

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 31-1- 2014

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 2012 & D.R.P.No.29 of 2012	Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) ACE, Erode EDC	Adv. Seshadri	Praying to direct the respondents not to levy and collect the backup power or outage charges. For counter on the maintainability of the petition.
2	I.A.No.1 of 2012 & D.R.P.No. 30 of 2012	Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) ACE, Erode EDC	Adv. Seshadri	Praying to direct the respondents not to levy and collect the backup power or outage charges. For counter on the maintainability of the petition.
3	D.R.P.No.26 of 2012	Madurai Power Corp. Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the respondents are bound to issue dispatch instructions under the PPA strictly in terms of Article 6.3 thereby disentitling them from issuing part / zero power dispatch instructions under the terms of the PPA between the parties except in the event of an emergency affecting the grid system. For admission
4	D.R.P.No.27 of 2012	Samalpatti Power Co. Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to declare that the respondents are bound to issue dispatch instructions under the PPA strictly in terms of Article 6.3 thereby disentitling them from issuing part / zero power dispatch instructions under the terms of the PPA between the parties except in the event of an emergency affecting the grid system. For admission
5	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 admission.
6	I.A.No.1 of 2013 in D.R.P.No.23 of 2013	Auromira Biopower India Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv. Vinod Kumar	Praying to set aside the demand of Rs.40,50,397/- made by the second respondent vide letter dated 18-4-2013. For admission and interim relief.
7	D.R.P.No.26 of 2013	M/s. Sai Regency Power Corporation Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	Adv. Jenasenan " E. Manoharan	Praying to direct the respondents to release the sum of Rs.2,35,76,000/- withheld from the sums payable to the petitioner for supply of energy. For admission.

8	D.R.P.No.17 of 2011	Kaveri Gas Power Ltd., Versus 1)Director, TANTRANSCO 2)Director, TANGEDCO 3) SE, Nagapattinam EDC 4) TNEB	Adv. Vinod Kumar “ Chitra Narayan	Direct the respondent to pay for 509340 units of power exported into the grid during 4-1-2011 and 20-1-2011. For arguments.
9	D.R.P.No.20 of 2011	MMS Steel & Power Pvt., Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji	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.
10	P.P.A.P. No.1 of 2011	1. Sakthi Sugars Ltd., 2. TNPL Versus TNEB / TANGEDCO	Thiru. Shivakumar “ Suresh	Details called for.

(By Order of the Commission)

S. Gunasekaran
Secretary