

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**  
**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru. S. Akshayakumar** .... **Chairman**

**Thiru. S.Nagalsamy** .... **Member**

**Thiru. G.Rajagopal** .... **Member**

**S.M.P.No. 3 of 2014**

Coimbatore Consumer Cause ..... Petitioner

Versus

1) The CE, Commercial TANGEDCO and three others. .... Respondents

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The petitioner and the SE (North), (South) and (Metro) of Coimbatore Electricity Distribution Circles and CE, Commercial, TANGEDCO were present. The petitioner submitted that more than ten thousand consumers are affected due to undue delay in effecting service connection and nearly Rs.1.4 crores are to be paid as compensation in Coimbatore region alone. He also submitted that there was no improvement in effecting new service connections within 30 days and the Licensee continued to violate the standard of performance norms prescribed by the Commission. The petitioner further submitted that the Order of the Commission issued in 2007 to pay compensation to the affected consumers and to report the compliance to the Commission in August 2007 was not obeyed by the Licensee till date. In reply, the CE, Commercial, TANGEDCO has submitted that now sufficient number of meters are made available and there is no problem in effecting new service connections. For a question from the Commission as to why compensation was not made automatically, the CE, Commercial stated that whenever compensation was claimed it was paid to the individual consumers and payment of automatic compensation was not resorted to since the Commission itself has floated a draft amendment to its regulation. The Commission questioned the CE, Commercial as to why the orders of the Commission made in 2007 was not complied till 2014. The Chief Engineer replied that Commission order could not be given effect due to stringent financial problem and staff shortage faced by TANGEDCO. The standing counsel for TANGEDCO intervened and prayed for 15 days time to furnish further details in this regard to the Commission. Accordingly, 15 days time is granted to the TANGEDCO and the matter is adjourned.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
**Chairman**

/ 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. Akshayakumar	.... Chairman
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	.... Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	.... Member

**S.M.P.No. 4 of 2014**

S.R.P.Construction Company	..... Petitioner
Versus	
1) AEE, Pudupalayam, Gadilam	
2)The SE,Cuddalore EDC	..... Respondents

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The representative of S.R.P.Construction Company and the AEE, Pudupalayam and the SE, Cuddalore EDC were present. During the hearing the petitioner submitted that the assessment on account of alleged theft of energy has since been revised by the AEE as the difference on account of incorrect application of tariff to the concerned service connection and that he has paid the difference in amount and has no grievance any more. Therefore, the S.M.P. is closed.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ 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. Akshayakumar	.... Chairman
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	.... Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	.... Member

**D.R.P.No. 26 of 2013**

M/s.Sai Regency Power Corporation Pvt. Ltd.,	..... Petitioner
	Thiru Manoharan, Advocate

Versus

TANGEDCO two others.	..... Respondents
----------------------	-------------------

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner Thiru E.Manoharan submitted that the petitioner company is a captive generator/open access customer. The respondents withheld sums due to the petitioner company on account of composite scheduling charges. The respondents did this though the scheduling is controlled by SLDC. The petitioner's counsel contended that the first two respondents namely TANGEDCO and TANTRANSCO have no jurisdiction in the matter and the charges are withheld due to misinterpretation of the certain provisions need to be refunded. After hearing, the petition is admitted and the respondents directed to file the counter within 4 weeks.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ 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. Akshayakumar .... Chairman

Thiru. S.Nagalsamy .... Member

Thiru. G.Rajagopal .... Member

**I.A.No.1 of 2014 in P.P.A.P.No. 4 of 2014**

IOT Mabagas Ltd., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Versus

TANGEDCO ..... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner Thiru Rahul Balaji submitted that the petitioner's project is a joint venture of IOC and the petitioner company and based on Biogas derived from chicken waste. He submitted that the Biomass Tariff order of the Commission is not applicable to the petitioner company since the petitioner is a Biogas based generator and prayed that project specific tariff fixation may be made. After hearing the counsel the petition is admitted and notice ordered to the TANGEDCO.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ 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. Akshayakumar** .... **Chairman**

**Thiru. S.Nagalsamy** .... **Member**

**Thiru. G.Rajagopal** .... **Member**

**M.P.No. 30 of 2014**

Cuddalore Powergen Corporation Ltd., ..... Petitioner  
Thiru Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Versus

TANGEDCO ..... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner Thiru Rahul Balaji submitted that the PPA already executed is a protected PPA. Delay in the project has been considered earlier by the Commission twice. Notwithstanding TANGEDCO refusal to accept the power from the project, the Commission still has jurisdiction since in law each time a petition is filed the Commission needs to exercise its jurisdiction and test its tenability. The Counsel submitted that at present 696 acres of land has already been acquired and still 107 acres need to be acquired. The petitioner is exploring the possibility of locating the project within the already acquired land without awaiting further progress in the acquisition of land. At this stage, the counsel for M/s.Chemplast Sanmar intervened and submitted that the company wants to intervene in this petition as a third party since there are allegation against the company concerning the delay of the project. The counsel said that the High Court of Madras also has given directions in this matter. The petitioner counsel submitted that there is no averment concerning the proposed intervener. The Commission however directed the petitioner to furnish copies of the petition to the intervener to check and verify the position. The case is adjourned for the response of TANGEDCO.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
**Chairman**

/ 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. Akshayakumar	.... Chairman
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	.... Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	.... Member
TANGEDCO	..... Petitioner
Nil	..... Respondent

Versus

**M.P.No. 32 of 2014**

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The Chief Engineer/Gas Turbine represented the matter for TANGEDCO. He submitted that the power has been generated under unavoidable and emergency circumstances from Basin Bridge Gas Plant and prayed that the same may be ratified. The Commission asked about the time limit for submission of such petition for approval. The CE mentioned that it has to be got approved from TNERC before actually generating and in emergency condition within 7 days of generation of power. The petitioner also replied that it has been prayed in the petition to relax the time limit and ratify the generation. The Commission questioned the necessity to file this petition after the end of the year 2013-14. The Commission directed the TANGEDCO to file proper justification for the delay. The counsel for the petitioner prayed time to file the additional details. Time is granted and the case is adjourned.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ 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. Akshayakumar	.... Chairman
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	.... Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	.... Member

**D.R.P.No. 47 of 2014**

White House	..... Petitioner
	Thiru Rahul Balaji, Advocate
	Versus
1) TANGEDCO and another.	..... Respondents

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner Thiru Rahul Balaji submitted that this is a case where interest on delayed payment for the power purchased is prayed and it is similar to the 40 cases already referred to respondents for negotiation. However, he submitted that in 2 of the 40 cases already in negotiation the payment of 6% interest was accepted and even that amount has not been paid till date. After hearing, the Commission adjourned the case to enable the counsel for the respondents to get further instructions and submit to the Commission.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ 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. Akshayakumar	.... Chairman
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	.... Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	.... Member

**S.M.P.No. 2 of 2012**

TANGEDCO	Versus	..... Petitioner
1) Thiru D.R.Subbaian		
2) Thiru Syed Tajudeen Madani		..... Respondents

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent were present. The counsel for the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent submitted that his client has an 'Auditor office' which is assessed under commercial tariff instead of domestic tariff. He elaborately argued the matter presenting citations of Supreme Court and some High Courts. The 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent submitted that he has an 'Advocate Office' and the service connection to the office is assessed under commercial tariff. He submitted that his counsel is out of station and the matter may be adjourned as part-heard. The case is adjourned for further hearing on behalf of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ 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. Akshayakumar	.... Chairman
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	.... Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	.... Member

**M.P.No. 20 of 2014**

The Chief Engineer, MTS  
TANGEDCO

..... Petitioner

Versus

Nil

..... Respondent

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The Chief Engineer, Mechanical Thermal Power Station represented for the petitioner. He submitted that the delay in filing the petition was due to certain internal problem as to who should file the application whether CE, ETPS or CE, MTS. The Commission felt it is belated application without furnishing justifiable reason. TANGEDCO prayed time to file the reasons for justifying the delay. The case is adjourned.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ 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. Akshayakumar	.... Chairman
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	.... Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	.... Member

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

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

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the details regarding generation of power as well as consumption were furnished to the TANGEDCO as directed by the Commission in the last hearing. The Commission observed that there are some discrepancies in the details furnished such as negative banking. However, the Commission directed the TANGEDCO to peruse the details furnished by the petitioner and then come up to the Commission with its response.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ 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. Akshayakumar	.... Chairman
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.	..... Respondents

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the details regarding generation of power as well as consumption were furnished to the TANGEDCO as directed by the Commission in the last hearing. The Commission observed that there are some discrepancies in the details furnished such as negative banking. However, the Commission directed the TANGEDCO to peruse the details furnished by the petitioner and then come up to the Commission with its response.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ 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. Akshayakumar	.... Chairman
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.	..... Respondents

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the generator is not able to utilize the entire energy within the banking period at present provided. They further submitted that they are asking for the relief which has been granted by the Commission in previous year. The counsel also submitted that the granting of relief prayed for now is technically feasible and that the petitioner will furnish further details during the arguments to justify their case. The case is adjourned.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ 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. Akshayakumar .... Chairman

Thiru. S.Nagalsamy .... Member

Thiru. G.Rajagopal .... Member

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

The Southern India Mills Association

..... Petitioner

Thiru N.L.Rajah, Advocate

Versus

TANGEDCO and another.

..... Respondents

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the generator is not able to utilize the entire energy within the banking period at present provided. They further submitted that they are asking for the relief which has been granted by the Commission in previous year. The counsel also submitted that the granting of relief prayed for now is technically feasible and that the petitioner will furnish further details during the arguments to justify their case. The case is adjourned.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

**/ 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. Akshayakumar	.... Chairman
Thiru. S.Nagalsamy	.... Member
Thiru. G.Rajagopal	.... Member

**D.R.P.No. 24 of 2013**

M/s.Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries (P) Ltd.,	..... Petitioner
	Thiru Rahul Balaji, Advocate
Versus	
TANGEDCO and four others.	..... Respondents

**Hearing dated : 23-6-2014**

**DAILY ORDER**

The counsel for the petitioner Thiru Rahul Balaji and the standing counsel for the TANGEDCO were present. When the Commission took up the matter for hearing the standing counsel for the respondents prayed for adjournment. The case is adjourned at the request of the respondents.

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

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

(Sd.....)  
**(S.Akshayakumar)**  
Chairman

/ True Copy /

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