

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 27-08-2019

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 11.00 AM

Item No.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	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 admission.
2	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 admission.
3	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 admission.
4	M.P.No. 13 of 2017	National Solar Energy Federation of India Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC 3) TANTRANSCO 4) MNRE	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To take action under section 142 and enforce the interim directions in the pending petition to enforce the Must Run status granted to all solar power plants. For admission.
5	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 filing reply to the Additional affidavit.
6	D.R.P.No. 27 of 2013	Simran Wind Project Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to amend the power purchase agreements. For filing additional counter by the respondent and filing of Memo by the petitioner.

7	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 as directed in the Daily Order dated 6.8.2019.
8	D.R.P.No. 42 of 2014	Jayakrishna Flour Mills Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) DFC, TANGEDCO 3) CFC, TANGEDCO 4) CE/NCES 5) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct TANGEDCO to make payment of Rs.5.07/- lakhs with interest. For filing Memo on computation of net amount payable to the petitioner.
9	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 as directed in the Daily Order dated 6.8.2019.
10	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 negotiation.
11	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 negotiation.
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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.
13	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 negotiation.
14	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 negotiation.

15	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For negotiation.
16	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 negotiation.
17	D.R.P. No.34 of 2014	Natesan Synchrocones P. 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 negotiation.
18	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 negotiation.
19	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 negotiation.
20	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 reporting on withdrawal of the petition pending before the High Court or the Commission.
21	I.A.No.3 of 2019 and D.R.P.No.5 of 2019	M/s.ReGen Powertech Private Limited Versus 1.CMD / TANGEDCO 2.Direction/Generation 3.CE/NCES 4.SE/NCES	Fox Mandal & Associates	Seeking extension of time for date of commissioning of the project on account of reasons beyond the control of the petitioner and seeking an order of interim injunction restraining the TANGEDCO from invoking and/or encashing the Performance Bank Guarantee for an amount of Rs.20.00 crores. For reporting on the compliance of the payment of deficit court

				fee and for further hearing.
22	I.A.No.5 of 2019 and D.R.P.No.6 of 2019	M/s.Corolla Green Power Private Limited Versus 1.CMD / TANGEDCO 2.Direction/Generation 3.CE/NCES 4.SE/NCES	Fox Mandal & Associates	Seeking extension of time for date of commissioning of the project on account of reasons beyond the control of the petitioner and seeking an order of interim injunction restraining the TANGEDCO from invoking and/or encashing the Performance Bank Guarantee for an amount of Rs.25.00 crores. For reporting on the compliance of the payment of deficit court fee and for further hearing.
23	S.M.P.No. 2 of 2012	TANGEDCO Versus 1) Thiru. D.R. Subbaian 2) Thiru. Syed Tajudeen Madani	Adv. M.Gopinathan Adv.Sathyamoorthy Adv. Lakshmi Narayanan	Clarification with regard to professionals having consultation room in their residence and outside. For submission of arguments of the respondents.
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. 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. 25 of 2013	Sun Paper Mill Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.Gopinathan	To fix the rate for supply of power. For arguments.
28	M.P.No. 27 of 2016	SEPC Power Private Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Abdul Saleem	To take on record the Financial Closing date as 30-10-2015. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission