

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**CAUSE LIST**

**Cases posted for 17-09-2019**

**Venue: Court Hall of the Commission**

**Time : 11.00 AM**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No. 6 of 2015	Super Springs Private Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Kanyakumari EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.11.67 lakhs being the sums due and payable to the petitioner as on 9-2-2015 towards unutilized banked units. For admission.
2	D.R.P.No. 7 of 2015	M/s.A.R.S.Metals (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Seshadri  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix the supervision charges for erection of 230 K.V. temporary connectivity line and direct the respondents to refund the excess amounts collected with interest. For admission.
3	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.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 admission.
4	D.R.P.No. 4 of 2017	Al Ameen Green Energy Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) The Secretary, Energy Dept., Govt. of Tamil Nadu 2) TANGEDCO 3) CE, NCES	Adv.S.Haja Mohideen Gisthi  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to set aside the CE/NCES letter dated 18.9.2017. For admission.
5	D.R.P.No. 5 of 2017	Al Ameen Green Energy Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) The Secretary, Energy Dept., Govt. of Tamil Nadu 2) TANGEDCO	Adv.S.Haja Mohideen Gisthi	Praying to set aside the CE,NCES of TANGEDCO letter dated 18-9-2017. For admission.

		3) CE, NCES	Adv.M.Gopinathan	
6	D.R.P.No. 1 of 2018	M/s.National Enterprises  Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.V.N.Bohra  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.98 crores being the balance of amount due to the petitioner from TANGEDCO which is delay payment interest. For admission.
7	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 admission.
8	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 admission.
9	M.P.No.14 of 2018	TANGEDCO Versus  Nil	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Exemption on the applicablity of Regulation 8. For admission.
10	M.P.No.8 of 2019	M/s.Navin Housing & Properties Pvt. Limited Versus 1)CMD/TANGEDCO 2)CE/Distribution 3)CE/Commercial 4) SE/Distn, Chennai South-II	Stephen & Stephen Advocates Associates	To proceed under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for wilful contravention of Regulations 29(12)(ii) of Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Code against the officials of TANGEDCO. For admission.
11	D.R.P.No.7 of 2019	M/s.Walwhan Renewable Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	SKV Law Offices	Direct the TANGEDCO to refund the Security Deposit amount of Rs.5.37 crores along with interest. For admission.
12	D.R.P.No.9 of 2019	M/s.Aquasub Engineering  Versus  TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Arun Anbumani  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the communication of TANGEDCO demanding a sum of Rs.9.49 crores and to refund a sum of Rs.4.34 crores along with interest.

				For admission.
13	D.R.P.No.58 of 2014	Ramco Cements Ltd.,  Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Virudhunagar EDC 3) Audit Branch,Tirunelveli	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 2 <sup>nd</sup> respondent letter dated 12-4-2013. For counter.
14	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.
15	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 counter.
16	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 against delayed payments made by respondents for power supplied. For counter.
17	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.
18	D.R.P.No. 2 of 2017	M/s.SRB Consultancy Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Tiruppur EDC	Bohra & Associates  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to release the Late Payment Surcharge of Rs.36.08 lakhs. For counter.
19	D.R.P.No. 3 of 2017	M/s.SRB Consultancy Pvt., ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Bohra & Associates  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to release the Late Payment Surcharge of Rs.34.26 lakhs. For counter.
20	D.R.P.No. 2 of	Sunil Wind Energy	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Direct the respondents to

	2015	Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.M.Gopinathan	make payment of Rs.3.45/- lakhs being the interest due. For counter.
21	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 counter.
22	D.R.P. No. 6 of 2014	Anu Cashews Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for delay in settlement of invoices beyond the period of 30 days. For counter.
23	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For counter.
24	D.R.P. No.28 of 2014	VVD and Sons 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 of invoices. For counter.
25	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For counter.
26	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For counter.
27	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For counter.
28	D.R.P. No.32 of 2014	The Metal Powder Company Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For

		2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.M.Gopinathan	counter.
29	D.R.P. No.33 of 2014	Spikepower Protection Systems & Technologies Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For counter.
30	D.R.P. No.34 of 2014	Natesan Synchrocones Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For counter.
31	D.R.P. No.36 of 2014	Mangalam 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. For counter.
32	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 counter.
33	D.R.P.No. 75 of 2014	D.A.Srinivas Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Dindigul EDC	Adv.S.P.Parthasarathy  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to pay the balance amount due to the petitioner for power supplied. For counter.
34	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 counter.
35	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 counter.
36	R.A.No.4 of 2019	Association of Healthcare Providers (India) Versus  TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Venkatesh  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Change of tariff from HT-III to HT-IIA or a special category below HT-III for hospitals at Rural and Semi-urban areas. For counter.

37	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.
38	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.
39	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.
40	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.
41	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.
42	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.
43	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.
44	D.R.P. No.14 of 2014	Elveety Industries Pvt. Ltd.,	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in

		<p><b>Versus</b></p> <p>1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue</p>	<p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>settlement. For negotiation.</p>
45	D.R.P. No.15 of 2014	<p>Sri Kumaraswamy Mineral Exports Pvt. Ltd.,</p> <p><b>Versus</b></p> <p>1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement. For negotiation.</p>
46	D.R.P. No.16 of 2014	<p>Orange County Resorts and Hotels Ltd.,</p> <p><b>Versus</b></p> <p>1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement. For negotiation.</p>
47	D.R.P. No.17 of 2014	<p>Zuri Hotels and Resorts Pvt. Ltd.,</p> <p><b>Versus</b></p> <p>1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.</p>
48	D.R.P. No.18 of 2014	<p>Om Sakthi Wind Power Pvt. Ltd.,</p> <p><b>Versus</b></p> <p>1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.</p>
49	D.R.P. No.19 of 2014	<p>Sree Rayalaseema Hi-Strength Hypo Ltd.,</p> <p><b>Versus</b></p> <p>1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.</p>
50	D.R.P. No.20 of 2014	<p>Krishna Kumar Orthopaedic Hospital and Institute of Orthopaedics (P) Ltd.,</p> <p><b>Versus</b></p> <p>1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.</p>
51	D.R.P. No.21 of 2014	<p>Maris Spinners Ltd.,</p> <p><b>Versus</b></p> <p>1) TANGEDCO</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p>	<p>Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.</p>

		2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.M.Gopinathan	
52	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.
53	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.
54	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.
55	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.
56	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 negotiation.
57	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 negotiation.
58	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 negotiation.
59	D.R.P. No.39 of 2014	Tamil Nadu Gears and Shafts Corporation  Versus	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.4.57



		1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.M.Gopinathan	lakhs. For negotiation.
60	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 negotiation.
61	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 negotiation.
62	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 being the interest due against the delayed payments. For negotiation.
63	D.R.P.No. 56 of 2014	M/s.Techno Electric & Engineering Company Limited (formerly Simran Wind Project Limited) Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs. 4.85/- crores being the interest due against the delayed payments made by the respondents. For negotiation.
64	D.R.P.No. 59 of 2014	M/s.Techno Electric & Engineering Company Limited (formerly Simran Wind Project Limited) Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.11.80 being the interest due against the delayed payments made by the respondents. For negotiation.
65	D.R.P.No. 60 of 2014	M/s.Techno Electric & Engineering Company Limited (formerly Simran Wind Project Limited) Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.7.39 crores being the interest due against the delayed payments made by the respondents. For negotiation.
66	D.R.P.No. 64 of	TNPL	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of

	2014	Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Rs.3.76 being the interest due against the delayed payments made by the respondents. For negotiation.
67	D.R.P.No. 70 of 2014	KBD Sugars and Distilleries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.31.96/- lakhs being the balance amount due to the petitioner for power supplied. For negotiation.
68	D.R.P.No. 71 of 2014	KBD Sugars and Distilleries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.6.38/- crores being the balance amount due to the petitioner for power supplied. For negotiation.
69	D.R.P.No.72 of 2014	KBD Sugars and Distilleries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs. 92.57/- lakhs being the balance amount due to the petitioner for power supplied. For negotiation.
70	D.R.P.No. 73 of 2014	D.A.Sathya Prabha Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to pay the balance amount due to the petitioner for power supplied. For negotiation.
71	D.R.P.No. 74 of 2014	D.A.Srinivas Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.40/- crores being the balance amount due to the petitioner for power supplied. For negotiation.
72	D.R.P.No.77 of 2014	M/s.Vision Textiles 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.5.12/- lakhs being the interest due. For negotiation.

73	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.
74	D.R.P.No.26 of 2013	Sai Regency Power Corp. Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	Adv. Jenasen  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.
75	D.R.P.No. 50 of 2014	OPG Power Generation Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC 4) SE, Chennai EDC 5) Internal Audit Officer	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the respondent letter dated 20-3-2014. For arguments.
76	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 arguments.
77	D.R.P.No. 61 of 2014	Hi-Tech Arai Private Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC 4) SE, Tiruppur EDC 5) SE, Dindigul EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 2 <sup>nd</sup> respondent letter dated 16-4-2014. For arguments.
78	D.R.P.No. 66 of 2014	Samalpatti Power Company Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 1 <sup>st</sup> respondent and make payment of Rs.5.82 crores/- together with interest of Rs.51.22 lakhs. For arguments.
79	M.P.No. 27 of 2016	SEPC Power Private Ltd.,	Adv.Rahul Balaji	To take on record the Financial Closing date as

		<b>Versus</b> <b>TANGEDCO</b>	<b>Adv.Abdul Saleem</b>	<b>30-10-2015. For arguments.</b>
<b>80</b>	<b>T.A.No.1 of 2019</b> <b>(Transferred by</b> <b>the Hon'ble High</b> <b>Court of Madras</b> <b>in</b> <b>W.P.Nos.11133</b> <b>to 11139 of</b> <b>2018)</b>	<b>1) M/s.Venkatewara</b> <b>Cotton Yarn Mills Salem</b> <b>Pvt. Ltd.</b> <b>2) M/s.Tamil Nadu</b> <b>Spinning Mills Assn.</b> <b>3) M/s.Eswar Rubber</b> <b>Products Pvt. Limited</b> <b>4) M/s.Perumal Spinning</b> <b>Mills Pvt. Limited</b> <b>5) M/s.Thangavel Fabrics</b> <b>Pvt. Limited</b> <b>6) M/s.Aland Spinners Pvt.</b> <b>Limited</b> <b>7) M/s.Balaji Rubber</b> <b>Industries Pvt. Limited</b>  <b>Versus</b> <b>1) Energy Deptt. / GoTN.</b> <b>2) TANGEDCO</b> <b>3) TANTRANSCO</b> <b>4) SLDC</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>For notice to parties and</b> <b>further hearing on the policy</b> <b>direction issued by the</b> <b>Government of Tamil Nadu</b> <b>in the matter of grant of</b> <b>Open Access above 1 MW.</b>

**(By order of the Commission)**

**Secretary**  
**Tamil Nadu Electricity**  
**Regulatory Commission**