

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**

**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

Thiru M.Chandrasekar

.... Chairman

and

Thiru. K.Venkatasamy

.... Member (Legal)

**D.R.P.No.35 of 2014**

M/s.TCP Limited

..... Petitioner  
(Adv.Rahul Balaji)

Versus

TANGEDCO & Ors.

... Respondents  
(Adv.M.Gopinathan)

**Hearing dated : 05-05-2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

**Order pronounced.**

*“(vi) In result, we are of the considered view that the petitioner has no prima facie case in claiming of any other method of Demand / Energy quota. The petition is dismissed devoid any merits”.*

(Sd ..... )  
**(K. Venkatasamy)**  
**Member (Legal)**

(Sd .....)  
**(M.Chandrasekar)**  
**Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**

**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru M.Chandrasekar**

**.... Chairman**

**and**

**Thiru. K.Venkatasamy**

**.... Member (Legal)**

**M.P.No.25 of 2015**

Southern Railway

..... Petitioner  
(Adv. Rahul Balaji)

Versus

TANGEDCO & Ors.

... Respondents  
(Adv.M.Gopinathan)

**Hearing dated : 05-05-2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

Order pronounced.

*"Having concluded as above we are not in a position to order the claim of the petitioner for refund and accordingly reject it.*

***In effect we order as follows:***

- 1. Respondent TANGEDCO is directed to procure/arrange new meters of revised standard IEEE 519-2014 and amended CEA Regulations 2019 as given in Para 8.9*
- 2. Respondent TANGEDCO to make measurements and determine the TDD values adopting the methodology and duration strictly in accordance with the provisions in the IEEE 519-2014 standard and CEA amended Regulations 2019 without any deviation.*
- 3. To grant time of six months from the date of receipt of intimation from Respondent to the Petitioner with measurement values and test results to facilitate to suppress harmonics in case of measured values exceeding the limits, as given in Para 8.10.*

*The petitioner's prayer to refund the harmonic surcharge already collected is rejected".*

(Sd..... )  
**(K. Venkatasamy)**  
**Member (Legal)**

(Sd.....)  
**(M.Chandrasekar)**  
**Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**

**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru M.Chandrasekar**

**.... Chairman**

**Thiru. K.Venkatasamy**

**.... Member (Legal)**

**D.R.P.No.11 of 2016**

M/s.Orchid Pharma Limited

.... Petitioner  
(Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj)

Versus

TANGEDCO & Ors.

.... Respondents  
( Adv. M.Gopinathan)

**Hearing held on 05.05.2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

*Order pronounced.*

*“6.11.1. In view of all the above findings, having installed 5 slot TOD meter on 05.07.2010, the delay caused by the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent in execution of EWA upto 20.11.2010, cannot be permitted. Aggrieved over the denial of accounting of 5,37,310 Units by the Respondents, we see merits in the claim of the Petitioner. As held by the Commission in Wind T.O.1 of 2009, dated 20.03.2009 and subsequent Commission’s Order in D.R.P. No.48 of 2014 dated 19.04.2022, which were ordered taking into consideration of R&C measures in force on those days, we direct that, such unadjusted units generated from 15.08.2010 (i.e., the date of execution of the EWA) for all the 3 Windmills services, may be allowed to be claimed @ 100 % purchase rate along with the interest rate agreed between the parties in the EWA.*

*6.11.2. Further, in respect of the impugned demand notice dated 29.07.2015, it stands set aside with the above findings. Hence this petition is partly allowed”.*

(Sd.....)  
**(K. Venkatasamy)**  
**Member (Legal)**

(Sd.....)  
**(M.Chandrasekar)**  
**Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**

**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru M.Chandrasekar**

**.... Chairman**

**and**

**Thiru. K.Venkatasamy**

**.... Member (Legal)**

**M.P.No.34 of 2020**

CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO

..... Petitioner  
(Thiru M.Gopinathan  
Standing Counsel for TANGEDCO)

Versus

CWRE Wind Power Pvt. Limited

..... Respondent  
(Thiru. Rahul Balaji  
Advocate for the Respondent)

**Hearing dated : 05-05-2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

**Order pronounced.**

"In order to have a balanced approach, the Commission, therefore, directs the Petitioner - TANGEDCO as under:

1. To provide an opportunity to the Respondent to present their case with the supporting documents for the period 2018-19 and 2019-20.
2. Verify the same and satisfy themselves about the fulfilment of twin criteria of "Ownership" and "Consumption" by the Respondent.

As stated in Clause 9.9.9.6 of the Commission's Order for CGP verification in M.P. No.24 of 2020 dated 07-12-2021, wherever non-compliance of CGP status is noticed, the Petitioner shall file a Miscellaneous Petition before the Commission for adjudication and the Commission shall dispose the same within six months. With these observations, the petition is disposed of".

(Sd.....)  
**(K. Venkatasamy)**  
**Member (Legal)**

(Sd.....)  
**(M.Chandrasekar)**  
**Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**

**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru M.Chandrasekar**

**.... Chairman**

**and**

**Thiru. K.Venkatasamy**

**.... Member (Legal)**

**D.R.P.No.9 of 2020**

M/s.Tirunelveli Solar Project Pvt. Limited

**.... Petitioner  
(Adv.Rahul Balaji )**

**Versus**

**i) CMD / TANGEDCO & Ors.**

**...Respondent  
(Adv.M.Gopinathan)**

**Hearing held on 05-05-2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

**Order pronounced.**

“10.8. In view of the same, it is observed that the petitioner cannot be penalized with invocation of Bank Guarantee and levy of Liquidated Damages for the delay in commissioning of the plant beyond 24 months. In the result, the petition is allowed.”

**(Sd.....)  
(K. Venkatasamy)  
Member (Legal)**

**(Sd.....)  
(M.Chandrasekar)  
Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary  
Tamil Nadu Electricity  
Regulatory Commission**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**

**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru M.Chandrasekar**

**.... Chairman**

**Thiru. K.Venkatasamy**

**.... Member (Legal)**

**M.P.No.28 of 2021**

Thiru.B.Balamurali,  
Pollachi

.... Petitioner  
(Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj )

Versus

i) CMD / TANGEDCO

...Respondent  
(Adv.M.Gopinathan)

**Hearing held on 05-05-2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

Order pronounced.

“5.22. The respondent Licensee is directed to communicate this order with due instructions to all levels of the officers and staff concerned (including Anti-Power Theft squad & other squad) for strict adherence. And in future, if any such complaint/petition received, the Commission will not hesitate to initiate action under section 142 of the Electricity Act 2003. Ordered accordingly”.

(Sd.....)  
**(K. Venkatasamy)**  
**Member (Legal)**

(Sd.....)  
**(M.Chandrasekar)**  
**Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**

**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru M.Chandrasekar**

**.... Chairman**

**Thiru. K.Venkatasamy**

**.... Member (Legal)**

**M.P.No.42 of 2021**

M/s.OPG Energy Pvt. Limited

..... Petitioner  
(Adv.Rahul Balaji)

Versus

- (i) CMD/TANGEDCO  
(ii) AAA Plus Energy Pvt. Limited

... Respondents  
(Adv.M.Gopinathan for R-1)

**Hearing dated : 05-05-2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

Order pronounced.

“7.13. In result of our findings above, we clarify that Wheeling charge in respect of the petitioner’s case which has an arrangement of in-house consumption of power transmitted through dedicated transmission line situated within the plant premises from the CGP (M/s.OPG Energy Pvt Ltd) to its Captive user (M/s.AAA Plus Trading Pvt. Limited) does not arise”.

(Sd.....)  
**(K. Venkatasamy)**  
**Member (Legal)**

(Sd.....)  
**(M.Chandrasekar)**  
**Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**

**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru M.Chandrasekar**

**.... Chairman**

**Thiru. K.Venkatasamy**

**.... Member (Legal)**

**M.P.No.43 of 2021**

Chief Electrical Traction Engineer,  
Southern Railway

..... Petitioner  
(Adv.K.Muthamil Raja)

Versus

- (i) CMD/TANGEDCO  
(ii) MD/TANTRANSCO

... Respondents  
(Adv.M.Gopinathan for R-1  
& Adv.V.Anil Kumar for R-2)

**Hearing dated : 05-05-2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

Order pronounced.

"7.14. In effect, we order as follows:

7.14.1. The respondent Licensee is directed to implement the order passed in M.P.18 of 2018 by extending the net metering facility to all the locations with respective loads within Tamil Nadu as mentioned in the order, within one month from the date of this order.

7.14.2. The respondent railways shall be liable to pay the network charges mandatorily as stipulated in the Commission's Generic Tariff Order No.8 of 2021 as the statutory Network charges.

7.14.3. The Commission refrains from initiating action under section 142 of the Electricity act 2003 for the reasons stated in Para 7.13. Ordered accordingly.

(Sd.....)  
**(K. Venkatasamy)**  
**Member (Legal)**

(Sd.....)  
**(M.Chandrasekar)**  
**Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**



**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**  
**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru M.Chandrasekar**

**.... Chairman**

**and**

**Thiru. K.Venkatasamy**

**.... Member (Legal)**

**R.A.No.1 of 2021**

- (i) M/s.Walwhan Renewable Energy Limited  
(ii) National Solar Energy Federation of India

..... Petitioners  
(M/s.HSA Advocates for R-1 &  
Adv.Rahul Balaji for R-2)

Versus

- (1) TANGEDCO  
(2) CE/NCES, Revenue

..... Respondents  
(Thiru M.Gopinathan  
Standing Counsel for TANGEDCO)

**Hearing dated : 05-05-2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

**Order pronounced.**

“Commission passes the order re-determining the tariff in the Order No.2 of 2016 with the tariff determinants in arriving at the tariff fixed by the Central Commission

Working sheet for tariff is annexed. This order is subject to the outcome of the Civil Appeal No.1633 of 2020 before the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India”.

(Sd.....)  
**(K. Venkatasamy)**  
**Member (Legal)**

(Sd.....)  
**(M.Chandrasekar)**  
**Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**

**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru M.Chandrasekar**

**.... Chairman**

**Thiru. K.Venkatasamy**

**.... Member (Legal)**

**D.R.P.No.19 of 2021**

M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited

.... Petitioner  
(Adv.Rahul Balaji)

Versus

TANGEDCO

.... Respondent  
(Adv.M.Gopinathan)

**Hearing held on 05-05-2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

Order pronounced.

“6.15. In the result, the following directions are given:-

- (a) All reliefs under various heads to the extent of Rs.41,72,15,979/- are allowed as there is no disagreement between the parties;
- (b) the petitioner is entitled to the relief to the extent of Rs.8,25,91,046/- in regard to CVD as the same has not been disputed by the respondent in terms of the quantum or in terms of law;
- (c) the prayer ( c) is rejected for the reasons stated in para 12. Ordered accordingly”.

(Sd.....)  
**(K. Venkatasamy)**  
**Member (Legal)**

(Sd.....)  
**(M.Chandrasekar)**  
**Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**(Constituted under Section 82 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003**

**Central Act 36 of 2003)**

**PRESENT:-**

**Thiru M.Chandrasekar**

**.... Chairman**

**and**

**Thiru. K.Venkatasamy**

**.... Member (Legal)**

**M.P.No.14 of 2022**

**CE/Grid Operation, TANTRANSO**

**... Petitioner  
(Adv.V.Anil Kumar)**

**Hearing dated : 05-05-2022**

**DAILY ORDER**

Order pronounced.

“Having considered the submissions of the petitioner and the negative financial impact that the pandemic created, the Commission is inclined to modify clause 6.9 (h) as follows:-

*“The petitioner may seek equity assistance as required towards the Capital Investment Plan for each FY from the Government of Tamil Nadu for the investments made as approved in this order”.*

(Sd.....)  
**(K. Venkatasamy)**  
**Member (Legal)**

(Sd.....)  
**(M.Chandrasekar)**  
**Chairman**

**//True Copy//**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**