

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**REVISED CAUSE LIST**

**Cases posted for 16 - 11 - 2011**

**Venue: Court Hall of the Commission**

**Time : 2.30 pm**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1.	I.A.No.1 of 2011 in M.P.No.29 of 2011 and M.P.No.29 of 2011	The Southern India Mills Association Versus 1) TNEB 2) CE, NCES	Adv.N.L. Rajah	Praying to set aside the proceedings Nos. 216 and 13 dated 25-6-2011 and 16-11-2010 respectively. For admission and interim relief.
2.	D.R.P.No.16 of 2011	1. Shree Ambika Sugars Ltd., 2. Terra Energy Ltd., Versus 1. TNEB 2. TANGEDCO 3. CE, Operation, SLDC 4. PTC India Ltd.,	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to direct PTC to make payment of Rs.4,97,14,775/- being the amount illegally deducted from the bills of 1 <sup>st</sup> petitioner. For admission and arguments on jurisdiction.
3.	M.P.No. 30 of 2011	Beta Wind Farm Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC, TANTRANSCO	Adv. Jenasen " Manoharan	Direct the respondent to execute the renewable energy wheeling agreement under REC scheme. For admission.
4.	P.P.A.P.No. 7 of 2011	TANGEDCO Versus Nil	Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	praying to fix temporary tariff for purchase of 80MW additional power from sugar mill co-generation plants for the period up to May 2012. For admission.
5.	M.P.No.16 of 2011	Simran Wind Project Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1. TANGEDCO 2. TNEB	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to clarify that the licensee is required to pay pooled cost of power to generators under the REC scheme as modified from time to time. For arguments.
6.	M.P.No.24 of 2011	TANGEDCO Versus Nil	Thiru. Ezhilarasan Chief Engineer	Praying to approve the deviation of certain parts of the guidelines. For arguments.
7.	I.A.No. 1 of 2011 in M.P.No.48 of 2010	TANGEDCO Versus Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Ltd.,	Thiru. Ezhilarasan CE, PPP, TANGEDCO	praying to fix minimum bid capacity. For arguments.

8.	M.P.No.17 of 2011	M/s. Clover Energy (P) Ltd., Versus 1. TANTRANSCO 2. TANGEDCO	Adv. A. Jenasenan ‘ E. Manoharan  Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	Praying to clarify that the petitioner is eligible to apply and procure REC immediately without the waiting the period of 3 years. For arguments.
9.	R.A.No.1 of 2011 – Appeal No.23 of 2011	TMT Muthammal Textiles Mills Ltd., Versus TNEB	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	To consider and decide the date of effect of order dated 7-9-2010. For arguments.
10.	R.A.No.2 of 2011 – Appeal Nos.79 & 80 of 2011	National Textiles Corporation Ltd., Versus TNEB	Adv. Ramesh Kumar  Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	To consider and decide the date of effect of order dated 7-9-2010. For arguments.
11.	R.A.No.3 of 2011 – Appeal No.120 of 2011	Southern India Mills Association Versus TNEB	Adv. N.L. Rajah  Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	To consider and decide the date of effect of order dated 7-9-2010. For arguments.
12.	M.P.No.8 of 2011	Sai Regency Power Corporation Pvt., Ltd.,  Versus  TNEB	Adv. A. Jenasenan “ E. Manoharan  Adv. R. Selvakumar	Praying to pass appropriate orders against the respondent Board for disobedience of the Commission’s order dated 7-9-2010 in D.R.P.No.4 of 2010. For arguments.

(By Order of the Commission)

(M.Velayudhaperumal)  
Assistant Secretary