

No.39/2019 dated: 13-12-2019

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 17-12-2019****Venue: Court Hall of the Commission****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.17 of 2019	State Load Despatch Centre (SLDC)	Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Praying to approve the Capital Investment Plan for the control period of FY 2019-2020 to FY 2021-2022. For admission.
2	I.A.No.1 of 2019 & D.R.P.No.12 of 2019	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus TANTRANSCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Declare that the respondents are not entitled to collect annual O&M charges and direct the respondent to refund a sum of Rs.1.00 crore along with interest. For admission.
3	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 & Anr.	Adv.S.Haja Mohideen Gisthi Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to set aside the CE/NCES letter dated 18.9.2017. For reporting the status of the case in Hon'ble High Court of Madras.
4	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 & Anr.	Adv.S.Haja Mohideen Gisthi Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to set aside the CE,NCES of TANGEDCO letter dated 18-9-2017. For reporting the status of the case in Hon'ble High Court of Madras.
5	M.P.No.16 of 2019	TANTRANSCO	Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Seeking approval for Capital Investment Plan for Transmission function for the FY 2019-20, 2020-21 & 2021-22. For filing additional affidavit.

6	R.A.No.5 of 2019	Ramnad Renewable Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to grant the petitioner a project specific extension of the control period and to declare the petitioner has successfully commissioned its 72 MW solar power project. For counter.
7	R.A.No.6 of 2019	Kamuthi Solar Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to grant the petitioner a project specific extension of the control period and to declare the petitioner has successfully commissioned its 216 MW solar power project. For counter.
8	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 filing common counter.
9	D.R.P.No.3 of 2019	M/s.Tulsyan NEC Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE/Grid Operation 3) SE/CEDC/North	Adv.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay Rs.44.80/- lakhs being the value of the energy lapsed due to over injection. For counter.
10	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.
11	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.

12	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.
13	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.
14	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.
15	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.
16	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.
17	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.
18	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.
19	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.

20	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.
21	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.
22	D.R.P. No.20 of 2014	Krishna Kumar Orthopaedic Hospital and Institute of Orthopaedics (P) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	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.64 of 2014	TNPL Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	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	R.P.No. 2 of 2013	Spictex Cotton Mills (P) Ltd. Versus 1) CFC/ Revenue, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv. M.Gopinathan	To review the order dated 17.4.2013 in D.R.P.No.2 of 2012. For arguments.
25	D.R.P.No.14 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Virudhunagar EDC	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv. M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 2 nd respondent impugned notice dated 11.8.2012 towards short levy of excess energy charges. For arguments.
26	D.R.P.No.15 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Virudhunagar EDC	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv. M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 2 nd respondent impugned notice dated 28.9.2012. For arguments.
27	D.R.P.No.29 of 2013	Angalakshmi Spinning Mills Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO & ors.	Adv. S.Sivanandam Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.48.31/- lakhs for the belated payment for supply of electricity. For arguments of Respondent.

28	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 Respondent.
29	M.P.No.14 of 2017	M/s.Ambika Cotton Mills Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) CFC, Revenue	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To allow the adjustment of WEG from the first commissioned machine and second commissioned machine. For arguments.
30	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 arguments.
31	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 arguments.
32	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 arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission