

No.36/ 2024 dated: 13-06-2024

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION****CAUSE LIST for 18-06-2024 (Forenoon)****(Court Sitting will be held through Virtual & Physical Mode)****Venue: Court Hall of the Commission****Time : 11.00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel / Party	Remarks
1	I.A.No.1 of 2024	CE/GO, TANTRANSCO Ltd Versus M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To condone the delay of 46 days in filing the review petition for reviewing the order dated 12.03.2024 in D.R.P.No.8 of 2023.  For filing counter in I.A.No.1 of 2024.
2	M.P.No.14 of 2024	Thiru.N.Muthukumaar Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC / Revenue (iii) CE/NCES (iv) SE/Tiruppur EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To impose penalty upon the respondents in accordance with section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of the orders of the Commission dated 07.12.2021 in D.R.P.No.12 of 2021 and consequently direct the respondents to make payments of the entire sum as directed in the said orders.  For filing memo of calculations.
<b>Batch cases - In the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power - For filing reply by the petitioner</b>				
3	T.A.No.1 of 2022	M/s.Sundaram Clayton Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates  Adv.Richardson Wilson for R-1 & R-2 Adv.Mahasweta for R-3	W.P.No.25357 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power.

4	T.A.No.2 of 2022	M/s.Sundaram Clayton Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates Adv.Richardson Wilson for R-1 & R-2 Adv.Mahasweta for R-3	W.P.No.25245 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power.
5	T.A.No.3 of 2022	M/s.Sundaram Clayton Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Dharmapuri EDC (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Ltd	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates Adv.Richardson Wilson for R-1 & R-2 Adv.Mahasweta for R-3	W.P.No.25246 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power.
6	T.A.No.4 of 2022	M/s.Lucas TVS Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Chennai EDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates Adv.Richardson Wilson for R-1 & R-2 Adv.Mahasweta for R-3	W.P.No.25247 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power.
7	T.A.No.5 of 2022	M/s.Sundaram Fasteners Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates Adv.Richardson Wilson for R-1 & R-2 Adv.Mahasweta for R-3	W.P.No.25248 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levying penalty on alleged excess drawal of power.
<b>Batch cases - In the matter of adjustment of lapsed units – For filing rejoinder and arguments</b>				
8	D.R.P.No.5 of 2024	M/s.ARS Energy Private Ltd Versus (i) SE/Chennai North EDC, TANGEDCO (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) Chairman / TANTRANSCO (iv) Director (Oprns.), TANTRANSCO Ltd (v) Director(Distn.), TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To quash the impugned demand letter dated 30.1.2024 seeking to levy a sum of Rs.2,71,02,948/- towards "Grid Availability Charges" as well as the audit slips on the basis of which the said impugned demand was issued, as the letter and claims therein are illegal, barred by limitation and have been issued without authority of law.  For rejoinder.

9	T.A.No.7 of 2022	Kamachi Industries Limited Versus (i) Chairman/TANTRANS CO (ii) MD/TANTRANS CO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.475 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of units. For arguments.
10	T.A.No.8 of 2022	M/s.ARS Energy Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANTRANS CO (ii) MD/TANTRANS CO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.11480 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of units. For arguments.
11	T.A.No.9 of 2022	Suryadev Alloys & Powers Pvt. Limited  Versus (i) Chairman / TANGEDC (ii) MD/TANTRANS CO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.12062 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of units. For arguments.
12	T.A.No.10 of 2022	Tulsyan NEC Limited Versus (i) Ch/TANTRANS CO (ii) MD/TANTRANS CO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.12083 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of units. For arguments.
13	T.A.No.11 of 2022	Kamachi Industries Limited Versus (i) Chairman/ TANTRANS CO (ii) MD/TANTRANS CO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.12584 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of units. For arguments.
14	T.A.No.12 of 2022	OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Ch./TANTRANS CO (ii) MD/TANTRANS CO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.15861 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of units. For arguments.

15	D.R.P.No.3 of 2023	<b>M/s.MALCO Energy Limited</b> <b>Versus</b> <b>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO</b> <b>(ii) CE/PPP</b> <b>(iii) SE/Mettur EDC</b> <b>(iv) SLDC</b>	<b>Adv.Rahul Balaji</b>  <b>Adv.Richardson Wilson</b>	<b>To set aside the impugned communications dated 13.02.2015 and 24.04.2015 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.29.06.2015 demanding a sum of Rs.8,58,23,430/- and pass other orders.</b> <b>For arguments.</b>
16	D.R.P.No.4 of 2023	<b>Tamil Nadu Newsprint &amp; Papers Limited</b> <b>Versus</b> <b>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO</b> <b>(ii) CE/PPP</b> <b>(iii) SE/Karur EDC</b> <b>(iv) SLDC</b>	<b>Adv.Rahul Balaji</b>  <b>Adv.Richardson Wilson</b>	<b>To set aside the impugned communications dated 13.02.2015 and 24.04.2015 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.21.07.2016 demanding a sum of Rs.2,64,97,493/- and pass other orders.</b> <b>For arguments.</b>
17	D.R.P.No.7 of 2022	<b>M/s.Arkey Energy (Rameswaram) Limited</b> <b>Versus</b> <b>(i) Principal Secretary to Govt., Energy Department, GoTN</b> <b>(ii) CMD/TANGEDCO</b>	<b>Adv.Anirudh Krishnan</b>  <b>Adv.Richardson Wilson</b>	<b>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.</b>  <b>For respondent side arguments.</b>

18	D.R.P.No.12 of 2023	<p>M/s.Narbheram Solar TN Private Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/NCES (iii) SLDC / TANTRANSCO</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan &amp; Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>To refix the condition of achieving minimum 17% CUF by fixing an appropriate band and direct to restrain the respondents from issuing backing down / curtailment for any reason other than grid safety and security issues and also direct the respondents to refund an amount of Rs.13,51,82,821 deducted towards CUF penalty for the financial year 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. For reply arguments of the respondent.</p>
19	D.R.P.No.13 of 2023	<p>M/s.NVR Energy Pvt Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/NCES (iii) SLDC / TANTRANSCO</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan &amp; Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>To review the working and applicability of Clause-6 of the PPA with regard to CUF and working of such provision, including revising the CUF band to 12% - 19% to cover variations and direct to restrain the respondents from issuing backing down / curtailment for any reason other than grid safety and security issues and also direct the respondents to refund an amount of Rs.11,53,11,360 deducted towards CUF penalty for the financial year 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. For reply arguments of the respondent.</p>

20	D.R.P.No.2 of 2024	M/s.Dhanalakshmi Srinivasan Sugars Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) MNRE	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the TANGEDCO to roll over and reallocate 1823391 units value of Rs.1,26,90,801/- that the petitioner exported to the TANGEDCO's grid during April 2020 and permit to adjust by petitioner's captive users during 2024-25 or to allow the petitioner to encash Rs.1,26,90,801. For arguments.
21	D.R.P.No.19 of 2023	M/s.Kamuthi Renewable Energy Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Declare that under law, the applicable Regulations and the "Comprehensive Tariff Order on Solar Power, the petitioner is entitled to and has correctly accounted for payments made against its energy bills under the EPA and the respondent is required to pay the interest stipulated under the EPA and direct the respondents to pay Rs.41,10,50,492/- including interest as on 11.10.2023 and payable against LPS and further pendente lite interest. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary  
Tamil Nadu Electricity  
Regulatory Commission