

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 13-08-2019

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 11.00 AM

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No. 80 of 2014	VTX Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.Arun Anbumani Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents not to levy cross subsidy charges and other charges. For admission.
2	D.R.P.No. 5 of 2016	M/s. Tapi Energy Projects Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Tuticorin EDC 4) SE, Chennai EDC	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 admission.
3	D.R.P.No. 6 of 2016	Kaveri Gas Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Nagapattinam EDC	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest. For admission.
4	D.R.P.No. 7 of 2016	Cauvery Power Generation Chennai Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Chennai EDC North	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.53.92/- lakhs. For admission.
5	D.R.P.No. 8 of 2016	MALCO Energy Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) PTC India Limited	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay Rs.4.69/- crores for power supplied for the period from 1-6-2010 to 3-6-2010. For admission.

6	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. 2.50/- lakhs being the interest due. For counter on the maintainability.
7	D.R.P.No. 2 of 2016	DCW Ltd., Versus 1) PTC Limited 2) TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay the sum of Rs.48.02 lakhs along with interest. For counter.
8	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 the interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days. For negotiation.
9	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 any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days. For negotiation.
10	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 any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days. For negotiation.
11	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 any delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days. For negotiation.

12	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 any delay in settlement. For negotiation.
13	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 any delay in settlement. For negotiation.
14	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 any delay in settlement. For negotiation.
15	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 any delay in settlement. For negotiation.
16	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 any delay in settlement. For negotiation.
17	D.R.P. No.16 of 2014	Orange County Resorts and Hotels 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. For negotiation.
18	D.R.P.No.15 of 2011	1. Terra Energy Ltd., 2. Shree Ambika Sug. Ltd. Versus 1. TNEB	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Declare the action of TANGEDCO and M/s.PTC India Limited in treating the non-

		2. TANGEDCO 3. CE, Operation, SLDC 4. PTC India Ltd.,	M/s.RNS Associates	acceptance of generation and supply of power as arbitrary and illegal. For arguments.
19	D.R.P.No.16 of 2011	1. Shree Ambika Sug.Ltd., 2. Terra Energy Ltd., Versus 1. TNEB 2. TANGEDCO 3. CE, Operation, SLDC 4. PTC India Ltd.,	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan M/s.RNS Associates	Direct M/s.PTC India Limited to make payment of Rs.4.97/- crores being the amount illegally deducted from the bills of the 1 st petitioner. For arguments.
20	D.R.P.No.17 of 2012	PTC India Ltd., Versus 1) S.V.Sugar Mills Limited 2) TNEB 3) TANGEDCO 4) SLDC	Adv. Ravi Kishore Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the SV Sugar to pay Rs.8.53/- crores along with interest. For arguments.
21	D.R.P.No.25 of 2012	PTC India Ltd., Versus 1) Auomira Energy Co.P.Ltd., 2) TANGEDCO	M/s.RNS Associates Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the 1 st respondent to make a payment of Rs.1.19/- crore along with interest. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission