C. No. 1 of 2014		
TANGEDCO			Petitioner
1) D.B. Power Ltd., and 10 otl	Versus hers.		Respondents
He	earing dated : 17-3-201	<u>14</u>	
	DAILY ORDER		
Orders pronounced in	the open court.		
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member		(Sd(S. Nagals	samy)
I		Secre mil Nadu E egulatory C	•

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

PRESENT:-

Thiru. S.Nagalsamy Member

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

M.P.Nos. 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 28, 53, 72, 81 of 2013 and M.P.Nos. 9, 18 of 2014

The Chief Engineer, PPP
Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Ltd.,
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai. Petitioner

Versus

Nil Respondent

Hearing dated : 17-3-2014

DAILY ORDER

The standing counsel for TANGEDCO and Chief Engineer, PPP presented the case. All the merit order dispatch petitions are clubbed together. The petitions are admitted. The petitioner was directed to submit the following details within three weeks.

- Total demand for power, availability of power and details of power purchase made from different generators with cost of power.
- 2) Whether steps have been taken to purchase cheaper power other than IPP and if so, the details therefor.
- 3) Whether any cheaper power available during the relevant period was backed down or shut down to purchase IPP power.

4) Do the short term and medium term power purchase agreements contain any clause for purchasing power at a higher level than the contracted

quantum and if so, whether such provision was invoked scrupulously before

resorting to power purchase from the IPPs during the periods of shortage.

5) The agreed dates of commissioning, actual dates of trial run and the Dates

of Commercial operation in respect of the new power plants at Mettur, Vallur

and North Chennai along with the reasons for the delay in commissioning

and the action taken by the TANGEDCO in this regard.

6) Whether there is any LD clause available in the agreements and if so, steps

taken to impose the LD on the contractors.

7) Is there any clause in the contract document for recovery of loss of

generation from the contractor; Any such compensation recovered from any

contractor.

8) The average cost of electricity purchased from high cost IPPs and how it is

proposed to be recovered from the consumers.

(Sd......)
(G.Rajagopal)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member
Member

/ True Copy /

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
<u>M.P. N</u>	o. 52 of 2013
TANGEDCO	Petitioner
Versus Nil	Respondent
Hearing da	ated : 17-3-2014
DAIL	Y ORDER
The Chief Engineer, GTS, TAN	GEDCO prayed for withdrawal of the petition
The petition is dismissed as withdrawn	l.
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member	(Sd) (S. Nagalsamy) Member
/ True Co	• •
	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
S.M.P. No.	1 of 2013
The Chief Engineer, Commercial TANGEDCO.	Petitioner
Versus Nil	Respondent
Hearing dated	: 17-3-2014
DAILY O	RDER
The Chief Engineer, Commercial, and submitted the details. Heard the argu	TANGEDCO appeared for the petitioner ments and 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
S.M.P. No	o. 2 of 2013
The Chief Engineer, Commercial TANGEDCO.	Petitioner
Versus Nil	Respondent
Hearing date	d : 17-3-2014
DAILY	<u>ORDER</u>
The Chief Engineer, Commercial and submitted the details. Heard the arg	, TANGEDCO appeared for the petitioner uments and orders reserved.
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member	(Sd) (S. Nagalsamy) Member
/ True Copy	/ Secretary 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
	M.A.P. No. 1 of 2	<u>013</u>	
TANGEDCO.			Petitioner
Nil	Versus		Respondent
	Hearing dated: 17-3-	<u>-2014</u>	
	DAILY ORDER		
The Chief Engine	or Projects and the sou	upped for the T	

The Chief Engineer, Projects and the counsel for the TANGEDCO pleaded for the extension of time for 9 weeks. Extension granted and list the case after 9 weeks.

(Sd......)
(G.Rajagopal)
Member
(Sd......)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member

/ True Copy /

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

PRESENT:-			
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy			 Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal			 Member
	M.A.P. No. 2 of 2013	<u>3</u>	
TANGEDCO.			Petitioner
Nil	Versus		Respondent
	Hearing dated: 17-3-20	<u>14</u>	

The Chief Engineer, Civil Design and the counsel for the TANGEDCO pleaded for the extension of time for 9 weeks. Extension granted and list the case after 9 weeks.

DAILY ORDER

 (Sd.......)
 (Sd........)

 (G.Rajagopal)
 (S. Nagalsamy)

 Member
 Member

/ True Copy /

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

PRESENT:-	70111a17101 00 01 2000	1	
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy		•••	. Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal		•••	. Member
1	D.R.P. No. 42 of 2014	<u> </u>	
Jayakrishna Flour Mills Pvt. Ltd	I .,		Petitioner
, 1) TANTRANSCO and four oth	Versus ers		Respondents

Hearing dated: 17-3-2014

DAILY ORDER

The Commission directed both the parties to make one more attempt within a month's time to negotiate and settle the issues. Both the counsels agreed. List the case thereafter.

(Sd......)
(G.Rajagopal)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member
Member

/ True Copy /

(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. 43 of 2014		
Emerald Jewel Industry India Ltd.,		Petitioner
Versus 1) TANTRANSCO and another	Resp	oondents

Hearing dated: 17-3-2014

DAILY ORDER

The Commission directed both the parties to make one more attempt within a month's time to negotiate and settle the issues. Both the counsels agreed. List the case thereafter.

(Sd......)(Sd.......)(G.Rajagopal)(S. Nagalsamy)MemberMember

/ True Copy /

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

PRESENT:-

Thiru. S.Nagalsamy Member

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

M.P. No. 19 of 2014

Southern Railway Petitioner

Versus

1) The Secretary, Energy Deptt., and another. Respondents

Hearing dated : 17-3-2014

DAILY ORDER

The counsel for Southern Railway presented the case. The petition has been filed as directed by the Hon'ble High Court. The petition is admitted. The respondents are directed to file their counter. The case shall be listed thereafter.

(Sd......)
(G.Rajagopal)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member
Member

/ True Copy /

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

Thiru. S.Nagalsamy Member

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

P.P.A.P. No. 1 of 2014

The Chief Engineer, PPP, TANGEDCO Petitioner

Versus

Nil Respondent

Hearing dated : 17-3-2014

DAILY ORDER

Thiru. P.H. Arvind Pandian, Additional Advocate General argued for the withdrawal of the first prayer in the main petition and he filed the amendment petition along with type set. Heard the arguments of the petitioner. Orders reserved on the admissibility of the petition.

(Sd......)
(G.Rajagopal)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member
Member

/ True Copy /

(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. 2 of 2014

The Chief Engineer, PPP, TANGEDCO Petitioner

Versus

GMR Power Corporation Ltd., Respondent

Hearing dated: 17-3-2014

DAILY ORDER

The Chief Engineer, PPP of TANGEDCO presented the case. The petition is admitted. The Chief Engineer was directed to submit the following information within four weeks.

- 1) Who is empowered to ask for extension of the agreement, TANGEDCO or Generator.
- 2) The approval of extension has to be obtained before 18 months of expiry of agreement if this is the provision why the present petition is filed at the last minute?
 - 3) Average cost of realization of power for TANGEDCO for 2013-14.
- 4) Month wise details of cost of power Fixed charges and Variable charges of GMR Power Corporation Ltd.,
- 5) The details of other high cost power, fixed charges and variables charge from April 2013.
 - 6) What is the TANGEDCO's proposal to sell this power at high tariff?
- 7) What would be the loss to TANGEDCO month wise due to the purchase of this power?

(Sd......)
(G.Rajagopal)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member
Member

/ True Copy /

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

Central Act 36 of 2003)

PRESENT:	_
----------	---

Thiru. S.Nagalsamy Member

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

M.P. No. 38 of 2012

TANGEDCO. Petitioner

Versus

Nil Respondent

Hearing dated: 17-3-2014

DAILY ORDER

The Chief Engineer, NCES of TANGEDCO presented the case. This case has been filed on the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras. TANGEDCO is directed to implead all the writ petitioners as respondents in this Miscellaneous petition by getting the cause title suitably amended and serve a copy of the petition on them. Two weeks time is given for filing the amendment petition. The case shall be listed thereafter.

(Sd......)
(G.Rajagopal)
(S. Nagalsamy)
Member
Member

/ True Copy /