

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**CAUSE LIST**

**Cases posted for 30-07-2019**

**Venue: Court Hall of the Commission**

**Time : 11.00 AM**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	
1	R.A.No.1 of 2019	M/s.Ramnad Solar Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji	For orders.
2	R.A.No.2 of 2019	M/s.Kamuthi Renewable Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji	For orders.
3	R.A.No.3 of 2019	M/s.Adani Green Energy (Tamil Nadu) Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji	For orders.
4	R.A.No.4 of 2019	Association of Healthcare (India) Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	President, Association of Healthcare (India)	To consider the representation of the petitioner dated 02.03.2017 in accordance with the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.4199 of 2019 dated 8.3.2019.
5	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 for the month of September and October 2009 as arbitrary and illegal. For arguments.

6	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 1 <sup>st</sup> petitioner. For arguments.
7	D.R.P.No.17 of 2012	PTC India Ltd., Versus 1) S.V.Sugar Mills Limited 2) TNEB 3) TANGEDCO 4) SLDC	Adv. Ravi Kishore  Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the SV Sugar to pay Rs.8.53/- crores along with interest. For arguments.
8	D.R.P.No.25 of 2012	PTC India Ltd., Versus 1) Auromira Energy Co.P.Ltd., 2) TANGEDCO	M/s.RNS Associates  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the 1 <sup>st</sup> respondent to make a payment of Rs.1.19/- crore along with interest for not complying with its contractual obligations. For arguments.
9	D.R.P.No.14 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Virudhunagar EDC	Adv. Parthasarathy  Adv. T.Mohan	To set aside the 2 <sup>nd</sup> respondent impugned notice dated 28.9.2012. For arguments. For arguments.
10	D.R.P.No.15 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Virudhunagar EDC	Adv. Parthasarathy  Adv. T.Mohan	To set aside the 2 <sup>nd</sup> respondent impugned notice dated 28.9.2012. For arguments.
11	D.R.P.No. 25 of 2013	Sun Paper Mill Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv. Parthasarathy	To fix the rate for supply of power. For arguments.
12	D.R.P.No.26 of 2013	Sai Regency Power Corp. Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	Adv. Jenasen  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to release the sum of Rs.2.35/- crores withheld from the sums payable to the petitioner for supply of energy. For arguments.

13	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 arguments.
14	D.R.P.No.29 of 2013	Angalakshmi Spinning Mills Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SE, Coimbatore EDC 4) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv. S.Sivanandam Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.48.31/- for the belated payment for supply of electricity and for encashment of unutilized banking energy. For arguments.
15	D.R.P.No. 30 of 2013	Shakthi Murugan Textiles Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC 4) SE, Coimbatore EDC	Adv. S.Sivanandam Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.32.91/- lakhs for the belated payment for supply of electricity and for encashment of unutilized banking energy. For arguments.
16	R.P.No. 2 of 2013	Spictex Cotton Mills (P) Versus 1) CFC, Revenue 2) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv. Gopinathan	To declare that the withdrawal of deemed demand benefit by the 2 <sup>nd</sup> respondent is illegal and contrary to law. For arguments.
17	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 till 29-4-2010. For maintainability
18	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 due to the petitioner for power supplied till 11-11-2011. For maintainability.

19	D.R.P.No.72 of 2014	KBD Sugars and Distilleries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunneveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs. 92.57/- lakhs being the balance amount due to the petitioner for power supplied till 24-5-2010. For maintainability.
20	D.R.P.No. 74 of 2014	D.A.Srinivas Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunneveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.40/- crores being the balance amount due to the petitioner for power supplied till 2-8-2011. For maintainability.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary  
Tamil Nadu Electricity  
Regulatory Commission