No.44/2021 dated: 17-09-2021

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 21-09-2021 (Through Video Conferencing)

Time : 11-00 AM

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	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	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 admission.
2	D.R.P.No.10 of 2021	M/s.Asian Star Company Limited Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) CE/NCES (iii) SE/Palladam EDC (iv) SE/Dindigul EDC	M/s.Kartikeya and Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.3.30 crores along with interest @ 1% p.m. of Rs.2.61 crores for the power supplied from the wind generation units of the petitioner. For admission.
3	T.A.No.1 of 2019 (Transferred by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.Nos.11133 to 11139 of 2018 & W.A.Nos.3254, 3255 & 3163 of 2019 and connected M.Ps)	1) M/s.Venkatewara Cotton Yarn Mills Salem Pvt. Ltd. 2) M/s.Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Assn. 3) M/s.Eswar Rubber Products Pvt. Limited 4) M/s.Perumal Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited 5) M/s.Thangavel Fabrics Pvt. Limited 6) M/s.Aland Spinners Pvt. Limited 7) M/s.Balaji Rubber Industries Pvt. Ltd 8) Tamil Nadu Electricity Consumers' Assn. 9) Tamil Nadu Power Producers' Assn.		IN THE MATTER OF directions given by Hon'ble High Court of Madras to examine the policy direction issued by Government of Tamil Nadu under section 108 of the Electricity Act, 2003 in regard to grant of open access above 1 MW and amending the regulations. For hearing.

		Versus 1) Energy Dept. / GoTN. 2) TANGEDCO 3) TANTRANSCO 4) SLDC	Adv.M.Gopinathan	
4	M.P.No.29 of 2021	M/s.Lanco Tanjore Power Co. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/Commerical, TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To relax the norms and permit auxiliary energy consumption of the petitioner's plant at 5.5% with immediate effect and direct respondents to enhancement the petitioner's sanctioned HT connection demand under HT connection for start-up power from 3.993 MVA to 4.5 MVA. For counter.
5	D.R.P.No.7 of 2021	M/s.Grace Infrastructure Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) Director (Finance)	M/s.Rugan & Arya Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.17.04 crores along with interest @ 12% p.a. of Rs.11.03 crores for the power supplied from the wind generation units of the petitioner. For counter.
6	D.R.P.No.5 of 2021	M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle	Adv.Anirudh Krishnan Adv.M.Gopinathan	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. For rejoinder.
7	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 rejoinder.
8	M.P.No.13 of 2021	Thiru.P.Muthusamy Versus i) SE/CEDC/South-II, TANGEDCO ii) EE/O&M/Adyar	Party-in-Person Adv.M.Gopinathan	To impose the maximum penalty on Respondent-2 under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for having violated the order of the Commission in M.P.No.32 of 2020 dated 22.12.2020. For reporting compliance.

9	I.A.No.No.1 of 2021 in M.P.No.12 of 2021	TANTRANSCO	Adv.V.Anil Kumar Adv.Rahul Balaji for Tamil Nadu Power Producers' Assn. (TNPPA) as Impleading Petitioner	Seeking approval for the collection of Operation & Maintenance Charges for the maintenance of Bays and Associated equipments at the TANTRANSCO's Sub-Stations and Charges for the space allotted for the Bay. For further hearing.
10	M.P.No.30 of 2021	CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To determine additional surcharge payable by all OA consumers for the period from 1.10.2021 to 31.03.2022 and to determine the additional surcharge of Rs.0.85 per unit payable by OA consumers on scheduled quantum of power purchase through OA. For filing affidavit along with stakeholders' comments and for further hearing.
11	D.R.P.No.24 of 2013	Sree Rengaraj Ispat Indsutries Pvt. Ltd., Versus i) TANGEDCO ii) M/s.DSRM Pvt. Limited	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	Direct the respondents to adjust 88,100 energy units. For arguments.
12	D.R.P. No.35 of 2014	TCP Limited Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Sivagangai EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Refixing the demand and energy quota taking into account unique circumstances. For arguments.
13	D.R.P.No.48 of 2014	Super Sales India Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Arun Anbumani Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 3rd respondent letter dated 11-2-2014 and demand of Rs.15.28 lakhs. For arguments.
14	D.R.P.No.58 of 2014	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 2nd respondent letter dated 12-4-2013. For arguments of the respondent.
15	M.P.No.25 of 2015	Southern Railway Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Direct the respondent to dispense with the levy of surcharge for harmonics as far as Railway Traction is concerned. For arguments.

16	**D.R.P.No.10 of 2016**	**Lanco Tanjore Power Co., Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO**	**Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.Richardson Wilson**	**Declare that the petitioner is entitled for variable charges towards difference of tariff heat rate for the period from 2008 to 2015. For arguments.**
17	**Interlocutory Application (I.A.) filed in SR.No.50 of 2021 dt.30.3.2021**	**M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i)The Secretary to Govt., GoTN. (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) CE/GTS, Ramnad (iv) SE/GTS, Ramnad**	**Adv.Anirudh Krishnan Adv.M.Gopinathan**	**Prayed to condone delay of 1259 days in re-presenting the petition in SR.No.94 of 2017 in the matter of payment of compensation under section 11(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. For arguments on the maintainability of the petition.**
18	**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**	**Direct the respondent to refund the balance amount of Rs.5.72 crores for the period upto March 2018 that has been collected on the basis of erroneous application of the Amendment dated 19.6.2013 along with interest of Rs.2.30 crores. For arguments of the respondent.**
19	**D.R.P.No.16 of 2020**	**Nuclear Power Corpn of India Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO iii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC**	**S.Ramasubramaniam & Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan**	**To declare that the demand for Rs.2,05,79,242/- for the year 2015-16 and the demand for Rs.1,55,51,538/- for the year 2016-17 raised by the respondents against the petitioner as illegal and set-aside the same and direct the respondents to refund the amount of Rs.10,68,72,880/-together with interest. For arguments.**

20	**D.R.P.No.22 of 2020**	**M/s.SSMT Power Private Limited** **Versus** **i) CMD/TANGEDCO** **ii) CFC/Revenue** **iii) CE/NCES** **iv) SE/OA & Co-ordination, SLDC.**	**Adv. Rahul Balaji** **Adv.M.Gopinathan**	**To direct Rollover of banked electricity from the CGP Renewbale Energy Generating Plant of the petitioner under Captive Category of FY-2019-2020-FY-2021-22 and set out the manner and methodology for its implementation since the accumulation of excess banked units of value of Rs.2,58,01,600/- for FY-2019-2020 and the Captive Consumers ought to be permitted to adjust the unutilised banked units as payments. For arguments of the respondent.**
21	**M.P.No.20 of 2021**	**Indian Wind Power Association (IWPA)** **Versus** **i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO** **ii) MNRE**	**Adv.Rahul Balaji** **Adv.M.Gopinathan**	**To pass an interim order directing TANGEDCO to file the details for the year 2019-2020 and 2020-21 with regard to Units that were banked and remained unutilised and direct Rollover of banked electricity from OA Renewable Wind Energy Generating Stations under Captive and Third Party Sale category of FY 2021 and set out the manner and methodology for its implementation. For arguments as a last chance.**
22	**M.P.No.1 of 2021**	**M/s.NLC India Limited** **Versus** **i) TANGEDCO** **ii) TANTRANSCO**	**Adv.K.Harishankar** **Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar**	**Direct SLDC to strictly follow and enforce "MUST RUN" status on all solar and wind power plants and direct to forthwith stop issuing backing down / curtailment instructions to Solar and Wind Plants. For arguments.**

23	**P.R.C.No.1 of 2021**	**Thiru.S.Neelakanta Pillai** **Versus** **(i) Thiru.Asokan, Chief Engineer/Transmission Projects-I and his predecessor, TANTRANSCO** **(ii) Thiru.Kannan, Chief Engineer/System Operation and his predecessor, TANTRANSCO** **(iii) Thiru.Sadayappa Vallal, Chief Engineer / P&C Wing and his predecessor, TANTRANSCO**	**Party-in-Person** **Adv.V.Anil Kumar**	**Complaint against the officials of TANTRANSCO under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of the Sections 40(a) & 150 and Regulation 16(1) of the TNERC-Conduct of Business Regulations. For arguments of the respondent.**
24	**S.M.P.No.1 of 2021**	**Suo-Motu Proceedings in the matter of TNERC – Fees & Fines Regulations.**		**For seeking the views of all the stakeholders on the perceived excessive filing fees upon directions from the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.10944 of 2021, W.P.No.15030 of 2020 and W.P.No.23678 of 2017. For hearing.**

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission