

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 03-11-2020 (Through Video Conferencing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.18 of 2020	CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO Versus i)Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Assn. (TASMA) ii)Indian Wind Power Assn. (IWPA) iii) Southern India Mills Assn. (SIMA) iv)Watsun Infrabuild Ltd. v) Tamil Nadu Power Producers' Assn.	Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj – R-1 Adv.Rahul Balaji – R-2, R-3 & R-5 M/s.Desai & Diwanji Adv. & Solicitors (R-4)	To determine the additional surcharge of Rs.1.40 per unit payable by OA consumers on quantum of power purchase through Open Access using the network of distribution licensee. For filing reply by TANGEDCO on the objections to maintainability and for further hearing.
2	D.R.P. No.11 of 2014	P.M. Granite 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 reporting compliance.
3	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 reporting compliance
4	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 reporting compliance
5	D.R.P. No.18 of 2014	Om Sakthi Wind Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For reporting compliance
6	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 reporting compliance

7	D.R.P. No.20 of 2014	Krishna Kumar Orthopaedic Hospital and Institute of Orthopaedics (P) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For reporting compliance.
8	D.R.P. No.21 of 2014	Maris Spinners Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For reporting compliance.
9	D.R.P. No.22 of 2014	Texonic Instruments Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For reporting compliance.
10	D.R.P. No.23 of 2014	Maris Hotels and Theatres (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For reporting compliance.
11	D.R.P. No.24 of 2014	Bhabani Pigments Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For reporting compliance.
12	D.R.P. No.25 of 2014	R.Madan Mohan Rao Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For reporting compliance.
13	D.R.P. No.26 of 2014	Powerica 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 reporting the stage of settlement.
14	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 reporting the stage of settlement.
15	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 reporting the stage of settlement.

16	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 reporting the stage of settlement.
17	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 reporting the stage of settlement.
18	D.R.P.No.40 of 2014	Nupower Renewables 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 reporting the stage of settlement.
19	D.R.P.No.49 of 2014	Coimbatore Pioneer Fertilizers Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For reporting the stage of settlement.
20	D.R.P.No.6 of 2020	M/s.Kamal Encon Industries Limited Versus i)CMD / TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES iii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC iv) CFC/Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.1.16 crore along with interest for the wind power supplied to TANGEDCO till December 2018. For reporting compliance.
21	D.R.P.No.54 of 2014	National Energy Trading and Services Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, Commercial 3) Director / Operation	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay an amount of Rs.33.13 crores towards balance of energy charges. For reporting the status from the petitioner.
22	D.R.P.No.3 of 2020	Ratedi Wind Power Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Adithya Reddy Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the past outstanding Principal amount and late payment interest totaling to Rs.19.06 crores. For reporting compliance.
23	D.R.P.No.4 of 2020	Wind Urja India Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Adithya Reddy Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the past outstanding Principal amount and late payment interest totaling to Rs.16.71 crores. For reporting compliance.

24	D.R.P.No.18 of 2013	M/s.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 of the respondent.
25	D.R.P.No.48 of 2014	Super Sales India Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Arun Anbumani Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 3 rd respondent letter dated 11-2-2014 and demand of Rs.15.28 lakhs. For arguments.
26	D.R.P.No.14 of 2015	SKI Carbon Black (India) Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to release the outstanding payments of Rs.1.10 crores along with interest of Rs.23.03 lakhs. For arguments.
27	M.P.No.25 of 2015	Southern Railway Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv.Siddarth Bahety Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to dispense with the levy of surcharge for harmonics as far as Railway Traction is concerned. For arguments.
28	D.R.P.No.1 of 2016	M/s.R.K.K.R.Steels Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Dindigul 3) SE, Chennai	Adv.K.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.31.72/-lakhs being the 75% of the purchase rate injected into respondents grid. For arguments of the respondent.
29	D.R.P.No.6 of 2016	Kaveri Gas Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.32 crores. For arguments.
30	M.P.No.4 of 2018	M/s.Ranergy Solutions (P) Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue a clarification on the interpretation of the 19% CUF value as per T.O.No.7 of 2014 dated 12-9-2014. For arguments.
31	M.P.No.11 of 2018	M/s.B.S.Apparel Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue a clarification on the interpretation of the 19% CUF value as per T.O.No.7 of 2014 dated 12-9-2014. For arguments.
32	M.P.No.11 of 2019	National Solar Energy Federation of India Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	To set aside the circular issued by CE/NCES dt.14-6-2017 and direct the TANGEDCO to adhere to the terms of the PPAs entered into with Solar Power Generators and not make deductions by applying CUF. For arguments.

33	D.R.P.No.2 of 2020	Crescent Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to issue interim injunction against the enforcement of the circular dt.28.11.2017 issued by the CE/NCES and to issue clarification on the interpretation of the 19% CUF value as per TNERC T.O.No.7 of 2014 dt.12.9.2014 and consequently set-aside the circular issued dt.14.6.2017. For arguments.
34	R.A.No.8 of 2019	i) M/s.Sutherland Global Services Pvt. Limited ii) M/s.K.G.Information Systems Pvt. Limited Versus i)CMD/TANGEDCO ii) Energy & IT Dept.	Adv.M.Venkatakrishnan Adv.M.A.Mudimannan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Directions given by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.19720 of 2010 & W.P.No.13425 of 2008 in the matter of classification of electricity tariff for IT enabled industries. For arguments.
35	D.R.P.No.8 of 2019	Ramnad Renewable Energy Ltd. Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to direct the TANGEDCO to make payment of all outstanding amount of Rs.16.80 crores including late payment surcharge payable to the petitioner. For filing revised counter affidavit and for arguments.
36	M.P.No.15 of 2020	Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) MNRE 3) Energy Dept., GoTN	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan Thiru.S.Gandhi, President, PESOT Impleading Petitioner	Allowing to rollover the Banked Wind Energy found unutilised as on 31.3.2020 to FY 2020-21, without making it to go for encashment and not to levy Banking Charges @ 14% over the Wind Energy Units moving to Banking every month due to Covid-19 Lockdown and restrictions enforced and to allow the Rollover of Solar Energy Found unutilised during the every month from March 2020, till the end of Financial Year 2020-21. For filing counter on the impleading petition and for arguments.

37	M.P.No.16 of 2020	The Southern India Mills Association (SIMA) Versus 1. CE/NCES, TANGEDCO 2. MNRE 3. Secretary to Govt., Energy Dept., GoTN	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Thiru.S.Gandhi, President, PESOT Impleading Petitioner	Allowing to rollover of banked electricity from OA Renewable Energy Generating Stations under Captive and Third-Party Sale category of FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 to FY 2021-22 and set out the manner and methodology for its implementation. For filing counter on the impleading petition and for arguments.
38	M.P.No.17 of 2020	National Solar Energy Federation of India Versus 1. CE/NCES, TANGEDCO 2. MNRE 3. Secretary to Govt., Energy Dept., GoTN	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Thiru.S.Gandhi, President, PESOT Impleading Petitioner	Allowing to rollover of banked electricity from OA Renewable Energy Generating Stations under Captive and Third-Party Sale category of FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 to FY 2021-22 and set out the manner and methodology for its implementation. For filing counter on the impleading petition and for arguments.
39	M.P.No.29 of 2020	Solar Energy Developers Association Salem Versus i)Chairman / TANGEDCO ii) Director (Distribution) iii) Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency (TEDA)	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To pass an order of interim injunction restraining 2 nd & 3 rd respondents to enforce 3 rd respondent's Tender reference with respect to the specification provided in para-12.8 and to issue a clarification with respect to Para-7.0 LT connectivity in Order on Rooftop Solar Generation order No.3 of 2019 dated 25.3.2019 and also to issue directions for use of single phase inverters in Rooftop Solar Power Plants with capacity upto 4 KW irrespective of Single or three phase at the consumer's end. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
40	D.R.P.No.13 of 2020	M/s.Rajaguru Spinning Mills Private Limited Versus 1) CMD/TANGEDCO 2) SE/Dindigul, TANGEDCO	Adv.S.Venkatesan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay the petitioner a sum of Rs.2,34,90,014/- being the principle and interest for the supply of wind energy with respect to wind energy purchase agreement. For arguments.

41	D.R.P.No.14 of 2020	M/s.Rajaguru Spinning Mills Private Limited Versus 1) CMD/TANGEDCO 2) SE/Dindigul	Adv.S.Venkatesan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay the petitioner a sum of Rs.2,49,64,765/- being the principle and interest for the supply of wind energy. For arguments.
42	D.R.P.No.15 of 2020	M/s.Rajaguru Spinning Mills Private Limited Versus 1) CMD/TANGEDCO 2) SE/Dindigul, TANGEDCO	Adv.S.Venkatesan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay the petitioner a sum of Rs.3,88,12,377/- being the principle and interest for the supply of wind energy with respect to wind energy purchase agreement. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission