

No.14/2023 dated: 03-03-2023

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 07-03-2023 (Physical Hearing)

Time : 02-30 PM

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.6 of 2023	M/s.SEPC Power Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO Ltd	M/s.J Sagar Associates Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	To approve the actual capital cost incurred by the petitioner as being the "Trued Up Capital Cost" in terms of Article 3.9, Article 12 and Article 14 of the PPA read with Regulations 18 to 20 and 90 of the TNERC - Tariff Regulations 2005 and to approve the revised tariff as per the Trued Up Capital Cost which shall be applicable from 3rd anniversary of the CoD. For admission.
2	M.P.No.29 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.The KTM Jewellery Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Rep. by its Executive	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2016-2017. For counter.
3	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	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2014-2015. For counter.
4	D.R.P.No.9 of 2022	M/s.Palvai Green Power Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Virudhunagar EDC (iii) CE/NCES (iv) CFC/General	Adv.Veda Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondents to pay an amount of Rs.1,02,96,915/- to the petitioner towards interest on account of delay in payment of monthly bills along with interest upto June

				2020 and award interest @ 12% p.a. from the date of this petition till the date of actual payment. For filing a detailed counter.
5	D.R.P.No.12 of 2022	The Tata Power Co. Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO iii) SE/Udumalpet EDC	SKV Law Offices Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondents to make payment of Rs.53.72 crores in favour of the petitioner as the differential amount including interest for wrongfully fixing the rate at 75% of the preferential tariff rates even for the years where the APPC rates did not breach the preferential tariff rates. For counter.
6	M.P.No.3 of 2023	The South Indian Sugar Mills Association - Tamil Nadu Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) Director / Finance	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Exercise its regulatory powers to direct TANGEDCO to purchase power from petitioner's members having subsisting PPAs at full price beyond 55% / 60% PLF as the case may be till such time they reach the 55% / 60% PLF on cumulative basis to compensate for the very low PLF achieved in the earlier years. For counter.
7	M.P.No.5 of 2023	M/s.K.G.Foundations Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) Director / Finance (iii) SE/CEDC/South-2 (iv) Chairman/CGRF (v) EE/O&M, Taramani	M/s.Stephen & Stephen Advocates Associates Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To invoke section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-compliance of the orders of the Commission dated 09.11.2021 in M.P.No.2 of 2021 and direct the respondent to revise the estimate strictly adhering to the statutory rules / orders / directions in force and to refund

				the same immediately and to pass just & further or other orders. For counter.
8	D.R.P.No.1 of 2023	M/s.KR Wind Energy LLP Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/Dindigul EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondents to give adjustment of the banked energy available in the Group Captive Generator's account, maintained in the generation end EDC and to treat the unutilised banked energy for encashment at 75% of the relevant tariff rate as per the Wind Tariff Orders issued by the Commission. For counter.
9	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	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. For counter.
10	D.R.P.No.3 of 2022	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/GO/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 rejoinder.
11	D.R.P.No.18 of 2021	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 and such further pendent lite interest from the date of filing. For rejoinder.
12	M.P.No.4 of 2023	M/s.Pandian Chemicals Limited Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) Director / Finance (iii) CFC/Revenue (iv) SE/Cuddalore EDC (v) SE/Sivaganga EDC (vi) SE/Tirunelveli EDC (vii) SE/Kanyakumari EDC	Adv.S.Yasar Arafath Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To take necessary action against respondent TANGEDCO under section 142 & 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for deliberate non-compliance of TNERC order dated 02.02.2021 in D.R.P.No.1 of 2020. For reporting status by the petitioner.
13	D.R.P.No.24 of 2013	Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries Pvt. Ltd., Versus i) TANGEDCO & ors iii) DSRM Steels Pvt. Ltd	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj for M/s.DSRM Steels Pvt Ltd (R-3)	Direct the respondents to give adjustment of 88,100 energy units. For arguments of the respondent-3 i.e., M/s.D.S.R.M. Steels Pvt. Limited.
14	D.R.P.No.9 of 2016	Vijayalakshmi Marketing Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Edumalpet EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	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 of the respondent.
15	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.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	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 arguments of the respondent.
16	R.P.No.6 of 2021 in M.P.No.14 of 2012	M/s.The Tata Power Company Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SLDC (iii) IWPA (iv) Ushdev Power Holdings Pvt. Limited	SKV Law Offices Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Review / modify the impugned order dated 05.10.2021 passed in M.P.No.14 of 2012 in terms of the submissions made in the present Review Petition and appoint POSOCO to verify the data and clarify the compensatory mechanism in terms of the NSEFI Judgement. For arguments of the respondent.
17	R.P.No.7 of 2021 in M.P.No.25 of 2021	Rajah Muthiah Chettiar Charitable and Educational Trust Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Regulatory Cell (iii) SE/Chengalpattu EDC	Adv.T.Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To issue an order of Interim Injunction restraining the respondents not to levy demand and collect electricity charges i.r.o. petitioner's electricity service connection and to review the order of the Commission in M.P.No.25 of 2021 dated 16.11.2021. For arguments.
<u>Batch cases - In the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power</u>				
18	T.A.No.1 of 2022	M/s.Sundaram Clayton Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/West	M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates Adv.N.Kumanan &	W.P.No.25357 of 2010 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of levy of penalty on alleged

		(iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited	Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	excess drawal of power. For arguments.
19	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 arguments
20	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 arguments
21	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 arguments.
22	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 arguments

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission