

No.41/2020 dated: 30-09-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 06-10-2020 (Through Video Conferencing)****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.68 of 2014	Dattatreya Textiles Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) SE, Madurai EDC 5) AO/Revenue, CEDC/North	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 under the REC scheme against the petitioner's HTSC No.47 and thereafter adjust the energy generated. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
2	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. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
3	M.P.No.20 of 2020	Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association (TASMA) Versus CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To punish the Respondent for having violated the order of the Commission dated 11.10.2008 in the matter of collection of Scheduling and System Operation charges as required to be passed under Section 142 read with section 146 of the Electricity Act, 2003. For filing counter on the admissibility of the petition.

4	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 counter.
5	D.R.P.No.14 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.2,49,64,765/- being the principle and interest for the supply of wind energy with respect to wind energy purchase agreement. For counter.
6	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 counter.
7	M.P.No.25 of 2020	Ramnad Renewable Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to grant the petitioner a project specific extension of the control period and to declare the petitioner has successfully commissioned its 72 MW solar power project on or before 31 st March 2016. For filing counter or adoption of memo.
8	M.P.No.26 of 2020	Kamuthi Solar Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to grant the petitioner a project specific extension of the control period and to declare the petitioner has successfully commissioned its 216 MW solar power project on or before 31 st March 2016. For filing counter or adoption of memo.

9	R.A.No.3 of 2020	i) Ind-Bharat Power Gencome Limited ii) M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Ltd. iii) The Madras Aluminium Co. Ltd. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Dev Dakshan for P-1 Adv. Rahul Balaji for P-2 & P-3 Adv.M.Gopinathan	In W.P.No.18129 of 2011, the Hon'ble High Court in its order dated 30.8.2019 set-aside the orders of this Commission in P.P.A.P.No.5 of 2011 dated 11.7.2011 and remanded back to the Commission. For filing counter by M/s.Ind-Bharath Power Gencom Ltd and M/s.MALCO Limited.
10	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 refund a sum of Rs.4.34 crores along with interest. For filing rejoinder.
11	M.P.No.22 of 2020	CE/Commercial, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Approve the new methodology for measurement of Harmonics with the HT/EHT consumers and fix the compensation at 15% of the respective tariff in respect of 11 KV and 22 KV consumers and to instruct all the HT/EHT consumers by the TANGEDCO to install power quality meters by themselves within 12 months from the date of commencement of the amended Regulations. For further hearing.
12	M.P.No.2 of 2020	Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency (TEDA) Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) GoTN, Finance Dept.	GM / TEDA Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval for the proposed implementation of the KUSUM (Component-C) Agricultural Solar Pump Scheme in 20000 pumpsets with 7.5 HP load by installing 11 KW Solar PV Plant in each of the pump sets and to approve a maximum / bench mark tariff of Rs.4.53 per unit for the gross unit generated by the proposed Solar PV plant erected under the PM-KUSUM scheme. For further hearing.

13	D.R.P. No.8 of 2014	India 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 reporting compliance.
14	D.R.P. No.9 of 2014	Savita Oil Technologies 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.
15	D.R.P. No.10 of 2014	M. Babanna 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.
16	M.P.No.10 of 2020	M/s.Leshark Global LLP Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To punish the TANGEDCO under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of the directions issued by this Commission in its order dated 29.10.2019 in M.P.No.14 of 2018 and consequently direct the respondents to implement the said order. For reporting compliance.
17	R.P.No.1 of 2020 in M.P.No.8 of 2019	M/s.Navin Housing & Properties Pvt. Limited Versus CMD/TANGEDCO & Anr.	Stephen & Stephen Advocates Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	To review the order passed in M.P.No.8 of 2019 dated 10.12.2019. For reporting compliance.
18	D.R.P.No.24 of 2013	Sree Rangaraj Ispat Industries Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to adjust 88,100 energy units. For arguments.
19	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.

20	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 arguments.
21	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.Venkatakrisnan 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.
22	D.R.P.No.1 of 2015	Balkrishna Wind Energy Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.2.69/- lakhs being the interest due. For arguments.
23	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 arguments.
24	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 arguments.
25	D.R.P.No.5 of 2015	Padmaadevi Sugars Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC & 3) CE, PPP	Tr.M.V.Gangadharan, I.R.P. Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.2.48 crores being the sums due. For arguments of the IRP.
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	D.R.P.No.3 of 2016	M/s. Mitra Fidelity Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	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.
28	D.R.P.No.4 of 2016	M/s. Greenweiz Projects Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.28.39/- lakhs with interest. For arguments.

29	D.R.P.No.5 of 2016	M/s. Tapi Energy Projects Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	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.
----	--------------------	--	--	---

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission