

No.65/2020 dated: 05-12-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 08-12-2020 (Through Video Conferencing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.80 of 2014	VTX Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.Arun Anbumani Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
2	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	For orders.
3	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.K.Seshadri Adv.V.Anil Kumar	For orders.
4	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.K.Seshadri Adv.V.Anil Kumar	For orders.
5	M.P.No.13 of 2020	CE/Commercial, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
6	M.P.No.15 of 2020	Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) MNRE 3) Energy Dept., GoTN	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan Thiru.S.Gandhi, President, PESOT Impleading Petitioner	For orders.
7	M.P.No.16 of 2020	The Southern India Mills Association (SIMA) Versus 1. CE/NCES, TANGEDCO 2. MNRE 3. Secretary to Govt., Energy Dept., GoTN	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Thiru.S.Gandhi, President, PESOT Impleading Petitioner	For orders.

8	M.P.No.17 of 2020	National Solar Energy Federation of India Versus 1. CE/NCES, TANGEDCO 2. MNRE 3. Secretary to Govt., Energy Dept., GoTN	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Thiru.S.Gandhi, President, PESOT Impleading Petitioner	For orders.
9	M.P.No.33 of 2020	M/s.Arulmozhi Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus i) SE/Tirunelveli EDC ii) Chairman / TANGEDCO iii) CFC/Revenue	Party-in-Person Adv.M.Gopinathan	To initiate action under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against the SE/Tirunelveli EDC, TANGEDCO for non-compliance of the order of the Commission dated 22.9.2020 in D.R.P.No.67 of 2014. For admission.
10	M.P.No.34 of 2020	CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.CWRE Wind Power Pvt. Limited	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To cancel captive wheeling of energy in respect of M/s.CWRE Wind Power Pvt. Limited with effect from 13.6.2018 treated as third party transaction as per law and their captive users are liable to pay Cross Subsidy Surcharge for such disqualification of Captive status. For admission.
11	M.P.No.35 of 2020	CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To grant time extension for filing True-up of ARR for FY-2016-17, FY 2017-18, FY 2018-19 & FY 2019-20, Annual Performance Review of ARR for FY 2020-21 and determination of ARR for FY 2021-22 to FY 2023-24 till 28th February 2021. For admission.
12	M.P.No.36 of 2020	CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO Versus The Chettinad Cement Corpn. Pvt. Limited	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To declare that M/s.Chettinad Cement Corporation Pvt. Limited is not a Captive Generating Plant for the Financial Years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 and they are liable to pay Cross Subsidy Surcharge for an amount of Rs.95,02,09,269/- for disqualification of Captive Status. For admission.

13	D.R.P.No.22 of 2020	<p>M/s.SSMT Power Private Limited</p> <p>Versus</p> <p>i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CFC/Revenue iii) CE/NCES iv) SE/OA & Co-ordination, SLDC.</p>	<p>Adv. Rahul Balaji</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>Exercise its regulatory power and direct Rollover of banked electricity from the CGP Renewable Energy Generating Plant of the petitioner under Captive Category of FY-2019-2020-FY-2021-22 and set out the manner and methodology for its implementation since the accumulation of excess banked units of value of Rs.2,58,01,600/- for FY-2019-2020 and the Captive Consumers ought to be permitted to adjust the unutilised banked units as payments. For admission.</p>
14	M.P.No.2 of 2019	<p>TANGEDCO</p> <p>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>	<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.</p>

15	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 reporting compliance.
16	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 reporting compliance.
17	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 reporting compliance.
18	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 reporting compliance.
19	D.R.P. No.23 of 2014	Maris Hotels and Theatres (P) Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For reporting compliance.
20	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 reporting compliance.
21	D.R.P. No.27 of 2014	Devi Sea Foods 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.
22	D.R.P. No.31 of 2014	Hindustan Platinum Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & CFC/Rev.	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.
23	D.R.P. No.32 of 2014	The Metal Powder Company 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.
24	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 pay interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For reporting compliance.

25	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 interest at 1% per month for any delay in settlement of invoices. For reporting compliance.
26	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 reporting compliance.
27	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 reporting compliance.
28	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 filing of memo by TANGEDCO.
29	D.R.P.No.3 of 2020	Ratedi Wind Power Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Adithya Reddy Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the past outstanding Principal amount and late payment interest totaling to Rs.19.06 crores. For reporting compliance.
30	D.R.P.No.4 of 2020	Wind Urja India Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Adithya Reddy Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the past outstanding Principal amount and late payment interest totaling to Rs.16.71 crores. For reporting compliance.
31	D.R.P.No.15 of 2011	1. Terra Energy Ltd. 2. Shree Ambika Sugars Ltd. Versus 1. TNEB 2. TANGEDCO 3. CE, Operation, SLDC 4. PTC India Ltd.,	Thiru.C.Sanjeevi, IRP Adv.Raghav Menon for Thiru.Anurag Goel, IRP Adv.Abdul Saleem 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.
32	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.Raghav Menon for Thiru.Anurag Goel, IRP Thiru.C.Sanjeevi, IRP (P2) Adv.Abdul Saleem 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 st petitioner. For arguments.

33	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 & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	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 & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	-do-
	M.P.Nos.22 & 23 of 2014	Indian Wind Power Assn. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	-do-
34	M.P.No.21 of 2014	Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Assn. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	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 & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	-do-
35	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.
36	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.
37	D.R.P.No.15 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv. M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 2 nd respondent impugned notice dated 28.9.2012. For arguments.

38	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 filing of memo by TANGEDCO and for arguments.
39	D.R.P. No.35 of 2014	TCP Limited 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 arguments.
40	D.R.P.No.48 of 2014	Super Sales India Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Arun Anbumani Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 3 rd respondent letter dated 11-2-2014 and demand of Rs.15.28 lakhs. For arguments.
41	D.R.P.No.65 of 2014	Madurai Power Corporation pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	To set aside the TANGEDCO's communication and direct payment of Rs.6.01/- crores along with interest. For arguments.
42	D.R.P.No.66 of 2014	Samalpatti Power Company Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	To set aside the TANGEDCO's communication and make payment of Rs.5.82 crores along with interest. For arguments.
43	M.P.No.21 of 2018	Indian Wind Power Association (IWPA) Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking directions determining the banking charges in paise equivalent to 10% of the banked energy. For arguments.
44	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 arguments.
45	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.
46	D.R.P.No.9 of 2019	M/s.Aquasub Engineering Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Arun Anbumani Adv. M.Gopinathan	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 arguments of the respondent.

47	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 filing affidavit and for further arguments.
48	M.P.No.25 of 2020	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 on or before 31 st March 2016. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
49	M.P.No.26 of 2020	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 on or before 31 st March 2016. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
50	D.R.P.No.7 of 2020	M/s.VSR Solar Power Private Limited Versus i)TANGEDCO ii)CE/NCES iii) SE/GCC, Madurai	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Grant the petitioner an extension of time for commissioning its 50 MW Solar Power Plant at Vilathikulam, Tuticorin since there has been a change in law i.r.o. of PPA dated 22.3.2018 and consequently direct TANGEDCO to not invoke the bank guarantee. For arguments of the respondent.

51	D.R.P.No.8 of 2020	M/s.Raasi Green Earth Energy Pvt. Limited Versus i)TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Grant the petitioner an extension of time for commissioning its 100 MW Solar Power Plant at Vilathikulam, Tuticorin since there has been a change in law i.r.o. of PPA dt.26.9.2017 and consequently direct TANGEDCO to not invoke the bank guarantee. For arguments of the respondent.
----	--------------------	--	--	---

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission