

No.02/2021 dated: 13-01-2021

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION****CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 19-01-2021 (Through Video Conferencing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.4 of 2021	CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To clarify that the following establishments where there is no manufacturing activity being carried out and charged under HT Tariff IA based on registered factories licensees and under LT Tariff III B without any certificate for manufacturing of goods as required in Clause 6.2.11.3. For admission.
2	M.P.No.5 of 2019	Power Engineers' Society of Tamil Nadu (PESOT) Versus 1)TANGEDCO 2) Director (Finance),	Thiru.S.Gandhi, President,PESOT  Adv.M.Gopinathan  Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Impleading Petitioner	Praying to withdraw banking on any generation and to dispense the status of Group Captive to Wind generators and to order that the adjustment of generation. For filing counter on admissibility.
3	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.
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 counter.

5	D.R.P.No.21 of 2020	<b>M/s.Techno Electric and Engg. Company Limited</b> <b>Versus</b> <b>i) CMD/TANGEDCO</b> <b>ii) Chief Financial Controller</b> <b>iii) CE/NCES</b> <b>iv) EE/NCES</b> <b>v) SE/Palladam EDC</b> <b>vi) SE/Tirunelveli EDC</b>	<b>Adv.Rahul Balaji</b>  <b>Adv.M.Gopinathan</b>	<b>To set aside the impugned communications dt.12.4.2019 i.r.o. Palladam EDC &amp; dt.9.8.2019 i.r.o.Tirunelveli EDC issued by CE/NCES and direct the Respondents to effect the name change for the petitioner's windmills and also direct to refund a sum of Rs.89,15,172/- being the excess amount collected together with interest thereon. For counter.</b>
6	D.R.P.No.23 of 2020	<b>M/s.Grace Infrastructure Pvt. Limited</b> <b>Versus</b> <b>i) CMD/TANGEDCO</b> <b>ii) Director (Finance)</b> <b>iii) CE/NCES</b> <b>iv) SE/Tirunelveli EDC</b> <b>v) SE/Theni EDC</b> <b>vi) SE/Dindigul EDC</b>	<b>M/s.Rugan &amp; Arya</b>  <b>Adv.M.Gopinathan</b>	<b>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 counter.</b>
7	M.P.No.2 of 2021	<b>Tmt. Tara Murali</b> <b>W/o. Mr.N.Murali</b> <b>No.260A, TTK Road</b> <b>Chennai - 600 018</b> <b>Versus</b> <b>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO</b> <b>(ii) SE/CEDC/Central</b> <b>(iii) EE/O&amp;M/T.Nagar</b> <b>(iv) AE/Teynampet</b>	<b>Adv.Arun Anbumani</b>  <b>Adv.M.Gopinathan</b>	<b>To punish the respondents 2 to 4 for demanding a sum of Rs.13,90,100/- vide impugned procs. Dt.4.12.2020 and 7.12.2020 for effecting LT-3 Phase service connection to a load of 42 KW under Tariff 1A and a common service connection to a load of 5 KW under Tariff 1A for the petitioner's premises, in contravention of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the Regulations made by the Commission. For counter.</b>
8	<b>R.P.No.6 of 2020</b> <b>in</b> <b>M.P.No.2 of 2020</b>	<b>Tamil Nadu Energy Development Agency (TEDA)</b> <b>Versus</b> <b>TANGEDCO</b>	<b>Rep. by its General Manager</b>  <b>Adv.M.Gopinathan</b>	<b>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 filing affidavit.</b>

9	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 filing memo on settlement of dues to the petitioner.
10	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.
11	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.
12	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.
13	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.
14	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 negotiation.
15	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.
16	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.
17	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.
18	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.

19	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.
20	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.
21	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.
22	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.
23	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.
24	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.
25	D.R.P.No.3 of 2020	Ratedi Wind Power Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Adithya Reddy  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the past outstanding Principal amount and late payment interest totaling to Rs.19.06 crores. For reporting compliance.
26	D.R.P.No.4 of 2020	Wind Urja India Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Adithya Reddy  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the past outstanding Principal amount and late payment interest totaling to Rs.16.71 crores. For reporting compliance.
27	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 reporting compliance.

28	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 filing written arguments.
29	M.P.No.14 of 2012	i) Indian Wind Power Assn. ii) The Tata Power Co.Ltd. iii) M/s.Ushadev Power Holidays Private Limited Versus  TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Hon'ble APTEL has directed the Commission Appeal Nos.239 of 2015, 203 of 2015, 240 of 2015 and 241 of 2015 dated 05.02.2020 for taking up the matters from which these appeals arose for further proceedings and adjudication in accordance with law. For arguments.
	D.R.P.No.28 of 2012	i) Green Infra Wind Power Projects Limited & Ors. Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	-do-
	M.P.Nos.22 & 23 of 2014	Indian Wind Power Assn. Versus  TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	-do-
30	M.P.No.21 of 2014	Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Assn. Versus  TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Hon'ble APTEL has directed the Commission Appeal Nos.239 of 2015, 203 of 2015, 240 of 2015 and 241 of 2015 dated 05.02.2020 for taking up the matters from which these appeals arose for further proceedings and adjudication in accordance with law. For arguments.
	M.P.No.45 of 2014	Arasan Syntex Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj  Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	-do-
31	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.
32	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.

33	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.
34	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.
35	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.
36	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.
37	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.
38	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.
39	M.P.No.21 of 2018	Indian Wind Power Association (IWPA) Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji  Adv.M.Gopinathan	Seeking directions determining the banking charges in paise equivalent to 10% of the banked energy. For arguments of the respondent.
40	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.
41	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 of the respondent.

42	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 not to invoke bank guarantee. For arguments.
----	--------------------	---	--	---

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary  
Tamil Nadu Electricity  
Regulatory Commission