

No. 28/2022 dated: 04-04-2022

TAMIL NADU ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
CAUSE LIST

Cases posted for 05-04-2022 (Through Video Conferencing)

Time : 11-00 AM

Sl. No	Case No.	Name of the Parties	Counsel	Remarks
1	M.P.No.20 of 2019	TANGEDCO Versus Nupower Wind Farms Ltd.	Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj	For order
2	M.P.No.22 of 2020	CE/Commercial, TANGEDCO Versus i)Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills Assn. (TASMA) ii)Tamil Nadu Electricity Consumers' Assn. (TECA)	Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj for R-1 & R-2 M/s.PQ Welfare Consortium as Impleading petitioner	For order
3	M.P.No.1 of 2021	M/s.NLC India Limited Versus i) TANGEDCO ii) TANTRANSCO	Adv.K.Harishankar Adv.M.Gopinathan & Adv.V.Anil Kumar	For order
4	M.P.No.24 of 2021	CFC/TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	For order
5	D.R.P.No.8 of 2021	M/s.NVR Energy Pvt Limited Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) SE/Tuticorin EDC (iv) SLDC / TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	For order
6	D.R.P.No.9 of 2021	M/s.Narbheram Solar TN Pvt Limited Versus (i) CMD / TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) SE/Tuticorin EDC (iv) SLDC / TANTRANSCO	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	For order
7	M.P.No.10 of 2022	CFC/Regulatory Cell, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	For order
8	P.P.A.P.No.1 of 2022	CE/PPP, TANGEDCO	Adv.M.Gopinathan	For order

9	M.P.No.8 of 2022	M/s.Evita Constructions Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Chengalpet EDC (iii) CE/Distn./Chennai South (iv) CE/Commercial	M/s.Stephen & Stephen Advocates Associates Adv.M.Gopinathan	To invoke section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against the distribution officials for non-compliance of the order of Electricity Ombudsman and also to ensure strict compliance of the order passed by the TNEO in A.P.No.58 of 2021 dated 19.1.2022. For counter.
10	D.R.P.No.3 of 2022	M/s.OPG Power Generation Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CMD/TANGEDCO (ii) MD/TANTRANSCO	Adv.Tanya Kapoor Adv.M.Gopinathan Adv.V.Anil Kumar	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 filing counter by TANGEDCO & TANTRANSCO.
11	D.R.P.No.4 of 2022	M/s.Sulochana Cotton Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Palladam EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to give adjust of 1,28,004 units generated in the petitioner's solar power generator during the period from 01.08.2021 to 28.09.2021 against the petitioner HTSC as per the solar tariff order No.4 of 2014. For counter.
12	D.R.P.No.5 of 2022	M/s.Sulochana Cotton Spinning Mills Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Palladam EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to give adjust of 4,93,599 units generated in the petitioner's solar power generator during the period from 01.08.2021 to 28.09.2021 against the petitioner HTSC as per the solar tariff order No.4 of 2014. For counter.

13	D.R.P.No.6 of 2022	M/s.Hindustan Textiles Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) CFC/Revenue (iii) CE/IT Wing (iv) SE/Dindigul EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to give adjust of 2,41,920 units generated in the petitioner's solar power generator during the period August 2021 against the petitioner HTSC as per the solar tariff order No.4 of 2014. For counter.
14	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.
15	M.P.No.19 of 2021	M/s.R.S.Yarns and Power Pvt. Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) CFC / TANGEDCO	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	To issue a clarification, as to whether additional surcharge on wheeling charges are applicable to the OA Consumers having drawal voltage over and above 66 kV, who source electricity from the Third Party Power Generators having injecting voltage over and above 66 kV or not. For arguments.
16	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.

17	M.P.No.47 of 2021	M/s.T.R.K.Textile India Pvt. Limited Versus (i) CE/NCES, TANGEDCO (ii) SE/Palladam EDC	Adv.R.S.Pandiyaraj Adv.M.Gopinathan	Direct the respondents to revise the EWA by ordering to expunge the inconsistent portions of the EWA and to execute a fresh EWA and also to accept the invoices of the petitioner whenever raised for the encashment of the unutilised Solar Energy available at the account of the petitioner, for its 75% of the value and to effect the payment. For arguments.
18	M.P.No.42 of 2021	M/s.OPG Energy Pvt. Limited Versus i) CMD/TANGEDCO ii) AAA Plus Energy Pvt. Limited	Adv.Rahul Balaji Adv.M.Gopinathan	To exercise its regulatory powers and clarify that no wheeling charges are payable where a captive consumer is being supplied electricity through a dedicated transmission line and is situated within the same premises as the generating plant. For arguments.
19	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 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 hearing</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. <i>For hearing.</i>
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. <i>For hearing.</i>
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. <i>For hearing.</i>

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. For hearing.
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. For hearing.
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. For hearing.

(By order of the Commission)

Secretary
Tamil Nadu Electricity
Regulatory Commission