

No.6/2020 dated: 07-02-2020

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION****CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 11-02-2020****Venue: Court Hall of the Commission****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.3 of 2020	Thiru.N.Alagu Narayanan Versus CE/Civil Transmission, TANTRANSCO	Party-in-Person  Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Praying to quash the CE/Civil Transmission's letter dated 5.3.2019 by which the work of supply, erection, testing and commissioning of 400 KV DC transmission line between M/s.SEPC Generating Station to Thenampatti substation & to impose the maximum penalty on TANTRANSCO u/s 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003. For admission.
2	D.R.P.No.1 of 2020	Pandian Chemicals Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.S.Yasar Arafath	Direct the respondent to pay a total sum of Rs.30.41 lakhs being the principal and interest amount towards the unadjusted banked units sold to TANGEDCO. For admission.
3	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & D.R.P.No.2 of 2020	Crescent Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	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 admission.

4	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & D.R.P.No.3 of 2020	Ratedi Wind Power Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Adithya Reddy	Direct the respondent to release the past outstanding Principal amount and late payment interest totaling to Rs.19.06 crores and also direct to strictly comply and abide with the provisions of the EPAs entered into between the petitioner and the respondent. For admission.
5	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & D.R.P.No.4 of 2020	Wind Urja India Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Adithya Reddy	Direct the respondent to release the past outstanding Principal amount and late payment interest totaling to Rs.16.71 crores and also direct to strictly comply and abide with the provisions of the EPAs entered into between the petitioner and the respondent. For admission.
6	D.R.P.No.20 of 2012	Pioneer Power Ltd.,  Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE,PPP 3) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Sathyaseelan  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Declare that the respondents are not entitled to claim the liquidated damages of Rs.12.82 crores. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
7	M.P.No.25 of 2014	Pioneer Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Generation) 3) CE, IPP	Adv.Sathyaseelan Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue directions on the respondents in terms of section 142 of the Electricity Act 2003 for non-compliance of the order dated 30-12-2011. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
8	D.R.P.No.68 of 2014	Dattatreya Textiles Pvt. Ltd., Versus	Adv.Rahul Balaji	Direct that TANGEDCO to first effect adjustment of the wind energy supplied

		<p>1) TANGEDCO  2) CFC, Revenue  3) SE, CEDC/North  4) SE, Madurai EDC  5) AO/Revenue,  CEDC/North</p>	Adv.M.Gopinathan	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 by the other wind mills and to raise the current consumption bills accordingly. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
9	D.R.P.No.69 of 2014	<p>Sundaram Textiles Ltd.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Versus</p> <p>1) TANGEDCO  2) CFC, Revenue  3) SE, CEDC/North  4) SE, Madurai/North  5) AO/Revenue,  CEDC/North</p>	<p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	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 by the other wind mills and to raise the current consumption bills accordingly. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
10	M.P.No.16 of 2019	TANTRANSCO	Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Seeking approval for Capital Investment Plan for Transmission function for the FY 2019-20, 2020-21 & 2021-22. For further hearing.
11	M.P.No.17 of 2019	State Load Despatch Centre (SLDC)	Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Praying to approve the Capital Investment Plan for the control period of FY 2019-2020 to FY 2021-2022. For further hearing.

12	M.P.No.18 of 2019	TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval of Capital Investment Plan for each year of the MYT control period of FY 2019-2020, FY 2020-21 & FY 2021-2022. For filing additional affidavit.
13	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 filing additional affidavit.
14	M.P.No.20 of 2019	TANGEDCO  Versus  Nupower Wind Farms Ltd.	Adv.M.Gopinathan  Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	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 filing memo by TANGEDCO in regard to left out items and for further hearing.
15	D.R.P.No.64 of 2014	TNPL  Versus  1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
16	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 filing counter as a last chance.
17	D.R.P.No.10 of 2015	Indowind Energy 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.2.77 lakhs along with interest. For counter.
18	D.R.P.No.12 of 2015	Indowind Energy Ltd.,  Versus  1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.C.S.K.Sathish  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.01 crores along with interest. For counter.

19	D.R.P.No.11 of 2016	Orchid Pharma Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC 3) SE, Chengalpattu EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the 1 <sup>st</sup> respondent demand notice and consequently direct the 2 <sup>nd</sup> respondent to give adjustment for the unutilized banked energy or encashment of Rs.23.93/- lakhs. For counter.
20	D.R.P.No.1 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.44 crores. For filing counter as a last chance.
21	D.R.P.No.2 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.2.52 crores towards 2% of line loss. For filing counter as a last chance.
22	D.R.P.No.4 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.15.19 lakhs towards 2% of line loss. For filing counter as a last chance.
23	I.A.No.1 of 2019 & D.R.P.No.12 of 2019	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus TANTRANSCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Declare that the respondents are not entitled to collect annual O&M charges and direct the respondent to refund a sum of Rs.1.00 crore along with interest. For counter.
24	M.P.No.2 of 2019	TANGEDCO  Versus 1) Asahi Glass India Limited 2) Technical Stamp Lings Automotive Ltd 3) National Textile Corpn Ltd. 4) CAMBODIA Mills 5) Pankaja Mills 6) Sri Ranga Vilas Spg & Wvg Mills 7) Kaleeswara Mills 8) Pioneer Spinners 9) TMT Muthammal Textiles Mills Pvt. Ltd	Adv.T.Mohan  Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  (R-3, R-4, R-5, R-6, R-7, R-8, R-10, R-11, R-13, R-14, R-15, R-16, R-17, R-18 & R-19)	To pass orders for implementing both Captive and Third Party Users in connection with calculation of excess demand and energy charges in the orders passed by the Commission dated 7.9.2010 in M.P.No.9 of 2010, M.P.No.6 of 2010, M.P.No.17 of 2010 and D.R.P.No.9 of 2010. For counter.

		<p>10) The Southern India Mills Association  11) Best Cotton Mills  12) Spictex Cotton Mills  13) Super Sales India Ltd  14) Aswin Textiles (P) Ltd  15) Bannari Amman Spinning Mills Ltd.  16) Bannari Amman Spinning Mills Ltd.  17) Rajapalayam Mills Limited  18) Tamil Nadu Spinnings Mills Assn.  19) Indoshell Mould Limited  20) TATA Consultancy Services  21) Madras Cements Limited</p>		
25	M.P.No.7 of 2019	<p>M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited  Versus  TANGEDCO &amp; Anr.</p>	<p>Adv. Rahul Balaji    Adv.Abdul Saleem</p>	<p>Direct the respondents to comply with the order of the Commission in PPAP No.3 of 2014 dated 29.7.2016 and PPA dated 12.12.2013. For filing counter both on the main petition and on the memo filed by the petitioner as a last chance.</p>
26	I.A.No.1 of 2019 in R.P.No.1 of 2019	<p>M/s.Vedanta Limited (Formerly known as Sesa Sterlite Limited)    Versus  TANGEDCO</p>	<p>Adv. Rahul Balaji    Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>To grant an interim order of stay of operation of the Commission's order dated 10.12.2018 passed in M.P.No.82 of 2013 and review this petition. For counter.</p>
27	M.P.No.2 of 2020	<p>Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency (TEDA)    Versus  TANGEDCO</p>	<p>GM / TEDA    Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>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</p>

				by the proposed Solar PV plant erected under the PM-KUSUM scheme. For filing affidavit by TEDA and TANGEDCO.
28	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.
29	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.
30	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.
31	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.
32	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.
33	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.
34	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.

35	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.
36	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.
37	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.
38	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.
39	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.
40	D.R.P.No.72 of 2014	KBD Sugars and Distilleries Ltd., 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. 92.57/- lakhs. For reporting compliance.
41	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.
42	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.



43	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.
44	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.
45	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.
46	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.
47	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.
48	D.R.P.No.25 of 2012	PTC India Ltd., Versus 1) Auomira Energy Co.Pvt.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/- crores along with interest. For filing affidavit along with order copy and for further arguments.
49	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 as arbitrary and illegal. For arguments.
50	D.R.P.No.16 of 2011	1. Shree Ambika Sugars 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 the 1 <sup>st</sup> petitioner. For arguments.

51	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. M.Gopinathan	To review the order dated 17.4.2013 in D.R.P.No.2 of 2012. For arguments.
52	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 <sup>nd</sup> respondent impugned notice dated 11.8.2012 towards short levy of excess energy charges. For arguments.
53	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 <sup>nd</sup> respondent impugned notice dated 28.9.2012. For arguments.
54	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 filing the written submission of the TANGEDCO and arguments of the petitioner.
55	D.R.P.No.48 of 2014	Super Sales India Ltd.,  Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Arun Anbumani  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 3 <sup>rd</sup> respondent letter dated 11-2-2014 and demand of Rs.15.28 lakhs. For arguments.
56	D.R.P.No.65 of 2014	Madurai Power Corporation pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the TANGEDCO's communication and direct payment of Rs.6.01/-crores along with interest. For arguments.
57	D.R.P.No.66 of 2014	Samalpatti Power Company Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the TANGEDCO's communication and make payment of Rs.5.82 crores along with interest. For arguments.

58	D.R.P.No.67 of 2014	Arulmozhi Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited  Versus  TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To release of cash equivalent of Rs.8.14 lakhs for the unutilized banked energy. For arguments of the respondent.
59	D.R.P.No.80 of 2014	VTX Industries Ltd.,  Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.Arun Anbumani  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents not to levy cross subsidy charges and other charges. For arguments.
60	D.R.P.No.4 of 2015	Ghanshyamdas Kanhaiyalal Totala HUF  Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.2.46 lakhs being the interest due against delayed payments made by respondents for power supplied. For arguments of the petitioner.
61	D.R.P.No.2 of 2016	DCW Ltd.,  Versus 1) PTC Limited 2) TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv. Ravi Kishore Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.48.02 lakhs along with interest. For arguments.
62	D.R.P.No.8 of 2016	MALCO Energy Ltd.,  Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) PTC India Limited	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.Ravi Kishore	Direct the respondents to pay Rs.4.69/- crores for power supplied for the period from 1-6-2010 to 3-6-2010. For arguments.
63	M.P.No.14 of 2017	M/s.Ambika Cotton Mills Ltd.,  Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) CFC, Revenue	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To allow the adjustment of WEG from the first commissioned machine and second commissioned machine. For arguments.
64	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.

65	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.
66	I.A.No.1 of 2019 in 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 filing I.A. by TANGEDCO on the question of maintainability of this present petition.
67	I.A.No.1 of 2019 & D.R.P.No.9 of 2019	M/s.Aquasub Engineering  Versus  TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Arun Anbumani  Adv. T.Mohan	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 affidavit by both side and for arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary  
Tamil Nadu Electricity  
Regulatory Commission