

No.37 / 2019 dated: 06-12-2019

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 10-12-2019****Venue: Court Hall of the Commission****Time : 11.00 AM**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	S.M.P.No.7 of 2014	Thiru Raguram Versus 1) CFC, Tariff Cell 2) CE, Planning	Party-in-Person Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
2	R.P.No.3 of 2016 in M.P.No.30 of 2014	Cuddalore Powergen Corporation Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
3	M.P.No.8 of 2019	M/s.Navin Housing & Properties Pvt. Limited Versus 1)CMD/TANGEDCO 2)CE/Distribution 3)CE/Commercial & ors.	Stephen & Stephen Advocates Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
4	D.R.P.No.10 of 2015	Indowind Energy Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Thiru. Diraviam Company Secretary Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.2.77 lakhs along with interest. For admission.
5	D.R.P.No.12 of 2015	Indowind Energy Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Thiru. Diraviam Company Secretary Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.01 crores along with interest. For admission.
6	M.P.No.13 of 2019	TANGEDCO	CFC / Regulatory Cell	Seeking approval for time extension for filing of ARR and Tariff Petition for the year 2020-21. For admission.

7	M.P.No.14 of 2019	TANTRANSCO	CFC / TANTRANSCO	Seeking approval for time extension for filing the ARR for FY 2020-21 along with True-up for the FY 2016-17 to 2018-19 and Annual Performance Review for 2019-20. For admission.
8	M.P.No.15 of 2019	State Load Despatch Centre (SLDC)	CE / Grid Operation	Seeking approval for time extension for filing of ARR along with true-up petition for FY 2017-18 to 2018-19 and CIP for control period 2019-20 to 2021-22 under MYT framework. For admission.
9	M.P.No.16 of 2019	TANTRANSCO	CE/Transmission	Seeking approval for Capital Investment Plan for Transmission function for the FY 2019-20, 2020-21 & 2021-22. For admission.
10	T.L.A.No.1 of 2019	Star Eco Energy Private Limited	Thiru.K.G.Rajkumar, Managing Director	Praying to grant Intra-State Trading Licence. For admission.
11	M.P.No.1 of 2018	TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To consider the estimated Capital Cost of Rs.2567/- Crores for conversion of existing Overhead Lines to Underground Cables in the extended are of Chennai City. For filing affidavit.
12	D.R.P.No.58 of 2014	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 2 nd respondent letter dated 12-4-2013. For counter.
13	D.R.P.No.81 of 2014	Dalmia Bharat and Sugar Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) DFC, TANGEDCO 3) CFC, TANGEDCO 4) SE, Tirunelveli	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a total sum of Rs.3.8/- crores. For counter.

14	D.R.P.No. 10 of 2016	Lanco Tanjore Power Co., Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.Abdul Saleem	Declare that the petitioner is entitled for variable charges towards difference of tariff heat rate for the period from 2008 to 2015. For counter.
15	D.R.P.No. 11 of 2016	Orchid Pharma Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC 3) SE, Chengalpattu EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the 1 st respondent demand notice and consequently direct the 2 nd respondent to give adjustment for the unutilized banked energy or encashment of Rs.23.93/- lakhs. For counter.
16	D.R.P.No. 2 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC 3) SE, Perambalur EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.3.89 crores towards excess energy pumped and surcharge of Rs.1.68 crores. For counter.
17	D.R.P.No.3 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC 3) SE, Perambalur EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.18 crores towards excess energy pumped and surcharge of Rs.21.79 lakhs. For counter.
18	M.P.No.2 of 2019	TANGEDCO Versus 1) Asahi Glass India Limited 2) Technical Stamp Lings Automotive Ltd 3) National Textile Corpn Ltd. 4) CAMBODIA Mills 5) Pankaja Mills 6) Sri Ranga Vilas Spg & Wvg Mills 7) Kaleeswara Mills 8) Pioneer Spinners 9) TMT Muthammal Textiles Mills Pvt. Ltd 10) The Southern India	Adv.T.Mohan Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj (R-3, R-4, R-5, R-6, R-7, R-8, R-10, R-11, R-13, R-14, R-15, R-16, R-17, R-18 & R-19)	To pass orders for implementing both Captive and Third Party Users in connection with calculation of excess demand and energy charges in the orders passed by the Commission dated 7.9.2010 in M.P.No.9 of 2010, M.P.No.6 of 2010, M.P.No.17 of 2010 and D.R.P.No.9 of 2010. For counter.

		Mills Association 11) Best Cotton Mills 12) Spictex Cotton Mills 13) Super Sales India Ltd 14) Aswin Textiles (P) Ltd 15) Bannari Amman Spinning Mills Ltd. 16) Bannari Amman Spinning Mills Ltd. 17) Rajapalayam Mills Limited 18) Tamil Nadu Spinnings Mills Assn. 19) Indoshell Mould Limited 20) TATA Consultancy Services 21) Madras Cements Limited		
19	D.R.P.No. 1 of 2017	Satia Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.44.00 lakhs. For counter.
20	P.P.A.P.No. 2 of 2018	Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency Versus TANGEDCO	Thiru. Vijayaraj, Sr.Manager Adv. M.Gopinathan	Tariff determination and exemption from Grid connectivity norms. For counter.
21	I.A.No.1 of 2019 in R.P.No.1 of 2019	M/s.Vedanta Limited (Formerly known as Sesa Sterlite Limited) Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To grant an interim order of stay of operation of the Commission's order dated 10.12.2018 passed in M.P.No.82 of 2013 and review this petition. For counter.
22	M.P.No.7 of 2019	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.Abdul Saleem	Direct the respondents to comply with the order of the Commission in PPAP No.3 of 2014 dated 29.7.2016 and PPA dated 12.12.2013. For filing counter both on the main petition and on the memo filed by the petitioner.

23	D.R.P. No.21 of 2014	Maris Spinners Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
24	D.R.P. No.22 of 2014	Texonic Instruments Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
25	D.R.P. No.23 of 2014	Maris Hotels and Theatres (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
26	D.R.P. No.24 of 2014	Bhabani Pigments Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
27	D.R.P. No.25 of 2014	R.Madan Mohan Rao Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
28	D.R.P. No.26 of 2014	Powerica Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
29	D.R.P. No.37 of 2014	Woodside Fashions Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.21.95 lakhs. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.

30	D.R.P. No.38 of 2014	Natesan Precision Components Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.15.91 lakhs. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
31	D.R.P. No.39 of 2014	Tamil Nadu Gears and Shafts Corporation Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.4.57 lakhs. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
32	D.R.P.No. 40 of 2014	Nupower Renewables Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.10.95 crores. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
33	D.R.P.No. 47 of 2014	White House Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.62.31 lakhs. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
34	D.R.P.No. 49 of 2014	Coimbatore Pioneer Fertilizers Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.68.14 lakhs. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment.
35	D.R.P.No. 52 of 2014	Designco Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) DFC, TANGEDCO 3) SE, Tuticorin EDC	Sri & Shankar Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.57.23 lakhs. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
36	D.R.P.No. 62 of 2014	CLP Wind Farms (India) Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payments of a sum of Rs.10.61 crores being the interest due. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.

37	D.R.P.No.63 of 2014	CLP Wind Farms (Theni Project-II) Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Finance) 3) SE, Theni EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payments of a sum of Rs.11.62 crores being the interest due. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
38	D.R.P.No. 32 of 2013	Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North	Adv. Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	To declare that the withdrawal of deemed demand benefit by the 2 nd respondent is illegal and contrary to law. For arguments.
39	D.R.P.No. 54 of 2014	National Energy Trading and Services Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, Commercial 3) Director / Operation	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay an amount of Rs.33.13 crores towards balance of energy charges and surcharge accrued as on the date of the petition. For filing memo and arguments.
40	D.R.P.No.18 of 2013	ITC Ltd. Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Fin) & ors.	S.Ramasubramaniam & Associates Adv. M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondent to make payment of Rs.91.16 lakhs. For arguments.
41	D.R.P.No.24 of 2013	Sree Rangaraj Ispat Industries Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. T.Mohan	Direct the respondents to adjust 88,100 energy units. For arguments.
42	D.R.P.No.26 of 2013	Sai Regency Power Corpn. Ltd Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	Thiru. Ramakrishnan Chief Executive Officer Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to release a sum of Rs.2.35/-crores withheld from the sums payable to the petitioner for supply of energy. For arguments.
43	D.R.P.No. 27 of 2013	M/s.Techno Electric & Engineering Company Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to amend the power purchase agreements. For arguments.

44	D.R.P.No. 4 of 2015	Ghanshyamdas Kanhaiyalal Totala HUF Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.2.46 lakhs being the interest due against delayed payments made by respondents for power supplied. For arguments.
45	D.R.P.No. 5 of 2015	Padmaadevi Sugars Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC & 3) CE, PPP	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.2.48 crores being the sums due. For arguments.
46	D.R.P.No. 3 of 2016	M/s. Mitra Fidelity Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. T.Mohan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.66.22/-lakhs for unutilized banked energy along with interest. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
47	D.R.P.No. 4 of 2016	M/s. Greenweiz Projects Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. T.Mohan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.28.39/-lakhs with interest. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
48	D.R.P.No. 5 of 2016	M/s. Tapi Energy Projects Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.13.04/-lakhs for unutilized banked energy along with interest. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
49	I.A.No.1 of 2019 & D.R.P.No.9 of 2019	M/s.Aquasub Engineering Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Arun Anbumani Adv. T.Mohan	To set aside the communication of TANGEDCO demanding a sum of Rs.9.49 crores and refund a sum of Rs.4.34 crores along with interest. For filing of additional particulars and arguments.

50	M.P.No.12 of 2019	TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval for procurement of power to meet the anticipated deficit under short term power procurement of 300 MW to 1000 MW RTC power for the period from 15.02.2020 to 21.05.2020. For admission.
----	-------------------	----------	------------------	--

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission