

No.4/2020 dated: 24-01-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 28-01-2020****Venue: Court Hall of the Commission****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.6 of 2012	Karmic Business Specialities Pvt., Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. P. Subba Reddy Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
2	D.R.P.No.1 of 2014	M/s. Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus TANTRANSCO	Adv.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
3	D.R.P.No.3 of 2014	M/s. Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus TANTRANSCO	Adv.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
4	D.R.P.No.61 of 2014	Hi-Tech Arai Private Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC 4) SE, Tiruppur EDC 5) SE, Dindigul EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
5	M.P.No.7 of 2017	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
6	R.A.No.7 of 2019	<u>In the matter of:</u> Procedure for verification of status of Captive Generating Plants and Captive users as directed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.A.(MD) Nos.930 & 931 of 2017 and C.M.P.Nos.5958 and 5959 of 2019 in W.A.(MD) Nos.930 & 931 of 2017.		For orders.
7	M.P.No.3 of 2020	Thiru.N.Alagu Narayanan Versus CE/Civil Transmission, TANTRANSCO	Party-in-Person	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.
8	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & M.P.No.4 of 2020	TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	For condonation of delay and seeking approval for time extension till February 2020 for filing of ARR and Tariff Petition for the year 2020-21 along with true-up petition for the FY 2016-17 and 2017-18. For admission.
9	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & M.P.No.5 of 2020	TANTRANSCO	Adv.V.Anil Kumar	For condonation of delay and seeking approval for time extension till February 2020 for filing the ARR for FY 2020-21 along with True-up for the FY 2016-17 to 2018-19 and Annual Performance Review for 2019-20. For admission.
10	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & M.P.No.6 of 2020	State Load Despatch Centre (SLDC)	Adv.V.Anil Kumar	For condonation of delay and seeking approval for time extension till February 2020 for filing of ARR along with true-up petition for FY 2017-18 to 2018-19 and CIP for control period 2019-20 to 2021-22 under MYT framework. For admission.
11	R.P.No.1 of 2020 in M.P.No.8 of 2019	M/s.Navin Housing & Properties Pvt. Limited Versus 1)CMD/TANGEDCO 2)CE/Distn&Comml.&ors	Stephen & Stephen Advocates Associates	To review the order passed in M.P.No.8 of 2019 dated 10.12.2019. For admission.
12	R.A.No.8 of 2019	i) M/s.Sutherland Global Services Pvt. Limited ii) M/s.K.G.Information Systems Pvt. Limited Versus	Director AGM(Legal)	As directed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.19720 of 2010 & W.P.No.13425 of 2008 in the matter of classification

		i)CMD/TANGEDCO ii) Energy & IT Dept.		of electricity tariff for IT enabled industries. For admission.
13	D.R.P.No. 25 of 2013	Sun Paper Mill Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix the rate for supply of power. For filing withdrawal memo.
14	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.
15	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.
16	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 further hearing.
17	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 further hearing.
18	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 further hearing.
19	M.P.No.1 of 2020	CE/NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval for procurement of 440.64 MW of wind power from the prospective wind power generators for 25 years at the rate of Rs.2.84 + 0.07 as trading margin to meet TANGEDCO's RPO

				requirement from the year 2021-22. For further hearing.
20	M.P.No.8 of 2016	Ind-Barath Power Infra Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	President (Commercial & Legal) Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to maintain uniformity in the payment without showing the discrimination among the generators. Re-opening the petition and arguments.
21	M.P.No. 16 of 2018	TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Approval and Ratification for dispatching power from unapproved sources for the period from 1-4-2016 to 31-3-2017 and 1-4-2017 to 31-3-2018. Re-opening the petition and arguments.
22	M.P.No.5 of 2019	Power Engineers' Society of Tamil Nadu (PESOT) Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) Director (Finance),	Thiru.S.Gandhi, President,PESOT Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to withdraw banking on any generation and to dispense the status of Group Captive to Wind generators and to order that the adjustment of generation. Re-opening the petition and arguments.
23	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 counter.
24	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 counter.
25	D.R.P.No.58 of 2014	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 2 nd respondent letter dated 12-4-2013. For counter.
26	D.R.P.No.81 of 2014	Dalmia Bharat and Sugar Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2 CFC, TANGEDCO&ors	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a total sum of Rs.3.8/- crores. For counter.

27	D.R.P.No.14 of 2015	SKI Carbon Black (India) Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) AO, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to release the outstanding payments for 10% power supplied and billed over and above the contracted quantum amounting to a sum of Rs.1.10 crores along with interest of Rs.23.03 lakhs. For counter.
28	I.A.No.1 of 2018 in M.P.No. 21 of 2018	Indian Wind Power Association Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.T.Mohan	Seeking directions determining the banking charges in paise equivalent to 10% of the banked energy. For counter.
29	D.R.P.No.1 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) CE, NCES & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.44 crores. For counter.
30	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 counter.
31	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 counter.
32	R.A.No.5 of 2019	Ramnad Renewable Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to grant the petitioner a project specific extension of the control period and to declare the petitioner has successfully commissioned its 72 MW solar power project. For counter.

33	R.A.No.6 of 2019	Kamuthi Solar Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to grant the petitioner a project specific extension of the control period and to declare the petitioner has successfully commissioned its 216 MW solar power project. For counter.
34	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 filing counter both on the main petition and on the memo filed by the petitioner.
35	D.R.P.No.8 of 2019	M/s.Ramnad Renewable Energy Ltd. Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to direct the TANGEDCO to make payment of all outstanding amount of Rs.16.80 crores including late payment surcharge payable to the petitioner. For counter.
36	M.P.No.9 of 2019	M/s.India Power Corpn (Tuticorin) Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Thiru.Jyotirmay Bhaumik, Director Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval for company's name change and allow transfer of all financial and contractual liabilities of IPCTPL as Deemed Distribution Licensee to TESPL. For counter.
37	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 counter.

38	D.R.P. No.8 of 2014	India 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 filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
39	D.R.P. No.9 of 2014	Savita Oil Technologies Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	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.
40	D.R.P. No.10 of 2014	M. Babanna Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	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.
41	D.R.P. No.14 of 2014	Elveety Industries 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 filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
42	D.R.P. No.15 of 2014	Sri Kumaraswamy Mineral Exports 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 filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
43	D.R.P. No.18 of 2014	Om Sakthi Wind Power 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 filing memo for acceptance of the offer made by TANGEDCO.
44	D.R.P. No.19 of 2014	Sree Rayalaseema Hi-Strength Hypo Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	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.
45	D.R.P. No.20 of 2014	Krishna Kumar Orthopaedic Hospital and Institute of Orthopaedics (P) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	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.

46	D.R.P. No.21 of 2014	Maris Spinners Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
47	D.R.P. No.22 of 2014	Texonic Instruments Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
48	D.R.P. No.23 of 2014	Maris Hotels and Theatres (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
49	D.R.P. No.24 of 2014	Bhabani Pigments 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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
50	D.R.P. No.25 of 2014	R.Madan Mohan Rao Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
51	D.R.P. No.26 of 2014	Powerica 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 filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
52	D.R.P.No. 40 of 2014	Nupower Renewables Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.10.95 crores. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.

53	D.R.P.No. 49 of 2014	Coimbatore Pioneer Fertilizers Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.68.14 lakhs. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment.
54	D.R.P.No. 52 of 2014	Designco Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Sri & Shankar Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.57.23 lakhs. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment.
55	D.R.P.No. 62 of 2014	CLP Wind Farms (India) Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payments of a sum of Rs.10.61 crores being the interest due. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
56	D.R.P.No.63 of 2014	CLP Wind Farms (Theni Project-II) Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Finance) 3) SE, Theni EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payments of a sum of Rs.11.62 crores being the interest due. For filing memo for accepting 6% interest on the payment from TANGEDCO.
57	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.
58	D.R.P.No.18 of 2013	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.
59	D.R.P.No.24 of 2013	Sree Rangaraj Ispat Industries Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. T.Mohan	Direct the respondents to adjust 88,100 energy units. For arguments.
60	D.R.P.No.26 of 2013	Sai Regency Power Corpn. Ltd Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	MSA Partners Advocates Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Direct the respondents to release a sum of Rs.2.35/-crores withheld from the sums payable to the petitioner for supply of energy. For arguments.

61	D.R.P.No. 4 of 2014	B&G Solar Private Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC/Revenue 3) Director / Finance 4) SE, NagapattinamEDC	Adv.Vinodkumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the CFC/Revenue dt. 9-12-2013 issued by TANGEDCO. For arguments.
62	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.
63	D.R.P. No.11 of 2014	P.M. Granite Exports 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 arguments.
64	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 of both side.
65	D.R.P.No. 54 of 2014	National Energy Trading and Services Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, Commercial 3) Director / Operation	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay an amount of Rs.33.13 crores towards balance of energy charges. For filing memo and arguments.
66	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.
67	D.R.P.No.76 of 2014	M. Sathish Kumar 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. 2.5/- lakhs being the interest due. For arguments.

68	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 filing rejoinder and arguments.
69	D.R.P.No.1 of 2015	Balkrishna Wind Energy Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.2.69/- lakhs being the interest due. For arguments.
70	D.R.P.No. 2 of 2015	Sunil Wind Energy Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.3.45/- lakhs being the interest due. For arguments.
71	D.R.P.No.3 of 2015	Lanco Tanjore Power Company Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.50.70 crores being the interest due. For arguments.
72	D.R.P.No.7 of 2015	M/s.A.R.S.Metals (P) 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.
73	D.R.P.No.8 of 2015	M/s.A.R.S.Metals (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CE, Transmission 2) SE, General Construction Circle-1	Adv.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	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.

74	D.R.P.No.9 of 2015	M/s.A.R.S.Metals (P) Ltd., Versus 1) Director(Operation), TANTRANSCO 2) SE, Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	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.
75	M.P.No. 25 of 2015	Southern Railway Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv.Siddarth Bahety Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to dispense with the levy of surcharge for harmonics as far as Railway Traction is concerned. For arguments.
76	D.R.P.No.1 of 2016	M/s.R.K.K.R.Steels Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Dindigul 3) SE, Chennai	Adv.K.Seshadri Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.31.72/-lakhs being the 75% of the purchase rate injected into respondents grid. For arguments.
77	D.R.P.No.3 of 2016	M/s. Mitra Fidelity Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. T.Mohan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.66.22/-lakhs for unutilized banked energy along with interest. For arguments.
78	D.R.P.No. 4 of 2016	M/s. Greenweiz Projects Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. T.Mohan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.28.39/-lakhs with interest. For arguments.
79	D.R.P.No. 5 of 2016	M/s. Tapi Energy Projects Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the CE/NCES letter and direct the TANGEDCO to pay a sum of Rs.13.04/-lakhs for unutilized banked energy along with interest. For arguments.
80	D.R.P.No. 6 of 2016	Kaveri Gas Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Nagai EDC	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.32 crores. For arguments.

81	D.R.P.No. 7 of 2016	Cauvery Power Generation Chennai Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.53.92/- lakhs. For seeking comments of the IRP and arguments.
82	P.P.A.P.No. 2 of 2018	Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency Versus TANGEDCO	Thiru. Vijayaraj, Sr.Manager Adv. M.Gopinathan	Tariff determination and exemption from Grid connectivity norms. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission