

No.05/2023 dated: 07-02-2023

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 09-02-2023 (Physical Hearing)****Time : 02-30 PM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	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 admission.
2	M.P.No.34 of 2022	M/s.Doshi Housing Private Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/South-I	M/s.Stephen & Stephen Advocates Associates Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To invoke section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for non-complying with the orders of the Commission in Taramurali's case and statutes, apart from directing the respondent to revise the estimate strictly adhering to the statutory rules / orders / directions in force and to refund the same. For counter
3	D.R.P.No.11 of 2022	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) Director/Finance (iii) SE/Theni EDC (iv) SE/Virudhunagar EDC (v) SE/Tuticorin EDC (vi) SE/Chennai North EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy for R-1 to R-6	To set aside the claim pertaining to audit shortfall contained in letter dated 9.6.2021 issued by the 6th Respondent deducting an amount of Rs.6,39,95,942/- from the Compensation

		(vii) Theni Gurukrishna Textile Mills Pvt. Ltd (viii) Sri Jaya Jothi & Co. Ltd (ix) Kayaar Exports Pvt. Ltd		Charges payable to the petitioner, allegedly for Audit shortfall for not having STOA for the period from 1.6.2016 to 31.7.2016. For counter.
4	M.P.No.12 of 2022	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Seeking approval for power procurement under Short Term Power procurement upto 1000 MW RTC power and 1000 MW for the evening peak hours for the period from 14.3.2022 to 20.5.2022. For further hearing.
5	M.P.No.15 of 2022	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Seeking approval for power procurement under Short Term Power procurement upto 1000 MW RTC power and 1000 MW for the period from 04.04.2022 to 20.5.2022. For further hearing.
6	M.P.No.43 of 2022	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To approve to float the tender as per bidding guidelines of the Commission for procurement of power from both Inter and Intra-State generators. For further hearing.
7	D.R.P.No.24 of 2013	Sree Rengaraj Ispat Industries Pvt. Ltd., Versus i) TANGEDCO & Ors ii) DSRM	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj for M/s.DSRM Steels Pvt Ltd	Direct the respondents to give adjustment of 88,100 energy units. For arguments.

8	M.P.No.37 of 2021	M/s.Kamuthi Renewable Energy Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/NCES (iii)SE/P&C/TANTRANSCO/ Mdu (iv) SE/NCES/Tirunelveli	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To declare that the entire 72 MW solar power plant stood commissioned and entitled to the Tariff fixed under "Comprehensive Tariff Order on Solar Power" in Order No.4 of 2014 and set aside the CE/NCES communication's dated 30.9.2016 to segregate the 72 MW solar power plant erected as 25 MW and 47 MW separately with separate energy meters and be paid at different tariff rates as illegal. For arguments.
9	R.P.No.1 of 2021 in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016	PTC India Limited Versus (i) MALCO Energy Ltd (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.Ravi Kishore Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Review the order of the Commission dated 02.03.2021 in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016. For arguments.
10	R.P.No.5 of 2021 in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO Versus (i) M/s.MALCO Energy Ltd. (ii) M/s.PTC India Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.Ravi Kishore	Review the order of the Commission issued in D.R.P.No.8 of 2016 dt.02.03.2021 in the matter of directing the respondents to jointly and severally pay the petitioner at the applicable tariff. For arguments.
11	R.P.No.1 of 2022 in M.P.No.2 of 2021, M.P.Nos.33 to 36 of 2021, T.A.No.7 of 2021 & M.P.No.45 of 2021	CE/Commercial, TANGEDCO Versus (i) Tmt.Tara Murali (ii) Thiru.V.Gunalan (iii) Tmt.S.Shalini (iv) Tmt.J.Shobha Lalith (v) Tmt.G.Kumari Selva (vi) Thiru.K.Sakthivel (vii) Thiru.Manivasagan	Adv.Richardson Wilson Adv.Arun Anbumani for R-1, Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj for R-2 to R-6 & Adv.Rahul Balaji for R-7	To review the orders of the Commission by considering the cost of DT erected within the consumer premises with respect to extension of LT service connections and also the actual cost of extension with respect to extension of HT service connections. For arguments.

<u>Batch cases- In the matter of adjustment of lapsed units</u>				
12	T.A.No.6 of 2022	Tamil Nadu Power Producers' Association Versus (i) Chairman / TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) Director /operations (iv) SE/Commercial Divn/TANTRANSCO (v) Director/Distribution	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.15433 of 2020 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. For arguments.
13	T.A.No.7 of 2022	Kamachi Industries Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/CEDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.475 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. <i>For arguments.</i>
14	T.A.No.8 of 2022	M/s.ARS Energy Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.11480 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. For arguments.
15	T.A.No.9 of 2022	Suryadev Alloys & Powers Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANGEDCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.12062 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. For arguments.

16	T.A.No.10 of 2022	Tulsyan NEC Limited Versus (i) Ch/TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.12083 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. For arguments.
17	T.A.No.11 of 2022	Kamachi Industries Limited Versus (i) Chairman/TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations (v) Director/Distribution (vi) SE/Chennai EDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.12584 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. For arguments.
18	T.A.No.12 of 2022	OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Ch./TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	W.P.No.15861 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. For arguments.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission