

No.30 / 2019 dated: 18-10-2019

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 22-10-2019

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	I.A.No.1 of 2015 in D.R.P.No.14 of 2015	SKI Carbon Black (India) Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) AO, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to release the outstanding payments for 10% power supplied and billed over and above the contracted quantum as per the PPA for the period from July 2013 to September 2014, amounting to a sum of Rs.1.10 crores along with interest of Rs.23.03 lakhs. For admission.
4	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.

5	M.P.No.10 of 2019	Thiru.K.Subramani, Namakkal Versus 1)S.E./Namakkal, TANGEDCO 2) EE/Namakkal	Party-in-Person Adv.M.Gopinathan	Petition filed u/s 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of the CGRF orders by the officials of TANGEDCO. For admission.
6	R.A.No.5 of 2019	Ramnad Renewable Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Party-in-Person	As directed by the Hon'ble Tribunal in its order dated 24-9-2019 in Appeal No.31 of 2017. For compliance of the order of the Hon'ble APTEL.
7	R.A.No.6 of 2019	Kamuthi Solar Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Party-in-Person	As directed by the Hon'ble Tribunal in its order dated 24-9-2019 in Appeal No.32 of 2017. For compliance of the order of the Hon'ble APTEL.
8	D.R.P.No.78 of 2014	KCP Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, Commercial & other	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.
9	D.R.P.No. 8 of 2015	M/s.A.R.S.Metals (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CE, Transmission 2) SE, General Construction Circle-1	Adv.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix establishment, supervision charges, testing and commissioning charges (1x60 MW) for 230 K.V. temporary transmission line and direct the respondents to refund the excess amounts collected with interest. For counter.
10	D.R.P.No.9 of 2015	M/s.A.R.S.Metals (P) Ltd., Versus 1) Director(Operation), TANTRANSCO 2) SE, Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix the supervision charges payable by the petitioner in the erection of 230 KV temporary connectivity line from the plant to Gummidipoondi 230 KV SS and direct the respondents to refund the excess amount collected with interest. For counter.

11	D.R.P. No.35 of 2014	TCP Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Sivagangai EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Refixing the demand and energy quota taking into account unique circumstances. For counter.
12	D.R.P.No.46 of 2014	M/s.Techno Electric & Engg. Company Limited Versus TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	To determine the pooled cost of power purchase for the financial years 2010 to 2013. For counter.
13	D.R.P.No.67 of 2014	Arulmozhi Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Thiru. Tharmaraj, Party-in-Person Adv.M.Gopinathan	To release of cash equivalent of Rs.8.14 lakhs for the unutilized banked energy as on 31-03-2012 without insisting of 51% utilization may be considered. For filing counter as a last chance.
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. 79 of 2014	Madras Hardtools Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.11.88 lakhs being the interest due against the delayed payments. For counter.
16	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.
17	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.

18	D.R.P.No. 2 of 2016	DCW Ltd., Versus 1) PTC Limited 2) TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. Ravi Kishore Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.48.02 lakhs along with interest. For filing counter by M/s.PTC India Limited.
19	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 filing counter by M/s.PTC India Limited (R-2).
20	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.
21	P.P.A.P.No. 2 of 2018	Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency Versus TANGEDCO	Thiru. Vijayaraj, Sr.Manager Party-in-Person Adv. M.Gopinathan	Tariff determination and exemption from Grid connectivity norms. For counter.
22	I.A.No.1 of 2018 in M.P.No. 21 of 2018	Indian Wind Power Association Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.T.Mohan	Seeking directions determining the banking charges in paise equivalent to 10% of the banked energy. For counter.
23	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.
24	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.

25	M.P.No.2 of 2019	<p>TANGEDCO</p> <p>Versus</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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 	<p>Adv.T.Mohan</p> <p>Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj</p> <p>(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)</p>	<p>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 filing counter on maintainability of the petition.</p>
26	M.P.No.3 of 2019	TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	<p>Seeking approval for the procedure to be adopted by TANGEDCO for Repowering of existing Wind Energy Generator's within the State of Tamil Nadu and Tariff proposed. For reporting the comments sought for from</p>

				the stakeholders.
27	D.R.P.No.1 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) CE, NCES & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.44 crores. For counter.
28	D.R.P.No.2 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) CE, NCES & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.2.52 crores towards 2% of line loss. For counter.
29	D.R.P.No.4 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.15.19 lakhs towards 2% of line loss. For counter.
30	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 counter.
31	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	To proceed under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003. For submitting the inspection report by TANGEDCO.
32	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 accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
33	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 a copy of the notice issued by TANGEDCO to the petitioner.

34	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 a copy of the notice issued by TANGEDCO to the petitioner.
35	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
36	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 accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
37	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
38	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 accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
39	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.

40	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 accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
41	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 accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
42	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
43	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
44	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
45	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 accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.

46	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
47	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 accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
48	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
49	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
50	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 accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
51	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.

52	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
53	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
54	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
55	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
56	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
57	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 accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.

58	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 accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
59	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
60	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. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
61	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 lakhs. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
62	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. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
63	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 made by the respondents. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.

64	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
65	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. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
66	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. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
67	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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
68	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. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
69	D.R.P.No. 75 of 2014	D.A.Srinivas Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Dindigul 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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.

70	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. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
71	D.R.P.No.15 of 2011	1. Terra Energy Ltd., 2. Shree Ambika Sug. Ltd. Versus 1. TNEB 2. TANGEDCO 3. CE, Operation, SLDC 4. PTC India Ltd.,	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan M/s.RNS Associates	Declare the action of TANGEDCO and M/s.PTC India Limited in treating the non-acceptance of generation and supply of power as arbitrary and illegal. For arguments.
72	D.R.P.No.16 of 2011	1. Shree Ambika Sugars 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.
73	D.R.P.No.25 of 2012	PTC India Ltd., Versus 1) Auomira Energy Co.P.Ltd., 2) TANGEDCO	M/s.RNS Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the 1 st respondent to make a payment of Rs.1.19/- crores along with interest. For arguments.
74	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.
75	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.
76	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.

77	D.R.P.No. 6 of 2016	Kaveri Gas Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Nagai EDC	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.32 crores. For arguments.
78	D.R.P.No. 7 of 2016	Cauvery Power Generation Chennai Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.53.92/- lakhs. For arguments.
79	T.L.A.No.1 of 2018	Ventus Energy Consultants	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. E.Anbarasan on behalf of the Objector, Thiru.N.Sivakumar Rajaprabhu.	Request for grant of Intra State Trading Licence. For arguments by the objector.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission