

No.01/2020 dated: 03-01-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 10-01-2020****Venue: Court Hall of the Commission****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No. 27 of 2016	SEPC Power Private Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Abdul Saleem	For orders.
2	M.P.No.12 of 2019	TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
3	D.R.P.No.11 of 2015	Ind Eco Ventures Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv. C.S.K.Sathish Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.40.59 lakhs together with interest. For admission.
4	D.R.P.No.13 of 2015	Manikaran Power Ltd., Versus Auro Mira Bio Energy (Madurai) Limited	Adv.Abhinandan Das	Direct the respondent to pay a sum of Rs.12.61 lakhs as compensation along with interest. For admission.
5	M.P.No.19 of 2019	TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval and ratification for dispatching of power from unapproved sources for the period from 1.4.2018 to 30.9.2019. For admission.
6	M.P.No.20 of 2019	TANGEDCO Versus Nupower Wind Farms Ltd.	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking declaration that the methodology prescribed in the impugned circular of the TANGEDCO dated 30.3.2017 in regard to the generation of electricity and other. For admission.

7	M.P.No.21 of 2019	Tmt.K.Poornavalli Versus i)S.E./Madurai EDC of TANGEDCO ii)E.E./Madurai EDC of TANGEDCO	Party-in-person Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking action under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of order of Ombudsman in Appeal No.62 of 2018 dt.19.9.2019. For admission.
8	D.R.P.No. 79 of 2014	Madras Hardtools Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.11.88 lakhs being the interest due against the delayed payments. For reporting compliance.
9	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 reporting compliance.
10	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 reporting compliance.
11	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 reporting compliance.
12	D.R.P. No.34 of 2014	Natesan Synchrocones Pvt. 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 reporting compliance.
13	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 reporting compliance.

14	D.R.P. No.16 of 2014	Orange County Resorts and Hotels Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For reporting compliance.
15	D.R.P.No. 56 of 2014	M/s.Techno Electric & Engineering Company Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs. 4.85/- crores being the interest due. For reporting compliance.
16	D.R.P.No. 59 of 2014	M/s.Techno Electric & Engineering Company Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.11.80 lakhs. For reporting compliance.
17	D.R.P.No. 60 of 2014	M/s.Techno Electric & Engineering Company Limited (formerly Simran Wind Project Limited) Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.7.39 crores being the interest due. For reporting compliance.
18	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. For reporting compliance.
19	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. For reporting compliance.
20	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. For reporting compliance.

21	D.R.P.No. 73 of 2014	D.A.Sathya Prabha Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to pay the balance amount due to the petitioner for power supplied. For reporting compliance.
22	D.R.P.No. 74 of 2014	D.A.Srinivas Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.40/- crores being the balance amount. For reporting compliance.
23	D.R.P.No. 75 of 2014	D.A.Srinivas Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Dindigul EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to pay the balance amount due to the petitioner for power supplied. For reporting compliance.
24	D.R.P.No.77 of 2014	M/s.Vision Textiles Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Finance) 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.5.12/- lakhs. For reporting compliance.
25	D.R.P.No.2 of 2017	M/s.SRB Consultancy Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Tiruppur EDC	Bohra & Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to release the Late Payment Surcharge of Rs.36.08 lakhs. For reporting compliance.
26	D.R.P.No.3 of 2017	M/s.SRB Consultancy Pvt., ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Bohra & Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to release the Late Payment Surcharge of Rs.34.26 lakhs. For reporting compliance.
27	D.R.P.No.1 of 2018	M/s.National Enterprises Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.V.N.Bohra Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.98 crores being the balance of amount due to the petitioner. For reporting compliance.
28	D.R.P.No.16 of 2012	Samalpatti Power Co. Pvt. Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rishabh Prasad Adv. T.Mohan	Direct the respondent to pay a sum of Rs.239.00 crores along with interest. For reporting the status of the case pending before APTEL.

29	D.R.P.No.19 of 2012	Madurai Power Corpn Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Anand K Ganesan Adv. T.Mohan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.232.00 crores along with interest. For reporting the status of the case pending before APTEL.
30	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.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission