

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 13-06-2023

Time : 11.00 AM

Sl. No.	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	R.P. No. 2 of 2022	M/s. Techno Electric & Engg. Co. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO & (ii) CMD/TANTRANSCO	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv. N. Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To review the order dated 14-09-2021 in D.R.P. No. 27 of 2013 for non-consideration of the order in M/s. B&G Solar and in terms of grounds stated in para-18. For filing counter on maintainability and merits of the Review Petition.
2	I.A.No.1 of 2023 in D.R.P.No.5 of 2021	M/s.Arkey Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd (ii) CE/GTS, TANGEDCO (iii) SE/GTS, Ramnad Circle	Adv.Anirudh Krishnan Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondents to pay a total sum of Rs.128 crores along with interest towards illegal deduction, compensation for deviation 15% of the contracted value, power supplied to the captive consumers, power supplied 10% over and above the contracted quantum and delayed payment along with interest. For filing counter on the impleading of TANTRANSCO and SLDC.
3	M.P.No.11 of 2022	Power Engineers Society of Tamil Nadu (PESOT) Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) PPN Power Generating Co. Pvt. Limited	Rep. by its President Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To declare the payment made and to be made to M/s.PPN Power Generating Ltd in accordance to the BP 21 dated 30.3.2020 is in violation of PPA entered on 03.01.1997 and to disapprove the amendments to PPA, if any entertained and order

				<p>to recover the entire amount paid to PPN Power Ltd and also to punish TANGEDCO for the violation to the provision of section 142 of the E.A., 2003.</p> <p>For filing counter on the maintainability of the petition as well as on merits by R-1 & R-2 and filing of affidavit by R-1.</p>
4	I.A.No.1 of 2023 in D.R.P.No.1 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	<p>Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.44 crores.</p> <p>Reply arguments of the Petitioner.</p>
5	I.A.No.1 of 2023 in D.R.P.No.2 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	<p>Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.2.52 crores towards 2% of line loss.</p> <p>Reply arguments of the Petitioner.</p>
6	I.A.No.1 of 2023 in D.R.P.No.4 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	<p>Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.15.19 lakhs towards 2% of line loss.</p> <p>Reply arguments of the Petitioner.</p>
7	D.R.P.No.13 of 2021	M/s.EID Parry (India) Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CFC/Revenue, TANGEDCO iii) CE/NCES iv) SE/Cuddalore EDC v) SE/Pudukkottai EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	<p>Direct the respondents to implement the order of the Commission in P.P.A.P No.8 of 2011 dt.31.3.2016 and consequently release the payment towards 2% line loss of Rs.2,87,29,026/- payable together with interest of Rs.1,53,69,099/- thereon at 12% p.a.</p> <p>For arguments of the respondent</p>
8	D.R.P.No.17 of 2021	M/s.Dharani Sugars & Chemicals Limited Versus 1) CMD/TANGEDCO Ltd	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan &	<p>Direct the respondents to make payment of principal amount of Rs.2,74,04,230/- along</p>

		<p>2) CFC/General 3) Director (Finance) 4) Director (Generation) 5) SE/Kallakurichi EDC</p>	<p>Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>with interest @ 18% p.a. and also to direct payment of Rs.12,35,53,367/- towards interest on delayed payments. For further arguments of the petitioner.</p>
9	<p>I.A.No.1 of 2023 in M.P.No.3 of 2022</p>	<p>M/s.SEPC Power Private Limited Versus CMD/TANGEDCO</p>	<p>M/s.J.Sagar Associates Adv.Richardson Wilson</p>	<p>Permit the petitioner to terminate the Coal Supply and Transportation Agreement (CSTA) dt.9.2.2018 and to execute a FSA with CIL / any domestic coal supplier in order to procure Indian Domestic Coal and consequently remove the ceiling price mechanism and to procure coal from alternate sources and to amend the PPA to incorporate the above changes. For admission on the I.A. filed by the respondent and for further arguments.</p>
10	<p>M.P.No.18 of 2022</p>	<p>Thiru. Somasundaram, Tiruppur Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) EE/Operation (iii) AEE/O&M/Town/South</p>	<p>Adv.K.Sasindran Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>To set aside the order of the 3rd respondent dt.24.06.2016 and 2nd respondent order dated 28.09.2016 and direct the respondents to repay the 50% of assessed amount paid by the petitioner at the time of filing the statutory appeal. For arguments on the jurisdiction of the Commission.</p>

11	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.
12	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.
13	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.
14	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 Counter.
15	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.
16	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.
17	M.P.No.25 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.KKSK Leather	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.

		Processors Pvt. Limited		For counter.
18	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 counter.
19	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.
20	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.
21	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.
22	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.
23	M.P.No.6 of 2023	M/s.SEPC Power Private Limited Versus TANGEDCO Ltd	M/s.J Sagar Associates Adv.Richardson Wilson	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 Counter
24	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 in respect of 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.
Batch cases - In the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power				
25	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 arguments.
26	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.

27	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
28	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.
29	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

**Batch cases - In the matter of adjustment of units –
For payment of deficit court fee**

30	T.A.No.7 of 2022	Kamachi Industries Limited Versus (i) Chairman/TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO (iii) CE/Grid Operations (iv) Director/Operations & ors.	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 units. <i>For reporting compliance on the payment of deficit court fee and filing of memo.</i>
31	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 units. <i>For reporting compliance on the payment of deficit court fee and filing of memo.</i>

Batch cases - In the matter of adjustment of units – For arguments				
32	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 units. For arguments.
33	T.A.No.9 of 2022	Suryadev Alloys & Powers Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Chairman / TANGEDCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO & Ors.	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 units. For arguments.
34	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 units. <i>For arguments.</i>
35	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 units. For arguments

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission