

No.67/2020 dated: 19-12-2020

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION****CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 22-12-2020 (Through Video Conferencing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.16 of 2012	Samalpatti Power Co. Pvt. Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rishabh Prasad  Adv. M.Gopinathan	For orders.
2	D.R.P.No.19 of 2012	Madurai Power Corpn Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv. M.Gopinathan	For orders.
3	M.P.No.16 of 2018	TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
4	M.P.No.4 of 2018	M/s.Ranergy Solutions (P) Ltd., Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
5	M.P.No.11 of 2018	M/s.B.S.Apparel Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
6	M.P.No.11 of 2019	National Solar Energy Federation of India Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji  Adv. M.Gopinathan	For orders.
7	D.R.P.No.2 of 2020	Crescent Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
8	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	For orders.

9	M.P.No.11 of 2020	M/s.Aiki Eco Power LLP  Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Ramaswamy Meyappan  Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
10	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	For orders.
11	M.P.No.32 of 2020	CE/Commercial, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
12	M.P.No.37 of 2020	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval for power procurement under Short term RTC power of upto 1000 MW for the period from 15.02.2021 to 20.05.2021. For admission.
13	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & R.P.No.6 of 2020 In M.P.No.2 of 2020	Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency (TEDA)  Versus TANGEDCO	Rep. by its General Manager  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to condone delay in filing Review Petition and to approve a revised maximum / bench mark tariff of Rs.2.97 per unit for the proposed implementation of the KUMSUM (Component-C) Agricultural Solar Pump Scheme in 20,000 Pump set with 7.5 HP load by installing 11 KW solar PV plant in each of the pumpsets. For admission.
14	D.R.P.No.23 of 2020	M/s.Grace Infrastructure Pvt. Limited  Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) Director (Finance) iii) CE/NCES iv) SE/Tirunelveli EDC v) SE/Theni EDC vi) SE/Dindigul EDC	M/s.Rugan & Arya  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to forthwith pay to the petitioner a sum of Rs.80,96,12,127.65/- being the balance amount along with interest for power supplied from the Wind generation units of the petitioner. For admission.

15	M.P.No.3 of 2020	Thiru.N.Alagu Narayanan Versus CE/Civil Transmission, TANTRANSCO	Party-in-Person  Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Praying to quash the CE/Civil Transmission's letter dated 5.3.2019 by which the work of supply, erection, testing and commissioning of 400 KV DC transmission line between M/s.SEPC Generating Station to Thenampatti substation & to impose the maximum penalty on TANTRANSCO u/s 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003. For counter.
16	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 by TANGEDCO along with acceptance letter of the petitioner.
17	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 reply of the petitioner.
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 filing memo by TANGEDCO along with acceptance letter of the petitioner.
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 reply of the petitioner.
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 reply of the petitioner.
21	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 reply of the petitioner.
22	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 reply of the petitioner.
23	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 reply of the petitioner.

24	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 reply of the petitioner.
25	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 reply of the petitioner.
26	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 reply of the petitioner.
27	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 reply of the petitioner.
28	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 reply of the petitioner.
29	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 reporting status.
30	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 reply of the petitioner.
31	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 reply of the petitioner.
32	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 <sup>nd</sup> respondent letter dated 12-4-2013. For arguments.
33	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.

34	D.R.P.No.3 of 2015	Lanco Tanjore Power Company Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.50.70 crores being the interest due. For arguments.
35	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 arguments.
36	D.R.P.No.2 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.3.89 crores towards excess energy pumped and surcharge of Rs.1.68 crores. For arguments.
37	D.R.P.No.3 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.1.18 crores towards excess energy pumped and surcharge of Rs.21.79 lakhs. For arguments.
38	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.
39	D.R.P.No.6 of 2020	M/s.Kamal Encon Industries Limited Versus i)CMD / TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES iii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC iv) CFC/Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.1.16 crore along with interest for the wind power supplied to TANGEDCO till December 2018. For arguments.
40	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 arguments.
41	D.R.P.No.14 of 2020	M/s.Rajaguru Spinning Mills Private Limited Versus 1) CMD/TANGEDCO 2) SE/Dindigul	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. For arguments.

42	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 arguments.
----	---------------------	---	--	--

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary  
Tamil Nadu Electricity  
Regulatory Commission