

No.66/2020 dated: 14-12-2020

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION****CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 15-12-2020 (Through Video Conferencing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.7 of 2019	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv.Abdul Saleem	For orders.
2	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	For orders.
3	D.R.P.No.11 of 2020	M/s.OPG Renewable Energy Pvt. Limited Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar  Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	For orders.
4	D.R.P.No.24 of 2013	Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries Pvt. Ltd., Versus i) TANGEDCO ii) M/s.DSRM Pvt. Limited	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv. M.Gopinathan Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	Direct the respondents to adjust 88,100 energy units. For filing counter by M/s.DSRM Pvt. Limited.
5	D.R.P.No.17 of 2020	i) M/s.Walwhan Renewable Energy Limited ii) M/s.Walwhan Solar TN Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) SLDC iii) TANTRANSCO iv) MNRE	SKV Law Offices  Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue directions treating the loss of generation of Rs.78.73 crores as computed till August, 2020 on account of curtailment of power as deemed generation by the petitioners and to make payment for the said deemed generation charges. For counter.
6	M.P.No.18 of 2020	CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO Versus i)Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Assn. (TASMA) ii)Indian Wind Power Assn. (IWPA) iii) Southern India Mills Assn. (SIMA) iv)Watsun Infrabuild Ltd. v) Tamil Nadu Power Producers' Assn.	Adv.M.Gopinathan  Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj – R-1  Adv.Rahul Balaji – R-2, R-3 & R-5  M/s.Desai & Diwanji Adv. & Solicitors (R-4)	To determine the additional surcharge of Rs.1.40 per unit payable by OA consumers on quantum of power purchase through Open Access using the network of distribution licensee. For filing additional affidavit by the petitioner.

7	M.P.No.32 of 2020	CE/Commercial, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking an appropriate order for processing applications of willing consumers in solar net meter scheme for installation of additional capacity by changeover from Solar Net Meter Scheme under TN Solar Policy 2019 for the existing installed capacity and installation of additional PV Capacity in Solar Feed-in Scheme within the sanctioned demand. For filing affidavit.
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 reporting compliance.
9	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 reporting compliance.
10	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 reporting compliance.
11	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 reporting compliance.
12	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 reporting status of the petitioner.
13	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 reporting status of the petitioner.
14	D.R.P. No.29 of 2014	Nalco Metal Products 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 status of the petitioner.

15	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 reporting compliance.
16	M.P.No.33 of 2020	M/s.Arulmozhi Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus i) SE/Tirunelveli EDC ii) Chairman / TANGEDCO iii) CFC/Revenue	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  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 filing status report.
17	M.P.No.27 of 2020	M/s.India Power Corpn.(Tuticorin) Private Limited	Rep. by its Director	Seeking approval of Capital Investment Plan for the base year FY 18-19 and each year of MYT control period of FY 19-20, FY 20-21 and FY 21-22 in terms of Regulation 17 of the TNERC (Terms and conditions for Determination of Tariff) Regulations, 2005. For further hearing.
18	M.P.No.28 of 2020	M/s.India Power Corpn.(Tuticorin) Private Limited	Rep. by its Director	Seeking approval of Business Plan for the base year FY 17-18 and five year period of FY 18-19 to FY 22-23 in terms of Regulation 16 of the TNERC (Terms and conditions for Determination of Tariff) Regulations, 2005. For further hearing.
19	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.
20	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.
21	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 <sup>nd</sup> respondent is illegal and contrary to law. For arguments.

22	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.
23	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.
24	D.R.P.No.14 of 2015	Birla Carbon India Pvt. Limited (Formerly M/s.SKI Carbon Black (India) Pvt. Limited) Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to release the outstanding payments of Rs.1.10 crores along with interest of Rs.23.03 lakhs. For arguments.
25	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.
26	D.R.P.No.6 of 2016	Kaveri Gas Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.32 crores. For arguments.
27	D.R.P.No.8 of 2019	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 arguments of the respondent.
28	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 of the Electricity Act, 2003. For arguments.

29	R.A.No.1 of 2020	M/s. ASE Structure Design Pvt. Limited Versus i)CMD/TANGEDCO ii) Energy & IT Dept.	TATVA Legal  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Directions given by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.20722 of 2010 in the matter of classification of electricity tariff for IT enabled industries. For written arguments.
30	T.A.No.1 of 2020	TANGEDCO Versus (i) Trichy Cold Storage (Pvt) Ltd (ii) Association of Cold Storages	Adv.M.Gopinathan  Adv.Rahul Balaji	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 arguments.
31	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 reply arguments of the petitioner.
32	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 reply arguments of the petitioner.

33	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 of the petitioner.
----	--------------------	---	--	---

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary  
Tamil Nadu Electricity  
Regulatory Commission