

**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. 24 of 2011**

Terra Energy Ltd., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Versus

TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the subject matter in the High Court with regard to B.P.No.93 dated 16-5-2000 is different. He filed the rejoinder. Thiru. N.C.Ramesh, Senior Counsel appeared for the respondents. He filed the type set of papers and stated that if there was a need, he would file the reply to the rejoinder. The petition is admitted. The case shall be listed for final arguments.

(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. 25 of 2011**

Terra Energy Ltd., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the subject matter in the High Court with regard to B.P.No.93 dated 16-5-2000 is different. He filed the rejoinder. Thiru. N.C.Ramesh, Senior Counsel appeared for the respondents. He filed the type set of papers and stated that if there was a need, he would file the reply to the rejoinder. The petition is admitted. The case shall be listed for final arguments.

(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 2011**

Shree Ambika Sugars Ltd., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the subject matter in the High Court with regard to B.P.No.93 dated 16-5-2000 is different. He filed the rejoinder. Thiru. N.C.Ramesh, Senior Counsel appeared for the respondents. He filed the type set of papers and stated that if there was a need, he would file the reply to the rejoinder. The petition is admitted. The case shall be listed for final arguments.

(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 2011**

Shree Ambika Sugars Ltd., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner stated that the subject matter in the High Court with regard to B.P.No.93 dated 16-5-2000 is different. He filed the rejoinder. Thiru. N.C.Ramesh, Senior Counsel appeared for the respondents. He filed the type set of papers and stated that if there was a need, he would file the reply to the rejoinder. The petition is admitted. The case shall be listed for final arguments.

(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**

Sai Regency Power Corp. Pvt. Ltd., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Manoharan, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO and two others. .... Respondents

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner prayed for adjournment as his senior is not available. 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  
TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the respondents argued that the petition is in the nature of challenging the Commission's Tariff Order 2012. The counsel for the petitioner argued that the Tariff order 2013 specifically mentioned that the petitioner's generation is outside the scope of the merit order. The issue of provisions of power purchase agreement and section 32 of the Electricity Act, 2003 prescribed clearly the functions of SLDC. Issues are to be examined in detail. The petitions are admitted. The respondents shall 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 2012**

Madurai Power Corporation Pvt. Ltd., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the respondents argued that the petition is in the nature of challenging the Commission's Tariff Order 2012. The counsel for the petitioner argued that the Tariff order 2013 specifically mentioned that the petitioner's generation is outside the scope of the merit order. The issue of provisions of power purchase agreement and section 32 of the Electricity Act, 2003 prescribed clearly the functions of SLDC. Issues are to be examined in detail. The petitions are admitted. The respondents shall 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**

**M.P. No. 4 of 2012**

Indian Wind Power Association ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
Nil ..... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The State Load Dispatch Centre was directed to submit the status report for 2011-12 and as on today. Counsel for the petitioner argued that the inability to comply with the RPO obligations for the year ended March 2012 was due to implementation of the R&C measures in the state. SLDC is directed to submit the status report within two weeks and list the case thereafter.

(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**

**M.P. No. 5 of 2012**

Indian Wind Power Association ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsel for both side were present and presented the case. The following details are to be submitted by the petitioner:-

- 1) The installed capacity and the quantum of wind energy generated month wise;
- 2) The sanctioned load.
- 3) Energy purchased from power exchange and CPP's
- 4) Energy purchased from he third parties; and
- 5) Total energy consumed every month and the balance left over in each month for the period from 1-4-2011 to 31-3-2012 and 1-4-2012 to 31-3-2013.

These information shall be submitted by all the members of the associations. The judgment of this case shall be applicable only for those members who submit these details.

The details of load shedding month wise and circle wise is to be submitted to the Commission by the TANGEDCO.

All these details shall be submitted within four 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**

**M.P. No. 7 of 2012**

The Southern India Mills Assn., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsel for both side were present and presented the case. The following details are to be submitted by the petitioner:-

- 1) The installed capacity and the quantum of wind energy generated month wise;
- 2) The sanctioned load.
- 3) Energy purchased from power exchange and CPP's
- 4) Energy purchased from he third parties; and
- 5) Total energy consumed every month and the balance left over in each month for the period from 1-4-2011 to 31-3-2012 and 1-4-2012 to 31-3-2013.

These information shall be submitted by all the members of the associations. The judgment of this case shall be applicable only for those members who submit these details.

The details of load shedding month wise and circle wise is to be submitted to the Commission by the TANGEDCO.

All these details shall be submitted within four 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**

**M.P. No. 3 of 2013**

The Southern India Mills Assn., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. N.L.Rajah, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsel for both side were present and presented the case. The following details are to be submitted by the petitioner:-

- 1) The installed capacity and the quantum of wind energy generated month wise;
- 2) The sanctioned load.
- 3) Energy purchased from power exchange and CPP's
- 4) Energy purchased from he third parties; and
- 5) Total energy consumed every month and the balance left over in each month for the period from 1-4-2011 to 31-3-2012 and 1-4-2012 to 31-3-2013.

These information shall be submitted by all the members of the associations. The judgment of this case shall be applicable only for those members who submit these details.

The details of load shedding month wise and circle wise is to be submitted to the Commission by the TANGEDCO.

All these details shall be submitted within four 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**

**M.P. No. 6 of 2013**

Indian Wind Power Association ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsel for both side were present and presented the case. The following details are to be submitted by the petitioner:-

- 1) The installed capacity and the quantum of wind energy generated month wise;
- 2) The sanctioned load.
- 3) Energy purchased from power exchange and CPP's
- 4) Energy purchased from he third parties; and
- 5) Total energy consumed every month and the balance left over in each month for the period from 1-4-2011 to 31-3-2012 and 1-4-2012 to 31-3-2013.

These information shall be submitted by all the members of the associations. The judgment of this case shall be applicable only for those members who submit these details.

The details of load shedding month wise and circle wise is to be submitted to the Commission by the TANGEDCO.

All these details shall be submitted within four 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**

**M.P. No. 14 of 2012**

1) Indian Wind Power Assn., and two others. .... Petitioners  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO and another. .... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsels for both sides were present. The counsel for the petitioners presented the case. He is directed to submit the details of the backed down wind power for the year 2012-13. SLDC is directed to submit the details of compliance of merit order dispatch during the period 2012-13 and 2013-14 till date and date wise details for August 2012 and August 2013. All these similar cases are to be clubbed together and shall be listed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of March. Both the parties are directed to submit the details within a week.

(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

**M.P. No. 34 of 2012**

Brakes India Ltd., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO ..... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsels for both sides were present. Both the counsels sought for adjournment. The case is adjourned at the request of both the parties.

(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. 5 of 2012**

M/s. SEPC Power Pvt. Ltd., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate  
Versus  
TANGEDCO ..... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 26-2-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

Counsels for both sides were present. In the last hearing dated 12-2-2013, the Commission ordered both the parties to freeze the capital cost at Rs.5.39 crores MW at the exchange rate indicated in the addendum to the PPA. The counsel for the petitioner confirmed that the pending case with the high court was withdrawn and the copies have been submitted. The counsel for the respondent prayed adjournment for four weeks. The time prayed for is granted.

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

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

/ True Copy /

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**