

No.01/2021 dated: 08-01-2021

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 12-01-2021 (Through Video Conferencing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.1 of 2021	M/s.NLC India Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES iii) CE/Transmission iv) CE/SLDC v) SE/Cuddalore EDC vi) SE/Tirunelveli EDC vii) SE/Ramnad EDC viii) SE/Virudhunagar EDC ix) SE/Tuticorin EDC	Adv.K.Harishankar Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Direct SLDC to strictly follow and enforce "MUST RUN" status on all solar and wind power plants and direct to forthwith stop issuing backing down / curtailment instructions to Solar and Wind Plants, except in the situations as contemplated in the applicable Regulations and also direct SLDC to agree for compensation claim towards the loss of Generation due to backdown. For admission.
2	T.L.A.No.1 of 2021	M/s.eClouds Energy LLP	Rep. by its Designated Partner	Praying to grant Intra-State Trading License within the State of Tamil Nadu. For admission.
3	T.A.No.2 of 2020	M/s.Arkey Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus i CMD/TANGEDCO ii Chairman/TANTRANSCO iii SE/Ramnad EDC iv CFC/Revenue	Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	Directions issued by the Madurai Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.(MD) Nos.14514 & 14525 of 2020 and WMP (MD) Nos.12170, 12174, 12183 & 12184 of 2020 in the matter of deciding the OA charges during lock down period. <i>For the payment of court fee by the petitioner as per the TNERC-Fees & Fines Regulations, 2004 on the amount in dispute and also to file the relevant records for further proceedings.</i>

4	T.A.No.1 of 2021	<p>M/s.OPG Power Generation Private Limited Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/Nagapattinam EDC (iv) SE/CEDC/North (v) TANTRANSCO (vi) SLDC</p>	<p>Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar</p>	<p>Directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.Nos.7737 & 7738 of 2020 in the matter of deciding the OA charges during lock down period. <i>For the payment of court fee by the petitioner as per the TNERC-Fees & Fines Regulations, 2004 on the amount in dispute and also to file the relevant records for further proceedings.</i></p>
5	T.A.No.2 of 2021	<p>M/s.OPG Energy Private Limited Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/Nagapattinam EDC (iv) SE/CEDC/North (v) TANTRANSCO (vi) SLDC</p>	<p>Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar</p>	<p>Directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.7739 of 2020 in the matter of deciding the OA charges during lock down period. <i>For the payment of court fee by the petitioner as per the TNERC-Fees & Fines Regulations, 2004 on the amount in dispute and also to file the relevant records for further proceedings.</i></p>
6	T.A.No.3 of 2021	<p>M/s.Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Limited Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/Nagapattinam EDC (iv) SE/CEDC/North (v) TANTRANSCO (vi) SLDC</p>	<p>Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar</p>	<p>Directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.8415 of 2020 in the matter of deciding the OA charges during lock down period. <i>For the payment of court fee by the petitioner as per the TNERC-Fees & Fines Regulations, 2004 on the amount in dispute and also to file the relevant records for further proceedings.</i></p>
7	T.A.No.4 of 2021	<p>M/s.Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries Limited Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/Nagapattinam EDC (iv) SE/CEDC/North (v) TANTRANSCO (vi) SLDC</p>	<p>Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar</p>	<p>Directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.8429 of 2020 in the matter of deciding the OA charges during lock down period. <i>For the payment of court fee by the petitioner as per the TNERC-Fees & Fines Regulations, 2004 on the amount in dispute and also to file the relevant records for further proceedings.</i></p>

8	T.A.No.5 of 2021	<p>M/s.ARS Energy Private Limited</p> <p>Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/Nagapattinam EDC (iv) SE/CEDC/North (v) TANTRANSCO (vi) SLDC</p>	<p>Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar</p>	<p>Directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.8484 of 2020 in the matter of deciding the OA charges during lock down period. <i>For the payment of court fee by the petitioner as per the TNERC-Fees & Fines Regulations, 2004 on the amount in dispute and also to file the relevant records for further proceedings.</i></p>
9	T.A.No.6 of 2021	<p>M/s.TCP Limited</p> <p>Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/Nagapattinam EDC (iv) SE/CEDC/North (v) TANTRANSCO (vi) SLDC</p>	<p>Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar</p>	<p>Directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.9321 of 2020 in the matter of deciding the OA charges during lock down period. <i>For the payment of court fee by the petitioner as per the TNERC-Fees & Fines Regulations, 2004 on the amount in dispute and also to file the relevant records for further proceedings.</i></p>
10	D.R.P.No.16 of 2020	<p>Nuclear Power Corpn of India Limited</p> <p>Versus</p> <p>i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO iii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC</p>	<p>S.Ramasubramaniam & Associates</p> <p>Adv.M.Gopinathan</p>	<p>To grant an order of stay of the demand of Rs.69,62,689/- vide SE/Tirunelveli EDC's letter dated 16.5.2019 and to declare the demand for Rs.2,05,79,242/- for the year 2015-16 and the demand for Rs.1,55,51,538/- for the year 2016-17 raised by the respondents against the petitioner as illegal and set-aside the same and direct the respondents to refund the amount of Rs.10,68,72,880/- for the year 2015-16 & 2016-17 to the petitioner together with interest at the rate of 10% per annum from August 2017 till the date of payment. For counter.</p>

11	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 counter.
12	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 of memo.
13	D.R.P. No.14 of 2014	Elveety Industries 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 on settlement of dues to the petitioner.
14	D.R.P. No.20 of 2014	Krishna Kumar Orthopaedic Hospital and Institute of Orthopaedics (P) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	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.
15	D.R.P. No.24 of 2014	Bhabani Pigments Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Anr.	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.
16	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 any delay in settlement of invoices. For filing memo on settlement of dues to the petitioner.
17	M.P.No.33 of 2020	M/s.Arulmozhi Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus i) SE/Tirunelveli EDC ii) Chairman / TANGEDCO iii) CFC/Revenue	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To initiate action under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against the SE/Tirunelveli EDC, TANGEDCO for non-compliance of the order of the Commission dated 22.9.2020 in D.R.P.No.67 of 2014. For filing status report.
18	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 arguments.

19	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 arguments.
20	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.
21	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.
22	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 arguments.
23	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.
24	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.
25	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 arguments.
26	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 and for further hearing.

27	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 and for further hearing.
28	R.A.No.3 of 2020	(i) Ind-Bharat Power Gencome Limited (ii) M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Ltd. (iii) MALCO Energy Limited Versus TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Dev Dakshan for P-1 Adv. Rahul Balaji for P-2 & P-3 Adv.M.Gopinathan	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 arguments of the respondent.
29	M.P.No.25 of 2020	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 on or before 31 st March 2016. For reply arguments of the petitioner.
30	M.P.No.26 of 2020	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 petitioner has successfully commissioned its 216 MW solar power project on or before 31 st March 2016. For reply arguments of the petitioner.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission