

No. 61 / 2020 dated: 19-11-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 24-11-2020 (Through Video Conferencing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	T.L.A.No.1 of 2018	M/s.Ventus Energy Consultants	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. E.Anbarasan on behalf of the Objector, Thiru.N.Sivakumar Rajaprabhu.	For orders.
2	D.R.P.No.5 of 2020	Solitaire BTN Solar Private Limited Versus i)TANGEDCO ii)TANTRANSCO iii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO	HSA Advocates Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	For orders.
3	D.R.P.No.18 of 2020	M/s.Techno Electric and Engg. Company Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) Chief Financial Controller iii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC iv) SE/Udumalpet EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to pay a sums due and payable against interest on delayed payment amounting to Rs.8.83/- crores along with further interest, under the EPA entered into with TANGEDCO. For admission.
4	D.R.P.No.19 of 2020	M/s.Kandoi Clean Energy Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO iii) SE/NCES, TANGEDCO	Bohra & Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to release the interest on delayed payment amount to the petitioner jointly a sum of Rs.38.49/- lakhs @ 1% p.m. beyond 30 days as per EPA. For admission.
5	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 counter.

6	M.P.No.31 of 2020	TANGEDCO Versus M/s.A.R.S.Energy Pvt. Ltd	Adv.M.Gopinathan Rep. by its Deputy Director	To declare the M/s.A.R.S. Energy Pvt. Limited is not a captive generating plant and the petitioner may be permitted to levy Cross Subsidy Surcharge for the period from 01.04.2019 onwards from their captive users for captively adjusted energy. For counter.
7	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 filing affidavit.
8	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 filing affidavit.
9	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 disposal of the representation received from the petitioner.
10	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 disposal of the representation received from the petitioner.
11	D.R.P.No.18 of 2013	M/s.ITC Ltd. Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Fin) & ors.	S.Ramasubramaniam & Associates Adv. M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondent to make payment of Rs.91.16 lakhs. For arguments of the respondent.
12	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.

13	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.
14	D.R.P.No.65 of 2014	Madurai Power Corporation pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	To set aside the TANGEDCO's communication and direct payment of Rs.6.01/- crores along with interest. For arguments.
15	D.R.P.No.66 of 2014	Samalpatti Power Company Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	To set aside the TANGEDCO's communication and make payment of Rs.5.82 crores along with interest. For arguments.
16	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.
17	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 of the respondent.
18	D.R.P.No.1 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.44 crores. For arguments.
19	D.R.P.No.2 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.2.52 crores towards 2% of line loss. For arguments.
20	D.R.P.No.4 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.15.19 lakhs towards 2% of line loss. For arguments.
21	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.

22	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 arguments on the admissibility of the petition.
23	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.
24	M.P.No.24 of 2020	Indian Wind Power Assn. (IWPA) 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.
25	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 arguments.

26	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & R.A.No.3 of 2020	(i) Ind-Bharat Power Gencome Limited (ii) M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Ltd. (iii) The Madras Aluminium Co. Ltd. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Dev Dakshan for P-1 Adv. Rahul Balaji for P-2 & P-3 Adv.M.Gopinathan	I.A.filed by the Petitioner-(iii) praying to allow the application for substituting the company name as M/s.MALCO Energy Limited and 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 hearing the matter pertaining to name change and for arguments.
27	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.
28	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.
29	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.

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.7 of 2016	Cauvery Power Generation Chennai Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Vinod Kumar on behalf of Thiru.Amier Hamsa, IRP Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.53.92/- lakhs. For arguments.
32	D.R.P.No.10 of 2016	Lanco Tanjore Power Co., Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Vinod Kumar Adv.Abdul Saleem	Declare that the petitioner is entitled for variable charges towards difference of tariff heat rate for the period from 2008 to 2015. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
33	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.
34	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