

No. 30/2022 dated: 18-04-2022

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 19-04-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)

Time : 11-00 AM

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.11 of 2019	M/s.Ratedi Wind Power Private Limited Versus 1)CMD/TANGEDCO 2)CE/NCES/TANGEDCO 3) SE/EDC, Tirunelveli	Adv.Adithya Reddy Adv.M.Gopinathan	For order.
2	M.P.No.7 of 2021	CFC/Deposits and Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus i) M/s.Sai Regency Power Corpn Limited & Ors. ii) Brakes India Pvt. Limited iii) Chemplast Sanmar Limited iv) Harshini Textiles Mills Limited v) Jagannath Textile Mills Limited vi) Sri Rameshwar Textiles vii) Lakshmi Mills Co. Ltd. viii) ABI Showatech India Limited ix) MRF Limited x) Orchid Chemicals Pharmaceuticals Limited xi) Precot Meridian Limited xii) Sundaram Clayton Limited xiii) TVS Srichakra Limited	Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.Anand K.Ganesan for R-1 Adv.Rahul Balaji for R-2, R-4 to R-13 M/s.Shree Law Services for R-3	For order.
3	D.R.P.No.48 of 2014	Super Sales India Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Arun Anbumani Adv.M.Gopinathan	For order.

4	P.P.A.P.No.2 of 2022	CE/NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking adoption of tariff of Rs.2.99 per unit offered by 2 bidders i.r.o. the proposed solar power plants of combined capacity of 3 MW, arrived through tender floated for procurement of 500 MW of solar power under PM-KUSUM Scheme. For admission.
5	M.P.No.6 of 2022	M/s.Palvai Green Power Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Virudhunagar EDC	Adv.Veda Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue appropriate clarifications or directions to the respondents that interpretation of the 19% CUF value as per T.O.No.7 of 2014 only in the event of petitioner delivering more than 5 MW of alternating current to the respondents at the delivery point. For counter.
6	M.P.No.7 of 2022	Thiru.M.Xavier, Tuticorin Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) Director / Distribution (iv) CE/Distn., Tirunelveli (v) SE/Tuticorin EDC	Represented by Tr.S.Neelakanta Pillai Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Direct TANGEDCO to supply LT three phase power supply 24 hrs in a day on regular basis for his industry and to issue suitable and appropriate direction to the licensee to stop such illegal restriction of power supply with immediate effect and others. For filing counter by TANGEDCO & TANTRANSCO.
7	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 counter.

8	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 filing counter by TANGEDCO & TANTRANSCO.
9	R.P.No.2 of 2022 in D.R.P.No.27 of 2013	M/s.Techno Electric & Engg. Co. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO & (ii) CMD/TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To review the order dated 14.9.2021 in D.R.P.No.27 of 2013 for non-consideration of the order in M/s.B&G Solar and in terms of grounds stated in para-18. For filing counter on the admissibility of the petition.
10	M.P.No.12 of 2022	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval for power procurement under Short Term Power procurement upto 1000 MW RTC power and 1000 MW for the evening peak hours for the period from 14.3.2022 to 20.5.2022. For reporting status and for further hearing.
11	R.P.No.2 of 2013	Spictex Cotton Mills (P) Ltd. Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj AGP. Richardson Wilson	To review the order dated 17.4.2013 in D.R.P.No.2 of 2012. For arguments.
12	D.R.P.No.14 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Virudhunagar EDC	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj AGP. Richardson Wilson	To set aside the 2 nd respondent impugned notice dated 11.8.2012 towards short levy of excess energy charges. For arguments.

13	D.R.P.No.15 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO .	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj AGP. Richardson Wilson	To set aside the 2 nd respondent impugned notice dated 28.9.2012. For arguments.
14	D.R.P.No.24 of 2013	Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries Pvt. Ltd., Versus i) TANGEDCO & Ors ii) DSRM	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	Direct the respondents to adjust 88,100 energy units. For arguments.
15	D.R.P.No.1 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.44 crores. For arguments of the respondent.
16	D.R.P.No.2 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.2.52 crores towards 2% of line loss. For arguments of the respondent.
17	D.R.P.No.4 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.15.19 lakhs towards 2% of line loss. For arguments of the respondent.
18	D.R.P.No.13 of 2021	M/s.EID Parry (India) Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO iii) CE/NCES iv) SE/Cuddalore EDC v) SE/Pudukkottai EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to implement the order of the Commission in P.P.A.P No.8 of 2011 dt.31.3.2016 and consequently release the payment towards 2% line loss of Rs.2,87,29,026/- payable together with interest of Rs.1,53,69,099/- thereon at 12% p.a. For arguments of the respondent.
19	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.

20	R.P.No.1 of 2022 in M.P.No.2 of 2021, M.P.Nos.33 to 36 of 2021, T.A.No.7 of 2021 & M.P.No.45 of 2021	CE/Commercial, TANGEDCO Versus (i) Tmt.Tara Murali (ii) Thiru.V.Gunalan (iii) Tmt.S.Shalini (iv) Tmt.J.Shobha Lalith (v) Tmt.G.Kumari Selva (vi) Thiru.K.Sakthivel (vii) Thiru.Manivasagan	AGP.Richardson Wilson Adv.Arun Anbumani for R-1, Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj for R-2 to R-6 & Adv.Rahul Balaji for R-7	To review the orders of the Commission by considering the cost of DT erected within the consumer premises with respect to extension of LT service connections and also the actual cost of extension with respect to extension of HT service connections. For arguments.
----	--	---	---	--

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission