

No.24/2019 dated: 19-09-2019

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 24-09-2019****Venue: Court Hall of the Commission****Time : 11.00 AM**

Sl. No.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	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 5,39,628 units as against the base energy of 8,99,380 units by applying 40% power cut without adjusting wind mill energy and demand. For admission.
2	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 the establishment and supervision charges for the temporary transmission lines erected by the petitioner from their power plant to Gummidipoondi 230 KV SS to refund the excess amounts collected with interest. For admission.
3	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 admission.
4	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.1,44,12,339/-. For admission.

5	D.R.P.No.2 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) CE, NCES 4) SE, Villupuram EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.2,52,51,487/- towards 2% of line loss. For admission.
6	D.R.P.No.4 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) CE, NCES 4) SE, Theni EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.15,18,791/- towards 2% of line loss. For admission.
7	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.
8	D.R.P.No.46 of 2014	M/s.Techno Electric & Engineering Company Limited Versus TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	To determine the pooled cost of power purchase for the financial years 2010 – 2011 to 2012-2013. For counter
9	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.8,14,213/- for the unutilized banked energy as on 31-03-2012 without insisting of 51% utilization may be considered. For counter.
10	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.11,88,760 being the interest due against the delayed payments. For counter.
11	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 of Rs.1.32 crores. For counter.

12	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 counter.
13	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 counter.
14	D.R.P.No. 9 of 2016	Vijayalakshmi Marketing Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Edumalpet EDC 3) SE, Tiruppur EDC & Anr.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the impugned notices dated 4-8-2014 and 2-12-2014 issued by the 1 st and 2 nd respondents and direct them to give effect to the EWA. For counter.
15	D.R.P.No. 10 of 2016	Lanco Tanjore Power Co., Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Declare that the petitioner is entitled for variable charges towards difference of tariff heat rate for the period from 2008 to 2015. For counter.
16	D.R.P.No. 11 of 2016	Orchid Pharma Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC 3) SE, Chengalpattu EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the 1 st respondent demand notice and consequently direct the 2 nd respondent to give adjustment for the unutilized banked energy or encashment of Rs.23.93/- lakhs. For counter.
17	M.P.No. 27 of 2016	SEPC Power Private Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Abdul Saleem	To take on record the Financial Closing date as 30-10-2015. For written submission of the respondent.
18	D.R.P.No. 62 of 2014	CLP Wind Farms (India) Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payments of a sum of Rs.10.61 crores being the interest due against delayed payments. For negotiation.

19	D.R.P.No.63 of 2014	CLP Wind Farms (Theni Project-II) Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Finance) 3) SE, Theni EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payments of a sum of Rs.11.62 crores being the interest due against delayed payments. For negotiation.
20	D.R.P.No. 52 of 2014	Designco Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) DFC, TANGEDCO 3) SE, Tuticorin EDC	Sri & Shankar Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.57.23 lakhs being the amount due under the PPA together with interest. For negotiation.
21	D.R.P.No.20 of 2012	Pioneer Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE,PPP 3) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Sathyaseelan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Declare that the respondents are not entitled to claim the liquidated damages of Rs.12.82 crores. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
22	D.R.P.No. 69 of 2014	Sundaram Textiles Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) SE, Madurai/North 5) AO/Revenue, CEDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the TANGEDCO to first effect adjustment of the wind energy supplied to the petitioner from wind mills operating under the Renewable Energy Wheeling Agreement under the REC scheme against the petitioner's HTSC No.203 and thereafter adjust the energy generated by the other wind mills and to raise the current consumption bills accordingly. For reporting the status of pending Supreme Court case in the subject matter.
23	D.R.P.No. 68 of 2014	Dattatreya Textiles Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) SE, Madurai EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct that TANGEDCO to first effect adjustment of the wind energy supplied to the petitioner from wind mills operating under the Renewable Energy Wheeling Agreement

		5) AO/Revenue, CEDC/North		under the REC scheme against the petitioner's HTSC No.47 and thereafter adjust the energy generated by the other wind mills and to raise the current consumption bills accordingly. For reporting the status of pending Supreme Court case in the subject matter.
24	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.
25	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.
26	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 reporting the stage of Insolvency proceedings and arguments.
27	D.R.P.No.24 of 2013	Sree Rangaraj Ispat Industries Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE,Dindigul EDC 3) DSRM Steels Pvt. Ltd. 4) Addl.CE 5) TANTRANSCO/SLDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. T.Mohan	Direct the respondents to adjust 88,100 energy units. For arguments.
28	M.P.No. 25 of 2014	Pioneer Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Generation)	Adv.Sathyaseelan Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue directions on the respondents in terms of section 142 of the Electricity Act 2003 for non-compliance of the

		3) CE, IPP		order dated 30-12-2011. For filing certain details by TANGEDCO and arguments.
29	S.M.P.No.3 of 2014	Coimbatore Consumer Cause Versus 1) CE, Commercial 2) SE, Coimbatore EDC Metro 3) SE, Coimbatore North & South	Tr. Kathir Mathiyon, Party-in-Person Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the licensee to pay compensation to all the eligible consumers in Coimbatore Region along with interest. For filing certain details by TANGEDCO and arguments.
30	S.M.P.No. 7 of 2014	Thiru Raguram Versus 1) CFC, Tariff Cell 2) CE, Planning	Thiru.Raguram, Party-in-Person Adv.M.Gopinathan	Clarification sought for on eligibility of Tariff III A1 for those registered in SFS category for agricultural service. For arguments.
31	D.R.P.No. 27 of 2013	M/s.Techno Electric & Engineering Company Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to amend the power purchase agreements. For arguments.
32	D.R.P.No. 1 of 2014	M/s. Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) Director / Operation 2) SE, LD & GO 3) SE, Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to refund the excess amount collected. For arguments.
33	D.R.P.No. 3 of 2014	M/s. Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) Dir/Oprn., TANTRANSCO 2) SE, LD & GO 3) SE, Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to refund the excess amount collected. For arguments.
34	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.

35	M.P.No. 7 of 2017	CE,PPP of TANGEDCO Versus Nil	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To approve and ratify the dispatching the high cost IPPs, M/s.PPN and M/s.MPCL for the year 2016-17. For arguments.
36	D.R.P.No.81 of 2014	Dalmia Bharat and Sugar Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) DFC, TANGEDCO 3) CFC, TANGEDCO 4) SE, Tirunelveli	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a total sum of Rs.3.8/- crores. For arguments.
37	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 the sum of Rs.48.02 lakhs along with interest. For arguments.
38	D.R.P.No. 3 of 2016	M/s. Mitra Fidelity Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Tuticorin EDC 4) SE, Chennai EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. T.Mohan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.66.22/- lakhs for unutilized banked energy along with interest. For arguments.
39	D.R.P.No. 4 of 2016	M/s. Greenweiz Projects Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Tuticorin EDC 4) SE, Chennai EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. T.Mohan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.28.39/- lakhs with interest. For arguments.
40	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 arguments.

41	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 arguments.
42	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 arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission