

No.04/2022 dated: 29-01-2022

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
**CAUSE LIST- I**

**Cases posted for 01-02-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)**

**Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.14 of 2021	M/s.Fulchand Exports Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/NCES (iii) SE/Theni EDC	Adv.V.N.Bohra  Adv.M.Gopinathan	For order
2	D.R.P.No.15 of 2021	M/s.Kandoi Clean Energy Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES iii) SE/Theni EDC	Adv.V.N.Bohra  Adv.M.Gopinathan	For order
3	D.R.P.No.3 of 2022	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.Tanya Kapoor  Adv.M.Gopinathan	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 admission.
4	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	Direct the respondents to forthwith make payment of a sum of Rs.90,62,345/- being the interest due and payable to the petitioner till 30.11.2021 against delayed payments made by TANGEDCO. For counter.

5	D.R.P.No.1 of 2022	M/s.Velathal Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) Director/Finance (iii) SE/Palladam EDC (iv) SE/Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to forthwith make payment of a sum of Rs.1,86,21,704/- for the period from April 2018 to June 2020 being the sum due and payable to the petitioner against delayed payments made by TANGEDCO for power supplied. For counter.
6	D.R.P.No.17 of 2021	M/s.Dharani Sugars & Chemicals Limited Versus 1) CMD/TANGEDCO 2) CFC/General 3) Director (Finance) 4) Director (Generation) 5) SE/Kallakurichi EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Grant an interim stay on the operation of the Respondent-5's letter dt.25.9.2020 and consequently direct the respondent to make payment principal amount of Rs.2,74,04,230/- along with interest @ 18% p.a. and also direct to make payment of Rs.12,35,53,367/- towards interest on delayed payments. For counter.
7	M.P.No.20 of 2020	Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association (TASMA) Versus CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To punish the Respondent under section 142 of the E.A., 2003 for having violated the order of the Commission dated 11.10.2008 in the matter of collection of Scheduling and System Operation charges under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003. For filing memo and for further hearing.
8	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.

9	M.P.No.27 of 2021	CE/NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Approve the new methodology for measurement of Harmonics in Wind / Solar / Bagasse / Biomass Energy Generators as per the CEA Regulations and to fix the compensation at 15% of the respective tariff in respect of Generators and also to instruct all the existing HT/EHT Generators to install power quality meters by themselves within 12 months and other orders. For further hearing.
10	M.P.No.48 of 2021	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To accord approval to float a medium term tender under FOO guidelines with the deviations proposed in the Bidding Documents in line with Pilot Scheme-II for purchase of 1500 MW RTC power for a period of 5 years appointing PTC India Limited as an Aggregator. For further hearing.
11	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 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> respondents and direct them to give effect to the EWA. For arguments.
12	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 <sup>st</sup> respondent demand notice and consequently direct the 2 <sup>nd</sup> respondent to give adjustment for the unutilized banked energy or encashment of Rs.23.93/- lakhs. For arguments.

13	D.R.P.No.2 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC 3) SE, Perambalur EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.3,89,55,341/ towards excess energy pumped and surcharge of Rs.1,68,06,240/-. For arguments on the written submissions filed by TANGEDCO.
14	D.R.P.No.3 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC 3) SE, Perambalur EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1,18,86,792/- towards excess energy pumped and surcharge of Rs.21,79,704/-. For arguments on the written submissions filed by TANGEDCO.
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.
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.
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.
18	D.R.P.No.9 of 2020	M/s.Tirunelveli Solar Project Private Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Grant the petitioner an extension of time for commissioning its 100 MW Solar Power Plant at Kollankinar & other villages, Tuticorin since there has been a change in law i.r.o. of PPA dt.28.9.2017 and consequently direct TANGEDCO not to invoke bank guarantee. For arguments of the respondent.

19	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.
20	M.P.No.38 of 2021	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CFC/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To impose penalty upon the Respondents in accordance with section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of the Order of the Commission in M.P.No.7 of 2019 dated 15.12.2020 and consequently direct the respondents to make payments of the pending amounts along with interest till date of payment. For arguments.
21	M.P.No.43 of 2021	Chief Electrical Traction Engineer, Southern Railway Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) MD/TANTRANSCO iii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv.K.Muthamil Raja  Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	To punish the respondents for non-compliance of the order dated 25.02.2020 passed in M.P.No.19 of 2018 under section 142 of the E.A., 2003 and also to direct TANGEDCO to permit provision of net metering for all the locations listed in NoC application under 4 MW dated 10.03.2021 within a timeline. For arguments.
22	M.P.No.44 of 2021	M/s.Nagai Power Pvt. Limited Versus i) CE/Grid Oprn./ SLDC ii) SE/C.O/TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.V.Anil Kumar	To exercise its regulatory powers and clarify that Transmission charges are not payable for the month of September 2021 i.r.o Format STOA2 dt.23.08.2021 conditional approval referring to letter bearing No.CE/GO/SE/CO/EE/OA/AEE3/F.NPPL.Cap/RO/21-22/D.92/21-22 dt.03.08.2021. For arguments.

23	D.R.P.No.13 of 2021	<b>M/s.EID Parry (India) Limited</b> <b>Versus</b> <b>i) CMD/TANGEDCO</b> <b>ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO</b> <b>iii) CE/NCES</b> <b>iv) SE/Cuddalore EDC</b> <b>v) SE/Pudukkottai EDC</b>	<b>Adv.Rahul Balaji</b>  <b>Adv.M.Gopinathan</b>	<b>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.</b>
----	---------------------	---	--	---

**(By order of the Commission)**

**Secretary  
Tamil Nadu Electricity  
Regulatory Commission**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**CAUSE LIST-II**

**Cases posted for 01-02-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)**

**(After the proceedings of the Main Cause List at 11-00 AM are over)**

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

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Case No.</b>	<b>Name of the Parties</b>	<b>Counsel / Party</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
1	Interlocutory Application (I.A.) filed in SR.No.50 of 2021 dt.30.3.2021	M/s.Arkey Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i)The Secretary to Govt., GoTN. (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) CE/GTS, Ramnad (iv) SE/GTS, Ramnad	Adv.Anirudh Krishnan  AGP Richardson Wilson	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.
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**