

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**CAUSE LIST****Cases posted for 24-01-2023 (Physical Hearing)****Time : 11-00 AM**

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	D.R.P.No.20 of 2012	Pioneer Power Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CE,PPP 3) CFC, Revenue	Adv.Sathyaseelan Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	Declare that the respondents are not entitled to claim the liquidated damages of Rs.12.82 crores. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
2	M.P.No.25 of 2014	Pioneer Power Ltd. Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) Director (Generation) 3) CE, IPP	Adv.Sathyaseelan Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	To issue directions on the respondents in terms of section 142 of the Electricity Act 2003 for non-compliance of the order dated 30-12-2011. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
3	D.R.P.No.44 of 2014	Mirra and Mirra Industries Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	To direct TANGEDCO to effect adjustment of the WEG from the petitioner's captive windmills operating under the REC scheme first and thereafter adjust the energy generated by the other wind mills. For reporting status of the case pending before the Supreme Court.
4	D.R.P.No.55 of 2014	SRF Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv. Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	Praying to first effect adjustment of WEG under REC scheme and thereafter adjust with banking facility. For reporting status of the case pending before the Supreme Court.

5	D.R.P.No.68 of 2014	Dattatreya Textiles Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) SE, Madurai EDC 5) AO/Revenue, CEDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	Direct that TANGEDCO to first effect adjustment of the wind energy supplied to the petitioner from wind mills operating under the Renewable Energy Wheeling Agreement under the REC scheme against the petitioner's HTSC No.47 and thereafter adjust the energy generated. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
6	D.R.P.No.69 of 2014	Sundaram Textiles Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue 3) SE, CEDC/North 4) SE, Madurai/North 5) AO/Revenue, CEDC/North	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the TANGEDCO to first effect adjustment of the wind energy supplied to the petitioner from wind mills operating under the Renewable Energy Wheeling Agreement under the REC scheme against the petitioner's HTSC No.203 and thereafter adjust the energy generated. For reporting the status of the case which is pending before the Supreme Court.
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.Venkatachalapathy Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj for M/s.DSRM	Direct the respondents to adjust 88,100 energy units. For arguments.
8	D.R.P.No.32 of 2013	Suryadev Alloys and Power Pvt. Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) CFC, Revenue	Adv. Vinod Kumar Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	To declare that the withdrawal of deemed demand benefit by the 2 nd respondent is illegal and contrary to law. For arguments.
9	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.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.

10	D.R.P.No.1 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.44 crores. For arguments of the respondent.
11	D.R.P.No.2 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.2.52 crores towards 2% of line loss. For arguments of the respondent.
12	D.R.P.No.4 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.15.19 lakhs towards 2% of line loss. For arguments of the respondent.
13	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.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.
14	R.P.No.4 of 2021 in R.A.No.3 of 2020	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO Versus (i) M/s.Ind-Barath Power Gencom Limited (ii) M/s.MALCO Energy Ltd.	Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy M/s.Shree Law Services for R-1 Adv.Rahul Balaji for R-2	Review the order of the Commission in R.A.No.3 of 2020 dated 09.02.2021 in the matter of fixing a tariff at the ceiling of Rs.3.79 per unit for the month of June 2011 and Rs.3.81 per unit for the months of July to September 2011. For arguments.
15	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.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.
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.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.
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.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.
16	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.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.
17	D.R.P.No.17 of 2021	M/s.Dharani Sugars & Chemicals Limited Versus 1) CMD/TANGEDCO 2) CFC/General 3) Director (Finance) 4) Director (Generation) 5) SE/Kallakurichi EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy	Grant an interim stay on the operation of the Respondent-5's letter dt.25.9.2020 and consequently direct the respondent to make payment principal amount of Rs.2,74,04,230/- along with interest @ 18% p.a. and also direct to make payment of Rs.12,35,53,367/- towards interest on delayed payments. For arguments.

18	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.N.Kumanan & Adv.Venkatachalapathy 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 levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power</u>				
19	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.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
20	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.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
21	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.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
22	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.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.

23	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.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 lapsed units</u>				
24	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.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.
25	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.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>
26	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.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.

27	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.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.
28	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.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.
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.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.
30	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.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