

No.16/2020 dated: 16-07-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 21-07-2020 (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.29 of 2013	Angalakshmi Spinning Mills Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv. S.Sivanandam Adv. M.Gopinathan	For orders
2	D.R.P.No.30 of 2013	Shakthi Murugan Textiles Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. S.Sivanandam Adv. M.Gopinathan	For orders
3	D.R.P.No.79 of 2014	Madras Hardtools Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders
4	D.R.P.No.4 of 2017	Al Ameen Green Energy Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) The Secretary, Energy Dept., GoTN 2) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.S.Haja Mohideen Gisthi Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to set aside the CE/NCES letter dated 18.9.2017. For reporting the status of the case in Hon'ble High Court of Madras.
5	D.R.P.No.5 of 2017	Al Ameen Green Energy Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) The Secretary, Energy Dept., GoTN 2) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.S.Haja Mohideen Gisthi Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to set aside the CE,NCES of TANGEDCO letter dated 18-9-2017. For reporting the status of the case in Hon'ble High Court of Madras.
6	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 reporting compliance.

7	R.A.No.4 of 2020	Chennai Metro Rail Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Jayesh B.Dolia Adv.M.Gopinathan	Hon'ble APTEL has directed the Commission in Appeal No.262 of 2016 dated 02.03.2020 to consider the request of CMRL and determine appropriate tariff for passing order afresh. For counter.
8	R.A.No.5 of 2020	Indian Railways Represented by Southern Railways Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Siddharth Bahety Adv.Abdul Saleem	Hon'ble APTEL has directed the Commission in Appeal No.188 of 2019 dated 27.02.2020 to consider the request of Southern Railway in accordance with law. For counter.
9	D.R.P.No.1 of 2020	Pandian Chemicals Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.S.Yasar Arafath Adv.M.Gopinathan	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 filing counter as a last chance.
10	M.P.No.9 of 2020	Dr.Rajah Muthiah Chettiar Charitable and Educational Trust Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CFC/Regulatory Cell	Adv.T.Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to reclassify the electricity HT Tariff-III to Tariff-IIB and consequently refund of any charges collected in excess. For counter.
11	M.P.No.11 of 2020	M/s.Aiki Eco Power LLP Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Ramaswamy Meyappan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking clarification to the order dated 28.1.2020 in R.A.No.7 of 2019 with regard to the applicability of the procedure for verification of status of captive generating plants and captive users. For counter.
12	M.P.No.18 of 2019	TANGEDCO Versus The Principal Secretary to Government, Finance Department, GoTN.	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 further hearing.

13	D.R.P.No.78 of 2014	KCP Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, Commercial &ors.	S.Ramasubramaniam & Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix the quota energy of 5.39 lakh units as against the base energy of 8.99 lakh units by applying 40% power cut without adjusting wind mill energy and demand. For arguments.
14	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.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission