

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**Order of the Commission dated this the 13<sup>th</sup> Day of February 2024**

**PRESENT:**

**ThiruB.Mohan  
Member (Legal)**

**.... Adjudicating Officer**

**Original Petition No. 01 of 2023**

TANGEDCO  
as Tamil Nadu State  
Designated Agency (TNSDA)

... Petitioner  
Rep. by its Chief Engineer  
Industrial Co-ordin.,  
R & D/ DSM

**Vs.**

M/s. Noble Tech Industries Pvt. Ltd.  
Rep. by its Plant Head  
14/2 A2, Melpakkam Village  
Kaliyampoondi – 603 402  
Kancheepuram, Tamil Nadu

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

Petition under Rule 6 of the Energy Conservation (Energy Consumption Norms and Standards or Designated Consumers, from time within which, and manner of Precreation and implementation of scheme, procedure for issue of Energy Savings Certificate and value of per Metric Ton of oil Equivalent of energy consumed) Rule, 2012 and section 14 (n) read with section 26 of the Energy Conservation Act, 2001 against the Respondent for its failure to comply with

energy consumption norms and standards, for imposing penalty on the respondent, the Designated Consumer under PAT Cycle IV, for not submitting the Performance Assessment Document (PAD) in Form A and Certificate of verification in Form “B” along with verification report under sub-clause-1 of Rule 6 of Energy Conservation Rule 2012 (PAT Rule 2012) and non-compliance of clause (n) of section 14 of the Energy Conservation Act, 2001.

This petition coming up for hearing on 10-01-2024 in the presence of Ms. Anchala Sagaya Mary, Chief Engineer / Industrial Co-ordination, R & D / DSM representing the petitioner, Tamil Nadu State Designated Agency and Thiru Keshava Ramanujam, junior to Thiru Rahul Balaji, Advocate for the Respondent and on consideration of the Memo filed on behalf of the petitioner, this Commission passes the following

### **ORDER**

Memo filed on behalf of the petitioner for withdrawal of the complaint. The Counsel for the Respondent has made “no objection” endorsement. Averments set out in the main petition traversed. There is no legal bar in permitting the petitioner to withdraw the petition more so when the alleged violations committed by the respondent are purely technical in nature and no criminality is attached to it. The petitioner being *dominus litus* is at liberty to withdraw the petition more so when plausible explanations have been offered in the memo for resorting such a recourse.

In the result, it is ordered that the main petition shall stand dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to institute a fresh petition if and when the occasion demands. Connected Interlocutory Application I.A. No. 2 of 2023 shall also stand dismissed as infructuous.

Sd/-XXXXX  
**Adjudicating Officer**

/True Copy /

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