

No.54/2020 dated: 05-11-2020

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

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	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 for R-2 & R-3	For orders.
2	P.P.A.P.No.2 of 2018	Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency Versus TANGEDCO	Rep. by the General Manager Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
3	R.P.No.1 of 2019 in M.P.No.82 of 2013	M/s.Vedanta Limited	Adv. Rahul Balaji	For orders.
4	M.P.No.2 of 2020	Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency (TEDA) Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) GoTN, Finance Dept.	Rep. by the General Manager Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
5	M.P.No.14 of 2020	Thiru.V.U.Maruthachalam Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) SE/South, Coimbatore	Rep. by Thiru.S.Gandhi Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
6	R.A.No.4 of 2020	Chennai Metro Rail Limited (CMRL) Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Jayesh B.Dolia Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.

7	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 as a last chance.
8	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 of compliance.
9	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 of compliance.
10	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 of compliance.
11	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.
12	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.
13	D.R.P.No.12 of 2020	Fulchand Exports Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO iii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.Rahul K.Jain Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release late payment surcharge amount of Rs.1.15 crore as agreed rate of the PPAs upto 30.09.2019. For filing memo of compliance.
14	D.R.P.No.20 of 2012	Pioneer Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE,PPP 3) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Sathyaseelan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Declare that the respondents are not entitled to claim the liquidated damages of Rs.12.82 crores. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.

15	M.P.No.25 of 2014	Pioneer Power Ltd. Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Generation) 3) CE, IPP	Adv.Sathyaseelan Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue directions on the respondents in terms of section 142 of the Electricity Act 2003 for non-compliance of the order dated 30-12-2011. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
16	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 reporting on the submission of documents by the respondents as directed in Daily Order dated 13.10.2020.
17	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-

18	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-
19	D.R.P.No.32 of 2013	Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	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.
20	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.
21	D.R.P.No.5 of 2014	Saheli Exports Private Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the CFC/Revenue letter dated 7-9-2013 and 9-12-2013. For arguments.
22	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.
23	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.

24	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 arguments.
25	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 arguments.
26	D.R.P.No.2 of 2016	DCW Ltd., Versus 1) PTC Limited 2) TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv. Ravi Kishore Adv. M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.48.02 lakhs along with interest. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
27	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.
28	D.R.P.No.12 of 2019	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Ltd Versus i) TANTRANSCO ii) TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.V.Anil Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Declare that the respondents are not entitled to collect annual O&M charges and direct the respondent to refund a sum of Rs.1.00 crore along with interest. For arguments of the TANTRANSCO.
29	D.R.P.No.11 of 2020	M/s.OPG Renewable Energy Pvt. Limited Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SE/CEDC North	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Grant an order of interim injunction restraining the respondents from taking any coercive action against the petitioner towards purported recovery of O&M charges and to declare that the respondents are not entitled to collect annual operation and maintenance charges from the petitioner. For arguments of the TANTRANSCO.

30	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.
31	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	Allowing to rollover the Banked Wind Energy found unutilised as on 31.3.2020 to FY 2020-21, without making it to go for encashment and not to levy Banking Charges @ 14% over the Wind Energy Units moving to Banking every month due to Covid-19 Lockdown and restrictions enforced and to allow the Rollover of Solar Energy Found unutilised during the every month from March 2020, till the end of Financial Year 2020-21. For arguments of the respondent.
32	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	Allowing to rollover of banked electricity from OA Renewable Energy Generating Stations under Captive and Third-Party Sale category of FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 to FY 2021-22 and set out the manner and methodology for its implementation. For arguments of the respondent.
33	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	Allowing to rollover of banked electricity from OA Renewable Energy Generating Stations under Captive and Third-Party Sale category of FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21 to FY 2021-22 and set out the manner and methodology for its implementation. For arguments of the respondent.

34	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.
35	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.
36	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 GM / TEDA	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 filing rejoinder and arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission