

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**

I.A.No.1 of 2014 in D.R.P. No. 44 of 2014

M/s. Mirra and Mirra Industries Petitioner
Thiru. Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Versus

TANGEDCO and four others. Respondents

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner presented the case and sought for interim relief to stay the operation of CFC letter dated 14-9-2012. The counsel for the respondents argued that the practice is based on the letter issued on 11-12-2007. However, High Court of Madras in a similar matter in M.P.No.2 and 3 of 2013 in W.P.No. 33439 of 2013, in its interim order dated 9-12-2013 has stayed the operation of the said letter issued by CFC in September 2012 on condition that the petitioner therein remits the undisputed current consumption charges in respect of the concerned HTSC. Taking similar view an interim stay of CFC's letter is granted to the petitioner till the case is disposed off. All similar cases shall be clubbed and listed for hearing.

(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 2012

International Institute of Bio Technology &
Toxicology

..... Petitioner
Thiru. Vinod Kumar, Advocate

Versus

TANGEDCO

..... Respondent

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner filed the rejoinder and prayed for adjournment of the case. 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. 24 of 2012

OPG Energy Pvt. Ltd., Petitioner
Thiru. Vinod Kumar, Advocate

Versus

TANGEDCO Respondent

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. Heard the arguments of both sides.

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. 43 of 2012

Tamil Nadu Electricity Consumer Association Petitioner
Thiru. N.L.Rajah, Advocate

Versus

TANGEDCO Respondent

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. This case is clubbed with M.P.No. 44 of 2012 and M.P.No.7 of 2013. During the arguments petitioner insisted the need for forming a committee to go into the details of the load shedding prevailing in Maharashtra. There has been considerable improvement in the supply of power resulting in NIL / Minimum load shedding now in the state consequent to the new projects getting commissioned one by one. The Commission directs the Secretary, TNERC to constitute a Committee consisting members of the representatives from TANGEDCO, SLDC, Consumers and one representative each from the Tamil Nadu Electricity Consumer Association and Coimbatore District Small Scale Industries Association. The whole exercise to be completed in two weeks time and 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**

M.P. No. 7 of 2013

Coimbatore District Small Scale Industries Association **Petitioner**

Versus

TANGEDCO **Respondent**

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. This case is clubbed with M.P.No. 44 of 2012 and M.P.No.43 of 2012. During the arguments petitioner insisted the need for forming a committee to go into the details of the load shedding prevailing in Maharashtra. There has been considerable improvement in the supply of power resulting in NIL / Minimum load shedding now in the state consequent to the new projects getting commissioned one by one. The Commission directs the Secretary, TNERC to constitute a Committee consisting members of the representatives from TANGEDCO, SLDC, Consumers and one representative each from the Tamil Nadu Electricity Consumer Association and Coimbatore District Small Scale Industries Association. The whole exercise to be completed in two weeks time and 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**

M.P. No. 44 of 2012

TANGEDCO Petitioner

Versus

Nil Respondent

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. This case is clubbed with M.P.No. 43 of 2012 and M.P.No.7 of 2013. During the arguments petitioner insisted the need for forming a committee to go into the details of the load shedding prevailing in Maharashtra. There has been considerable improvement in the supply of power resulting in NIL / Minimum load shedding now in the state consequent to the new projects getting commissioned one by one. The Commission directs the Secretary, TNERC to constitute a Committee consisting members of the representatives from TANGEDCO, SLDC, Consumers and one representative each from the Tamil Nadu Electricity Consumer Association and Coimbatore District Small Scale Industries Association. The whole exercise to be completed in two weeks time and 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

P.P.A.P. No. 9 of 2012

Ind-barath Thermal Power Ltd., Petitioner
Thiru. Rahul balaji, Advocate

Versus

1) TANGEDCO and another. Respondent

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. Similar cases were already heard and orders reserved. The case is adjourned for two weeks and all similar cases pending in the Commission shall be listed on a particular day after two 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. 49 of 2012

DCW Ltd., Petitioner

Versus

1) TANGEDCO and two others. Respondents

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner submitted the rejoinder affidavit on points raised in the counter affidavit. Since the rejoinder is submitted today, the counsel for the respondent pleaded for time. Time is allowed. The case shall be listed after 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

D.R.P. No. 28 of 2012

1)Green Infra Wind Power Projects Ltd.,
and two others. Petitioners
Thiru.Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Versus

1) TANGEDCO and two others. Respondents

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for both sides prayed to club this case along with M.P.No.14 of 2012 and other transferred writ petitions. These cases are clubbed together and shall be listed together.

(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.A.P.No.2 of 2007 & M.A.P. No. 1 of 2012

TANGEDCO	Petitioner
	Versus	
Samalpatti power Company Pvt. Ltd.,	Respondent
		Thiru.Rahul Balaji, Advocate
	and	
Samalpatti power Company Pvt. Ltd.,	Petitioner
		Thiru.Rahul Balaji, Advocate
	Versus	
TANGEDCO	Respondent

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner presented the case. Thiru. Yasod Vardhan, Senior Advocate appeared for TANGEDCO. While arguing the case, he mentioned about the difference in the understanding of the details regarding the exchange rate regulation and debt equity ratio. It was advised to the counsels of both the petitioner and the respondent to have one more meeting and try to resolve the issues which are still in dispute. The matter 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

M.A.P. No. 3 of 2007

TANGEDCO	Petitioner
	Versus	
Madurai Power Corporation pvt. Ltd.,	Respondent
		Thiru.Rahul Balaji, Advocate

Hearing dated : 27-2-2014

DAILY ORDER

Counsel for both side were present. The counsel for the petitioner presented the case. Thiru. Yasod Vardhan, Senior Advocate appeared for TANGEDCO. While arguing the case, he mentioned about the difference in the understanding of the details regarding the exchange rate regulation and debt equity ratio. It was advised to the counsels of both the petitioner and the respondent to have one more meeting and try to resolve the issues which are still in dispute. The matter shall be listed thereafter.

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

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

/ True Copy /

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission