

No.46/2020 dated: 08-10-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 13-10-2020 (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.56 of 2014	M/s.Techno Electric & Engineering Company Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
2	D.R.P.No.1 of 2017	Satia Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
3	M.P.No.27 of 2020	M/s.India Power Corpn.(Tuticorin) Private Limited	Represented by its Director	Seeking approval of Capital Investment Plan for the base year FY 18-19 and each year of MYT control period of FY 19-20, FY 20-21 and FY 21-22 in terms of Regulation 17 of the TNERC (Terms and conditions for Determination of Tariff) Regulations, 2005. For admission.
4	M.P.No.28 of 2020	M/s.India Power Corpn.(Tuticorin) Private Limited	Represented by its Director	Seeking approval of Business Plan for the base year FY 17-18 and five year period of FY 18-19 to FY 22-23 in terms of Regulation 16 of the TNERC (Terms and conditions for Determination of Tariff) Regulations, 2005. For admission.
5	I.A.No.1 of 2020 in 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 admission.
6	M.P.No.2 of 2019	<p>TANGEDCO Versus</p> <p>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 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>	<p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p> <p>Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj</p> <p>(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)</p> <p>Adv. Rahul Balaji for R-9, R-19 & R-21</p>	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.
7	T.A.No.1 of 2020	<p>TANGEDCO Versus</p> <p>(i) Trichy Cold Storage (Pvt) Ltd (ii) Association of Cold Storages</p>	<p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p> <p>Adv.Rahul Balaji</p>	Proceedings consequent to the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras transferring the subject matter of applicability of tariff for LT Cold Storage in W.P.(MD) No.23845 and 21945 of 2019 to the Commission for disposal. For counter.

8	D.R.P.No.52 of 2014	M/s.Designco Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Sri & Shankar Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.57.23 lakhs. For reporting compliance.
9	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 filing affidavit.
10	D.R.P.No.19 of 2012	Madurai Power Corpn Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.232.00 crores along with interest. For arguments on the main petition.
11	M.P.No.14 of 2012	i) Indian Wind Power Assn. ii) The Tata Power Co.Ltd. iii) M/s.Ushadev Power Holidays Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Hon'ble APTEL has directed the Commission Appeal Nos.239 of 2015, 203 of 2015, 240 of 2015 and 241 of 2015 dated 05.02.2020 for taking up the matters from which these appeals arose for further proceedings and adjudication in accordance with law. For arguments.
	D.R.P.No.28 of 2012	i) Green Infra Wind Power Projects Limited & Ors. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	-do-
	M.P.Nos.22 & 23 of 2014	Indian Wind Power Assn. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	-do-
12	M.P.No.21 of 2014	Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Assn. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Hon'ble APTEL has directed the Commission Appeal Nos.239 of 2015, 203 of 2015, 240 of 2015 and 241 of 2015 dated 05.02.2020 for taking up the matters from which these appeals arose for further proceedings and adjudication in accordance with law. For arguments.
	M.P.No.45 of 2014	Arasan Syntex Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	-do-
13	R.P.No.2 of 2013	Spictex Cotton Mills (P) Ltd. Versus TANGEDCO	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.

14	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 nd respondent impugned notice dated 11.8.2012 towards short levy of excess energy charges. For arguments.
15	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 nd respondent impugned notice dated 28.9.2012. For arguments.
16	D.R.P.No.32 of 2013	Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North	Adv. Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	To declare that the withdrawal of deemed demand benefit by the 2 nd respondent is illegal and contrary to law. For arguments.
17	D.R.P.No.4 of 2014	B&G Solar Private Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Vinod kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the CFC/Revenue dt. 9-12-2013 issued by TANGEDCO. For arguments.
18	D.R.P.No.5 of 2014	Saheli Exports Private Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinodkumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the CFC/Revenue letter dated 7-9-2013 and 9-12-2013. For arguments.
19	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.
20	D.R.P.No.7 of 2016	Cauvery Power Generation Chennai Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Thiru.Amier Hamsa Ali Abbas Rawther, IRP Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.53.92/- lakhs. For arguments of the IRP.
21	D.R.P.No.10 of 2016	Lanco Tanjore Power Co., Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.Abdul Saleem	Declare that the petitioner is entitled for variable charges towards difference of tariff heat rate for the period from 2008 to 2015. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
22	M.P.No.14 of 2017	M/s.Ambika Cotton Mills Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To allow the adjustment of WEG from the first commissioned machine and second commissioned machine. For further arguments of the respondent.

23	D.R.P.No.2 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.3.89 crores towards excess energy pumped and surcharge of Rs.1.68 crores. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
24	D.R.P.No.3 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.18 crores towards excess energy pumped and surcharge of Rs.21.79 lakhs. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
25	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.
26	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.
27	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.
28	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.
29	M.P.No.21 of 2018	Indian Wind Power Association Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking directions determining the banking charges in paise equivalent to 10% of the banked energy. For further arguments.

30	M.P.No.7 of 2019	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.Abdul Saleem	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 arguments of the respondent.
31	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 rejoinder and arguments.
32	D.R.P.No.11 of 2019	M/s.Ratedi Wind Power Private Limited Versus 1)CMD/TANGEDCO 2)CE/NCES/TANGEDCO 3) SE/EDC, Tirunelveli	Adv.Adithya Reddy Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to refund the balance amount of Rs.5.72 crores for the period upto March 2018 that has been collected on the basis of erroneous application of the Amendment dated 19.6.2013 along with interest of Rs.2.30 crores. For arguments.
33	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 seeking explanation from the concerned S.E.
34	M.P.No.21 of 2020	CREDAI Chennai Versus CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking clarification on the amendment to the TN Electy. Distribution Code, Notification No.TNERC/DC/8-25 dated 18.12.2019 amending Regulation 29 which sets out the space allocation for erection of sub-station where the load exceeds 5 MVA. For arguments.

35	M.P.No.23 of 2020	CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO Versus 1. Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Assn. (TASMA) 2. Tamil Nadu Power Producers' Assn(TPPA) 3. Indian Wind Power Assn.(IWPA)	Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj for R-1 Adv.Rahul Balaji for R-3	Seeking to issue suitable direction in S.M.P.No.1 of 2020 dated 24.4.2020 to the Captive Generators and the Distribution Licensee in the matter of Submission / collection of the documents for verification of CGP status in view of the relaxations provided by GoTN under various G.Os during the COVID lockdown period. For arguments.
----	-------------------	---	---	---

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission