

No.50/2020 dated: 22-10-2020

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION****CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 27-10-2020 (Through Video Conferencing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

<b>Sl. No</b>	<b>Case No.</b>	<b>Name of the Parties</b>	<b>Counsel</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
1	D.R.P.No.60 of 2014	M/s.Techno Electric & Engg Co Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
2	D.R.P.No.4 of 2015	Ghanshyamdas Kanhaiyalal Totala HUF Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
3	D.R.P.No.2 of 2017	M/s.SRB Consultancy Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Bohra & Associates  Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
4	D.R.P.No.3 of 2017	M/s.SRB Consultancy Pvt., ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Bohra & Associates  Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
5	M.P.No.31 of 2020	TANGEDCO  Versus  M/s.A.R.S.Energy Pvt. Limited	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To declare the M/s.A.R.S. Energy Pvt. Limited is not a captive generating plant and the petitioner may be permitted to levy Cross Subsidy Surcharge for the period from 01.04.2019 onwards from their captive users for captively adjusted energy. For admission.
6	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.

7	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 <sup>nd</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> respondents to enforce 3 <sup>rd</sup> 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 filing counter by TANGEDCO and TEDA.
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	D.R.P.No.18 of 2013	M/s.ITC Ltd. Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Fin) & ors.	S.Ramasubramaniam & Associates  Adv. M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondent to make payment of Rs.91.16 lakhs. For arguments of the respondent.
10	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 filing counter by M/s.DSRM Pvt. Limited.
11	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.
12	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.
13	D.R.P.No.51 of 2014	Lanco Tanjore Power Company Ltd., Versus 1) TNEB 2) TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay an amount of Rs.32.05 crores towards refund / reimbursement of the MAT for the period from 2005 to 2012. For arguments.

14	D.R.P.No.44 of 2014	Mirra and Mirra Industries Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct TANGEDCO to effect adjustment of the WEG from the petitioner's captive windmills operating under the REC scheme first and thereafter adjust the energy generated by the other wind mills. For arguments.
15	D.R.P.No.55 of 2014	SRF Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to first effect adjustment of WEG under REC scheme and thereafter adjust with banking facility. For arguments.
16	D.R.P.No.3 of 2015	Lanco Tanjore Power Company Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.50.70 crores being the interest due. For arguments.
17	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.
18	D.R.P.No.7 of 2015	M/s.A.R.S.Metals Pvt. Ltd Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Chennai EDC/North	Adv.K.Seshadri  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix the charges/tariff payable towards development charges, service connection charges and to refund the amounts collected unauthorisedly with interest. For arguments.
19	D.R.P.No.8 of 2015	M/s.A.R.S.Metals Pvt. Ltd Versus 1) CE, Transmission 2) SE, General Construction Circle-1	Adv.Seshadri  Adv.V.Anil Kumar	To fix establishment, supervision charges, testing and commissioning charges (1x60 MW) for 230 K.V. temporary transmission line and direct the respondents to refund the excess amounts collected with interest. For arguments.
20	D.R.P.No.9 of 2015	M/s.A.R.S.Metals Pvt. Ltd Versus 1) Director(Operation), TANTRANSCO 2) SE, Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Seshadri  Adv.V.Anil Kumar	To fix the supervision charges payable by the petitioner in the erection of 230 KV temporary connectivity line from the plant to Gummidipoondi 230 KV SS and direct the respondents to refund the excess amount collected with interest. For arguments.

21	D.R.P.No.3 of 2019	M/s.Tulsyan NEC Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE/Grid Operation 3) SE/CEDC/North	Adv.Seshadri  Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Direct the respondents to pay Rs.44.80/- lakhs being the value of the energy lapsed due to over injection. For arguments.
22	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 arguments.
23	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 arguments.
24	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 arguments.
25	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 arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary  
Tamil Nadu Electricity  
Regulatory Commission