

No.33/2020 dated: 10-09-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 15-09-2020 (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.37 of 2014	Woodside Fashions Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
2	D.R.P.No.67 of 2014	Arulmozhi Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
3	T.A.No.1 of 2020	TANGEDCO Versus (i) Trichy Cold Storage (Pvt) Ltd (ii) Association of Cold Storages	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Proceedings consequent to the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras transferring the subject matter of applicability of tariff for LT Cold Storage in W.P.(MD) No.23845 and 21945 of 2019 to the Commission for disposal. For admission.
4	D.R.P.No.13 of 2020	M/s.Rajaguru Spinning Mills Private Limited Versus 1) CMD/TANGEDCO 2) SE/Dindigul, TANGEDCO	Adv.S.Venkatesan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay the petitioner a sum of Rs.2,34,90,014/- being the principle and interest for the supply of wind energy with respect to wind energy purchase agreement. For admission.
5	D.R.P.No.14 of 2020	M/s.Rajaguru Spinning Mills Private Limited Versus 1) CMD/TANGEDCO 2) SE/Dindigul, TANGEDCO	Adv.S.Venkatesan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay the petitioner a sum of Rs.2,49,64,765/- being the principle and interest for the supply of wind energy with respect to wind energy purchase agreement. For admission.
6	D.R.P.No.15 of 2020	M/s.Rajaguru Spinning Mills Private Limited Versus 1) CMD/TANGEDCO 2) SE/Dindigul, TANGEDCO	Adv.S.Venkatesan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay the petitioner a sum of Rs.3,88,12,377/- being the principle and interest for the supply of wind energy with respect to wind energy purchase agreement. For admission.

7	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 filing rejoinder.
8	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 filing rejoinder.
9	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 reporting compliance.
10	D.R.P.No.63 of 2014	CLP Wind Farms (Theni Project-II) Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	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 reporting compliance.
11	D.R.P.No.76 of 2014	M.Sathish Kumar Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs. 2.5/- lakhs being the interest due. For reporting compliance.
12	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 on the consideration of representation of the petitioner by TANGEDCO.
13	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 on the consideration of representation of the petitioner by TANGEDCO.
14	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	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 filing rejoinder and for further hearing.
	D.R.P.No.28 of 2012	i) Green Infra Wind Power Projects Limited & Ors. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	-do-
	M.P.Nos.22 & 23 of 2014	Indian Wind Power Assn. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	-do-
15	M.P.No.21 of 2014	Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Assn. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	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 further hearing.
	M.P.No.45 of 2014	Arasan Syntex Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	-do-
16	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.
17	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 arguments.
18	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 arguments.
19	D.R.P. No.18 of 2014	Om Sakthi Wind Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For arguments.

20	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 arguments.
21	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 arguments.
22	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 arguments.
23	D.R.P. No.22 of 2014	Texonic Instruments Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For arguments.
24	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 arguments.
25	D.R.P. No.24 of 2014	Bhabani Pigments Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest at 1% per month. For arguments.
26	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 arguments.
27	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.
28	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.

29	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 filing written submissions and arguments.
30	M.P.No.10 of 2020	M/s.Leshark Global LLP Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To punish the TANGEDCO under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of the directions issued by this Commission in its order dated 29.10.2019 in M.P.No.14 of 2018 and consequently direct the respondents to implement the said order. For further hearing.
31	R.A.No.3 of 2020	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Ltd Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	In W.P.No.18129 of 2011, the Hon'ble High Court in its order dated 30.8.2019 set-aside the orders of this Commission in P.P.A.P.No.5 of 2011 dated 11.7.2011 and remanded back to the Commission. For filing counter by the petitioners and for further hearing.
32	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.
33	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.

34	D.R.P.No.9 of 2020	M/s.Tirunelveli Solar Project Private Limited Versus i) CMD/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 Kollankinar & other villages, Tuticorin since there has been a change in law i.r.o. of PPA dt.28.9.2017 and consequently direct TANGEDCO to not invoke the bank guarantee. For arguments.
35	M.P.No.25 of 2020	Ramnad Renewable Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	<i>In view of the orders of APTEL in Appeal No.31 of 2017 and the orders of the Commission in R.A.No.5 of 2019, the P.R.C.No.2 of 2016 is numbered as M.P.No.25 of 2020. For filing counter or filing adoption memo to treat the counter filed in R.A.No.5 of 2019 by the respondent as counter in the present Miscellaneous Petition.</i>
36	M.P.No.26 of 2020	Kamuthi Solar Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	<i>In view of the orders of APTEL in Appeal No.32 of 2017 and the orders of the Commission in R.A.No.6 of 2019, the P.R.C.No.3 of 2016 is numbered as M.P.No.26 of 2020. For filing counter or filing adoption memo to treat the counter filed in R.A.No.6 of 2019 by the respondent as counter in the present Miscellaneous Petition.</i>

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission