

No.09/2022 dated: 11-02-2022

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
CAUSE LIST-I

Cases posted for 15-02-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)

Time : 11-00 AM

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.12 of 2021	TANTRANSCO	Adv.V.Anil Kumar Adv.Rahul Balaji for Tamil Nadu Power Producers' Assn. (TNPPA) as Impleading Petitioner	For order
2	I.A.No.1 of 2022 & 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.M.Gopinathan	To condone the delay of 35 days in filing this Review Petition and 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 admission.
3	M.P.No.3 of 2022	M/s.SEPC Power Private Limited Versus CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	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.

4	D.R.P.No.19 of 2021	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Declare that the Change in law events in terms of Article 10 of the PPA dated 12.12.2013 and to determine the correct rate of CVD and other consequential claims for purposes of Change in Law and confirm the correctness and entitlement to the sum of Rs.8,25,91,046/- being the differential working after applying the correct rate towards CVD, Cess and Carrying cost attributable to Change in Law under the PPA. For counter.
5	D.R.P.No.20 of 2021	M/s.Bhabani Pigments Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/NCES (iv) SE/Tiruppur EDC	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to forthwith make payment of a sum of Rs.90,62,345/- being the interest due and payable to the petitioner till 30.11.2021 against delayed payments made by TANGEDCO. For counter.
6	D.R.P.No.1 of 2022	M/s.Velathal Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) Director/Finance (iii) SE/Palladam EDC (iv) SE/Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to forthwith make payment of a sum of Rs.1,86,21,704/- for the period from April 2018 to June 2020 being the sum due and payable to the petitioner against delayed payments made by TANGEDCO for power supplied. For counter.
7	D.R.P.No.2 of 2022	M/s.GMR Energy Trading Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) Director/Finance (iii) CFC/Palladam EDC (iv) SE/Tirunelveli EDC	Adv.Apoorva Misra Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to pay the outstanding Late Payment Surcharge (LPS) amount payable to the petitioner of Rs.3,12,19,097/- for the delay in payment of monthly bills / invoices raised by the petitioner. For counter.

8	D.R.P.No.3 of 2022	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus CMD/TANGEDCO	Adv.Tanya Kapoor Adv.M.Gopinathan	To declare the exorbitant increase in the price of imported coal along with the acute shortage and non-availability of domestic coal, as a Force Majeure event and direct the suspension of transmission charges to be levied under the MTOA agreement until the Force Majeure event ceases and also direct the TANGEDCO not to levy OA charges for the period of Force Majeure continuation and from levying any other charges, costs whatsoever. For counter.
9	D.R.P.No.48 of 2014	Super Sales India Ltd., Versus TANGEDCO	Adv.Arun Anbumani Adv.M.Gopinathan	To set aside the 3 rd respondent letter dated 11-2-2014 and demand of Rs.15.28 lakhs. For arguments.
10	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.M.Gopinathan	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.
11	D.R.P.No.11 of 2016	Orchid Pharma Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO 2) SE, Tirunelveli EDC 3) SE, Chengalpattu EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Quash the 1 st respondent demand notice and consequently direct the 2 nd respondent to give adjustment for the unutilized banked energy or encashment of Rs.23.93/- lakhs. For arguments.
12	D.R.P.No.1 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to pay the interest of Rs.1.44 crores. For arguments.
13	D.R.P.No.2 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.2.52 crores towards 2% of line loss. For arguments.

14	D.R.P.No.4 of 2019	Rajshree Sugars & Chemicals Ltd., Versus 1) TANGEDCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondent to release the payment of Rs.15.19 lakhs towards 2% of line loss. For arguments.
15	T.A.No.1 of 2019 (Transferred by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.Nos.11133 to 11139 of 2018 & W.A.Nos.3254, 3255 & 3163 of 2019 and connected M.Ps)	i) M/s.Venkateswara Cotton Yarn Mills Salem Pvt. Ltd. ii) M/s.Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Assn. iii) M/s.Eswar Rubber Products Pvt. Limited iv) M/s.Perumal Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited v) M/s.Thangavel Fabrics Pvt. Limited (vi) M/s.Aland Spinners Pvt. Limited (vii) M/s.Balaji Rubber Industries Pvt. Ltd & Ors. Versus 1) Energy Dept. / GoTN. 2) TANGEDCO 3) TANTRANSCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji & Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Tr.Muthukumar, G.P. Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	IN THE MATTER OF directions given by Hon'ble High Court of Madras to examine the policy direction issued by Government of Tamil Nadu under section 108 of the Electricity Act, 2003 in regard to grant of open access above 1 MW and amending the regulations. For further hearing.
16	D.R.P.No.9 of 2020	M/s.Tirunelveli Solar Project Private Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CE/NCES	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	Grant the petitioner an extension of time for commissioning its 100 MW Solar Power Plant at Kollankinar & other villages, Tuticorin since there has been a change in law i.r.o. of PPA dt.28.9.2017 and consequently direct TANGEDCO not to invoke bank guarantee. For arguments of the respondent.
17	M.P.No.28 of 2021	Thiru.B.Balamurali Pollachi Versus (i) SE/Udumalpet EDC (ii) AEE/O&M, Udumalpet EDC, TANGEDCO	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To punish the Respondent, TANGEDCO under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for contravening the T.O.No.1 of 2017 dated 11.7.2017 and non-compliance of the directions issued by this Hon'ble Commission in its order dated 2.3.2021 in M.P.No.4 of 2021. For arguments.

18	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.M.Gopinathan	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.
19	D.R.P.No.18 of 2021	Amarjothi Spinning Mills Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) Director /Finance (iii) SE/Theni EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to forthwith make payment of a sum of Rs.47,83,750/- being the sum due and payable to the petitioner against delayed payments made by TANGEDCO for power supplied and such further pendent lite interest from the date of filing. For arguments.
<u>Batch cases - In the matter of adjustment of lapsed units</u>				
20	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.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan	W.P.No.15433 of 2020 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. <i>For reporting status on the payment of court fee by the petitioner and filing of counter affidavit by the respondents and filing of relevant documents.</i>
21	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.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan	W.P.No.475 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. -do-

22	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.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan	W.P.No.11480 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. -do-
23	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.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan	W.P.No.12062 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. -do-
24	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.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan	W.P.No.12083 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. -do-
25	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.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan	W.P.No.12584 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. -do-

26	T.A.No.12 of 2022	OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) Ch./TANTRANSCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO & Ors.	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.V.Anil Kumar & Adv.M.Gopinathan	W.P.No.15861 of 2021 trd. by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of adjustment of lapsed units. -do-
----	-------------------	--	--	--

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission

No.12/2022 Dated:14-02-2022

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SUPPLEMENTARY CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 15-02-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)

(After the proceedings of the Cause List-I are over)

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel / Party	Remarks
1	M.P.No.48 of 2021	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	To accord approval to float a medium term tender under FOO guidelines with the deviations proposed in the Bidding Documents in line with Pilot Scheme-II for purchase of 1500 MW RTC power for a period of 5 years appointing PTC India Limited as an Aggregator. For filing affidavit and further hearing.

(By order of the Commission)

**Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission**

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE LIST- II

Cases posted for 15-02-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)

(After the proceedings of the Cause List-I are over)

CORAM: Thiru. M. Chandrasekar, Hon'ble Chairman
Thiru.K.Venkatasamy, Hon'ble Member (Legal)

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel / Party	Remarks
1	Interlocutory Application (I.A.) filed in SR.No.50 of 2021 dt.30.3.2021	M/s.Arkey Energy (Rameswaram) Limited Versus (i)The Secretary to Govt., GoTN. (ii) CMD/TANGEDCO (iii) CE/GTS, Ramnad (iv) SE/GTS, Ramnad	Adv.Anirudh Krishnan AGP Richardson Wilson	Prayed to condone delay of 1259 days in re-presenting the petition in SR.No.94 of 2017 in the matter of payment of compensation under section 11(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. For arguments on the maintainability of the petition.
<u>Batch cases - In the matter of levy of penalty on alleged excess drawal of power</u>				
2	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.M.Gopinathan	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 hearing.
3	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.M.Gopinathan	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 hearing.

4	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.M.Gopinathan	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 hearing.
5	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.M.Gopinathan	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 hearing.
6	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.M.Gopinathan	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 hearing.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission