

No. 23/2022 dated: 11-03-2022

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST-I****Cases posted for 15-03-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

| Sl. No | Case No. | Name of the Parties | Counsel | Remarks |
|--------|----------------------|---|--|---|
| 1 | M.P.No.4 of 2022 | CE/PPP, TANGEDCO | Adv.M.Gopinathan | For order |
| 2 | D.R.P.No.20 of 2021 | M/s.Bhabani Pigments Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/NCES (iv) SE/Tiruppur EDC | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan | For order |
| 3 | D.R.P.No.2 of 2022 | M/s.GMR Energy Trading Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) Director/Finance (iii) CFC/Palladam EDC (iv) SE/Tirunelveli EDC | Adv.Apoorva Misra Adv.M.Gopinathan | For order |
| 4 | P.P.A.P.No.1 of 2022 | CE/PPP, TANGEDCO | Adv.M.Gopinathan | To approve adoption of tariff at Rs.4.82 per unit for 325 MW RTC power and Rs.4.84 per unit for 150 MW RTC power at TANTRANSCO periphery for the period from 1.3.2022 to 31.3.2022 under Tender No.17 of 2021 and also for approval for the procurement of 353.4 MU for the period from 1.3.2022 to 31.3.2022. For admission. |
| 5 | M.P.No.8 of 2022 | M/s.Evita Constructions Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Chengalpet EDC (iii) CE/Distn./Chennai South (iv) CE/Commercial | M/s.Stephen & Stephen Advocates Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan | To invoke section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against the distribution officials for non-compliance of the order of Electricity Ombudsman and also to ensure strict compliance of the order passed by the TNEO in A.P.No.58 of 2021 dated 19.1.2022. For admission. |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---|---|---|
| 6 | M.P.No.9 of 2022 | CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO | Adv.M.Gopinathan | To approve Capital Investment Plant (CIP) for each year of the Multi Year Tariff control period of FY 2022-23, FY 2023-24, FY 2024-25 i.r.o. generation, projects and distribution. For admission. |
| 7 | M.P.No.10 of 2022 | CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO | Adv.M.Gopinathan | To modify the order in M.P.No.18 of 2019 dated 12.10.2021 in so far as para-5.50 (k). For admission. |
| 8 | M.P.No.47 of 2021 | M/s.T.R.K.Textile India Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Palladam EDC | Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan | Direct the respondents to revise the EWA by ordering to expunge the inconsistent portions of the EWA and to execute a fresh EWA and also to accept the invoices of the petitioner whenever raised for the encashment of the unutilised Solar Energy available at the account of the petitioner, for its 75% of the value and to effect the payment. For counter. |
| 9 | M.P.No.3 of 2022 | M/s.SEPC Power Private Limited Versus CMD/TANGEDCO | Adv.Rahul Balaji AGP.Richardson Wilson | Permit the petitioner to terminate the Coal Supply and Transportation Agreement (CSTA) dt.9.2.2018 and to execute a FSA with CIL / any domestic coal supplier in order to procure Indian Domestic Coal and consequently remove the ceiling price mechanism and to procure coal from alternate sources and to amend the PPA to incorporate the above changes. For counter. |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------|---|--|---|
| 10 | D.R.P.No.19 of 2021 | M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus CMD/TANGEDCO | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan | Declare that the Change in law events in terms of Article 10 of the PPA dated 12.12.2013 and to determine the correct rate of CVD and other consequential claims for purposes of Change in Law and confirm the correctness and entitlement to the sum of Rs.8,25,91,046/- being the differential working after applying the correct rate towards CVD, Cess and Carrying cost attributable to Change in Law under the PPA. For counter. |
| 11 | D.R.P.No.3 of 2022 | M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO | Adv.Tanya Kapoor Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar | To declare the exorbitant increase in the price of imported coal along with the acute shortage and non-availability of domestic coal, as a Force Majeure event and direct the suspension of transmission charges to be levied under the MTOA agreement until the Force Majeure event ceases and also direct the TANGEDCO not to levy OA charges for the period of Force Majeure continuation and from levying any other charges, costs whatsoever. For counter. |
| 12 | D.R.P.No.4 of 2022 | M/s.Sulochana Cotton Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Palladam EDC | Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan | Direct the respondents to give adjust of 1,28,004 units generated in the petitioner's solar power generator during the period from 01.08.2021 to 28.09.2021 against the petitioner HTSC as per the solar tariff order No.4 of 2014. For counter. |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------|---|--|---|
| 13 | D.R.P.No.5 of 2022 | M/s.Sulochana Cotton Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Palladam EDC | Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan | Direct the respondents to give adjust of 4,93,599 units generated in the petitioner's solar power generator during the period from 01.08.2021 to 28.09.2021 against the petitioner HTSC as per the solar tariff order No.4 of 2014. For counter. |
| 14 | D.R.P.No.6 of 2022 | M/s.Hindustan Textiles Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Dindigul EDC | Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan | Direct the respondents to give adjust of 2,41,920 units generated in the petitioner's solar power generator during the period August 2021 against the petitioner HTSC as per the solar tariff order No.4 of 2014. For counter. |
| 15 | D.R.P.No.9 of 2016 | Vijayalakshmi Marketing Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Edumalpet EDC | Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan | Quash the impugned notices dated 4-8-2014 and 2-12-2014 issued by the 1 st and 2 nd respondents and direct them to give effect to the EWA. For filing consolidated typedset and arguments. |
| 16 | D.R.P.No.11 of 2016 | Orchid Pharma Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC 3) SE, Chengalpattu EDC | Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan | Quash the 1 st respondent demand notice and consequently direct the 2 nd respondent to give adjustment for the unutilized banked energy or encashment of Rs.23.93/- lakhs. For filing consolidated typedset and arguments. |
| 17 | M.P.No.19 of 2021 | M/s.R.S.Yarns and Power Pvt. Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CFC / TANGEDCO | Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan | To issue a clarification, as to whether additional surcharge on wheeling charges are applicable to the OA Consumers having drawal voltage over and above 66 kV, who source electricity from the Third Party Power Generators having injecting voltage over and above 66 kV or not. For arguments. |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------|--|--|--|
| 18 | M.P.No.28 of 2021 | Thiru.B.Balamurali Pollachi Versus (i) SE/Udumalpet EDC (ii) AEE/O&M, Udumalpet EDC, TANGEDCO | Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan | To punish the Respondent, TANGEDCO under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for contravening the T.O.No.1 of 2017 dated 11.7.2017 and non-compliance of the directions issued by this Hon'ble Commission in its order dated 2.3.2021 in M.P.No.4 of 2021. For arguments. |
| 19 | M.P.No.42 of 2021 | M/s.OPG Energy Pvt. Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) AAA Plus Energy Pvt. Limited | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan | To exercise its regulatory powers and clarify that no wheeling charges are payable where a captive consumer is being supplied electricity through a dedicated transmission line and is situated within the same premises as the generating plant. For arguments. |
| 20 | D.R.P.No.8 of 2021 | M/s.NVR Energy Pvt Limited Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) SE/Tuticorin EDC (iv) SLDC / TANTRANSCO | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar | Direct TANGEDCO to modify the JMR statements for the period October 2019 till April 2021 and to refund of Rs.22,96,755/- collected from the petitioner by adopting such methodology including payments against the supplementary bills. For arguments of the respondent. |
| 21 | D.R.P.No.9 of 2021 | M/s.Narbheram Solar TN Pvt Limited Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) SE/Tuticorin EDC (iv) SLDC / TANTRANSCO | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar | Direct TANGEDCO to modify the JMR statements for the period October 2019 till April 2021 and to refund of Rs.27,08,933/- collected from the petitioner by adopting such methodology including payments against the supplementary bills. For arguments of the respondent. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 22 | R.P.No.1 of 2021 in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016 | PTC India Limited Versus (i) MALCO Energy Ltd (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO | Adv.Ravi Kishore Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan | Review the order of the Commission dated 02.03.2021 in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016. For arguments. |
| 23 | R.P.No.5 of 2021 in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016 | CE/PPP, TANGEDCO Versus (i) M/s.MALCO Energy Ltd. (ii) M/s.PTC India Ltd | Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Ravi Kishore | Review the order of the Commission issued in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016 dt.02.03.2021 in the matter of directing the respondents to jointly and severally pay the petitioner at the applicable tariff. For arguments. |
| <u>Batch cases - In the matter of adjustment of lapsed units</u> | | | | |
| 24 | T.A.No.6 of 2022 | Tamil Nadu Power Producers' Association Versus (i) Chairman / TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) Director /operations (iv) SE/Commercial Divn/TANTRANSCO (v) Director/Distribution | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan | W.P.No.15433 of 2020 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. <i>For hearing</i> |
| 25 | T.A.No.7 of 2022 | Kamachi Industries Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/CEDC/North | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan | W.P.No.475 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. <i>For hearing.</i> |
| 26 | T.A.No.8 of 2022 | M/s.ARS Energy Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan | W.P.No.11480 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. <i>For hearing.</i> |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------|---|---|--|
| 27 | T.A.No.9 of 2022 | Suryadev Alloys & Powers Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANGEDCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan | W.P.No.12062 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. For hearing. |
| 28 | T.A.No.10 of 2022 | Tulsyan NEC Limited Versus (i) Ch/TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan | W.P.No.12083 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. For hearing. |
| 29 | T.A.No.11 of 2022 | Kamachi Industries Limited Versus (i) Chairman/TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan | W.P.No.12584 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. For hearing. |
| 30 | T.A.No.12 of 2022 | OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Ch./TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO & Ors. | Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan | W.P.No.15861 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. For hearing. |

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

No.24/2022 dated: 11-03-2022

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
CAUSE LIST- II

Cases posted for 15-03-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)

(After the proceedings of the Cause List-I are over)

CORAM: Thiru. M. Chandrasekar, Hon'ble Chairman
Thiru.K.Venkatasamy, Hon'ble Member (Legal)

| Sl. No | Case No. | Name of the Parties | Counsel | Remarks |
|--------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 1 | D.R.P.No.7 of 2022 | M/s.Arkey Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO | Adv.Anirudh Krishnan Adv.M.Gopinathan | To offset the adverse financial impact on the generating company as a result of operating and maintaining the power plant as per the directions of the GoTN under section 11(1) and determine the price payable for the energy that was injected during the year 2009-10 and 2010-11 into the Tamil Nadu Grid for which payments to the tune of Rs.92.10 crores have not been made by the respondent and direct the 2nd respondent herein to make the said payment to the petitioner herein. For admission. |
| 2 | R.P.No.4 of 2021 in R.A.No.3 of 2020 | CE/PPP, TANGEDCO Versus (i) M/s.Ind-Barath Power Gencom Limited (ii) M/s.MALCO Energy Ltd. | Adv.M.Gopinathan M/s.Shree Law Services for R-1 Adv.Rahul Balaji for R-2 | Review the order of the Commission in R.A.No.3 of 2020 dated 09.02.2021 in the matter of fixing a tariff at the ceiling of Rs.3.79 per unit for the month of June 2011 and Rs.3.81 per unit for the months of July to September 2011. For arguments. |

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission