

No.7/2020 dated: 19-02-2020

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 25-02-2020****Venue: Court Hall of the Commission****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P. No.7 of 2014	Binaguri Tea Company Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
2	D.R.P. No.12 of 2014	Spero Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
3	D.R.P. No.13 of 2014	Scientific Mes-Technik Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
4	D.R.P. No.17 of 2014	Zuri Hotels and Resorts Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
5	D.R.P.No.43 of 2014	Emerald Jewel Industry India Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC/Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
6	M.P.No.19 of 2018	Southern Railway Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) CE, NCES	Adv. Vijay Anand Adv. M.Gopinathan	For orders.

7	D.R.P.No.7 of 2019	M/s.Walwhan Renewable Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	SKV Law Offices Adv.M.Gopinathan	For orders.
8	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.	Director Adv.M.A.Mudimannan	As directed 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 the payment of court fee by the petitioners as per the TNERC-Fees & Fines Regulations, 2004 and for admission.
9	R.A.No.1 of 2020	M/s. ASE Structure Design Pvt. Limited Versus i)CMD/TANGEDCO ii) Energy & IT Dept.	Director Adv.M.Gopinathan	As directed 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 the payment of court fee by the petitioner as per the TNERC-Fees & Fines Regulations, 2004 and for admission.
10	M.P.No.7 of 2020	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval and ratification for dispatching energy from unapproved sources for the period from 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019. For admission.
11	I.A.Nos.1 & 2 of 2020 in D.R.P.No.5 of 2020	Solitaire BTN Solar Private Limited Versus i)TANGEDCO ii)TANTRANSCO iii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO	HSA Advocates	Direct the respondents to complete construction / commissioning of requisite infrastructure beyond the Delivery Point required for evacuation and to declare that the delay in commissioning of the project is for the reasons not attributable to the petitioner and that the Scheduled COD as prescribed under the PPA. For admission.

12	D.R.P.No.4 of 2017	Al Ameen Green Energy Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) The Secretary, Energy Dept., Govt. of Tamil Nadu 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 of the case in Hon'ble High Court of Madras.
13	D.R.P.No.5 of 2017	Al Ameen Green Energy Pvt., Ltd., Versus 1) The Secretary, Energy Dept., Govt. of Tamil Nadu 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 of the case in Hon'ble High Court of Madras.
14	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & D.R.P.No.16 of 2012	Samalpatti Power Co. Pvt. Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Rishabh Prasad Adv. T.Mohan	Direct the respondent to pay a sum of Rs.239.00 crores along with interest. Permit the TANGEDCO to file the additional documents and for reporting the status of the case pending before APTEL.
15	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & D.R.P.No.19 of 2012	Madurai Power Corpn Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. Anand K Ganesan Adv. T.Mohan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.232.00 crores along with interest. Permit the TANGEDCO to file the additional documents and for reporting the status of the case pending before APTEL.
16	D.R.P.No.76 of 2014	M. Sathish Kumar Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Finance) 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs. 2.5/- lakhs being the interest due. For filing memo on the status of acceptance of offer by TANGEDCO.
17	D.R.P.No.14 of 2015	SKI Carbon Black (India) Pvt., Ltd., 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 counter.

18	M.P.No.2 of 2020	Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency (TEDA) Versus TANGEDCO	GM / TEDA Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval for the proposed implementation of the KUSUM (Component-C) Agricultural Solar Pump Scheme in 20000 pumpsets with 7.5 HP load by installing 11 KW Solar PV Plant in each of the pump sets and to approve a maximum / bench mark tariff of Rs.4.53 per unit for the gross unit generated by the proposed Solar PV plant erected under the PM-KUSUM scheme. For further hearing.
19	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 reporting compliance.
20	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 reporting compliance.
21	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 reporting compliance.
22	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 reporting compliance.
23	D.R.P.No.1 of 2017	Satia Industries Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.44.00 lakhs. For reporting compliance.
24	D.R.P. No.37 of 2014	Woodside Fashions Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.21.95 lakhs. For reporting compliance.

25	D.R.P. No.38 of 2014	Natesan Precision Components Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.15.91 lakhs. For reporting compliance.
26	D.R.P. No.39 of 2014	Tamil Nadu Gears and Shafts Corporation Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay interest of Rs.4.57 lakhs. For reporting compliance.
27	D.R.P.No.47 of 2014	White House Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make a payment of Rs.62.31 lakhs. For reporting compliance.
28	D.R.P.No.26 of 2013	Sai Regency Power Corpn. Ltd Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) TANTRANSCO 3) SLDC	MSA Partners Advocates Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar for R-2 & R-3	Direct the respondents to release a sum of Rs.2.35/- crores withheld from the sums payable to the petitioner for supply of energy. For arguments.
29	D.R.P.No.32 of 2013	Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North	Adv. Vinod Kumar Adv.M.Gopinathan	To declare that the withdrawal of deemed demand benefit by the 2 nd respondent is illegal and contrary to law. For arguments.
30	D.R.P.No.44 of 2014	Mirra and Mirra Industries Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) SE, Tirunelveli EDC 5) AO/Revenue, CEDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To direct TANGEDCO to effect adjustment of the WEG from the petitioner's captive windmills operating under the REC scheme first and thereafter adjust the energy generated by the other wind mills. For filing additional affidavit and for arguments.
31	D.R.P.No.55 of 2014	SRF Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC 4) SE, Tirunelveli EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to first effect adjustment of WEG under REC scheme and thereafter adjust with banking facility. For arguments.

32	D.R.P.No.78 of 2014	KCP Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE, Commercial &ors.	S.Ramasubramaniam & Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	To fix the quota energy of 5.39 lakh units as against the base energy of 8.99 lakh units by applying 40% power cut without adjusting wind mill energy and demand. For filing rejoinder and arguments.
33	D.R.P.No.5 of 2015	Padmaadevi Sugars Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC & 3) CE, PPP	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to make payment of a sum of Rs.2.48 crores being the sums due. For arguments.
34	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.
35	D.R.P.No.2 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC 3) SE, Perambalur EDC	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.
36	D.R.P.No.3 of 2018	The Ramco Cements Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SLDC 3) SE, Perambalur EDC	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.
37	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	To issue a clarification on the interpretation of the 19% CUF value as per T.O.No.7 of 2014 dated 12-9-2014. For arguments.
38	M.P.No.11 of 2018	M/s. B.S. Apparel Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue a clarification on the interpretation of the 19% CUF value as per T.O.No.7 of 2014 dated 12-9-2014. For arguments.

39	I.A.No.2 of 2020 & I.A.No.1 of 2019 & M.P.No.11 of 2019	National Solar Energy Federation of India Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. M.Gopinathan	To set aside the circular issued by CE/NCES dt.14-6-2017 and direct the TANGEDCO to adhere to the terms of the PPAs entered into with Solar Power Generators and not make deductions by applying CUF. For filing counter by the petitioner and for further arguments.
40	I.A.No.1 of 2020 & D.R.P.No.2 of 2020	Crescent Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Praying to issue interim injunction against the enforcement of the circular dt.28.11.2017 issued by the CE/NCES and to issue clarification on the interpretation of the 19% CUF value as per TNERC T.O.No.7 of 2014 dt.12.9.2014 and consequently set-aside the circular issued dt.14.6.2017. For filing counter and for further arguments.
41	D.R.P.No.3 of 2019	M/s.Tulsyan NEC Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE/Grid Operation 3) SE/CEDC/North	Adv.Seshadri Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Direct the respondents to pay Rs.44.80/- lakhs being the value of the energy lapsed due to over injection. For arguments.
42	R.A.No.5 of 2019	Ramnad Renewable Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to grant the petitioner a project specific extension of the control period and to declare the petitioner has successfully commissioned its 72 MW solar power project. For arguments.
43	R.A.No.6 of 2019	Kamuthi Solar Power Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to grant the petitioner a project specific extension of the control period and to declare the commissioning of 216 MW solar power project. For arguments.

44	M.P.No.7 of 2019	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Anr.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.Abdul Saleem	Direct the respondents to comply with the order of the Commission in PPAP No.3 of 2014 dated 29.7.2016 and PPA dated 12.12.2013. For arguments.
45	M.P.No.9 of 2019	M/s.India Power Corpn (Tuticorin) Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO	Director Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking approval for company's name change and allow transfer of all financial and contractual liabilities of IPCTPL as Deemed Distribution Licensee to TESPL. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission