

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**REVISED CAUSE LIST**

**Cases posted for 21-4- 2014**

**Venue: Court Hall of the Commission**

**Time : 2.30pm**

<b>Sl.</b>	<b>Case No.</b>	<b>Name of the Parties</b>	<b>Counsel or parties</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
1	I.A.No. 1 of 2014 in D.R.P.No. 6 of 2012	Karmic Business Specialities Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, TNEB 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv. P. Subba Reddy “ K. Aparna Devi	Praying to set aside the dismissal order dated 5-2-2014. For admission.
2	P.P.A.P.No. 3 of 2012	TANGEDCO  Versus  Nil	Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian	Praying to approve the purchase of power totaling a quantum of about 810 MW for a period less than one year i.e from June 2012 to May 2013. For arguments.
3	M.P.No.24 of 2012	Tamil Nadu Newsprint and papers Ltd., Versus Nil	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the petitioner's captive power plant comprised of steam powered turbo generators as cogeneration plants. For arguments.
4	M.P.No.25 of 2012	JSW Steel Ltd., Versus Nil	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the petitioner's captive power plant comprised of steam powered turbo generators as cogeneration plants. For arguments.
5	D.R.P.No.20 of 2011	MMS Steel & Power Pvt., Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Direct the respondent of Rs.4.67 per unit amounting to Rs.2,30,33,089 for power supplied between 24-5-2010 to 21-6-2010. For arguments.
6	P.P.A.P.No. 8 of 2011	CE, NCES, TANGEDCO  Versus 1. M.R.K. Co-Opt. Sugar Mills and 15 others.	Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian  Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to fix power purchase tariff for sugar mill co-generation plants commissioned based on power purchase agreements executed prior to 15-5-2006 for the period from 1-4-2010. For arguments.
7	P.P.A.P.No. 9 of 2011	CE, NCES, TANGEDCO Versus 1. Arashi Hi-Tech Bio Power Ltd., and four others.	Adv. P.H. Vinod Pandian  Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	Praying to fix power purchase tariff applicable for biomass power plants commissioned based on power purchase agreements executed prior to 15-5-2006 for the period from 1-4-2010. For arguments.
8	D.R.P.No. 24 of 2011	Terra Energy Ltd., Versus 1. TANGEDCO 2. SE, Cuddalore EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.5,40,90,289/- in terms of clause 7 of PPA dated 26-3-2004. For arguments.

9	D.R.P.No. 25 of 2011	Terra Energy Ltd., Versus 1. TANGEDCO 2. SE, Tanjavur EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.3,31,49,875/- in terms of clause 7 of PPA dated 31-3-2004. For arguments.
10	D.R.P.No. 26 of 2011	Shree Ambika Sugars Ltd., Versus 1. TANGEDCO 2. SE, Cuddalore EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.15,34,33,236/- in terms of clause 7 of PPA dated 18-8-2004. For arguments.
11	D.R.P.No. 27 of 2011	Shree Ambika Sugars Ltd., Versus 1. TANGEDCO 2. SE, Tanjavur EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.1,67,24,532/- in terms of clause 7 of PPA dated 15-3-2004. For arguments.
12	R.P.No. 2 of 2013	Spictex Cot Mills (P) Ltd., Versus 1)CFC, Revenue 2) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv. R.S. Pandiyaraj	Praying to review the order dated 17-4-2013 made in D.R.P.No.2 of 2012. For arguments.
13	D.R.P.No. 20 of 2013	KEC Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondent to make payment of a sum of Rs.21,34,127/- being the interest due against delayed payments made till February 2012. For arguments.
14	D.R.P.No.21 of 2013	Century Floor Mills Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.P.H.Vinod Pandian	Praying to direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.26,71,104/- being the interest due against delayed payments made till 14-2-2013 for power supplied. For arguments.
15	M.P.No.12 of 2013	TANFAC Versus Nil	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the petitioner's 2.23 MW plant as cogeneration plant. For arguments.
16	M.P.No.82 of 2013	SESA Sterlite Ltd., Versus Nil	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the petitioner's waster heat recovery boiler system is a cogeneration plant. For arguments.

(By Order of the Commission)

**S. Gunasekaran**  
Secretary