

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 19-1-2015

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 2.30 pm

Sl. No.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1	M.P.No. 11 of 2013	Subhashri Bio Energies Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Namakkal EDC	Thiru. S. Durairaju	For orders.
2	D.R.P.No.19 of 2013	Century Floor Mills Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, TANGEDCO 3) SE, Central EDC 4) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji	For orders.
3	M.P.No. 19 of 2014	Southern Railway Versus 1) Secy. to Govt. Energy Department. 2) TANGEDCO 3)Dir.FinanceTANGEDCO	Adv.R.Sathyabama	Praying to fix the tariff for Railway Traction for the disputed period from December 2001 to March 2003. R2&3 filed counter. R1 has to file the counter.
4	R.A.No. 1 of 2013	1) Sai Regency Power Corp. Pvt., Ltd., 2) Beta Wind Farm Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv.Manoharan	For determination of Transmission Charges as remanded by APTEL. For arguments.
5	R.A.No. 6 of 2013	1) Beta Wind Farm (P) Ltd., 2) Indian Wind Power Assn., 3) Southern India Mills Assn., 4) IWTMA 5) IWEA, 6)Velatal Spinning Mills Pvt. Ltd., 7) TASMA 8) Indian Spinning Mill Owner Assn., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul balaji Adv.N.L.Rajah Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.V.Mahendran	To comply with the directions issued in Appeal No.197, 198, 200, 201, 208 of 2012 and 6 of 2013. For arguments.
6	R.A.No.1 of 2014	OPG Renewable Energy Pvt. Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.N.L.Rajah	To comply with the directions issued in Appeal No.196 & 199 of 2013. For arguments.
7	R.A.No.2 of 2014	Tamil Nadu Power Producers Assn., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.N.L.Rajah	To comply with the directions issued in Appeal No.197 of 2013. For arguments.
8	R.A.No.3 of 2014	1) The south Indian Sugar Mills Assn., 2) Ponni Sugars (Erode) Ltd., 3) EID Parry (India) Ltd., 4) Rajashree Sugars and Chemicals Ltd., 5) Kothari Sugars&Chemicals Ltd., 6) Sakthi Sugars Ltd., 7) Dharani sugars & Chemicals Ltd.,	Adv. Gopal Chaudhary	To comply with the directions issued in R.P.No.13 of 2013 in Appeal No.199 of 2012. For arguments.

		8) Bannari Amman Sugars Ltd., 9) Dhanalakshmi Srinivasan Sugars pvt., Ltd., 10) Madras Sugars Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO		
9	R.A.No.4 of 2014	The Southern India Mills Assn., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.N.L.Rajah	To comply with the directions issued in Appeal No.257 of 2012. For arguments.
10	M.P.No.12 of 2012	Gangadhar Narasingdas Agarwal Versus TANGEDCO	Thiru. Srinath Sridaran	Praying to punish the respondent for failure to comply with the orders of the Commission dated 11-7-2011 in D.R.P.No. 14 of 2011. For arguments.
11	M.P.No.15 of 2013	Kaveri Gas Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Nagapattinam EDC	Adv. Vinod Kumar	Praying to punish respondents for their contravention of the Commission's order dated 21-2-2013 in R.A.No.3 of 2013. For arguments.
12	M.P.No. 25 of 2014	Pioneer Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) M(G) 3) CE, IPP	Adv.Sathyaseelan	Praying to issue directions on the respondents in terms of section 142 of the Electricity Act 2003 for non compliance of the order dated 30-12-2011. For arguments.
13	P.P.A.P.No.4 of 2014	IOT Mabagas Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Praying to fix an appropriate revised project specific tariff for the 2.40 MW anaerobic Biogas Plant. For arguments.
14	P.P.A.P. No.1 of 2011	1. Sakthi Sugars Ltd., 2. TNPL Versus TNEB / TANGEDCO	Thiru. Shivakumar " Suresh	Praying to fix the power purchase price for using coal instead of bagasse by the petitioner. For arguments.
15	M.A.P.No.3 of 2007	TANGEDCO Versus Madurai Power Corporation Pvt., Ltd.,	Adv. Rahul Balaji	For determination of capital cost. For arguments.
16	M.A.P.No. 2 of 2007 and M.A.P.No. 1 of 2012	TANGEDCO Versus Samalpatti Power Company Pvt. Ltd., And Samalpatti Power Company Pvt. Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji	Praying to finalize and fix the capital cost of the 105.66MW power project. For arguments.
17	M.P.No. 20 of 2014	TANGEDCO Versus Nil	CE, Mechanical Thermal Station, TANGEDCO	Praying to ratify and approve the units I, II, III and IV of Ennore TPS to keep in service even though the variable cost (Ex-Bus) is more than Rs.3.50per kwhr. For arguments.

(By Order of the Commission)

Secretary
TamilNadu Electricity Regulatory Commission