

No.34/2020 dated: 17-09-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 22-09-2020 (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.67 of 2014	Arulmozhi Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
2	R.A.No.8 of 2019	i) M/s.Sutherland Global Services Pvt. Limited ii) M/s.K.G.Information Systems Pvt. Limited Versus i)CMD/TANGEDCO ii) Energy & IT Dept.	Adv.M.Venkatakrishnan Adv.M.A.Mudimannan Adv.M.Gopinathan	Directions given 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 of electricity tariff for IT enabled industries. For counter.
3	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 counter.
4	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.
5	I.A.No.1 of 2020 in D.R.P.No.10 of 2020	M/s.GMR Power Corpn. Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the TANGEDCO to calculate the amount due and payable to the petitioner and set-off perpetuated by TANGEDCO on account of LLR and alleged Excess Payment along with interest. For filing counter and hearing the matter pertaining to name change.

6	M.P.No.18 of 2020	CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	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 TANGEDCO and filing of objections by the stakeholders.
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 and to grant an order of injunction, restraining the S.E.s of TANGEDCO concerned from the practice of collecting the Scheduling & System Opern. charges on WEGs. For filing counter on the admissibility of the petition.
8	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 filing written submission by the IRP of M/s.Ambika Sugars Limited and M/s.Terra Energy Limited.
9	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 filing written submission by the IRP of M/s.Ambika Sugars Limited and M/s.Terra Energy Limited.

10	D.R.P.No.25 of 2013	Sun Paper Mills Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix the rate for supply of power. For arguments.
11	R.P.No.2 of 2020 in R.A.No.7 of 2019	Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Association (TASMA) Versus CFC/TANGEDCO	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Review the order in R.A.No.7 of 2019 dated 28.1.2020 in the matter of providing procedure for verification of status of CGP and Captive Users as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in W.A.(MD) Nos.930 & 931 of 2017 and CMP No.5958-59 of 2019 of 2017. For arguments.
12	R.P.No.3 of 2020 in R.A.No.7 of 2019	TANGEDCO Versus 1. Sugapriya Paper & Boards Ltd 2. TN Spinnings Mills Assn. 3. Indian Wind Power Assn. 4. South Indian Mills Assn. 5. Tamil Nadu Electricity Consumers Assn. 6. Sri Venkateswara Board	Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj for R-2 Adv.Rahul Balaji for R-3 & R-4	Review the order of the Commission in R.A.No.7 of 2019 dated 28.01.2020 in the matter of providing procedure for Verification status of CGPs and Captive users as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in W.A.(MD) No.930 & 931 of 2017 & CMP No.5958 & 5959 of 2019. For arguments.
13	R.P.No.4 of 2020 in R.A.No.7 of 2019	M/s.Sugapriya Paper & Boards Pvt. Limited Versus CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Review the order of the Commission in R.A.No.7 of 2019 dated 28.01.2020 in the matter of providing procedure for Verification status of CGPs and Captive users as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in W.A.(MD) No.930 & 931 of 2017. For arguments.
14	M.P.No.21 of 2020	CREDAI Chennai Versus CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking clarification on the amendment to the TN Electy. Distribution Code, Notification No.TNERC/DC/8-25 dated 18.12.2019 amending Regulation 29 which sets out the space allocation for erection of sub-station where the load exceeds 5 MVA. For arguments.

15	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 arguments.
16	M.P.No.24 of 2020	M/s. Indian Wind Power Assn. Versus CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking clarification to the order dated 28.1.2020 in R.A.No.7 of 2019 in order to maintain consistency between the CGP Procedure. For arguments.
17	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 arguments.
18	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 filing memo and for arguments.
19	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 filing memo and for arguments.
20	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 filing memo and for arguments.
21	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 filing memo and for arguments.

22	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 arguments.
23	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 reporting the stage of settlement.
24	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.
25	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.
26	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 arguments.
27	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.
28	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.
29	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.

30	D.R.P.No.8 of 2016	MALCO Energy Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) PTC India Limited	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.Ravi Kishore	Direct the respondents to pay Rs.4.69/- crores for power supplied for the period from 1-6-2010 to 3-6-2010. For arguments.
31	D.R.P.No.9 of 2016	Vijayalakshmi Marketing Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Edumalpet EDC & Anr.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the impugned notices dated 4-8-2014 and 2-12-2014 issued by the 1 st and 2 nd respondents and direct them to give effect to the EWA. For arguments.
32	D.R.P.No.11 of 2016	Orchid Pharma Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC 3) SE, Chengalpattu EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the 1 st respondent demand notice and consequently direct the 2 nd respondent to give adjustment for the unutilized banked energy or encashment of Rs.23.93/- lakhs. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission