

**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. 3 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 6 of 2014**

Anu Cashews  
Archana Aradhana Theatre Building  
No.XVI/463, Parameshwar Nagar  
Quilon – 691 001.

..... 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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 4 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 7 of 2014**

Binaguri Tea Company Pvt.Ltd  
238A, A.J.C. Bose Road, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor,  
Kolkata.

..... 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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 5 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 8 of 2014**

India Fashions Ltd.  
A/2, 369, Shah & Nahar Indl Estate  
Lower Parel, Mumbai – 13.

..... 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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 6 of 2013**

**in**

**D.R.P.No. 9 of 2014**

Savita Oil Technologies Limited  
66/67, nariman Bhavan,  
Nariman Point,  
Mumbai- 400 021.

..... **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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 7 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 10 of 2014**

M.Babanna  
No.129, 7<sup>th</sup> Main,  
5<sup>th</sup> Block, Jayanagar,  
Banglore – 560 041.

..... **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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 8 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 11 of 2014**

P.M.Granite Export Private Limited  
No.129. 7<sup>th</sup> Main,  
5<sup>th</sup> Block, Jayanagar,  
Banglore – 560 041.

..... 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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 9 of 2013**

**D.R.P.No. 12 of 2014**

M/s.Spero Power Private Limited  
12/1, Bashyam Basheer Ahmeed Street,  
Alwarpet, Chennai- 600 018.

..... 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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 10 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 13 of 2014**

Scientific Mes-Technik Pvt. Ltd.  
B-14, Industrial Estate,  
Pologround, Indore- 452 015  
Madhya Pradesh, India.

..... **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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 11 of 2013**

**in**

**D.R.P.No. 14 of 2014**

M/s.Elveety Industrial Pvt. Ltd.

M-16, Industrial Estate,

Gokul Nagar,

Hubli- 580 030.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 12 of 2013**

**in**

**D.R.P.No. 15 of 2014**

Sri Kumarswamy Mineral export Pvt.ltd.

# 35,2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Park Enclave,

Tuskar Town, Shivajinagar,

Banglore- 560 051.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 13 of 2013**

**in**

**D.R.P.No. 16 of 2014**

Orange County Resorts and Hotals Ltd.  
II Floor, St.Patricks Business Complex,  
21 Museum Road, Banglore – 560 025.  
Versus

.....Petitioner  
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate

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

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

**Hearing dated : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 14 of 2013**

**in**

**D.R.P.No. 17 of 2014**

Zuri hotals & Resorts Private Limited

The Zuri varca, goa White Sands

Resorts & Casino,

Varca beach , varca, Salcete,

Goa- 403 721.s

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 15 of 2013**

**in**

**D.R.P.No. 18 of 2014**

Om Sakthi Wind Power Private Limited  
31/11, Rajaji Street, West Saidapet,  
Chennai- 600 015.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 16 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 19 of 2014**

Sree Rayalaseema Hi Strength Hypo Ltd.  
Gondiparla – 518 004.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 17 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 20 of 2014**

Dr. S. Krishnakumar  
Krishna Kumar Orthopaedic Hospital and  
Institute of Orthopaedics Pvt. Ltd.,  
15/82E, Near Overbridge  
Parvathipuram, Nagercoil.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 18 of 2013**

**in**

**D.R.P.No. 21 of 2014**

Maris Spinners Ltd.,  
11, Cathedral Road, Chennai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 19 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 22 of 2014**

Texonic Instruments  
No.9, Athipattan Street  
Mount Road, Chennai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 20 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 23 of 2014**

Maris Hotels and Theatres Pvt. Ltd.,  
11, Cathedral Road, Chennai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 21 of 2013**

**in**

**D.R.P.No. 24 of 2014**

Bhabani Pigments Pvt. Ltd.,  
A-30/B1, Mohan Cooperative  
Industrial Area, New Delhi.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 22 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 25 of 2014**

Mr. R. Madan Mohan Rao  
Executive Director  
6-2-1012, TGV Mansion  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Khairathabad  
Hyderabad.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 23 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 26 of 2014**

Powerica Ltd.,  
9<sup>th</sup> Floor, Bakhtawar  
Nariman Point, Mumbai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 24 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 27 of 2014**

Devi Sea Foods Ltd.,  
D.No.9-14-8/1, C.B.M. Compound  
Visakapattanam.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 25 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 28 of 2014**

VVD and Sons Pvt. Ltd.,  
182, Palayamkottai Road  
Tuticorin.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 26 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 29 of 2014**

Nalco Metal Products Ltd.,  
89, Maravankulam, Tirumangalam  
Madurai District.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 27 of 2013  
in  
D.R.P.No. 30 of 2014

TCP Ltd.,  
TCP Sapthagiri Bhawan  
No.4, Karpagambal Nagar\  
Mylapore, Chennai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 28 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 31 of 2014**

Hindustan Platinum Pvt. Ltd.,  
C-22, TTC Industrial Area  
Pawane, Navi Mumbai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 29 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 32 of 2014**

The Metal Powder Company Ltd.,  
No.89, Maravankulam, Tirumangalam.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 30 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 33 of 2014**

M/s. Spike Power Protection  
System and Technologies  
No.66, New Avadi Road  
Kilpauk, Chennai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 31 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 34 of 2014**

M/s. Natesan Synchrocones pvt. Ltd.,  
54/4, Paulwels Road  
Sripuram Colony  
St. Thomas Mount, Chennai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 32 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 35 of 2014**

TCP Ltd.,  
TCP Sapthagiri Bhawan  
No.4, Karpagambal Nagar,  
Mylapore, Chennai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 33 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 36 of 2014**

Mangalam Fashions Ltd.,  
22, Camac Street, Kolkata.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 34 of 2013  
in  
D.R.P.No. 37 of 2014

Woodside Fashions Ltd.,  
22, Camac Street, Kolkata.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 35 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 38 of 2014**

M/s. Natesan Precision Components  
Private Ltd.,

Triveni Apartments  
No.6, First Cross Road  
Kasturba Nagar, Adyar, Chennai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 36 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 39 of 2014**

M/s. Tamilnadu Gears and Shafts  
Corporation  
Triveni Apartments  
No.6, First Cross Road  
Kasturba Nagar, Adyar, Chennai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 37 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 40 of 2014**

Nupower Renewables Ltd.,  
618, Maker Chambers V  
Nariman point, Mumbai.

.....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 : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

D.R.P.No.6 of 2014 to D.R.P.No.40 of 2014 are taken up together for admission. Thirumathi.Revathy M Kannan, the Junior counsel of Thiru.Rahul Balaji represented the petitioner. Heard the arguments. The petitions are admitted. Both parties submitted that they propose to negotiate the issue for finding the possible settlement and prayed that the matter may be adjourned to enable them to negotiate. Considering the submission of both parties, the Commission grants 60 days time. The conclusion, if any, reached by the parties in the negotiation shall be reported to the Commission.

(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.R.C.No. 38 of 2013**  
**in**  
**D.R.P.No. 41 of 2013**

Rajapalayam Mills Ltd.,  
Post Box No.1, P.A.C.Ramasamy Raja Salai  
Rajapalayam, Virudhunagar District.

.....Petitioner  
Thiru. N.L. Rajah, Advocate

Versus

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

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

**Hearing dated : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner submitted that an error has crept in as to the date of effect of permitting the third party purchase upto the sanctioned demand and it needs to be rectified. The standing counsel for the respondent and the Chief Financial Controller, Revenue, TANGEDCO informed that the order pertains only to the third party purchase. Heard the arguments. 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

**M.P.No. 15 of 2013**

Kaveri Gas Power Ltd.,

.....Petitioner

Thiru. Vinod Kumar, Advocate

Versus

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

..... Respondents

Thiru. P.H. Vinod Pandian,  
Standing Counsel

**Hearing dated : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the respondent has filed the counter prior to the filing of additional affidavit and it does not meet the contention in the additional affidavit. The counsel for the respondent prayed one week time for filing the additional counter. The respondents were directed to file the same within one week. The case shall be listed 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

**D.R.P.No. 22 of 2013**

Shambu Vengu Spinning Mills pvt. Ltd., .....Petitioner  
Thiru. Sivanandam, Advocate  
Versus

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

**Hearing dated : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner prayed four weeks time for filing the rejoinder.  
The time prayed for 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

**D.R.P.No. 28 of 2013**

Sri Venkitalakshmi Textiles .....Petitioner  
Thiru. R.S.Pandiyaraj, Advocate  
Versus

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

**Hearing dated : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner prayed four weeks time for filing the rejoinder.  
The time prayed for 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

**D.R.P.No. 29 of 2013**

M/s.Angalakshmi Spinning Mills, .....Petitioner  
Thiru. Sivanandam, Advocate  
Versus

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

**Hearing dated : 28-4-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner prayed four weeks time for filing the rejoinder.  
The time prayed for is granted.

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

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

/ True Copy /

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