

No.08/2023 dated: 17-02-2023

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 21-02-2023 (Physical Hearing)****Time : 02-30 PM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.3 of 2023	The South Indian Sugar Mills Association - Tamil Nadu Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) Director / Finance	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Exercise its regulatory powers to direct TANGEDCO to purchase power from petitioner's members having subsisting PPAs at full price beyond 55% / 60% PLF as the case may be till such time they reach the 55% / 60% PLF on cumulative basis to compensate for the very low PLF achieved in the earlier years. For counter.
2	D.R.P.No.1 of 2023	M/s.KR Wind Energy LLP Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/Dindigul EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondents to give adjustment of the banked energy available in the Group Captive Generator's account, maintained in the generation end EDC and to treat the unutilised banked energy for encashment at 75% of the relevant tariff rate as per the Wind Tariff Orders issued by the Commission. For counter.
3	M.P.No.1 of 2023	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.SEPC Power Pvt. Ltd	Adv.Richardson Wilson M/s.J Sagar Associates	To ratify the power dispatched from M/s.SEPC Power Private Ltd to the grid on pass through as per the MoP guidelines dt.5.5.2022 and to fix the tariff for the power supplied from 30.04.2022 to 30.11.2022 by considering the payment already made by relaxing certain provisions of PPA / Addendum-3 as a one-time measure. For counter.

4	D.R.P.No.12 of 2022	<p>The Tata Power Co. Limited</p> <p>Versus</p> <p>i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO iii) SE/Udumalpet EDC</p>	<p>SKV Law Offices</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>Direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.53.72 crores in favour of the petitioner as the differential amount including interest for wrongfully fixing the rate at 75% of the preferential tariff rates even for the years where the APPC rates did not breach the preferential tariff rates.</p> <p>For counter.</p>
5	D.R.P.No.5 of 2021	<p>M/s.Arkey Energy (Rameswaram) Limited</p> <p>Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle</p>	<p>Adv.Anirudh Krishnan</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and above the contracted quantum and delayed payment along with interest.</p> <p>For rejoinder.</p>
6	M.P.No.8 of 2022	<p>M/s.Evita Constructions Pvt. Limited</p> <p>Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Chengalpet EDC (iii) CE/Distn./Chennai South (iv) CE/Commercial</p>	<p>M/s.Stephen & Stephen Advocates Associates</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>For reporting compliance.</p>
7	M.P.No.35 of 2022	<p>CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO</p>	<p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>To approve and ratify the dispatch of power made from Central Generating Stations viz., NLC & NTPC and approve the power procurement arrangements for the period of five years from the date of commencement of supply for a quantum totalling to 591.67 MW as per the rates fixed by CERC from time to time. For further hearing.</p>

Batch cases - In the matter of Start-up charges - For arguments				
8	D.R.P.No.5 of 2014	Saheli Exports Private Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.Richardson Wilson	To set aside the CFC/Revenue letter dated 7-9-2013 and 9-12-2013. For arguments.
9	T.A.No.13 of 2022	Tamil Nadu Newsprint and Paper Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.7736 of 2015 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
10	T.A.No.14 of 2022	M/s.A.R.S.Metals Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/North	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.26266 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
11	T.A.No.23 of 2022	M/s.Chettinad Cement Corpn. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Dindigul EDC	Adv.T.Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.27807 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
12	T.A.No.24 of 2022	M/s.Chettinad Cement Corpn. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Dindigul EDC	Adv.T.Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.27808 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
13	T.A.No.25 of 2022	M/s.Chettinad Cement Corpn. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue & Ors.	Adv.T.Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.27841 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
14	T.A.No.27 of 2022	M/s.Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenuen & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.28438 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
15	T.A.No.28 of 2022	M/s.Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.28440 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments

16	T.A.No.29 of 2022	M/s.Vedanta Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director (Finance) (iv) SE/Tuticorin EDC (v) AO/Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.28451 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
17	T.A.No.32 of 2022	M/s.TCP Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Chennai EDC/North (v) AO/Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.28952 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
18	T.A.No.34 of 2022	M/s.Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director (Finance) (iv) SE/Theni EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.30502 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
19	T.A.No.37 of 2022	M/s.Bannari Amman Sugars Limited (Formerly Madras Sugars Limited) Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.31160 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
20	T.A.No.39 of 2022	M/s.Kothari Sugars & Chemicals Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Ramnad EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.33113 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras_in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
21	T.A.No.40 of 2022	M/s.EID Parry (India) Ltd Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.33151 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
22	T.A.No.41 of 2022	M/s.EID Parry (India) Ltd Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Trichy EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.33150 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments

23	T.A.No.42 of 2022	M/s.EID Parry (India) Ltd Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Trichy EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.33210 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
24	T.A.No.46 of 2022	M/s.Sakthi Sugars Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Sivaganga EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.33119 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
25	T.A.No.48 of 2022	M/s.Kothari Sugars and Chemicals Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Trichy	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.33114 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras_in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
26	T.A.No.51 of 2022	M/s.MMS Steel & Power Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Nagapattinam EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.35042 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
27	T.A.No.52 of 2022	M/s.Sakthi Sugars Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Erode EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.848 of 2014 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
28	T.A.No.53 of 2022	M/s.Sakthi Sugars Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Erode EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.869 of 2014 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
29	T.A.No.54 of 2022	M/s.Bannari Amman Sugars Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Erode EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.4924 of 2014 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments

30	T.A.No.55 of 2022	M/s.Chemplast Sanmar Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Mettur EDC	Shree Law Services Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.14037 of 2014 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
31	T.A.No.56 of 2022	M/s.Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Mettur EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.14952 of 2014 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
32	T.A.No.58 of 2022	M/s.MALCO Energy Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Mettur EDC (v) AO/Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.6382 of 2014 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
33	T.A.No.60 of 2022	M/s.A.R.S. Metals Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/ Chennai EDC/North	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.3522 of 2017 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
34	T.A.No.62 of 2022	M/s.Bannari Amman Sugars Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director /Finance (iv) SE/Thiruvannamalai EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.31774 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
35	T.A.No.63 of 2022	M/s.EID Parry (India) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director/Finance (iv) SE/Karur EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.7887 of 2015 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
36	T.A.No.64 of 2022	M/s.Rajkumar Impex Pvt. Ltd Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) Director/Finance (iv) SE/Tuticorin EDC	Rep. by its General Manager (Power Plant) Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.30687 of 2016 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments

37	T.A.No.65 of 2022	M/s.SKI Carbon Black (India) Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.31037 of 2013 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments
38	T.A.No.1 of 2023	M/s.M.R.Krishnamurthy Co-op. Sugar Mills Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Richardson Wilson	W.P.No.6560 of 2015 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of start-up power charges. For arguments.
39	M.P.No.31 of 2020	CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO Versus M/s. A.R.S.Energy Pvt. Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare the M/s.A.R.S. Energy Pvt. Limited is not a captive generating plant and the petitioner may be permitted to levy Cross Subsidy Surcharge for the period from 01.04.2019 onwards from their captive users for captively adjusted energy. For arguments
40	M.P.No.36 of 2020	CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO Versus The Chettinad Cement Corpn. Pvt. Limited	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare that M/s.Chettinad Cement Corporation Pvt. Limited is not a Captive Generating Plant for the Financial Years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 and they are liable to pay Cross Subsidy Surcharge for an amount of Rs.95,02,09,269/- for disqualification of Captive Status. For arguments.
41	M.P.No.6 of 2021	CFC/Deposits and Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.Tulsyan NEC Limited	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare that M/s.Tulsyan NEC Limited is not a qualified Captive Generating Plant for the Financial Year 2019-2020 and their captive users are liable to pay Cross Subsidy Surcharge for an amount of Rs.63,96,64,445/- for disqualification of Captive Status. For arguments.

42	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.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy 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.
43	D.R.P.No.3 of 2022	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/GO/TANTRANSCO	Adv.Tanya Kapoor Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	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 arguments.
44	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.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondents to give adjustment 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 arguments.
45	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.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondents to give adjustment 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 arguments.

46	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.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondents to give adjustment 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 arguments.
----	--------------------	---	--	---

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission