

No.34/2019 dated: 07-11-2019

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 12-11-2019****Venue: Court Hall of the Commission****Time : 11.00 AM**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.11 of 2015	Ind Eco Ventures Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv. C.Raghunatha Reddy Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.40.59 lakhs together with interest. For admission.
2	D.R.P.No.13 of 2015	Manikaran Power Ltd., Versus Auro Mira Bio Energy (Madurai) Limited	Adv.Abhinandan Das	Direct the respondent to pay a sum of Rs.12.61 lakhs as compensation along with interest at 18% from the date on which the compensation amount was first demanded. For admission.
3	M.P.No.9 of 2019	M/s.India Power Corpn (Tuticorin) Private Limited	Thiru.Jyotirmay Bhaumik, Director	Seeking approval for company's name change and allow transfer of all financial and contractual liabilities of IPCTPL as Deemed Distribution Licensee to TESPL. For admission.
4	D.R.P.No.11 of 2019	M/s.Ratedi Wind Power Private Limited Versus 1)CMD/TANGEDCO 2)CE/NCES/TANGEDCO 3) SE/EDC, Tirunelveli	Adv.Adithya Reddy	Direct the respondent to refund the balance amount of Rs.5.72 crores for the period upto March 2018 that has been collected on the basis of erroneous application of the Amendment dated 19.6.2013 along with interest of Rs.2.30 crores. For admission.

5	D.R.P.No. 76 of 2014	M. Sathish Kumar Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Finance) 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs. 2.5/- lakhs being the interest due. For counter.
6	D.R.P.No.78 of 2014	KCP Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, Commercial &ors.	S.Ramasubramaniam & Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix the quota energy of 5.39 lakh units as against the base energy of 8.99 lakh units by applying 40% power cut without adjusting wind mill energy and demand. For counter.
7	D.R.P.No. 1 of 2016	M/s.R.K.K.R.Steels Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Dindigul 3) SE, Chennai	Adv.K.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.31.72/- lakhs being the 75% of the purchase rate injected into respondents grid. For counter.
8	M.P.No. 4 of 2018	M/s.Ranergy Solutions (P) Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue a clarification on the interpretation of the 19% CUF value as per T.O.No.7 of 2014 dated 12-9-2014. For counter.
9	M.P.No.11 of 2018	M/s. B.S. Apparel Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue a clarification on the interpretation of the 19% CUF value as per T.O.No.7 of 2014 dated 12-9-2014. For counter.
10	I.A.No.1 of 2019 in M.P.No.11 of 2019	National Solar Energy Federation of India Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	To set aside the circular issued by CE/NCES dt.14-6-2017 and direct the TANGEDCO to adhere to the terms of the PPAs entered into with Solar Power Generators and not make deductions by applying CUF. For counter.
11	D.R.P.No.8 of 2019	M/s.Ramnad Renewable Energy Ltd. Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to direct the TANGEDCO to make payment of all outstanding amount of Rs.16.80 crores including late payment

				surcharge payable to the petitioner for sale of power from solar power project. For counter.
12	D.R.P.No. 25 of 2013	Sun Paper Mill Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix the rate for supply of power. For filing withdrawal memo.
13	D.R.P.No.1 of 2015	Balkrishna Wind Energy Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.2.69/- lakhs being the interest due. For filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
14	D.R.P.No. 2 of 2015	Sunil Wind Energy Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.3.45/- lakhs being the interest due. For filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
15	D.R.P.No. 3 of 2015	Lanco Tanjore Power Company Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.50.70 crores being the interest due. For filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
16	D.R.P. No.27 of 2014	Devi Sea Foods 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
17	D.R.P. No.29 of 2014	Nalco Metal Products 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
18	D.R.P. No.30 of 2014	TCP 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.

19	D.R.P. No.31 of 2014	Hindustan Platinum Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & CFC/Rev.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
20	D.R.P. No.32 of 2014	The Metal Powder Company 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
21	D.R.P.No. 43 of 2014	Emerald Jewel Industry India Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC/Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct TANGEDCO to make a payment of Rs.8.84/- lakhs with interest. For filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
22	D.R.P. No.7 of 2014	Binaguri Tea Company 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
23	D.R.P. No.8 of 2014	India Fashions 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
24	D.R.P. No.9 of 2014	Savita Oil Technologies 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
25	D.R.P. No.10 of 2014	M. Babanna 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.

26	D.R.P. No.11 of 2014	P.M. Granite Ex 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
27	D.R.P. No.12 of 2014	Spero Power 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
28	D.R.P. No.13 of 2014	Scientific Mes-Technik 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
29	D.R.P. No.14 of 2014	Elveety Industries 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
30	D.R.P. No.15 of 2014	Sri Kumaraswamy Mineral Exports 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
31	D.R.P. No.17 of 2014	Zuri Hotels and Resorts 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
32	D.R.P. No.18 of 2014	Om Sakthi Wind Power 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
33	D.R.P. No.19 of 2014	Sree Rayalaseema Hi-Strength Hypo 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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.

34	D.R.P. No.20 of 2014	Krishna Kumar Orthopaedic Hospital and Institute of Orthopaedics (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 acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
35	D.R.P.No. 64 of 2014	TNPL Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.3.76 being the interest due against the delayed payments. For filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
36	D.R.P.No.29 of 2013	Angalakshmi Spinning Mills Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SE, Coimbatore EDC 4) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv. S.Sivanandam Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.48.31/- for the belated payment for supply of electricity and for encashment of unutilized banking energy. For arguments of Respondents.
37	D.R.P.No. 30 of 2013	Shakthi Murugan Textiles Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli 4) SE, Coimbatore	Adv. S.Sivanandam Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.32.91/- lakhs for the belated payment and for encashment of unutilized banking energy. For arguments of Respondents.
38	D.R.P.No. 51 of 2014	Lanco Tanjore Power Company Ltd., Versus 1) TNEB 2) TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay an amount of Rs.32.05 crores towards refund / reimbursement of the MAT for the period from 2005 to 2012. For arguments.

39	D.R.P.No. 7 of 2015	M/s.A.R.S.Metals (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Chennai EDC/North	Adv.K.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix the charges/tariff payable towards development charges, service connection charges and meter caution deposit and to refund the amounts collected unauthorisedly with interest. For arguments.
----	------------------------	---	--	--

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission