

No.44/2023 dated: 02-09-2023

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 05-09-2023

Venue: Court Hall of the Commission

Time : 11.00 AM

Item No.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.4 of 2022	M/s.Sulochana Cotton Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Palladam EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	For order.
2	D.R.P.No.5 of 2022	M/s.Sulochana Cotton Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Palladam EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	For order
3	D.R.P.No.6 of 2022	M/s.Hindustan Textiles Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Dindigul EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	For order
Batch cases - In the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power				
4	T.A.No.1 of 2022	M/s.Sundaram Clayton Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.25357 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power. For filing vakalath and counter by the 3 rd respondent, M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Ltd.

5	T.A.No.2 of 2022	M/s.Sundaram Clayton Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.25245 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power. For filing vakalath and counter by the 3 rd respondent, M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Ltd.
6	T.A.No.3 of 2022	M/s.Sundaram Clayton Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Dharmapuri EDC (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.25246 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power. For filing vakalath and counter by the 3 rd respondent, M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Ltd.
7	T.A.No.4 of 2022	M/s.Lucas TVS Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Chennai EDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.25247 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power. For filing vakalath and counter by the 3 rd respondent, M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Ltd.
8	T.A.No.5 of 2022	M/s.Sundaram Fasteners Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.25248 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levying penalty on alleged excess drawal of power. For filing vakalath and counter by the 3 rd respondent, M/s.Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Ltd.

9	M.P.No.19 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.Amaravathi Textiles	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the Fys 2014-2015, 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. For counter.	the
10	M.P.No.20 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.Atithya Clothing Co.	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2016-2017. For counter.	the
11	M.P.No.21 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.KOG-KTV Food Products (India) Pvt Ltd.	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2016-2017. For counter.	the
12	M.P.No.23 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.Bull Machines Pvt. Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. For counter.	
13	M.P.No.24 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.Sheenlac Paints Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.Rahul Balaji	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FYs 2015-2016, 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019. For counter.	
14	M.P.No.25 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.KKSK Leather Processors Pvt. Limite	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2016-2017. For counter.	
15	M.P.No.27 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.Ashok Granites Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FYs 2015-2016, 2016-17 and 2017-2018. For counter.	
16	M.P.No.28 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.Sri Vengadeshwara Spinners	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FYs 2018-2019 and 2019-2020. For counter.	

17	M.P.No.29 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.The KTM Jewellery Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2016-2017. For counter.
18	M.P.No.30 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.Raj Hair International Pvt. Limited	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.Ajay Francis Inigo Loyola	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2014-2015. For counter.
19	D.R.P.No.10 of 2023	M/s.Krishnaveni Carbon Products Pvt Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) SE/Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To quash the 3rd respondent's impugned demand notice No.SE/TEDC/TIN/DFC/AO/WIND/AS/F.OASoft ware/ D.No.354/23 dt.08.05.2023. For filing counter on the I.A. and Main Petition.
20	M.P.No.31 of 2022	M/s.Bhabani Pigments Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/NCES (iv) SE/Tiruppur EDC	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To impose penalty upon the Respondents in accordance with section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of the order of the Commission dated 15.03.2022 in D.R.P.No.20 of 2021 and consequently direct the respondents to make payment of the entire sum of Rs.87,08,492 along with interest @ 1% P.M. For reporting compliance.
21	R.P.No.2 of 2013	Spictex Cotton Mills (P) Ltd. Versus TANGEDCO	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.Richardson Wilson	To review the order dated 17.4.2013 in D.R.P.No.2 of 2012. For arguments.
22	D.R.P.No.14 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus 1) CFC, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Virudhunagar EDC	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv. Richardson Wilson	To set aside the 2 nd respondent impugned notice dated 11.8.2012 towards short levy of excess energy charges. For arguments.

23	D.R.P.No.15 of 2013	Sri Pathy papers and Board (P) Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO .	Adv. R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.Richardson Wilson	To set aside the 2 nd respondent impugned notice dated 28.9.2012. For arguments.
24	D.R.P.No.18 of 2021	M/s. Amarjothi Spinning Mills Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) Director /Finance (iii) SE/Theni EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondents to forthwith make payment of a sum of Rs.47,83,750/- being the sum due and payable to the petitioner against delayed payments made by TANGEDCO for power supplied. For arguments.
25	M.P.No.22 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.MOD Forge Pvt. Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.Rahul Balaji	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2014-2015 and 2016-2017. For arguments.
26	M.P.No.26 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.A.V.R.N. Hotels Pvt. Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.M.Santhanaraman	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2016-2017. For arguments.
27	D.R.P.No.3 of 2022	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/TANTRANSCO	Adv.Tanya Kapoor Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To declare the exorbitant increase in the price of imported coal along with the acute shortage and non-availability of domestic coal, as a Force Majeure event and direct the suspension of transmission charges to be levied under the MTOA agreement until the Force Majeure event ceases and also direct the TANGEDCO not to levy OA charges for the period of Force Majeure continuation and from levying any other charges, costs whatsoever. For arguments.

28	M.P.No.12 of 2023	M/s.Tagros Chemicals India Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/Commercial (iii) SE/Cuddalore EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	<p>To pass an interim directions directing the Respondents-2 to 5 to effect additional demand of 275 KVA in the petitioner's HT service connection without insisting on payment of the amounts demanded or any other amount in contravention of the Electricity Act, 2003 and the Regulations and to punish the respondents 2 to 5 for demanding a sum of Rs.1,78,66,700/- vide impugned procs dt.18.02.2023 for effecting additional demand of 275 KVA in the petitioner's HT service connection and also direct the respondents to effect additional demand of 275 KVA to the petitioner and also direct the respondents to refund the amounts collected from the petitioner.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">For arguments.</p>
29	D.R.P.No.2 of 2023	NLC India Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (iii) CE/Transmission (iv) CE/SLDC	HSB Advocates Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	<p>Direct the respondents to comply with the order of the Commission dt.5.4.2022 in M.P.No.1 of 2021 and to pay to the petitioner a sum of Rs.51,08,16,706/- for the period upto June 2022 as a compensation for issuing backing down instructions to Renewable Energy plants for reasons other than grid security.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">For arguments of the respondent.</p>

30	D.R.P.No.6 of 2023	Vagarai Wind farm Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) Director/Finance (iii) SE/Dindigul EDC	M/s.Sagus Legal Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondents to pay Rs.5.26 crores towards banking units settlement in terms of invoice dated 12.05.2022 along with interest @ 1% P.M. till payment is made by the Respondent. For arguments.
----	--------------------	---	---	--

**Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission**