PRESENT:-	
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	Member
D.R.P.N	o. 13 of 2012
Lanco Tanjavur Power Company Ltd., Versus	Petitioner
1) TANGEDCO and another.	Respondents
Hearing date	
Counsel for both side were preser	nt and prayed for adjournment. The case
is adjourned at the request of both parties	S.
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member	(Sd) (S. Nagalsamy) Member
/ True Copy	/ Secretary Tamil Nadu Electricity
	raiiiii ivauu ∟ieciricity

PRESENT:-	
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	Member
D.R.P.No. 20	of 2012
Pioneer Power Ltd., Versus	Petitioner
1) The Director (Generation) and two others.	Respondents
Hearing dated : 19	<u>)-2-2014</u>
DAILY ORDE	<u>:R</u>
Counsel for both side were present and	I prayed for adjournment. The case
is adjourned at the request of both parties.	
(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)

<u>P</u>	<u>'R</u>	E	<u>S</u>	E	N	T	:	_

Thiru. S.Nagalsamy Member

Thiru. G.Rajagopal Member

R.P.No. 4 of 2012

TANGEDCO Petitioner

Versus

Nil Respondent

Hearing dated: 19-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

The Executive Engineer and Superintending Engineer, Commercial appeared for the petitioner. They were directed to file the status report on the present condition of power position, and to state whether the TANGEDCO obtained approval of the Commission for lifting and reintroducing R&C measure.

(Sd......)
(G.Rajagopal)
(Sd.......)
(Sd.......)
(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:-	<u>Gentral Act 50</u>	<u>, 01 2000)</u>	
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy		Membe	r
Thiru. G.Rajagopal		Membe)r
	M.P.No. 15	of 2014	
TANGEDCO	Versus	Petitioner	
Nil		Respondent	
	Hearing dated :		
The Financ	cial Controller, Rev	venue, TANGEDCO appeared for t	he
petitioner. She was dire	ected to file the affid	avit with regard to the following:	
1) The list of outs	standing CC Charge	es and corresponding BPSC	
2) Who are all eli	gible.		
3) The financial in	mplication of the dec	cision.	
4) Propose the so	cheme with complet	te details.	
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member		(Sd) (S. Nagalsamy) Member	
	/ True Copy /	Socratary	
		Secretary Tamil Nadu Electricity	

PRESENT:-	<u></u>
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	Member
	R.C.No. 1 of 2014 in
TANGEDCO Versu	P.A.P.No. of 2014 Petitioner us
1) D.B.Power Ltd., 10 others.	Respondents
<u></u>	g dated : 19-2-2014 DAILY ORDER PP presented the case and prayed to waive the
_	d the arguments. Orders reserved.
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member	(Sd) (S. Nagalsamy) Member
/ True	Copy / Secretary Tamil Nadu Electricity

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

Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	Member		
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	Member		
I.A.No. 1 of 2014 & D.R	.P.No. 5 of 2014		
Saheli Exports Pvt. Ltd.,	Petitioner Thiru. Vinod Kumar, Advocate		
Versus	Tillia. Villou Kulliai, Auvocate		
1) TANGEDCO and three other.	Respondents		
Hearing dated :	<u>19-2-2014</u>		
DAILY ORI	<u>DER</u>		
Counsel for both side were present ar	nd prayed for adjournment. The case		
is adjourned at the request of both parties.			
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member	(Sd) (S. Nagalsamy) Member		
/ True Copy /	Secretary Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission		

PRESENT:-	
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	Member
I.A.Nos. 1 & 2 of 2014 & D	D.R.P.No. 4 of 2014
B&G Solar Private Ltd., Versus	Petitioner Thiru. Vinod Kumar, Advocate
1) TANGEDCO and three other.	Respondents
Hearing dated: ODAILY ORE Counsel for both side were present are	<u>DER</u>
is adjourned at the request of both parties.	
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member	(Sd) (S. Nagalsamy) Member
/ True Copy /	
	Secretary Tamil Nadu Electricity

PRESENT:-	
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	Member
D.R.P.No. 3	of 2014
M/s.Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus	Petitioner Thiru.Seshadri, Advocate
The Director Operation TANTRANSCO and two other.	Respondents
<u>Hearing dated :</u>	19-2-2014
DAILY OR	<u>DER</u>
Counsel for both side were present a	and prayed for adjournment. The case
is adjourned at the request of both parties.	
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member	(Sd) (S. Nagalsamy) Member
/ True Copy /	Secretary
	Tamil Nadu Electricity

PRESENT:-	
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	Member
D.R.P.N	o. 2 of 2014
M/s.Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd	
Versus	Thiru.Seshadri, Advocate
The Director Operation TANTRANSCO and two other.	Respondents
	red : 19-2-2014 ORDER
Counsel for both side were prese	ent and prayed for adjournment. The case
is adjourned at the request of both parti-	es.
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member	(Sd) (S. Nagalsamy) Member
/ True Cop	
	Secretary Tamil Nadu Electricity

PRESENT:-	<u> </u>
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	Member
D.R.P.N	o. 1 of 2014
M/s.Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Lt	
Versus	Thiru.Seshadri, Advocate
The Director Operation TANTRANSCO and two other.	Respondents
<u>Hearing da</u>	ted : 19-2-2014
DAIL	Y ORDER
Counsel for both side were pres	ent and prayed for adjournment. The case
is adjourned at the request of both part	ies.
(Sd) (G.Rajagopal) Member	(Sd) (S. Nagalsamy) Member
/ True Cop	
	Secretary Tamil Nadu Electricity

(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. 4 of 2013

Electro Automotive Madras Private Ltd., Petitioner

Versus

1) Thiru.N.Ravichandran and another. Respondent

Hearing dated : 19-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

The petitioner Thiru R. Venkataraman was not present and the respondent No. 2 Thiru N. Ravichandran, ADE construction, Adyar did not turn up. The respondent No. 1 Thiru N. Azhagarsami, AEE Enforcement Chennai EDC South has appeared before the Commission and explained the mode of operation of the enforcement wing and the detection of theft in this particular case. He presented that the concerned service was connected in 1980 in the name of Alpha Mega Hydro works and the present consumer namely Electro Automotive Madras Pvt Ltd is functioning in the premises for the last 10 years. The original tariff under LT III B continues even after the industry usage of this energy is changed from industry to commercial. The present consumer uses this energy for the multibrand premium car service station and it comes under the commercial tariff. On a specific question whether any action has been taken against the field officials for the failure to detect this mis-classification of the tariff during the last 10 years, the respondent replied in negative. He also replied that no one has been booked under Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003. He has been directed to submit the following:-

1) The Mandatory inspection reports of AE, AEE, EE and SE of the concerned section/Division of the circle for last 3 year and the records about the tariff of the

assessors who had taken the meter reading during the last 3 years;

2) Whether any mention about the misclassification of the tariff, was made in

the above inspection reports;

3) The similar cases detected on the same day by the same enforcement

team.

4) The justification for concluding this case as theft, 5 number of cases

detected by this team for the last 3 years as theft under Section 135 and cases

booked under Section 126 as misclassification of the tariff.

The respondent shall submit the records as well as the other relevant

supporting facts to establish his case. The respondent No.1 is directed to submit

the above information within 4 weeks.

The territorial AEE Thiru N. Ravichandran and the concerned Executive

Engineer and Superintending Engineer are to be summoned in the next hearing.

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

Member

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission