

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 2-6-2016

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 2.30 pm

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel or parties	Remarks
1	P.R.C.No. 1 of 2016	SEI Kathiravan Power Private Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE,NCES	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Praying to classify as Miscellaneous petition and grant a project specific extension of the control period from 31-3-2016 to the date of inter-connection of the petitioner's 50 MW project to the grid. For maintainability.
2	M.P.No. 8 of 2016	Ind-Barath Power Infra Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Seshadri	Praying to direct the respondent to maintain uniformity in the payment without showing the discrimination among the generators. For maintainability.
3	M.P.No.12 of 2016	TANGEDCO Versus Nil	CE,GTS of TANGEDCO	Praying to approve and ratify for having generated real power 10.5080 MUs at the fuel cost of Rs.16.66 Cr. in FY 2015-16 under unavoidable emergency circumstances. For admission.
4	I.A.No. 1 of 2016 & R.P.No.1 of 2016	Indian Wind Power Assn., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO/SLDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Praying to Review the Comprehensive Tariff Order on Wind Energy dated 31-3-2016. For admission and interim relief.
5	M.P.No. 13 of 2016	CE,NCES,TANGEDCO Versus Nil	CE,NCES	Praying to grant permission for procurement of 500 MW solar power from private developers through reverse bidding route with Rs.,5.10 per unit as upper limit. For admission.
6	M.P.No.39 of 2012	TANGEDCO Versus Nil	CFC, Revenue, TANGEDCO	Praying to approve the additional capitalization for the financial year 2010-11 to 2012-13. For arguments.
7	R.A.No. 1 of 2013	1) Sai Regency Power Corp. Pvt., Ltd., 2) Beta Wind Farm Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji	For determination of Transmission Charges as remanded by APTEL. For arguments.
8	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.

9	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.
10	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.
11	M.P.No. 26 of 2015	CE, Mechanical, Thermal Station, TANGEDCO Versus Nil	CE, Mechanical	Praying to permit the units of Ennore TPS and Mettur TPS – II to run continuously so as to meet the grid demand. For arguments.
12	M.P.No. 4 of 2016	Ind-Barath Thermal Power Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Seshadri	Praying to fix the compensatory cost under section 11(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. For arguments.
13	M.P.No. 5 of 2016	Ind-Barath Thermal Power Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Seshadri	Praying to issue appropriate direction for the payment of compensation under section 11(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. For arguments.
14	M.P.No. 6 of 2016	Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Seshadri	Praying to issue appropriate direction for the payment of compensation under section 11(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. For arguments.
15	M.P.No. 7 of 2016	Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Seshadri	Praying to fix the compensatory cost under section 11(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. For arguments.
16	M.P.No. 9 of 2016	Ind-Barath Powergencom Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Seshadri	Praying to fix the compensatory cost under section 11(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. For arguments.
17	M.P.No. 10 of 2016	TANTRANSCO Versus Nil	CE,Transmission	Praying to approve the Capital Investment Plan for the FY 2016-17 for Rs.2823.40 Crores, for the FY 2017-18 for Rs.2926 Crores and for the FY 2018-19 for Rs.3945 Crores. For arguments.

(By Order of the Commission)

S.Chinnarajalu
Secretary