

**TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION****CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 16-02-2023 (Physical Hearing)****Time : 02-30 PM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.5 of 2023	M/s.K.GFOUNDATIONS 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 admission.
2	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.
3	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.
4	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.
5	M.P.No.22 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Doc, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.MOD Forge Pvt. Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To declare that the respondent is not a Captive Generating Plant for the FY 2014-2015 and 2016-2017. For counter.

6	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.
7	M.P.No.24 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.Sheenlac Paints Ltd	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	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.
8	M.P.No.32 of 2022	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	To ratify the procurement of RTC Power from 11.04.2022 to 30.4.2022 for 500 MW and from 1.5.2022 to 20.5.2022 for 500 MW. For further hearing.
9	M.P.No.41 of 2022	CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	To determine additional surcharge payable by all open access consumers for the period from 1.10.2022 to 31.3.2023 and hold that the obligation of the State distribution licensee in terms of power purchase agreements has been and continues to be stranded and to determine the additional surcharge of Rs.0.88 per unit payable by open access consumers on adjusted quantum of power purchase through open access. For further hearing.
10	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.

11	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 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> respondents and direct them to give effect to the EWA. For arguments of the respondent.
12	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	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.44 crores. For arguments of the respondent.
13	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	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.2.52 crores towards 2% of line loss. For arguments of the respondent.
14	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	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.15.19 lakhs towards 2% of line loss. For arguments of the respondent.
15	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	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. For arguments of the respondent.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary  
Tamil Nadu Electricity  
Regulatory Commission