

No.22/2023 dated: 18-04-2023

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
REVISED CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 20-04-2023 (Physical Hearing)

Time : 11-00 AM

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.9 of 2016	Vijayalakshmi Marketing Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) CE, NCES, TANGEDCO 2) SE, Udumalpet EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	For order
2	P.R.C.No.1 of 2023	M/s.Khivraj Motors Pvt. Limited	Adv.Rahul Balaji	For order
3	D.R.P.No.3 of 2023	M/s.MALCO Energy Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CE/PPP (iii) SE/Mettur EDC (iv) SLDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy	To set aside the impugned communications dated 13.02.2015 and 24.04.2015 and the consequential demand of the 3rd respondent letter dt.29.06.2015 demanding a sum of Rs.8,58,23,430/- and pass other orders. For admission.
4	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.
5	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.
6	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.

7	M.P.No.22 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Doc, 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.
8	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.
9	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.
10	M.P.No.25 of 2022	CFC/Deposits & Documentation, TANGEDCO Versus M/s.KKSK Leather Processors Pvt. Limited	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.
11	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.
12	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.
13	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.
14	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.

15	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.
16	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 (vii) Theni Gurukrishna Textile Mills Pvt. Ltd (viii) Sri Jaya Jothi & Co. Ltd (ix) Kayaar Exports Pvt. Ltd	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy for R-1 to R-6 Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj for R-7 to R-9	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 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 filing counter by R-7 to R-9.
17	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.
18	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.
19	D.R.P.No.17 of 2020	<p>i) M/s.Walwhan Renewable Energy Limited ii) M/s.Walwhan Solar TN Limited</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Versus</p> <p>i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) SLDC iii) TANTRANSCO iv) MNRE</p>	<p>SKV Law Offices</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>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 reply arguments of the petitioner.</p>
20	R.P.No.6 of 2021 in M.P.No.14 of 2012	<p>M/s.The Tata Power Company Limited</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SLDC (iii) IWPA (iv) Ushdev Power Holdings Pvt. Limited</p>	<p>SKV Law Offices</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>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 reply arguments of the petitioner.</p>
21	R.P.No.7 of 2021	<p>Rajah Muthiah Chettiar Charitable and Educational Trust</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Regulatory Cell (iii) SE/Chengalpattu EDC</p>	<p>Adv.T.Balaji</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>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.</p>
22	M.P.No.16 of 2022	<p>Aditanar Educational Institution</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) SE/Tuticorin EDC</p>	<p>Adv.Rajesh Vivekananthan</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>To set aside the rejection order of the respondents and direct them to revise the excess levy for the period from 2010 to 2013 in tariff charging the sub-usage of electricity for</p>

				<p>construction within the HTSC of the petitioner and direct the respondents to refund a sum of Rs.26,00,000/- being the collection of excess amount along with interest @ 18% in accordance with law.</p> <p>For arguments.</p>
<u>Batch cases - In the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power</u>				
23	T.A.No.1 of 2022	<p>M/s.Sundaram Clayton Limited</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited</p>	<p>M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>For arguments.</p>
24	T.A.No.2 of 2022	<p>M/s.Sundaram Clayton Limited</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/CEDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited</p>	<p>M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>For arguments.</p>
25	T.A.No.3 of 2022	<p>M/s.Sundaram Clayton Limited</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Versus</p> <p>(i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Dharmapuri EDC (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited</p>	<p>M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>For arguments.</p>
26	T.A.No.4 of 2022	<p>M/s.Lucas TVS Limited</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Versus</p> <p>(i) Chairman / TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Chennai EDC/West (iii) Arkay Energy (Rameswaram) Limited</p>	<p>M/s.Sarvabhauman Associates</p> <p>Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.A.P.Venkatachalapathy</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>For arguments.</p>

27	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.
<u>Batch cases - In the matter of adjustment of units – For payment of deficit court fee</u>				
28	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>
29	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>
<u>Batch cases - In the matter of adjustment of units – For arguments</u>				
30	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.

31	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.
32	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>
33	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