

No.36 / 2019 dated: 21-11-2019

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 26-11-2019****Venue: Court Hall of the Commission****Time : 11.00 AM**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.10 of 2019	M/s.Pandian Chemicals Limited Versus 1)CMD/TANGEDCO 2) SE/Cuddalore EDC	Adv.Yasar Arafath Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the SE, Cuddalore to execute and implement the CGRF order dated 4.11.2017 to refund or adjust a sum of Rs.2.42 lakhs towards transmission and distribution charges collected from the petitioner. For reporting compliance by the respondent.
2	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.
3	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.
4	D.R.P.No. 65 of 2014	Madurai Power Corporation pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the TANGEDCO's communication and direct payment of Rs.6.01/-crores along with interest. For filing counter by TANGEDCO.
5	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 TANGEDCO's communication and make payment of Rs.5.82 crores along with interest. For filing counter by TANGEDCO.

6	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.
7	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.
8	D.R.P.No. 8 of 2016	MALCO Energy Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) PTC India Limited	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.Ravi Kishore	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.
9	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.
10	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.
11	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.
12	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.

13	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.
14	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.
15	D.R.P.No.25 of 2012	PTC India Ltd., Versus 1) Auomira Energy Co.Pvt.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.
16	D.R.P.No.67 of 2014	Arulmozhi Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj 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 arguments.
17	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.
18	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.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary (i/c)
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission